



Accreditation Policies and Procedures

Latest Amendments In Effect June 7, 2024

Implementation Notes

1. Applicability

The policies and procedures within this document have been approved for use by and with the following EPPs:

- EPPs beginning the Initial Accreditation Process (submitting a Part I application) on or after January 1, 2024; and
- EPPs scheduled to have a Reaccreditation Site Review on or after January 1, 2024, including any EPP scheduled to have a Site Review prior to January 1, 2022 and granted a Good Cause Extension or Postponement which results in the Site Review taking place after this date.

All other CAEP accreditation reviews are to be carried out in accordance with the applicable prior version of Accreditation Policy.

For purposes of Accreditation Council governance, including the election of Councilors and officers, roles of committees, and requirements for meetings, voting, and conduct (i.e., conflicts, confidentiality, consulting), and the election, duties, and conduct of other accreditation volunteers, this Accreditation Policy and Procedures replaces the following sections of prior Accreditation Policy: Section II. Accreditation Council Governance; Section VII. Accreditation Volunteers; and Section X. Administration. Any conflicts arising with the interpretation of other provisions applicable specifically to volunteers will be resolved in favor of this document.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

1. [Overview](#)
2. [Types of Accreditation](#)
3. [Recognition by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation](#)
4. [Recognition by the U.S. Secretary of Education](#)
5. [CAEP's Structure and Governance](#)
6. [Use of Policies, Procedures, and Guidance](#)
7. [Overview of CAEP's Accreditation Processes](#)
8. [Decisions by Level of Preparation: Initial and Advanced](#)

I. CAEP Standards and Materials to Support Implementation

1. [Standards in Effect](#)
[Policy I.1.01 CAEP Standards in Effect](#)
2. [Review and Revision of the Standards](#)
3. [Resources to Support Use of the Standards](#)
[Policy I.3.01 Workbooks, Criteria for the Evaluation of EPP-Created Assessments and Surveys, and Transition Plans](#)
[Policy I.3.02 Glossary](#)

II. Scope of Accreditation; General Provisions

1. [Scope of Accreditation](#)
2. [Levels of Preparation](#)
[Policy II.2.01 Levels of Preparation](#)
[Policy II.2.02 Decisions by Level](#)
3. [Scope of Review](#)
[Policy II.3.01 Scope of Review](#)
4. [Site Review Types](#)
[Policy II.4.01 Site Review Types](#)
5. [Requirements for Attainment of Accreditation: Compliance with Standards and Other Accreditation Requirements](#)
[Policy II.5.01 Compliance with Standards and Applicable Federal Regulatory Requirements](#)
[Policy II.5.02 Compliance with Other Accreditation Requirements](#)
6. [Multi-Site EPPs](#)
[Policy II.6.01 Multi-Site EPPs](#)
[Policy II.6.02 Additional Evidence Required for Auxiliary Locations](#)
7. [International Accreditation](#)
[Policy II.7.01 International Review](#)
[Policy II.7.02 Standards Used for an International Review](#)
[Policy II.7.03 International Review Teams](#)
[Policy II.7.04 Fees for an International On-Site Review](#)
8. [EPPs Providing Preparation Through Distance Education](#)
[Policy II.8.01 Distance Education](#)
9. [Timelines; Use of Semesters, Years, and Days](#)
[Policy II.9.01 Units of Time; Days, Semesters, Years](#)
10. [Fees](#)
[Policy II.10.01 Annual EPP Fees](#)
[Policy II.10.02 Additional Costs Per Accreditation Review](#)
11. [Use of the CAEP Accreditation Information Management System; File Size Limits](#)
[Policy II.11.01 Accreditation Information Management System Access and Termination](#)
[Policy II.11.02 Submission of Applications, Reports, Evidence, and Other Case Materials](#)

12. [English Language Requirement](#)
[Policy II.12.01 English Language Requirement](#)
[Policy II.12.02 Use of English Language for Public Notices and Consumer Reporting](#)
13. [Use of a Sign Language Interpreter](#)
[Policy II.13.01 Sign Language Interpretation](#)
14. [Notice](#)
[Policy II.14.01 Notice to EPP](#)
15. [Confidentiality](#)
[Policy II.15.01 Confidentiality](#)
[Policy II.15.02 Prohibition on Recording](#)
16. [Complaints](#)
[Policy II.16.01 Complaint Against a CAEP-Accredited EPP](#)
[Policy II.16.02 Complaint Against CAEP](#)
17. [Subsequent Policy Change](#)
[Policy II.17.01 Petition for Use of Subsequent Policy](#)
18. [Policy Waiver](#)
[Policy II.18.01 Waivers](#)
19. [Reconsideration](#)
[Policy II.19.01 Recommendation for Reconsideration](#)

III. [Initial Accreditation Process](#)

1. [Obtaining Applicant Status](#)
[Policy III.1.01 Eligibility](#)
[Policy III.1.02 Request for Evaluation](#)
[Policy III.1.03 Applicant Status Determination](#)
[Policy III.1.04 Interim Reporting](#)
2. [Accreditation](#)
[Policy III.2.01 Accreditation Review Request](#)
[Policy III.2.02 Selection of Program Review Option](#)
[Policy III.2.03 Self-Study Report](#)
[Policy III.2.04 Assignment of Evaluation Team](#)
[Policy III.2.05 Formative Feedback](#)
[Policy III.2.06 Self-Study Report Addendum](#)
[Policy III.2.07 Solicitation of Third-Party Comments](#)
[Policy III.2.08 Site Review](#)
[Policy III.2.09 Site Review Report](#)
[Policy III.2.10 EPP's Optional Rejoinder](#)
[Policy III.2.11 Team Lead's Optional Response](#)
[Policy III.2.12 Assignment of Accreditation Council Review Panels](#)
[Policy III.2.13 Accreditation Council Review, Decisions, and Term of Accreditation](#)
[Policy III.2.14 Adverse Action](#)
[Policy III.2.15 Voluntary Withdrawal by EPP](#)
[Policy III.2.16 REPEALED](#)
[Policy III.2.17 Restrictions on Communicating Accreditation Status; Correction of Incorrect or Misleading Information](#)
[Policy III.2.18 Timeline Modifications](#)

IV. [Renewal of Accreditation Process](#)

1. [Renewal of Accreditation](#)
[Policy IV.1.01 Accreditation Review Request](#)
[Policy IV.1.02 Selection of Program Review Option](#)
[Policy IV.1.03 Self-Study Report](#)
[Policy IV.1.04 Assignment of Evaluation Team](#)
[Policy IV.1.05 Formative Feedback](#)
[Policy IV.1.06 Self-Study Report Addendum](#)
[Policy IV.1.07 Solicitation of Third-Party Comments](#)

[Policy IV.1.08 Site Review](#)
[Policy IV.1.09 Site Review Report](#)
[Policy IV.1.10 EPP's Optional Rejoinder](#)
[Policy IV.1.11 Team Lead's Optional Response](#)
[Policy IV.1.12 Assignment of Accreditation Council Review Panels](#)
[Policy IV.1.13 Accreditation Council Review, Decisions, and Term of Accreditation](#)
[Policy IV.1.14 Adverse Action](#)
[Policy IV.1.15 Early Council Decision](#)
[Policy IV.1.16 Voluntary Withdrawal by EPP](#)
[Policy IV.1.17 REPEALED](#)
[Policy IV.1.18 Restrictions on Communicating Accreditation Status](#)

V. Continuing Accreditation

1. [Public Reporting](#)
[Policy V.1.01 Consumer Information](#)
2. [Annual Fee](#)
3. [Annual Monitoring and Reevaluation of Accredited EPPs](#)
[Policy V.3.01 Annual Accreditation Report](#)
[Policy V.3.02 Continued Compliance with Standards](#)
4. [Notice of Any Substantive Change: Approval Process](#)
[Policy V.4.01 Substantive Change](#)
5. [Good Cause Extension](#)
[Policy V.5.01 Timeline Modifications; Good Cause Extension; Term Changes](#)
[Policy V.5.02 Merger and Acquisition](#)
[Policy V.5.03 Teach-Out Plan](#)
[Policy V.5.04 Voluntary Withdrawal by an EPP](#)

VI. CAEP Volunteers

1. [Code of Conduct](#)
[Policy VI.1.01 Code of Ethics](#)
[Policy VI.1.02 Conflicts of Interest](#)
[Policy VI.1.03 Personal Agendas](#)
[Policy VI.1.04 Compensation or Gifts](#)
[Policy VI.1.05 Consulting](#)
[Policy VI.1.06 Confidentiality](#)
2. [Reviewers Eligible for Assignment to an Evaluation Team or Service as an Annual Report Reviewer](#)
[Policy VI.2.01 Qualifications](#)
[Policy VI.2.02 Election and Reelection; Term of Service](#)
[Policy VI.2.03 Training of Reviewers](#)
[Policy VI.2.04 Reviewer Roles and Responsibilities: Annual Report Reviewer; Review Team Member; Review Team Lead](#)
[Policy VI.2.05 Assignment of Reviews to an Evaluation Team](#)
[Policy VI.2.06 Removal of a Reviewer](#)
[Policy VI.2.07 Resignation](#)
3. [Review Observers](#)
[Policy VI.3.01 Observers](#)
4. [Accreditation Council Members](#)
[Policy VI.4.01 Number of Councilors](#)
[Policy VI.4.02 Public Representatives](#)
[Policy VI.4.03 Qualifications](#)
[Policy VI.4.04 Election and Reelection; Term of Service](#)
[Policy VI.4.05 Appointment, Term, and Voting Rights of Alternate Councilors](#)
[Policy VI.4.06 Training of Councilors](#)
[Policy VI.4.07 Removal of Councilors](#)
[Policy VI.4.08 Resignation](#)

VII. Accreditation Council Governance

1. Authority and Governance
 - Policy VII.1.01 Independence of Decision Making*
 - Policy VII.1.02 Charge*
 - Policy VII.1.03 Recognition and Oversight of Legacy-Accredited EPPs*
2. Composition
3. Officers
 - Policy VII.3.01 Officers*
4. Committees
 - Policy VII.4.01 Committees*
5. Council and Committee Action: Meetings; Quorum, Voting
 - Policy VII.5.01 Meetings*
 - Policy VII.5.02 Meeting Notice*
 - Policy VII.5.03 Written Action in Lieu of Meeting*
 - Policy VII.5.04 Quorum and Voting Requirements*
 - Policy VII.5.05 Restriction on the Participation of Councilors*
 - Policy VII.5.06 Observers and Guests*
6. Accreditation Decisions and Corrective Action Notices
 - Policy VII.6.01 Due Diligence*
 - Policy VII.6.02 Accreditation Decisions*
 - Policy VII.6.03 Warning Action*
 - Policy VII.6.04 Adverse Action*
7. Postponement Authority
 - Policy VII.7.01 Postponement of a Site Review*
 - Policy VII.7.02 Postponement after a Site Review*
 - Policy VII.7.03 Public Notice of Postponement*
8. Modification of Accreditation Policies
 - Policy VII.8.01 Modification of Accreditation Policies*
9. Notice of Accreditation Decisions, Warning Actions, and EPP Decisions to Withdraw or Lapse
 - Policy VII.9.01 Maintenance of Records*
 - Policy VII.9.02 Notice to EPPs, Appropriate Licensing or Authorizing Agencies, Other Accrediting Agencies, the U.S. Secretary of Education, and the Public*

HISTORY OF AMENDMENTS

Date of Adoption	Effective Date	Policies Amended or Repealed	Notes
Approved by the Council on October 26, 2020; accepted by the Board.	January 1, 2021	Entire document is new, including all policies and procedures	This document replaces all previous accreditation policies and procedures in accordance with the implementation information provided on p. 2.
Approved by the Council in April 2021; accepted by the Board.	July 1, 2021	Part I: 2.01; 3.01 (new policy); 3.02 (new policy) Part II: 3.01; 10.02 Part III: 1.02; 1.03; 2.01; 2.05; 2.13; 2.16 (repealed – see VII.9.02); 2.17 Part IV: 1.05; 1.13; 1.16 (repealed) 1.18 Part V: 3.01; 4.01 Part VI: 1.01; 2.01; 2.04; 2.06; 4.03; 4.07 Part VII: 4.01; 6.01; 6.04; 9.02 (new policy)	
Approved by the Board on December 2, 2021	January 1, 2022	Part VI procedures and policies 4.02; 4.03; 4.03; 4.06	
Approved by the Board on June 2, 2022	July 1, 2022	Part I procedures and policies 1.01 Part II procedures and policies 3.01; 5.02; 6.01; 7.02; 8.01; 10.01 Part III procedures and policies 1.03 Part V procedures and policies 4.01	

		Part VI: 1.06 Part VII: 9.02
Approved by the Board on December 2, 2022	January 1, 2023	Part II procedures and policies 3.01; 7; 10 Part VII: 6.01
Approved by the Board on June 1, 2023	July 1, 2023	Part I procedures 2 Part II procedures and policies 3; 5.01; 7; 11; 11.01 Part III: 1.01 Part VII procedures and policies 8
Approved by the Board on June 7, 2024	June 7, 2024	Part III, Policy III.1.01 and III.1.03

INTRODUCTION

1. Overview

The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) is a non-governmental, non-profit organization committed to the effective preparation of teachers and other P-12 professional educators. Accreditation is a process by which an educational institution or program elects to submit to a review to determine whether it meets accepted standards of quality.

Through its accreditation processes, CAEP assures the quality of educator preparation and supports continuous improvement in order to strengthen P-12 student learning. Any educator preparation provider (EPP) that agrees with CAEP's aims, is committed to pursuing quality as defined by the CAEP Standards and wishes to engage in evidence-based reflection and improvement is welcome to seek accreditation through CAEP, subject to the qualifications, other policies, and procedures contained herein. Through the first part of a 2-part application process, described in Section III of this document, CAEP makes a determination of eligibility based primarily on an EPP's application. CAEP may also request and review additional information from the applicant and/or third parties in order to reach its determination. Compliance with the eligibility criteria must be maintained throughout the accreditation evaluation process and any subsequent term of accreditation.

CAEP stands on a strong foundation and rich history of accreditation in teacher and educator preparation. CAEP seeks to increase the value of accreditation and to increase participation, building on the decades of institutional knowledge of education's previous accreditors.

2. Types of Accreditation

CAEP offers 3 types of accreditation for EPPs:

- **Specialty Area Accreditation:** Within the United States, CAEP offers specialty area accreditation for EPPs that operate within the administration to a college, university, or other institution of higher education which is accredited by a national institutional accrediting body.
- **Specialty Area Accreditation for Freestanding EPPs:** Within the United States, CAEP offers specialty area accreditation for independent/freestanding EPPs not operating within the administration of a college, university, or other institution of higher education. Any such EPP may itself meet one of the federal definitions of institutions provided in 34 CFR 600.3, such as an institution of higher education (§ 600.4), a proprietary institution (§ 600.5), or a postsecondary vocational institution (§ 600.6). Subject to CAEP's recognition by the U.S. Department of Education, only freestanding EPPs may use accreditation by CAEP to establish eligibility to participate in federal Title IV programs. Any such EPPs must meet CAEP's eligibility requirements and all applicable CAEP Standards (Initial-Licensure and/or Advanced Level) and comply with additional accreditation requirements as indicated throughout this document and as may be required by the U.S. Department of Education.
- **International Accreditation:** Outside the United States, CAEP offers specialty area accreditation to EPPs that meet CAEP's eligibility requirements and all applicable CAEP Standards (Initial-Licensure and/or Advanced Level), along with additional accreditation requirements as indicated throughout this document.

3. Recognition by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation

CAEP was recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) in September 2014 and has maintained recognition through regular reviews. Recognition by CHEA affirms that CAEP's Standards and processes are consistent with the academic quality, improvement, and accountability expectations that CHEA has established, including that the majority of institutions or programs CAEP accredits are degree-granting. CHEA recognition extends only to accreditation activities that are at the associate degree level or higher. CHEA is the only national organization focused exclusively on higher education accreditation.

4. Recognition by the U.S. Secretary of Education

CAEP's Board and Accreditation Council are interested in seeking recognition by the U.S. Secretary of Education, and will continue to evaluate and explore, as appropriate, the need of any CAEP-accredited EPP for CAEP to obtain such recognition as a condition of the EPP's participation in a federal program. Recognition verifies that an accreditor is a reliable authority as to the quality of education in the field and that it complies with the Department's criteria for recognition, which are the requirements stated in federal regulations 34 CFR Part 602 –The Secretary's Recognition of Accrediting Agencies.

5. CAEP's Structure and Governance

CAEP is a non-profit corporation organized under the laws and regulations of the District of Columbia. CAEP's activities are overseen by 3 bodies, all of which rely on CAEP staff for day-to-day administration of the organization:

- **Board of Directors**

The Board is the governing body of the corporation, not an accreditation decision-making body. The Board elects the Accreditation Council Chair from among Directors.

- **Accreditation Council**

The Council, the primary accreditation decision-making body, is charged with making accreditation decisions; it also is responsible for policymaking regarding accreditation and reaccreditation activities, as well as oversight of the volunteers that conduct Site Reviews and review Annual Reports. Additional information about the governance and administration of the Accreditation Council is included in Section VII.

- **Ad-Hoc Appeal Panel**

An Ad-Hoc Appeal Panel may be assembled to serve as a decision-making body, acting independent of the Accreditation Council, following any Council decision to deny or revoke accreditation.

The duties and responsibilities of each body are established in the CAEP Bylaws. Each body develops, adopts, and implements its own policies in accordance with applicable public comment, voting, and notice requirements. All amendments to Accreditation Policy and Ad-Hoc Appeal Panel Policy are subject to Board review and acceptance indicating consistency with the vision and scope of CAEP accreditation, as well as feasibility, fiscal impacts, and alignment with strategic and operational priorities of the Board.

CAEP's work is also supported by hundreds of volunteers who serve as evaluation team members, annual report reviewers, and Councilors serving on the Accreditation Council. Additional information about the selection/election and duties of volunteers is included in

Section VI. Every individual tasked with carrying out any portion of a CAEP accreditation process must comply with the Code of Conduct in Section VI.1 and meet training requirements as described in this document. To ensure volunteers have current information about CAEP Standards and policies, new volunteers are trained and existing volunteers are retrained if they are selected or elected in roles supporting the accreditation process. CAEP staff are required to comply with internal policies and procedures, including those regarding training, conflicts of interest, and confidentiality.

6. Use of Policies, Procedures, and Guidance

Throughout this document, all policies are clearly labeled as such and assigned a policy number which corresponds to the relevant Part and Section. Policies establish requirements and are, unless otherwise noted, intended to be implemented with fidelity by and on behalf of all EPPs, to support the consistent application of the CAEP Standards, and to enable a transparent and fair process. Procedural information is included, as appropriate, to provide additional information on the steps and/or means employed. CAEP may issue bulletins explaining the intent and impact of policy amendments, including any information regarding implementation timelines. CAEP also publishes guidance documents – including, but not limited to, handbook(s) and assessment frameworks.

If any provision of this document or CAEP's interpretation thereof conflicts with any provision of the Bylaws, the relevant provision of the Bylaws will be deemed to prevail. If any provision of this document or CAEP's interpretation thereof conflicts with any provision of the Ad-Hoc Appeal Panel Policy, the Ad-Hoc Appeal Panel Policy provision will prevail only to the extent it is used in the context of an independent review of an Adverse Action decision of the Accreditation Council. In no case shall any CAEP guidance document, including handbooks, supersede any provision of this document.

7. Overview of CAEP's Accreditation Processes

The Initial Accreditation process and Renewal of Accreditation process are CAEP's primary mechanisms for evaluating an EPP's compliance with all applicable Standards (Initial-Licensure and/or Advanced-Level) before the Accreditation Council reaches a decision to accredit or reaccredit the EPP. These processes, described below, are used to evaluate whether an EPP:

- Maintains clearly specified objectives regarding the achievement of its candidates, that are consistent with its mission and appropriate in light of the degrees or certificates awarded;
- Is successful in achieving its stated objectives; and
- Maintains degree and certificate requirements that at least conform to commonly accepted standards.

Both processes require an EPP to prepare, following CAEP's policies, procedures and guidance, an in-depth Self-Study Report that includes the EPP's own assessment of the educational quality offered and the EPP's continuing efforts to improve educational quality. Trained volunteers then review the EPP's self-study, provide formative feedback, and give the EPP an opportunity to submit an addendum to its self-study.

Through a Site Review of the EPP (an On-Site Review or a Virtual Site Review), an Evaluation Team obtains sufficient information to determine if the EPP complies with all applicable CAEP Standards (Initial-Licensure and/or Advanced Level) and document any deficiencies identified. Prior to a decision, the EPP is provided a copy of the Site Review Report and given an opportunity to respond in writing.

Throughout both processes, CAEP applies controls against the inconsistent application of Standards, including:

- Extensive training of all volunteers regarding the CAEP Standards, accreditation processes, policies, and procedures;
- Evaluations of volunteer performance;
- Timely resolution of questions and issues that may arise during a review, including regarding interpretations of the Standards;
- Development and use of tools such as writing guides and evidence sufficiency guidelines; and
- Ongoing monitoring of the extent to which the stated mission of EPPs is respected in the application of the CAEP Standards.

EPPs are encouraged to share any concerns or questions with CAEP at any time. CAEP staff will review and follow-up on any such information at least annually during the Annual Report review process, or immediately if more timely action is justified.

8. Decisions by Level of Preparation: Initial and Advanced

CAEP Accreditation differentiates between levels of educator preparation:

- (1) Initial-Licensure Preparation; and
- (2) Advanced-Level Preparation.

Pursuant to CAEP's Scope of Accreditation, an EPP will engage in a review of its Initial-Licensure Preparation, Advanced-Level Preparation, or both. Within a level of preparation, all programs within scope are included in a review. A separate accreditation decision or reaccreditation decision will be made for each level of preparation subject to review.

I. CAEP STANDARDS AND MATERIALS TO SUPPORT IMPLEMENTATION

1. *Standards in Effect*

The CAEP Standards are developed and adopted by the Board and reflect the professional judgment and consensus of a wide cross-section of the field of educator preparation that the expectations established therein are sufficiently rigorous to ensure that CAEP is a reliable authority regarding the quality of the education and training provided by the EPPs it accredits.

A CAEP-accredited EPP must demonstrate, among other things, how it is pursuing its mission and accomplishing its educational objectives while adhering to the Standards; and, that the EPP's educator staff engage in a culture of evidence to support continuous improvement that will maintain and enhance the quality of the professional programs offered.

Policy I.1.01 CAEP Standards in Effect

The CAEP Standards for Initial-Licensure Preparation and Standards for Advanced-Level Preparation, adopted by the Board of Directors, are referred to collectively as the CAEP Standards or Standards.

All Accreditation Council decisions are based on the Standards and components identified as applicable (by level of preparation – Initial-Licensure and/or Advanced-Level), and in effect at the time an eligible EPP submits a Request for Evaluation or Accreditation Review Request. Official versions of the Standards are maintained on the CAEP website. Public comment on the Standards may be provided to CAEP at any time.

2. *Review and Revision of the Standards*

The CAEP Board maintains a systematic program of review to establish that the Standards are adequate to evaluate the quality of educator preparation provided by EPPs and the relevance of their preparation to the needs of students. Bylaws and Governance Policy require the CAEP President to lead a standards revision process and recommend revised standards for adoption by the Board not less than once every 7 years. This review includes an examination of the standards' intellectual underpinnings, logic, and related policies.

The Research Committee of the Board, composed of Directors, researchers, and others selected by the President, is charged with carrying out a systematic program of review that examines whether and how the CAEP Standards, individually and as a whole, are: (1) adequate to evaluate the quality of educator preparation provided by the EPPs that CAEP accredits; (2) relevant to the educational or training needs of students (candidates and completers) EPPs enroll; and (3) are informed by the available evidence.

The Committee reviews the Standards on an ongoing basis in accordance with regulations of the U.S. Department of Education and sound accreditation practice. If the Committee determines that revisions are needed, the chair of the Research Committee or the Board Liaison will inform the President of CAEP at least 4 weeks prior to the next regular meeting of the Board and commence a revision process no later than 9 months following the meeting.

The Committee proposes revisions, if necessary, so that the Standards effectively and adequately assess the quality of EPPs including, but not limited to, quality in all areas identified in regulations of the U.S. Department of Education. The Committee identifies specific CAEP Standards, components, or aspects of either, for review and possible revision. Selection of areas for focus is based on information gathered from CAEP's reviews of EPPs, reports from the Accreditation Council, the annual report from the President to the Board on the state of EPP

quality and accreditation, and additional perspectives gathered through scholarly work and constituent engagement. The Committee updates research identified as relevant to the CAEP Standards and reviews CAEP's internal research efforts to continually review and improve the efficacy and validity of the Standards.

Accreditation Councilors, through the adoption of a resolution by the full Accreditation Council, or individually, may recommend revisions for the Research Committee to consider. At the beginning of any comprehensive review process, the President will report to the Board on the specific Research Committee charge, timeline, and process to the Council, along with information on the opportunity for Council input. Whether taking action as a body, or individually, Councilors are responsible for referring proposed amendments to the Research Committee in accordance with a timeline established by CAEP staff.

CAEP will seek input from as wide a spectrum of the profession as possible, including member and non-member EPPs. CAEP will also provide public notice of proposed changes and allow not less than 30 days for public comment by interested parties prior to adoption. A call for public comments should, among other things, seek input or concerns on the extent to which current and proposed standards: (1) support the autonomy of an EPP in determining academic quality as it relates to the mission of the EPP; and (2) support an EPP's implementation of innovative practices.

After considering all input, the Board will vote to adopt or to not adopt the recommended revisions. Any such action will be reported to the Accreditation Council, member EPPs, state and other governmental partners, and the public. CAEP will publish substantive revisions within 30 days of adoption.

3. Resources to Support Use of the Standards

📖 Policy I.3.01 Workbooks, Criteria for the Evaluation of EPP-Created Assessments and Surveys, and Transition Plans

CAEP staff, with input from the Accreditation Council, member EPP representatives, and others, publish and disseminate guidance and related resources on the CAEP Standards, other accreditation requirements, and processes, for use by EPPs and CAEP volunteers. These resources include workbooks which, among other things, explicate the Standards and may also include criteria for the evaluation of EPP-created assessments and surveys, as well as information on the extent to which an EPP will be allowed to demonstrate compliance with a Standard or Component through the submission of a qualifying transition plan and limited data.

Any provisions made for the allowance of a transition plan shall only extend to the Standards and components identified in the Workbook in use for an EPP's current review cycle and only within the established timeframe.

📖 Policy I.3.02 Glossary

CAEP maintains a Glossary of key terms (<http://caepnet.org/glossary>) used throughout the accreditation processes described in this document and the appeals process.

II. SCOPE OF ACCREDITATION; GENERAL PROVISIONS

Pursuant to Governance Policy, and as approved by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA):

CAEP's SCOPE OF ACCREDITATION is the accreditation of educator preparation providers (EPPs) that offer bachelor's, master's, and/or doctoral degrees, post-baccalaureate or other programs leading to certification, licensure, or endorsement in the United States and/or internationally.

An EPP is the entity responsible for the preparation of educators which may be a nonprofit or for-profit institution of higher education, a school district, an organization, a corporation, or a governmental agency.

2. Levels of Preparation

Within its Scope of Accreditation, CAEP distinguishes between two levels of educator preparation, as described below.

Policy II.2.01 Levels of Preparation

In carrying out its Initial Accreditation and Renewal of Accreditation processes, as described in this document and supporting materials, CAEP distinguishes between two levels of educator preparation:

(a.) **Initial-Licensure Preparation**

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.

(b.) **Advanced-Level Preparation**

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.

A separate accreditation or reaccreditation decision will be made for each level of preparation subject to review.

Policy II.2.02 Decisions by Level

CAEP reviews evidence derived from educator preparation provided at the initial-licensure level and advanced-level for sufficiency in relation to all applicable CAEP Standards (Initial-Licensure and/or Advanced-Level).

An EPP will receive a separate accreditation or reaccreditation decision for each level of preparation that is required to be reviewed in accordance with CAEP's Scope of Accreditation.

(a.) **Single-Level EPP**

An EPP providing educator preparation only at the initial-licensure level or advanced-level will receive an accreditation or reaccreditation decision for only the preparation level subject to review.

(b.) Dual-Level EPP

An EPP providing educator preparation at both the initial-licensure and advanced-level must submit a single Self-Study Report and then engage in a Site Review encompassing both levels. Although the EPP will submit a single Self-Study Report addressing preparation at both levels and evidence in support of both the Standards for Initial-Licensure and Standards for Advanced-Level Preparation, the Accreditation Council will render a separate accreditation decision for each level of preparation reviewed.

3. Scope of Review

Each CAEP review has a defined scope of review determined by the levels of preparation provided within CAEP's Scope of Accreditation.

Policy II.3.01 Scope of Review

Pursuant to CAEP's Scope of Accreditation, unless provided otherwise in policy or subject to the exceptions set-out below, for any CAEP review an EPP must include information and evidence on all licensure areas that prepare candidates to work in preschool through grade 12 settings at the initial and advanced level that lead to professional licensure, certification, or endorsement as defined by the state, country, or other governing authority under which the EPP operates and for which the state, country, or other governing authority has established program approval standards.

- (a.) An EPP that has secured specialty area accreditation from a specialized accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education or the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) may request to have any such accredited program exempted from review as well as from annually reporting. For any EPP operating in a state with which CAEP has entered into a state partnership agreement, no such exemption will be granted unless the EPP first obtains a letter of support from the state. An EPP granted an exemption must disclose to its candidates, faculty, the public, and others that the program(s) are not included in the EPP's accreditation by CAEP.
- (b.) No CAEP review carried out pursuant to this document is required to consider any advanced-level program not specific to the preparation of teachers or other school professionals for P-12 schools/districts; any advanced-level non-licensure programs, including those specific to content areas (e.g., M.A., M.S., Ph.D.); or educational leadership programs not specific to the preparation of teachers or other school professionals for P-12 schools/districts.

In communicating with candidates (students of the EPP), faculty, other stakeholders, and the public about its accreditation status and term, an EPP is required to distinguish accurately between programs that are accredited, as a result of having been included in the scope of review, and those that are not. All programs included within a CAEP review will be identified in information CAEP makes available to the public through its website (www.caepnet.org).

With regard to any CAEP review, or at any point during a period of Continuing Accreditation, an EPP is encouraged to share any concerns or questions that may arise regarding the extent to which CAEP standards, policies and procedures: (1) support the autonomy of an EPP in determining academic quality as it relates to the mission of the EPP; and (2) support an EPP's implementation of innovative practices.

If an EPP in Continuing Accreditation status following a CAEP accreditation or reaccreditation decision on just one level of preparation (Initial-Licensure or Advanced-Level) begins administering preparation at the second level (within CAEP's scope) during the existing term of accreditation, the preferred practice is for the EPP to submit both levels of preparation for

review on the timeline established for Renewal of Accreditation and using the Renewal of Accreditation process. (See Section IV)

4. Site Review Types

Site Reviews are an essential component of CAEP's accreditation processes (Initial Accreditation and Renewal of Accreditation, including interim reviews required for the removal of any Stipulation and exiting Probationary Accreditation status). They may also be used in the administration of policies regarding continuing accreditation and compliance monitoring.

Policy II.4.01 Site Review Types

CAEP volunteers appointed to an Evaluation Team pursuant to Policy VI.2.02 are tasked with conducting reviews of EPPs. Any such review will include a Site Review which may be an On-Site Review or Virtual Site Review.

(a.) On-Site Review

Any review leading to a recommendation to the Accreditation Council regarding a decision to grant accreditation or reaccreditation will include an On-Site Review (also called a Site Review) during which at least one member of the assigned Evaluation Team engages in the review while on-site at the EPP's main campus and other locations as appropriate. Other Evaluation Team members may carry out assigned Site Review activities through the use of a video or web conferencing tool which allows synchronous communication among participants and visual display of documents so that the Evaluation Team can accurately assess the sufficiency of information obtained.

(b.) Virtual Site Review

A Virtual Site Review is conducted by an Evaluation Team not physically present at the EPP's main campus or auxiliary location(s). Any such team may also be referred to as a Virtual Site Review Evaluation Team. At CAEP's discretion, the full Evaluation Team may carry out its assigned Site Review activities through the use of a video or web conferencing tool which allows synchronous communication among participants and visual display of documents so that the Evaluation Team can accurately assess the sufficiency of information obtained and the EPP's opportunities for providing information and evidence are the same or substantially similar to the opportunities afforded during an On-Site Review.

Any Site Review conducted entirely by electronic means is subject to a follow-up visit by a trained Evaluator assigned to verify information obtained by the Virtual Site Review Evaluation Team. The Evaluator may, but is not required to, be a member of the Virtual Site Review Evaluation Team.

5. Requirements for Attainment of Accreditation: Compliance with Standards and Other Accreditation Requirements

Policy II.5.01 Compliance with Standards and Applicable Federal Regulatory Requirements

The Accreditation Council, relying on evidence and information provided by an EPP and gathered throughout the accreditation review process, assesses the degree to which each applicable Standard (Initial-licensure and/or Advanced-level) and applicable Federal regulatory requirements have been met. Evidence and information considered include but are not limited to evidence submitted by the EPP; third-party comments; records of student complaints received by, or available to CAEP; records

of compliance with the EPP's program responsibilities under Title IV of the Higher Education Act and other information that the U.S. Secretary of Education may provide to CAEP, if applicable; and reports prepared by Evaluation Team members and Accreditation Council panel members.

An EPP must also establish and make public its expectations for achievement of academic quality and indicators of student success. The EPP shall implement processes to determine whether candidates and completers meet the stated expectations. At least annually, the EPP shall make evidence of student success public, in aggregate form, and include such evidence in the CAEP Annual Report and any subsequent Self-Study report, as appropriate. An EPP's failure to adhere to any annual reporting requirement, in full and within a timeline established by CAEP, will be determined non-compliant with CAEP policies and subject to Accreditation Council action which may be a Warning Action or, in the event of continued noncompliance, Adverse Action.

The Council evaluates compliance with each Standard based on the preponderance of evidence provided. In addition to determining whether each applicable Standard has been met, the Accreditation Council may cite Areas for Improvement (AFIs) and Stipulations. AFIs and Stipulations may be identified for any component of any Standard.

(a.) Areas for Improvement (AFIs)

AFIs indicate minor to moderate deficiencies in meeting a Standard or component which must be improved by the time of the next accreditation review. Evidence of improvement must be provided in an Annual Report.

(b.) Stipulations

Stipulations describe serious deficiencies in meeting a Standard or component and must be brought into compliance within a timeline identified by the Accreditation Council in order for the EPP to remain in Continuing Accreditation status. Evidence of improvement must be provided in an Annual Report.

Any recommendation made throughout a CAEP review process that suggests changes or improvement not specified as an AFI or Stipulation is not required to be addressed by the EPP.

📖 Policy II.5.02 Compliance with Other Accreditation Requirements

The Accreditation Council, relying on evidence and information provided by an EPP, and gathered throughout the accreditation review process, determines whether the EPP has demonstrated compliance with the requirements of this policy. These requirements are only applicable to an EPP that is seeking accreditation or reaccreditation through Specialty Accreditation for Freestanding EPPs and such accreditation enables the EPP to obtain eligibility to participate in Title IV, HEA programs.

Evidence and information considered include but are not limited to evidence submitted by the EPP; third-party comments; records of student complaints received by, or available to CAEP; records of compliance with the EPP's program responsibilities under Title IV of the Higher Education Act and other information that the U.S. Secretary of Education may provide to CAEP, if applicable; and reports prepared by Evaluation Team members and Accreditation Council panel members.

(a.) Distance Education Policies or Procedures

An EPP that offers distance education must have processes in place, and describe them in the Self-Study Report, through which the EPP establishes that any student who registers in a distance education course or program is the same student who participates in and completes the course or program and receives the academic credit. The EPP's processes must ensure that the EPP:

- (i.) Verifies the identity of a candidate (student of the EPP) who participates in class or coursework by using, at the option of the EPP, one or more methods such as -- a secure

login and pass code; proctored examinations; and new or other technologies and practices that are effective in verifying student identity; and

- (ii.) Makes clear in writing that the EPP uses processes that protect candidate privacy and notifies candidates of any projected additional candidate charges associated with verification of candidate identity at the time of registration or enrollment.

(b.) Transfer of Credit Policies

The EPP must provide a description of its transfer of credit policies that demonstrates that the policies:

- (i.) Are publicly disclosed;
- (ii.) Include a statement of the criteria established by the EPP regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education;
- (iii.) Include information on any types of institutions or sources from which the EPP will not accept credits;
- (iv.) List the institutions with which the EPP has established an articulation agreement; and
- (v.) State the written criteria used to evaluate and award credit for prior learning experience including, but not limited to, service in the armed forces, paid or unpaid employment, or other demonstrated competency or learning.

6. Multi-Site EPPs

CAEP accredits individual EPPs, some of which operate at multiple sites. In doing so, CAEP distinguishes between sites based on the instructional and/or administrative functions provided at the location. A location may be a Main Campus, Administrative Headquarters, Branch, or Auxiliary Location. Only a Main Campus or a Branch may receive CAEP accreditation. Although their standards-related practices will be included in the CAEP review, Administrative Headquarters and Auxiliary Locations are not separately accredited.

Any EPP providing courses largely or exclusively through distance education -- engaging candidates in coursework on-line, whether synchronous, asynchronous, or a combination thereof -- must disclose this to CAEP during its initial application and may be subject to additional disclosure and data reporting requirements, as well as modification to policies and procedures. See Section II.8, below, for additional distance education requirements.

Policy II.6.01 Multi-Site EPPs

(a.) Main Campus

A multi-site EPP's Main Campus is a site from which the EPP:

- (i.) Delivers educator preparation within CAEP's Scope of Accreditation; however, delivery may be through one or more auxiliary sites that are not a Branch Campus; and
- (ii.) Provides centralized administrative, executive, or management oversight for certain functions of the multi-site organization.

In cases where administrative functions are distributed to more than 1 site of the multi-site EPP, and the EPP does not specify a Main Campus, CAEP will designate 1 site as the Main Campus. If all such administrative functions are performed at a site that does not deliver educator preparation, CAEP will designate that site as the Administrative Headquarters for the Main Campus or Branch Campus, as appropriate.

After achieving Accreditation, an EPP must give CAEP notice of its plans to establish a new Branch Campus or Auxiliary Location, as described below and in accordance with Policy V.4.01.

(b.) Branch Campus

Any facility that is geographically apart from the EPP's Main Campus and at which the EPP offers at least 50 percent of a program is considered an additional campus. If an additional campus is not a Branch Campus, it is considered by CAEP to be an Auxiliary Location, as described in paragraph (c).

An additional campus is considered a Branch Campus if it is both geographically apart from and independent of the Main Campus. CAEP considers a site to be independent of the Main Campus if it:

- (i.) Is permanent in nature;
- (ii.) Offers courses in educational programs leading to a degree, certificate, or other recognized educational credential;
- (iii.) Has its own faculty and administrative or supervisory organization; and
- (iv.) Has its own budgetary and hiring authority.

If education preparation within CAEP's Scope of Accreditation is provided at a Branch Campus, the Branch Campus is considered to be an EPP (separate from the Main Campus for purposes of CAEP accreditation). Any such EPP will submit its own Request(s), host its own Review(s), and receive its own accreditation decisions. Once accredited, the EPP must follow the requirements for Continuing Accreditation, including submitting an Annual Report, remitting an annual fee, responding to all other applicable accreditation reporting requirements, and applying for Renewal of Accreditation.

(c.) Auxiliary Location

An Auxiliary Location undergoes review as part of the Main Campus or Branch Campus with which it is associated and is included within any accreditation decision for the campus with which it is associated.

(d.) Application, Review and Decision

A separate Initial Application or Renewal of Accreditation request must be submitted for a Main Campus and each Branch Campus applying for accreditation. An application must identify the applicant site's Administrative Headquarters and Auxiliary Locations, if any, but the Administrative Headquarters and Auxiliary Locations do not submit separate applications.

CAEP and the Accreditation Council will consider the Main Campus and each Branch Campus of a multi-site EPP separately in making accreditation decisions. Once accredited, the Main Campus and each Branch Campus must follow the requirements for maintaining accredited status, including submitting an Annual Report and annual fees, responding to accreditation reporting requirements, and applying for reaccreditation.

During a review, the Administrative Headquarters or the Main Campus will receive the first Site Review, followed by visits to each additional site. To provide consistency, CAEP will make every effort to identify Reviewers who are able to visit more than one site, including the Administrative Headquarters or Main Campus. Evidence and data in the Self-Study Report may be presented in the aggregate with respect to specialty areas of study; however, evidence and data must be reported by Auxiliary Location if any such location administers a program that is not under direct supervision of the Main Campus.

Policy II.6.02 Additional Evidence Required for Auxiliary Locations

An EPP, whether considered a Main Campus or Branch Campus in accordance with Policy II.6.01, must provide evidence in any Self-Study Report that the EPP meets the following conditions for each Auxiliary Location at which preparation within CAEP's Scope of Accreditation is provided:

- (a.) Requirements for delivery as set forth by the institutional accreditor(s) are met, if the EPP is seeking specialty area accreditation from CAEP;
- (b.) The state, country, or other governing authority under which the EPP operates has approved any program delivered via distance education, if the state/country requires such authorization and approval;
- (c.) Certification/licensure opportunities within and across states/countries are disclosed to candidates; and
- (d.) The EPP's quality assurance system ensures that data are sufficient to demonstrate quality throughout the EPP.

7. International Accreditation

Prior to commencing accreditation activities in another country, CAEP will notify the appropriate international authorities of its intent to do so and seek guidance regarding CAEP's current and proposed activities.

An EPP having its Main Campus outside of the United States, or any EPP that is a Branch Campus operating outside of the United States, is subject to the same CAEP Standards, policies, and requirements as EPPs within the United States, except that:

- CAEP may waive any Standards, policies, and requirements applicable only to EPPs relying on CAEP accreditation to access federal programs authorized by Title IV of the Higher Education Act;
- An international EPP's evidence for Standard 6. Fiscal and Administrative Capacity, must include a statement of assurance from the EPP's international governing or quality assurance body that 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 standards used within the country or territory in which the EPP operates; and
- CAEP eligibility and continuing accreditation status may be impacted by any US sanctions or embargoes. Any required in-person travel may be impacted by U. S. Department of State and/or U.S. Center for Disease Control travel advisories.

All such EPPs also must complete the 2-part CAEP application process, beginning with a Request for Evaluation, as described in this document. For any non-U.S. EPP in a country in which information on the legal authority of the EPP to award degrees is not available, the applicant EPP must provide evidence that it has standing and significant support in the local community or other communities of interest, such as well-known professional organizations and other respected entities that support the EPP.

Following receipt by CAEP of a Request for Evaluation or Accreditation Review Request from an international EPP, CAEP staff will contact the EPP and relevant in-country quality assurance or governing bodies to identify any special or unique circumstances to be taken into consideration including, but not limited to, differences and variations in accreditation activities in the country and any relevant local factors.

Policy II.7.01 International Review

A CAEP review of an EPP located outside of the United States is conducted using the accreditation processes established for reviews taking place within the United States. CAEP will ensure that international reviews reflect best practice in the field of accreditation in keeping with the CAEP Standards, while taking any cultural and unique circumstances into account. In addition:

- (a.) In cases where an international EPP cannot comply with one or more of the 7 capacity elements as stated by the U.S. Department of Education, the EPP shall provide a justification for why evidence cannot be submitted during Part 2 of the application to indicate the readiness of the EPP for CAEP Accreditation. CAEP staff shall determine whether supplemental information must be submitted in lieu of the missing capacity element(s).
- (b.) At the time of application to CAEP, the international EPP must identify the government authority to which it reports, providing complete contact information for that agency. Any governmental partnership agreements must be clearly described. In addition, the EPP must provide written authorization from the designated government authority for its submission of an application and pursuit of CAEP accreditation.
- (c.) The EPP must define the term(s) used in its country for educator credentialing and the grades/levels/childhood and youth designations covered.

Policy II.7.02 Standards Used for an International Review

An international EPP must respond to all applicable CAEP Standards. If an international EPP identifies any Standard or component that it believes does not apply due to its particular setting or governmental context, CAEP staff, in consultation with the EPP, may provide the EPP with written approval in the form of a waiver to omit or modify one or more Standard or component from its Self-Study Report.

Policy II.7.03 International Review Teams

Policies and procedures regarding an On-Site Review and Virtual Site Review conducted within the United States apply to reviews conducted outside of the United States, except:

- (a.) The composition of the Evaluation Team and the Program Review Options available to the EPP, pursuant to Policy III.2.02, may be adjusted to conform to the provisions of a partnership agreement entered into between CAEP and the country or other governing authority under which the EPP operates; and
- (b.) At CAEP's discretion, Evaluation Team Members may, depending on distance traveled, be provided with a rest period of not more than 24-hours after arrival on-site before beginning an On-Site Review.

Policy II.7.04 Fees for an International On-Site Review

Per CAEP's published fee structure, international EPPs pay a base rate plus direct expenses for the On-Site Review. CAEP staff will review the expected costs with the international site.

8. EPPs Providing Preparation Through Distance Education

CAEP accredits EPPs that provide educator preparation within CAEP's Scope of Accreditation through distance education. Subject to the following, any such EPP may provide all or any portion of its preparation through distance education.

Policy II.8.01 Distance Education

In accordance with federal regulations, an EPP is engaged in distance education if it uses one or more of the technologies listed in paragraphs (a.) through (d.) below to deliver instruction to candidates (students of the EPP) who are separated from the instructor and to support regular and substantive interaction between the candidates and the instructor, either synchronously or asynchronously. The technologies may include—

- (a.) The internet;
- (b.) One-way and two-way transmissions through open broadcast, closed circuit, cable, microwave, broadband lines, fiber optics, satellite, or wireless communications devices;
- (c.) Audio conferencing; or
- (d.) Video cassettes, DVDs, and CD-ROMs, if the cassettes, DVDs, or CD-ROMs are used in a course in conjunction with any of the technologies listed in paragraphs (a.) through (c.) of this definition.

Any EPP engaged in Distance Education must meet the same Standards that other EPPs are required to meet for CAEP accreditation; however, CAEP staff and Evaluation Team Members may request additional or clarifying information or data as needed to address the quality of the EPP's distance education. Pursuant to Policy II.5.02, the EPP must also have processes in place through which it establishes that the candidate who registers in a distance education course or program is the same candidate who participates in and completes the course or program and receives the academic credit.

CAEP accreditation does not extend to preparation provided through correspondence education. As defined in federal regulations (34 CFR Part 600.2), a correspondence course is a course provided by an institution under which the institution provides instructional materials, by mail or electronic transmission, including examinations on the materials, to students who are separated from the instructor. Interaction between the instructor and student is limited, is not regular and substantive, and is primarily initiated by the student.

9. Timelines; Use of Semesters, Years, and Days

CAEP has established timelines for many elements of the Initial Accreditation and Renewal of Accreditation processes. These timelines are tied to days (calendar days, not business days), semesters, and years.

Policy II.9.01 Units of Time; Days, Semesters, Years

The units of time specified in this Accreditation Policy and Procedures document, as well as in guidance, Accreditation decision letters, Action Reports, public disclosures, and other Accreditation-related communication are defined as follows:

(a.) Days

When a specific number of days is provided in any policy, days means calendar days which are all days in a month, including weekends and holidays. A calendar day is a 24-hour period from midnight Eastern Standard Time (EST) or Eastern Daylight Time (EDT) on a given day to midnight on the next day.

(b.) Months

When reference is made to any number of months, a month means a period starting on one day in a calendar month and ending on the numerically corresponding day in the next calendar month.

(c.) **Semesters**

Semesters mean as follows:

- (i.) Spring Semester: January 1 – June 30
- (ii.) Fall Semester: July 1 – December 31

(d.) **Years**

When a specific number of years is provided in any policy, year(s) means a 365-day period beginning at midnight Eastern Standard Time (EST) or Eastern Daylight Time (EDT), as applicable, on a given date and continuing through midnight on the previous date during the subsequent year.

10. Fees

Policy II.10.01 Annual EPP Fees

An EPP seeking accreditation, or reaccreditation, must pay annual fees which allow CAEP to carry out its mission, provide necessary activities and services, recover costs of doing business, and ensure CAEP's financial stability. Payment of fees establishes an EPP's annual membership in CAEP, as described in Bylaws; however, CAEP is not a member-governed corporation.

All EPP fees, which may be different for Initial Accreditation and Renewal of Accreditation, are reviewed annually by the Board, may be revised as necessary, and if revised become effective on the first day of July following adoption. The current EPP annual fee schedule, along with other information on accreditation costs is available at

<http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/accreditation/accred-costs-annual-epp-fees.pdf?la=en>.

CAEP will invoice EPPs an annual fee in an amount set by the Board of Directors or in accordance with a Board-approved formula. An EPP must pay its assessed fee no later than 30 days from the date on which CAEP's invoice is received. Failure to remit payment by the due date will result in application of a late fee and will be considered cause for an Accreditation Council decision to revoke Accreditation.

Policy II.10.02 Additional Costs Per Accreditation Review

In addition to annual fees, an EPP will be assessed costs for each accreditation review in accordance with a schedule approved by the CAEP Board of Directors, available at [accred-costs-epp-site-visit-fees.pdf \(caepnet.org\)](#).

An EPP preparing for an accreditation review is encouraged to send at least one representative to an accreditation workshop or conference. Such participation requires payment of a fee for each participant at the time of registration.

Pursuant to CAEP's corrective action policies, if an EPP does not remit fees on time, CAEP will send the EPP notice of the delinquency and CAEP's intent to refer the EPP to the EPP Transparency, Accountability and Improvement Committee of the Accreditation Council for consideration of Adverse Action. Through a Warning Action, an EPP will be given a specified timeframe in which it must come into compliance before any Adverse Action is taken by the Council. In addition to or in lieu of Adverse Action for nonpayment of fees, the Accreditation Council may postpone panel consideration and Council decision-making following an accreditation review until all outstanding fees have been paid.

11. Use of the CAEP Accreditation Information Management System; File Size Limits

Policy II.11.01 Accreditation Information Management System Access and Termination

An EPP that has remitted its annual fee on time is provided access to CAEP’s electronic accreditation platform, use of which is required for participation in any CAEP accreditation process.

Any representative of an EPP needing access to the platform must agree to any terms and conditions of platform access as may be established by CAEP, including confidentiality requirements which may extend beyond the confidentiality provisions of this document. Any failure to comply with the terms and conditions for system use will be grounds for termination of access.

Accreditation Information Management System access is terminated as follows:

- (a.) for all of the EPP’s designated system users immediately upon withdrawal or lapse of Accreditation and 30 days after a final decision to revoke or deny Accreditation; and
- (b.) for any CAEP volunteer, including an Accreditation Councilor or Ad Hoc Appeal Panel member, immediately upon resignation or removal.

CAEP maintains Accreditation Records, including records created in or uploaded to the Accreditation Information Management System, in accordance with a document retention schedule set out in Governance Policy. Accreditation Records include but are not limited to certain documents created by CAEP staff and volunteers, state personnel, and CAEP’s member EPPs as needed to carry out CAEP’s accreditation functions. Except as may be expressly permitted pursuant to an agreement entered into between CAEP and a SPA or EPP approval body of a state or other governing body, no information or records accessed through AIMS may be used for any purpose other than the conduct of a CAEP accreditation review, decision-making process, compliance monitoring, or by CAEP in carrying out its administration of any CAEP activity.

Policy II.11.02 Submission of Applications, Reports, Evidence, and Other Case Materials

An EPP must use CAEP’s electronic accreditation platform for the submission of any application or request for evaluation, report, evidence, or other materials that are required to be provided to CAEP or intended for consideration as part of an accreditation review. Evidence must be labeled or tagged in accordance with any guidelines established by CAEP.

In submitting any document or information using CAEP’s electronic accreditation platform, an EPP must adhere to any file size or character limitations established by CAEP.

Any questions regarding access to or use of CAEP’s electronic accreditation platform should be raised with CAEP in a timely manner.

12. English Language Requirement

All CAEP accreditation reviews and activities of the Accreditation Council and Ad-Hoc Appeal Panels are conducted in English.

Policy II.12.01 English Language Requirement

All EPP applications, reports, petitions, and supporting documentation, including all evidence submitted for review, are required to be provided in English.

All review-related activities, including all calls, videoconferences, and On-Site Review activities will be conducted with English as the language of interaction. At the discretion of the EPP or the Evaluation Team Lead, CAEP may request that the EPP provide for 1 or more English language

translators to assist with an On-Site Review. In any such instance, the EPP is responsible for ensuring that translation is provided, and that the translator(s) have sufficient familiarity with educator preparation and can provide a full and appropriate representation of the EPP's quality and evidence thereof in English.

In making any public or consumer report or disclosure required by these policies and procedures, an EPP is required to provide information in English.

Policy II.12.02 Use of English Language for Public Notices and Consumer Reporting

Information required pursuant to Policy V.1.01 to be made public and for use by consumers, an EPP's public announcement of an upcoming review, and solicitation of third-party comments made pursuant to Policies III.2.07 and IV.1.07, and any other required disclosure or public notice, must be provided in English as well as in any other language that is appropriate to reach the EPP's stakeholders, particularly if the primary language of instruction is other than English.

13. Use of a Sign Language Interpreter

An EPP may utilize a sign language interpreter, subject to the limitations specified in policy, below.

Policy II.13.01 Sign Language Interpretation

An EPP may, at its discretion, provide and utilize a sign language interpreter to accurately convey messages between 2 or more different languages. The participation of a sign language interpreter will be limited to portions of the Review involving discussions between representatives of the EPP and CAEP's volunteers. Any costs associated with the use of a sign language interpreter will be borne by the EPP.

An EPP planning to utilize a sign language interpreter should notify CAEP staff and the Site Review lead in advance.

14. Notice

Pursuant to Bylaws, an EPP will receive written notice from CAEP of any proposed or pending action that would result in a change of accreditation status.

Policy II.14.01 Notice to EPP

Whenever notice is to be given to any EPP, it may be given by postal (first-class or express mail with postage prepaid), electronic means (limited to e-mail or facsimile transmission), or courier service (charges prepaid), to the EPP's address (or e-mail address or facsimile number) appearing on CAEP's records. As such, it is incumbent on an EPP to ensure that the contact information provided to CAEP is current and accurate.

CAEP will provide an EPP with written notice of an accreditation decision and any proposed or pending action that would result in a change of accreditation status including a Warning Action.

- (a.) Any Adverse Action notice or notice of any pending action which may result in Adverse Action, such as a referral to the EPP Transparency, Accountability and Improvement Committee of the Accreditation Council for failure of an EPP to pay dues, is deemed effective on receipt which may be evidenced by a signature or electronic delivery confirmation.
- (b.) Any other notice is deemed effective when sent or dispatched by CAEP.

15. Confidentiality

CAEP and EPPs must work together to protect the confidentiality of EPP information that has not been made public and is not intended for public distribution. To facilitate the approval processes of a state, country, or other governing authority, and to minimize duplication of efforts by EPPs and approval authority personnel, CAEP may provide approval authority personnel with access to the CAEP electronic accreditation platform and permission to access case materials for EPPs operating under the jurisdiction of the authority.

All CAEP volunteers are required to adhere to Policy VI.1.06 on confidentiality that is part of the Code of Conduct for volunteers.

Policy II.15.01 Confidentiality

EPP faculty, staff, and any consultants who are provided with access to CAEP's accreditation information management system must clearly mark any confidential EPP materials as such prior to uploading them into the system or sharing them with CAEP staff, Evaluation Team Members, and other volunteers.

CAEP staff and volunteers will keep confidential all EPP materials designated as confidential to the extent they have not been made public by the EPP or unless disclosure is required in accordance with state or federal law, in conjunction with or in preparation for litigation, or as provided for in a partnership agreement entered into between CAEP and the state, country, or other governing authority under which an EPP operates.

Policy II.15.02 Prohibition on Recording

No portion of any On-Site Review, Virtual Site Review, or panel proceeding may be recorded.

16. Complaints

CAEP reviews carefully and may investigate any allegation that an accredited EPP has fallen out of compliance with accreditation standards or policies or that CAEP has not followed its own policies.

Policy II.16.01 Complaint Against a CAEP-Accredited EPP

CAEP will review in a timely, fair, and equitable manner any complaint against a CAEP-accredited EPP that is related to CAEP's Standards or procedures, and take follow-up action, as appropriate, based on the results of its review.

Any such complaint should be sent to the CAEP Compliance Officer in writing at the street address provided on the CAEP website or to compliance.officer@caepnet.org.

A complaint should include the following:

- (1) A statement of facts and circumstances leading the complainant to believe that the EPP does not meet 1 or more CAEP Standard or is not in compliance with any CAEP policy or procedure; and
- (2) A statement of the actions, if any, that the complainant and/or the EPP have taken to address the matters identified in the complaint.

No later than 7 days after receiving a written complaint, the CAEP Compliance Officer will review the information provided; advise the CAEP President and Chair of the Executive Committee of the Accreditation Council of the complaint; and open an investigation into the complaint if the complainant has provided evidence or credible information sufficient to form the basis of an investigation. The Compliance Officer or designated CAEP staff may request

additional information from a complainant, if such information is needed to facilitate consideration of the complaint or subsequent investigation.

No later than 7 days after an investigation is opened, the CAEP President, acting on behalf of the Executive Committee, will give notice of the complaint to the EPP and the EPP's state or other governing body. The EPP will have 30 days to provide the CAEP President and Compliance Officer with a response to the complaint.

At the conclusion of the review of any complaint and following any investigation, the Compliance Officer may recommend that the Executive Committee take follow-up action, including enforcement action, if necessary.

CAEP also reviews carefully and may investigate any allegation of impropriety against itself or any staff or volunteer.

Policy II.16.02 Complaint Against CAEP

CAEP will review in a timely, fair, and equitable manner, and apply unbiased judgement to, any complaint against itself. CAEP will take follow-up action, as appropriate, based on the results of its review.

Any such complaint should be sent to the CAEP Compliance Officer in writing at the street address provided on the CAEP website or to compliance.officer@caepnet.org.

A complaint should include a statement of facts and circumstances leading the complainant to believe that the CAEP has not followed its own policies or procedures.

No later than 7 days after receiving a written complaint, the CAEP Compliance Officer will review the information provided; advise the CAEP President of the complaint; and open an investigation into the complaint if the complainant has provided evidence or credible information sufficient to form the basis of an investigation.

No later than 7 days after being advised of a complaint, the CAEP President will give notice of the complaint to the Executive Committee of the Board and Executive Committee of the Accreditation Council, as appropriate.

At the conclusion of the review of any complaint and following any investigation, the Compliance Officer may recommend that CAEP take follow-up action.

17. Subsequent Policy Change

The version of this Accreditation Policies and Procedures manual in effect on the date of an EPP's submission of a Request for Evaluation (for Initial Accreditation) or Accreditation Review Request (for Renewal of Accreditation) will apply throughout the EPP's accreditation process through final accreditation action. If any policy is amended between the aforementioned date and the final accreditation action, an EPP may file a petition with CAEP requesting that the amended provision be applied. For any such petition to be accepted by CAEP's President and forwarded to the Accreditation Council for consideration, the EPP must provide a description of how the application of the subsequent policy would be beneficial to the EPP. The state, country, or other governing authority under which the EPP operates must also provide CAEP with a written statement of support for the EPP's petition. Contact CAEP staff for additional details.

Policy II.17.01 Petition for Use of Subsequent Policy

An EPP may file a petition with CAEP presenting evidence to support its assertion that a different accreditation status decision would have been reached if a subsequent version of the Accreditation

Policy had been applied. The state/country must concur with the EPP's request as a precondition for CAEP's approval.

Acting on a recommendation from the CAEP President, the Accreditation Council, with a two-thirds vote of Councilors present at a duly convened meeting, may change the accreditation status of an EPP.

18. Policy Waiver

At their discretion, the CAEP President may waive one or more requirements established in this manual and, in doing so, may impose any conditions deemed appropriate. No waiver of any policy is effective unless approval of such is provided in writing by the CAEP President. Contact CAEP staff for additional details.

Policy II.18.01 Waivers

CAEP reserves the authority to grant any EPP or group of EPPs a waiver from one or more requirements established in this Accreditation Policy and Procedures document or prior versions of the Accreditation Policy, as applicable. A waiver may be granted only upon the written approval of the CAEP President and subject to any terms or conditions provided therein which may include imposition of an administrative fee if the waiver results in a delay in an EPP's Accreditation Review or Accreditation decision.

No waiver may be approved if any portion of it would result in a change in any decision of the Accreditation Council or any deviation from the decision definitions provided for in Policy VII.6.02.

At the meeting immediately following the exercise of this authority, CAEP will report to the Accreditation Council and the CAEP Board of Directors.

19. Reconsideration

Policy II.19.01 Recommendation for Reconsideration

For any accreditation decision other than an Adverse Action (defined in Policies III.2.14 and IV.1.14) the CAEP President may recommend Accreditation Council reconsideration of the EPP's most recent accreditation decision. The Accreditation Council, with a two-thirds vote of Councilors present at a duly convened meeting, may change the accreditation status of an EPP.

CAEP may recommend reconsideration of any decision of the Accreditation Council if there is credible evidence the policies or processes of the Accreditation Council were not followed by a Review Panel or the Accreditation Council.

Approval of the Accreditation Council is required to change an EPP's accreditation status, upon a motion from a panel assigned to re-review the EPP's decision. A change in status shall not result in an extension of the EPP's term of accreditation past the maximum term length established in Policy VII.6.02. No other remedies or concessions will be made available to the EPP.

III. INITIAL ACCREDITATION PROCESS

Initial Accreditation is open to any EPP that is not in Continuing Accreditation status at the time of application and meets other eligibility criteria described below. All other EPPs are to proceed under the provisions of Section IV - Renewal of Accreditation Process.

Initial Accreditation is a 2-step process:

- Application leading to Applicant Status, and
- Accreditation.

Attaining and maintaining Applicant Status and accreditation is contingent on an EPP's payment of fees per Policy II.10.01 in amounts or in accordance with formulas established by the Board of Directors, timely submission of complete Annual Reports, and adherence to all applicable policies.

1. Obtaining Applicant Status

Policy III.1.01 Eligibility

- (a.) An EPP may seek to undertake the Initial Accreditation Process if it is not in Continuous Accreditation status (pursuant to Section V) at the time it submits a Request for Evaluation, has been offering educator preparation at the level(s) of preparation subject to review for at least 1 year, and satisfies at least 1 of the following conditions:
- (i.) The EPP operates under the authority or control of a U.S.-based institution that has achieved and maintains accreditation from an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education or the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) and has achieved and maintains full, unconditional approval to provide its programs of education beyond the secondary level from at least one state agency or entity charged with ensuring educator preparation quality within a state (state approval entity), including, at a minimum, from the state approval entity of the state in which the EPP's main campus is located;
 - (ii.) The EPP is a freestanding provider of educator preparation, has achieved and maintains full, unconditional approval to provide a program of education beyond the secondary level from at least one state agency or entity charged with ensuring educator preparation quality within a state (state approval entity), including, at a minimum, from the state approval entity of the state in which the EPP's main campus is located, and, if requested, provides CAEP with evidence that it has resources specific to ensuring adequate preparation, health and safety of its candidates; or
 - (iii.) The EPP is not operated under the authority or control of a U.S.-based institution and has either achieved and maintains full, unconditional recognition or approval by the appropriate quality assurance agency or entity in the country in which the EPP's main campus is located or provides CAEP with evidence that it has resources specific to ensuring adequate preparation, health and safety of its candidates.
- (b.) As a general rule, CAEP will not approve an application from or grant accreditation or reaccreditation to an EPP if CAEP knows, or has reasonable cause to know, that the EPP:
- (i.) Is the subject of a pending or final action brought by a state agency or other governing authority to suspend, revoke, withdraw, or terminate the EPP's legal authority to provide postsecondary education in the State, territory, or country (including but not limited to issuance of a warning or placement in probationary status and pending litigation with a state or governing body) ;

- (ii.) Is the subject of a decision by an institutional accrediting agency to deny accreditation or preaccreditation to the institution under which the EPP operates;
- (iii.) Is the subject of a pending or final action brought by an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education to suspend, revoke, withdraw, or terminate the institution's accreditation or preaccreditation;
- (iv.) Has been placed in probation or an equivalent status imposed by an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education against the institution; or
- (v.) Is or has recently experienced financial solvency challenges that may reasonably be believed to create financial risk to candidates who might enroll in the preparation program.

Pending an investigation of the facts underlying any of the conditions described above, if CAEP finds that the action of the other body does not preclude CAEP's grant of accreditation, CAEP may grant accreditation or reaccreditation and, in doing so, may impose any conditions or requirements deemed necessary to ensure that the EPP's continued compliance with CAEP Standards is appropriately monitored and enforced.

- (c.) As an accreditor recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA), a majority of EPPs accredited by CAEP must have legal authority to operate as higher education institutions or programs and confer degrees. Even if an EPP otherwise satisfies the eligibility criteria of this section, CAEP reserves the right to withhold approval of an application from an EPP that does not have legal authority to operate as a higher education institution or program and confer degrees.
- (d.) If an EPP has and maintains approval to provide a program of education beyond the secondary level from at least one state agency or entity charged with ensuring educator preparation quality within a state, it must, in establishing eligibility, disclose all such approvals. Throughout the Initial Accreditation Process and Continuing Accreditation, any EPP must provide CAEP with timely notice of a decision to seek approval in another state or internationally. Once any such approval has been obtained, the EPP must provide CAEP with timely notice of any change in the status of any state approval.
- (e.) Compliance with eligibility criteria must be maintained throughout the accreditation evaluation process and any subsequent term of accreditation.

After confirming its ability to establish eligibility, an EPP seeking Initial Accreditation begins the process by making a formal Request for Evaluation (initial application).

Policy III.1.02 Request for Evaluation

An EPP seeking Initial Accreditation must first make a formal Request for Evaluation (RFE) in accordance with Initial Application guidelines and including the signature of the EPP's administrator (e.g., CEO, Dean, or Director) and, if applicable, President/CEO.

No later than 7 days after receipt of a complete Request for Evaluation, CAEP staff will inform the EPP that an electronic Initial Application shell has been opened for the EPP.

The failure of an EPP to submit a completed application within 90 days from the date on which CAEP's notice and invoice were received will be deemed withdrawal of the Request for Evaluation and forfeiture of all fees paid. Following a withdrawal, even if such withdrawal is voluntary, an EPP must wait a minimum of 60 days before submitting a new Request for Evaluation.

Policy III.1.03 Accreditation Review Eligibility

Not later than 30 days after receipt of the Initial Application and fee from an EPP, CAEP staff will convene a panel of between 3 and 5 qualified volunteers, which may include a finance reviewer, to review the Initial Application and recommend for approval only those EPPs having provided sufficient information to demonstrate understanding of the CAEP Standards and processes and unambiguous intention to proceed toward an accreditation review under the timelines established in Accreditation Policy and Procedures. CAEP will subsequently notify the EPP that it is eligible to undergo an Accreditation Review (Eligible Status) or, if appropriate, that the EPP's Request for Evaluation does not meet requirements for approval. In making any such determination, CAEP staff may request and consider additional or clarifying information from the EPP and state, country, or other governing authority under which the EPP operates.

Not later than 6 months after the EPP has received notice of its eligibility to undergo an Accreditation Review (Eligible Status), CAEP will confirm the date(s) selected for the EPP's Review from among dates proposed by the EPP.

A decision to grant Eligible Status is not an accreditation decision and does not establish or imply recognition by the Accreditation Council. As such, it conveys no rights or privileges on an EPP and it is not subject to the accreditation notice provisions of this Policy.

An EPP denied Eligible Status does not have any due process rights. Following denial, an EPP may amend its RFE or submit a new RFE. CAEP will waive application of a subsequent Initial Application fee if an EPP obtains Applicant Status within 90 days from the date of its original RFE submission.

Policy III.1.04 Interim Reporting

After receipt of Applicant Status and until such time as an EPP is accredited, the EPP must promptly report any of the following events to CAEP:

- (a.) Change of primary contact;
- (b.) Change of EPP or institution name;
- (c.) Change of control or ownership;
- (d.) Closure of a site;
- (e.) Addition or closure of an Auxiliary Location or Branch Campus;
- (f.) Elimination of an educational offering cited in the Request for Evaluation;
- (g.) Any pending or final Adverse Action against the EPP or institution by another accrediting agency, or federal or state agency; and
- (h.) Any other change that may affect the EPP's compliance with CAEP's eligibility requirements.

Upon receipt of any report documenting any of the events described above, CAEP will review its Applicant Status determination and may withdraw Applicant Status or take other action if compliance with CAEP's Standards and policies is affected. An Evaluation Team assigned to review the EPP and the Accreditation Council may consider an EPP's interim reports as evidence in making any accreditation decision or in instituting a Warning.

2. Accreditation

If an EPP is to have reviews and decisions at both levels (Initial-Licensure and Advanced-Level), the Accreditation Review Request (ARR or Request) must apply to both. Upon receipt and acceptance of an ARR, CAEP staff will provide written notice of the acceptance to the EPP and to the Executive Committee of the Accreditation Council. The review process described below then commences.

Policy III.2.01 Accreditation Review Request

No later than 30 days after granting an EPP Applicant Status, CAEP staff will inform the EPP that an electronic Self-Study Report shell has been opened for the EPP. No later than 365 days after achieving Applicant Status, the EPP must acknowledge its intent to proceed toward Initial Accreditation and begin work on the Self-Study Report. The EPP's acknowledgement will be considered an Accreditation Review Request (Request) and marks the beginning of the Accreditation process.

Not later than 60 days after receipt of the Request, CAEP staff will provide the EPP with the date(s) selected for the EPP's Site Review.

Within 6 months after attaining Eligible Status, the EPP must acknowledge its intent to proceed toward Initial Accreditation. CAEP staff will create an electronic Self-Study Report shell in the semester consistent with the review dates. The EPP's acknowledgement will be considered an Accreditation Review (Request) and marks the beginning of the Accreditation process.

After an EPP has been notified of the date(s) selected for a Site Review, the review date(s) may only be changed with the written approval of CAEP, the EPP, and, if CAEP has entered into a partnership agreement with the state, country, or other governing authority under which the EPP operates, the appropriate governing authority. Any such governing authority may request a Review schedule modification to ensure alignment of CAEP and state review cycles. CAEP may, at its discretion, approve or deny any such request.

Policy III.2.02 Selection of Program Review Option

To meet CAEP's Standards for Accreditation, an EPP must provide information about the quality of educator preparation for specialty licensure areas derived from a program-level review. These can provide strong corroboration of claims for the strength of programs and the knowledge and professional skills attained by candidates in the area of licensure, certification, and/or endorsement. In addition, they can be a source of evidence for CAEP Standards 1/A.1/R.1, for which an EPP will need to demonstrate that its candidates have opportunities to learn, and abilities to develop, a deep understanding of the discipline they will be licensed to practice.

CAEP offers 3 program review options that may be used to satisfy this requirement, subject to limitations which may be established in a partnership agreement entered into between CAEP and the state, country, or other governing authority under which the EPP operates. The program review option selected ensures that individual program data is collected, analyzed, and prepared as part of the EPP's full accreditation.

If at the time an EPP receives acceptance of its Accreditation Review Request, CAEP does not have a partnership agreement with the state, country, or other governing authority under which the EPP operates, the EPP may choose from among any of the following program review options:

- (a.) **Program Review with National Recognition:** An EPP's specialty areas submit program reports for Initial Review responding to standards defined by the relevant specialized professional associations (SPAs) no earlier than 3 years prior to the CAEP Site Review. Program reports are reviewed by the appropriate SPA, and the SPA provides a report on its findings in relation to its professional standards and determines the recognition status of the submitted programs. Evaluation Team members and Councilors review SPA findings as part of the accreditation decision-making process. When successfully completed, the program receives "national recognition" by the appropriate SPA.
- (b.) **CAEP Evidence Review of Standard 1/A.1/R.1:** An EPP conducts an internal review of its specialty licensure areas by adopting existing specialty standards in the field to evaluate candidates' content and pedagogical knowledge and skills using outcomes assessments. The EPP presents the evidence and analysis on the Self-Study Report for the Evaluation Team to review.

- (c.) **State Program Review:** An EPP's specialty areas are reviewed by the EPP's governing authority. The EPP presents evidence from the state or international agency reports to CAEP during self-study reporting or the Site Review. Evaluation Team members and Councilors review findings from specialty licensure area reports from the state or international agency as part of the accreditation decision-making process. The EPP must coordinate with its respective governing authority to provide to CAEP the governing authority's report on the EPP's specialty areas.

Policy III.2.03 Self-Study Report

No later than 9 months prior to its scheduled Site Review, an EPP must submit its completed Self-Study Report and evidence in the format specified by CAEP. A maximum of 90 evidence documents may be uploaded for a Site Review based on just one level of accreditation. For a Site Review of both levels of accreditation, a maximum of 135 evidence documents may be uploaded. The failure of an EPP to make a complete submission within this timeline will result in termination of Applicant Status.

The Self-Study Report requires the EPP to prepare, in accordance with CAEP guidance, an in-depth report that as part of a self-study process that assesses the EPP's education quality and success in meeting its mission and objectives, highlights opportunities for improvement, and includes a plan for making those improvements.

- (a.) A Self-Study Report is required to include complete evidence addressing all applicable Standards and components.
- (b.) An EPP subject to Policy II.5.02 must include in its Self-Study Report evidence demonstrating compliance with requirements regarding distance education policies and procedures and transfer of credit policies.
- (c.) The Self-Study Report and all supporting documentation furnished by the EPP (collectively referred to as evidence) must be provided in English.

As part of CAEP's notification that an electronic Self-Study-Report template is opened for an EPP's use, the EPP is: (1) provided notice of the version of this policies and procedures document and the corresponding handbook that are in effect and which will be used by the EPP, staff, volunteer review panel members, Accreditation Councilors, and Ad-Hoc Appeal Panel members, if applicable, in carrying out the accreditation review through a final accreditation decision; and (2) asked to identify preferred Site Review dates. An EPP should confer with its state or other governing authority in its identification of preferred site visit dates if CAEP and the state have entered into a partnership agreement. The Site Review date(s), once confirmed by CAEP, becomes the date(s) by which the review timeline is established.

After an EPP has been notified of the date(s) selected for a Site Review, the review date(s) may only be changed with the written approval of CAEP, the EPP, and, if CAEP has entered into a partnership agreement with the state, country, or other governing authority under which the EPP operates, the appropriate governing authority. Any such governing authority may request a Review schedule modification to ensure alignment of CAEP and state review cycles. CAEP may, at its discretion, approve or deny any such request.

In submitting its Self-Study Report an EPP is expected to include evidence tagged to Standards for Accreditation. CAEP staff may request and consider additional or clarifying information before appointing an Evaluation Team to review the Self-Study Report. Any Evaluation Team member may also seek additional or clarifying information from the EPP, as necessary.

Policy III.2.04 Assignment of Evaluation Team

CAEP will inform the EPP once an Evaluation Team has been assigned, in accordance with policies and procedures on the selection of volunteers pursuant to Part VI, and will provide the EPP with the name and professional affiliation(s) of each team member.

Policy III.2.05 Formative Feedback

Following the EPP's submission of its Self-Study Report, the Evaluation Team will evaluate the Self-Study Report and supporting documentation provided by the EPP. The Evaluation Team may also consider the EPP's Annual Reports, if any, as well as any substantive change notices, third-party comments, complaints, and reports from or information provided by other accreditors. No less than 5 months prior to the date scheduled for the beginning of the Site Review, the designated lead of the Evaluation Team (Team Lead) will provide the EPP with a Formative Feedback Report based on the team's analysis of the EPP's case (Self-Study Report and supporting documentation furnished by the EPP). The Formative Feedback Report includes feedback on the format and content of the Self-Study Report, as determined appropriate by the Team Lead.

Following receipt of a Formative Feedback Report, an EPP has an opportunity to provide the Evaluation Team with additional information and evidence in the form of a Self-Study Report Addendum.

Policy III.2.06 Self-Study Report Addendum

Not later than 60 days after receipt of the Formative Feedback Report, the EPP must submit a Self-Study Report Addendum using an electronic template provided by CAEP or indicate in writing that it elects not to submit an Addendum. An Addendum may include up to 50 items of evidence not included with the Self-Study Report submission.

During this period and through the conclusion of the Review, the Team Lead, other team members, and CAEP staff may respond to questions or requests for guidance from the EPP; however, the EPP is ultimately responsible for understanding and adhering to the applicable CAEP policies, procedures, and Standards and should not rely on any such guidance as an official interpretation of or alternative to any requirement.

Policy III.2.07 Solicitation of Third-Party Comments

No later than 16 weeks prior to the first day of a scheduled Review, both the EPP and CAEP must publicly announce the dates scheduled for the upcoming Review. Any such announcement must provide an opportunity for third-party comment in writing concerning the EPP's qualifications for accreditation, in accordance with the following:

- (a.) An EPP must establish a third-party comment period of at least 1 month. CAEP will accept third-party comments up to 6 weeks prior to the first day of a scheduled Review.
- (b.) No later than 7 days after making the required announcement, the EPP must provide CAEP with evidence of the announcement. The failure of an EPP to comply with this established timeline may result in a decision by CAEP to reschedule the Review.
- (c.) No later than 1 month prior to the first day of a scheduled Review, CAEP will provide an EPP with a copy of any third-party comments it receives and the EPP will provide CAEP with a copy of any third-party comments it receives.

- (d.) The EPP may submit a written response on any such comments to CAEP no later than 2 weeks prior to the first day of the scheduled review.

The Evaluation Team, along with any designated observer(s) and state participant(s) which may be assigned by CAEP or in accordance with a partnership agreement entered into between CAEP and the EPP's governing authority, conducts a review of the EPP. See Section VI for information on the roles of CAEP staff, observers, and others in a Review.

Policy III.2.08 Site Review

In accordance with Site Review date(s) established pursuant to Policy III.2.01, the Evaluation Team will conduct a review of the EPP during which it will obtain sufficient information to determine if the EPP meets all applicable Standards.

- (a.) The Site Review will be conducted in English even if English is not the EPP's primary language of instruction.
- (b.) The activities of the Evaluation Team include the following:
 - (i.) Examination of all evidence consistent with the Standards cited in the Self-Study Report;
 - (ii.) Interviews of EPP administrators, faculty and/or instructors, candidates, graduates, employers, and other members of the professional community as appropriate and identified in consultation with the EPP's designated CAEP coordinator;
 - (iii.) Investigations into the cited evidence, as needed; and,
 - (iv.) Certification of the existence and sufficiency of policies and procedures related to other applicable accreditation requirements pursuant to Policy II.5.02, including requirements which may be necessitated if CAEP is recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education.
- (d.) During the Site Review, any team member may ask the EPP to provide additional supporting documentation (evidence) or the EPP may provide any such evidence to the Team on its own accord; however, a maximum of 50 additional evidence documents may be uploaded and no additional evidence may be submitted for evaluation after 5:00 PM local time on the last full day of the review.
- (e.) At the conclusion of the review, the Team Lead or the Team Lead's designee will share with the EPP's designee(s) an overview of the process steps from the end of the Site Review through Accreditation Council decision and notification of the decision by CAEP's President.

Because it is the role of the Accreditation Council, not the Review Team, to make an accreditation decision, EPPs should not consider information or perspectives shared by the Review Team at this point in the process to be indicative of Areas for Improvement (AFIs) and Stipulations. After the Review Team has completed its examination and analysis of all evidence and reflected on the totality of the evidence, findings, and recommendations regarding the EPP's compliance with all applicable Standards and components is summarized in a report and all deficiencies are clearly identified.

Policy III.2.09 Site Review Report

No later than 30 days after the conclusion of the Site Review, the Team Lead will submit the team's Site Review Report to CAEP. Following acceptance, CAEP will inform the EPP that the Report is available for review.

The Site Review Report will:

- (a.) Provide an explanation of the extent to which the EPP's compliance with all applicable Accreditation Standards and other applicable accreditation requirements were verified by the Review Team through the evidence that was examined;
- (b.) Summarize observations regarding the completeness, quality, and strength of evidence provided for each Standard;
- (c.) Clearly identify any deficiencies in the EPP's compliance with Standards.

All such judgments must be made only after the Team Lead concludes that the Review Team has a reasonable basis for determining that the information evaluated is accurate.

The EPP has an opportunity to respond in writing to CAEP's report on the Site Review.

Policy III.2.10 EPP's Optional Rejoinder

No later than 30 days after the EPP receives notice the Site Review Report is available for review, the EPP may opt to submit a Rejoinder. The Rejoinder may not include new evidence (i.e., evidence not included in the Self-Study Report or already submitted to CAEP via the electronic accreditation information management system).

If the EPP elects not to submit a Rejoinder, it must expressly waive the right to submit a Rejoinder by providing CAEP with written notice of the waiver within the established timeline for submission.

Policy III.2.11 Team Lead's Optional Response

If the EPP submits a Rejoinder within the timeline established in Policy III.2.10, the Team Lead has the option of providing a Response to the Rejoinder.

- (a) If the Team Lead elects to provide a Response to the Rejoinder, the Response will be submitted to CAEP no later than 30 days after the date on which the EPP submitted its Rejoinder. Following acceptance of the Rejoinder, CAEP will inform the EPP that the Response to the Rejoinder is available for review.
- (b) If the Team Lead elects not to submit a Response to the Rejoinder, they must provide CAEP with notice of that election.

Policy III.2.12 Assignment of Accreditation Council Review Panels

Before the Accreditation Council meeting during which an accreditation decision is to be made, CAEP staff, in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair, will:

- (a.) Assign Councilors that have been confirmed as participants to Review Panels; and
- (b.) Assign each EPP on the agenda for Accreditation Council action to an Initial Review Panel and Joint Review Panel pursuant to Policy III.2.13.

Initial Review Panels generally have 3 Councilors assigned; however, as few as 2 Councilors may constitute a properly established Initial Review Panel. Joint Review Panels are made up of two Initial Review Panels, one of which is the Initial Review Panel assigned for the initial review.

One member of each Review Panel is designated the Panel Chair. At his/her discretion, a Panel Chair may engage the panelists in a preliminary discussion on any case assigned to the Panel with the purpose of ensuring panelists have all information needed to prepare for the Panel meeting and, if needed, guidance on the Panel review process.

During the next regular meeting of the Accreditation Council, an Initial Review Panel assembled in accordance with Policy III.2.13, will consider the EPP's case for Accreditation, including any third-party comments, and may allow EPP testimony in support of the Self-Study Report before formulating a recommendation to grant or deny accreditation. In doing so, the Accreditation Council, including Initial and Joint Review panelists, conducts its own analysis of the Self-Study Report and supporting documentation furnished by the EPP, the Site Review Report, the EPPs' response to the report, if provided, any Rejoinder, and any other appropriate information from other sources to determine whether the EPP complies with CAEP's Standards.

Policy III.2.13 Accreditation Council Review, Decisions, and Term of Accreditation

(a.) Initial Review Panel

The Initial Review Panel reviews the EPP's case and makes a recommendation regarding whether an EPP meets all applicable Standards, and, if applicable, other accreditation requirements established pursuant to Policy II.5.02. In doing so, the Initial Review Panel confirms or modifies the recommendations made by the Evaluation Team.

The State Lead or designated representative (identified pursuant to any partnership agreement between CAEP and the state, country, or other governing authority under which the EPP operates) is invited to attend the Initial Review Panel session. The Evaluation Team Lead may also be asked to participate in any portion or the entirety of the Initial Review Panel meeting.

The Initial Review Panel provides the EPP an opportunity to participate in the meeting of the Panel for no more than 20 minutes, either in person or virtually. The primary purpose of this opportunity is to allow the EPP to respond to any clarifying questions the Initial Review Panel has identified through its activities, focusing first on any components for which severe or moderate deficiencies have been noted. The EPP may not present new evidence.

(b.) Joint Review Panel

After the Initial Review Panel concludes its review of an EPP's case, a Joint Review Panel reviews the recommendation(s) of the Initial Review Panel and either concurs with or modifies the recommendation(s).

(c.) Accreditation Council Review and Decision; Conditions Imposed

The accreditation decisions available to the Council, below, are further defined in Policy VII.6.002. Each has a standard term of accreditation that establishes the interval for a comprehensive re-evaluation of the EPP, conducted in accordance with the Renewal of Accreditation process (see Section IV). An EPP's term begins on the date of the final accrediting action.

- (i.) **Accreditation.** The Accreditation Council finds that the EPP has met all applicable Standards at the specified level of accreditation. The Council may identify one or more Areas for Improvement (AFIs). The EPP is given a 7-year term of accreditation, subject to full adherence to requirements for Continuing Accreditation as provided in Section VI. Continuing Accreditation. In each annual report, through the EPP's next accreditation review, the EPP must provide evidence of its efforts to address all AFIs and stipulations.
- (ii.) **Accreditation with Stipulations.** The Accreditation Council finds that the EPP has met all applicable Standards at the specified level of accreditation in spite of the identification of 1 or more serious deficiencies which shall be articulated as Stipulations. The Council may also identify one or more Areas for Improvement (AFIs). The EPP is given a 2-year term of accreditation subject to full adherence to the corrective action requirements described below and the requirements for Continuing Accreditation as provided in Section VI. Continuing

Accreditation. In each annual report, through the EPP's next accreditation review, the EPP must provide evidence of its efforts to address all AFIs and stipulations.

Corrective action is required. Before the expiration of the 2-year term, on a timeline established by CAEP, the EPP must submit a Targeted Stipulations Report demonstrating significant progress toward the complete correction of any identified Stipulation. Following submission of the Targeted Stipulations Report, the EPP must undergo a Virtual Site Review during which the Targeted Stipulations Report and related evidence is reviewed by an Evaluation Team. The Evaluation Team may also consider the EPP's Annual Reports, if any, as well as any substantive change notices, third-party comments, complaints, and reports from or information provided by other accreditors.

Not more than 30 days after the conclusion of the Review, the designated Evaluation Team Lead submits to CAEP a Stipulations Review Report with findings and 1 or more recommendations for Accreditation Council action, within the following parameters:

Full Correction of Stipulation(s) - If the Accreditation Council concludes that the EPP has completely corrected all Stipulations identified, it may remove the Stipulation(s), issue a decision of Accreditation, and extend the term of accreditation so that the EPP has the remainder of a full 7-year term (not more than 5 years beyond the initial 2-year Accreditation with Stipulations term). The Accreditation Council may also identify 1 or more new AFIs. In each annual report, through the EPP's next accreditation review, the EPP must provide evidence of its efforts to address all AFIs and stipulations.

Significant Improvement Toward Full Correction of Stipulation(s) – If the Accreditation Council concludes that the EPP has partially corrected the identified Stipulation(s), it may, if there is evidence of significant improvement such that there are no longer any serious deficiencies, downgrade the Stipulation(s) to one or more AFIs, issue a decision of Accreditation, and extend the term of accreditation so that the EPP has the remainder of a full 7-year term (not more than 5 years beyond the initial 2-year Accreditation with Stipulations term). In each annual report, through the EPP's next accreditation review, the EPP must provide evidence of its efforts to address all AFIs and stipulations.

Insufficient Improvement Toward Full Correction of Stipulation(s) – If the Accreditation Council concludes that the EPP has partially corrected the identified Stipulation(s), but finds insufficient evidence of significant improvement such that serious deficiencies remain, the Stipulation(s) may not be downgraded to AFIs. The Stipulation(s) must be retained. The Accreditation Council may also identify 1 or more new AFIs. Using the preponderance of evidence standard of review prescribed in Policy II.5.01, the Council may issue a decision of: (1) Accreditation with Stipulations, if it finds that the EPP has met all applicable Standards; (2) Probationary Accreditation if it finds that the EPP has met all but 1 applicable Standard; or (3) Revocation of Accreditation if it finds that the EPP has not met 2 or more applicable Standards or has failed to fully comply with the requirements of this Policy or any other accreditation requirements. In each annual report, through the EPP's next accreditation review, the EPP must provide evidence of its efforts to address all AFIs and stipulations.

- (iii.) **Probationary Accreditation.** The Accreditation Council finds that the EPP has met all but 1 applicable Standards at the specified level of accreditation (any 1 Standard is not met). Serious deficiencies shall be articulated as Stipulations and remedied by the EPP in accordance with the provisions, above, regarding Accreditation with Stipulations. The Council may also identify one or more AFIs. The EPP is given a 2-year term of accreditation subject to full

adherence to the corrective action requirements described below and the requirements for Continuing Accreditation as provided in Section VI. Continuing Accreditation. In each annual report, through the EPP's next accreditation review, the EPP must provide evidence of its efforts to address all AFIs and stipulations.

Corrective action is required. Before the expiration of the 2-year term, on a timeline established by CAEP, the EPP must submit a Targeted Self-Study Report demonstrating that it now meets the Standard previously found to be unmet and has made significant progress toward the complete correction of any identified Stipulation(s). Following submission of the Targeted Self-Study Report, the EPP must undergo a Site Review, focused on the unmet Standard and any identified Stipulation(s), during which the Targeted Self-Study Report and related evidence is reviewed by an Evaluation. The Evaluation Team may also consider the EPP's Annual Reports, if any, as well as any substantive change notices, third-party comments, complaints, and reports from or information provided by other accreditors.

Not more than 30 days after the conclusion of the Review, the designated Evaluation Team Lead submits to CAEP a Stipulations Review Report with findings and 1 or more recommendations for Accreditation Council action-, within the following parameters:

If the Accreditation Council concludes that the EPP has met the Standard previously identified as unmet and provided evidence of significant improvement toward the complete correction of any Stipulation identified, it may issue a decision of (1) Accreditation, and extend the term of accreditation so that the EPP has the remainder of a full 7-year term (not more than 5 years beyond the initial 2-year Accreditation with Stipulations term); or (2) Accreditation with Stipulations, and extend the term of accreditation for only 2 additional years after which the EPP will be required to undergo an Accreditation with Stipulations review as described above. The Accreditation Council may also identify 1 or more new AFIs. In each annual report, through the EPP's next accreditation review, the EPP must provide evidence of its efforts to address all AFIs and stipulations.

In all other cases, the Accreditation Council must Revoke accreditation. An EPP may not be given a subsequent Probationary Accreditation decision.

- (iv.) **Denial of Accreditation.** The Accreditation Council finds that the EPP has not met 2 or more applicable Standards.

See Policy VII.6.02 Accreditation Decisions and Notification for information on the notification CAEP issues (to an EPP, the appropriate state licensing or authorizing agency, other accreditors, and the public) following any accreditation decision.

Once accredited, an EPP must meet all Continuing Accreditation requirements established in Section V, including but not limited to, the submission of an Annual Report and remittance of an annual fee. Any failure to meet all such requirements may result in issuance of a Corrective Action notice, pursuant to Policy VII.6.03, or Adverse Action.

Policy III.2.14 Adverse Action

Any Accreditation Council decision to deny or revoke accreditation may be appealed in accordance with CAEP's Ad-Hoc Appeal Policy prior to the action becoming final. Following a final accreditation action of Revocation or Denial, an EPP may reapply and obtain applicant status only after demonstrating to CAEP that they have developed teach-out plans (in accordance with Policy V.5.03), if applicable, and are ready to proceed with an accreditation review in accordance with accreditation policies and procedures.

An EPP may voluntarily withdraw from the Initial Accreditation process prior to a decision by the Accreditation Council, as described below, or during the period of Continuing Accreditation, as described in Policy V.5.04.

Policy III.2.15 Voluntary Withdrawal by EPP

An EPP may withdraw from the Initial Accreditation Process at any time prior to the date of any Accreditation Council decision to grant or deny accreditation by submitting a letter of withdrawal from the EPP administrator (e.g., President, Provost, Chief Academic Officer) to the CAEP President. The EPP's Applicant Status will be terminated on the date that the letter of withdrawal is received by CAEP unless a date of withdrawal is enumerated in the letter. CAEP will not refund any fees paid prior to the date of withdrawal.

A notice of withdrawal received by CAEP after the date of any Accreditation Council decision to grant or deny accreditation is not effective, and the Council's decision will stand pending the outcome of any appeal.

Policy III.2.16 REPEALED

When representing its accreditation to the public, an EPP must report the accreditation decision accurately, including the specific licensure level covered by the accreditation, and the address and telephone number of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation as provided on the CAEP website. The official statement to be publicly displayed on the EPP's website is provided by CAEP following Accreditation Council action, as defined by the CAEP Communication Guidelines.

Policy III.2.17 Restrictions on Communicating Accreditation Status; Correction of Incorrect or Misleading Information

An EPP awarded accreditation may elect to make its accreditation status public. In doing so, it must:

- (a.) Disclose the status accurately, including the specific academic or instructional programs covered by that status and CAEP's name, address, and telephone number;
- (b.) Adhere to CAEP's guidelines on communicating CAEP accreditation status, including terms and conditions on use of the CAEP logo; and
- (c.) Issue an immediate correction if made aware or otherwise determining that the information the EPP has released about the following is in any way incorrect or misleading:
 - (i) The accreditation status of the EPP;
 - (ii) The contents of reports of on-site reviews; and
 - (iii) CAEP's accrediting actions with respect to the EPP.

CAEP staff and Annual Report Reviewers review EPP statements of accreditation at least annually to ensure the accuracy of representation. A Review Team may also verify the accuracy of representations made and may note any misleading or inaccurate statements in a Site Review Report. If CAEP becomes aware that an EPP is not accurately reporting its accreditation to the public, the EPP will be contacted and directed to immediately issue a corrective communication. Failure to correct misleading or inaccurate statements may lead to Adverse Action.

 **Policy III.2.18 Timeline Modifications**

- (a.) In cases where the accreditation process timeline established by CAEP for an EPP cannot be met due to CAEP’s scheduling constraints or unexpected circumstances encountered by the EPP, the CAEP President may approve a timeline modification.
- (b.) Notwithstanding paragraph (a.), up to no less than 60 days prior to a scheduled Site Review, an EPP may request a postponement of its Site Review of up to 1 year. In considering any such request, CAEP may seek additional information from the EPP and may solicit input from the state or other governing authority if applicable. A postponement may be granted at the discretion of the CAEP President and will be communicated in a “timeline waiver” letter establishing a revised timeline for all accreditation actions from Self-Study Report submission, if applicable, through the Accreditation Council decision. If any conditions established in a timeline waiver letter are not met, the waiver may be rescinded.

IV. RENEWAL OF ACCREDITATION PROCESS

An EPP that has attained Continuing Accreditation status, is approaching the end of its current term of accreditation, and is prepared to demonstrate that it continues to meet all applicable CAEP Accreditation Standards and requirements begins the renewal of accreditation process with the submission of an Accreditation Review Request (ARR) for renewal of accreditation. Upon receipt and acceptance of an ARR by CAEP staff, notice is provided to the EPP and to the Executive Committee of the Accreditation Council and the accreditation review process commences. During this period, an EPP must pay an annual fee, submit all required information and data in the form of an Annual Report, meet any conditions associated with the current accreditation status, and maintain compliance with all other Continuing Accreditation requirements established in Section V, as well as eligibility criteria established in Section II.

1. *Renewal of Accreditation*

Policy IV.1.01 Accreditation Review Request

No less than 18 months prior to the expiration of its current term of accreditation, CAEP staff will inform the EPP that an electronic Self-Study Report shell has been opened for the EPP. At that time, the EPP must acknowledge its intent to proceed toward Renewal of Accreditation and begin work on the Self-Study Report. The EPP's acknowledgement will be considered an Accreditation Review Request (Request) and marks the beginning of the Renewal of Accreditation process.

Not later than 60 days after receipt of the Request, CAEP staff will provide the EPP with the date(s) selected for the EPP's Site Review.

As part of CAEP's notification that an electronic Self-Study Report template is opened for an EPP's use, the EPP is: (1) provided notice of the version of this policies and procedures document and the corresponding handbook that are in effect and which will be used by the EPP, staff, volunteer review panel members, Accreditation Councilors, and Ad-Hoc Appeal Panel members, if applicable, in carrying out the accreditation review through a final accreditation decision; and (2) asked to identify preferred Site Review dates. An EPP should confer with its state or other governing authority in its identification of preferred Site Review dates if CAEP and the state have entered into a partnership agreement. The Site Review date, once confirmed by CAEP, becomes the date by which the review timeline is established.

After an EPP has been notified of the date(s) selected for a Site Review, the review date(s) may only be changed with the written approval of CAEP, the EPP, and, if CAEP has entered into a partnership agreement with the state, country, or other governing authority under which the EPP operates, the appropriate governing authority. Any such governing authority may request a Review schedule modification to ensure alignment of CAEP and state review cycles. CAEP may, at its discretion, approve or deny any such request.

An EPP scheduled to undergo a Site Review should immediately begin preparation of a Self-Study Report.

Policy IV.1.02 Selection of Program Review Option

To meet CAEP's Standards for Accreditation, an EPP must provide information about the quality of educator preparation for specialty licensure areas derived from a program-level review. These can provide strong corroboration of claims for the strength of programs and the knowledge and professional skills attained by candidates in the area of licensure, certification, or endorsement. In addition, they can be a source of evidence for CAEP Standard 1/A.1/R.1, for which an EPP will need to demonstrate that its candidates have opportunities to learn, and abilities to develop, a deep understanding of the discipline they

will be licensed to practice. CAEP offers 3 program review options that may be used to satisfy this requirement, subject to limitations which may be established in a partnership agreement entered into between CAEP and the state, country, or other governing authority under which the EPP operates. If at the time an EPP receives acceptance of its Accreditation Review Request, CAEP does not have a partnership agreement with the state, country, or other governing authority under which the EPP operates, the EPP may choose from among any of the following program review options:

- (a.) **Program Review with National Recognition:** An EPP’s specialty areas submit program reports for Initial Review responding to standards defined by the relevant specialized professional associations (SPAs) no earlier than 3 years prior to the CAEP Site Review. Program reports are reviewed by the appropriate SPA, and the SPA provides a report on its findings in relation to its professional standards and determines the recognition status of the submitted programs. Evaluation Team members and Councilors review SPA findings as part of the accreditation decision-making process. When successfully completed, the program receives “national recognition” by the appropriate SPA.
- (b.) **CAEP Evidence Review of Standard 1/A.1/R.1:** An EPP conducts an internal review of its specialty licensure areas by adopting existing specialty standards in the field to evaluate candidates’ content and pedagogical knowledge and skills using outcomes assessments. The EPP presents the evidence and analysis on the Self-Study Report for the Evaluation Team to review.
- (c.) **State Program Review:** An EPP’s specialty areas are reviewed by the EPP’s governing authority. The EPP presents evidence from the state or international agency reports to CAEP during self-study reporting or the Site Review. Evaluation Team members and Councilors review findings from specialty licensure area reports from the state or international agency as part of the accreditation decision-making process. The EPP must coordinate with its respective governing authority to provide to CAEP the governing authority’s report on the EPP’s specialty areas.

Any information that the EPP gathers during an external review of programs by a SPA or a state, or any trends noted by the EPP while conducting internal review of programs for CAEP Evidence Review of Standard 1/A.1/R.1, may be used to make a case that Standard 1 (A.1 or R.1) is met. Also, any subsequent actions the EPP takes in response to the program level findings can be addressed before the Self-Study Report is completed and the Site Review occurs. EPP leaders and faculty may decide, as well, that it would be best to update some of the SPA or state evidence or supplement it to complete its case for Standard 1 (A.1 or R.1) in the Self-Study Report or in the evidence available for the Site Review.

Policy IV.1.03 Self-Study Report

No later than 9 months prior to its scheduled Site Review, an EPP must submit its completed Self-Study Report. The failure of an EPP to submit a Self-Study Report within this timeline will be considered noncompliance with CAEP policy.

The Self-Study Report requires the EPP to prepare, in accordance with CAEP guidance, an in-depth report that as part of a self-study process that assesses the EPP’s education quality and success in meeting its mission and objectives, highlights opportunities for improvement, and includes a plan for making those improvements.

- (a.) A Self-Study Report is required to include complete evidence addressing all applicable Standards and components.
- (b.) An EPP subject to Policy II.5.02 must include in its Self-Study Report evidence demonstrating compliance with requirements regarding distance education policies and procedures and transfer of credit policies.
- (c.) The Self-Study Report and all supporting documentation furnished by the EPP (collectively referred to as evidence) must be provided in English.

In submitting its Self-Study Report, an EPP is expected to include evidence tagged to Standards for Accreditation. Any Review Team member may also seek additional or clarifying information from the EPP, as necessary.

Policy IV.1.04 Assignment of Evaluation Team

CAEP will inform the EPP once an Evaluation Team has been assigned, in accordance with policies and procedures on the selection of volunteers pursuant to Part VI and will provide the EPP with the name and professional affiliation(s) of each team member.

Policy IV.1.05 Formative Feedback

Following the EPP's submission of its Self-Study Report, the Evaluation Team will evaluate the Self-Study Report and supporting documentation provided by the EPP. The Evaluation Team may also consider the EPP's Annual Reports, if any, as well as any substantive change notices, third-party comments, complaints, and reports from or information provided by other accreditors. No less than 5 months prior to the first date of the scheduled Site Review, the designated lead of the Evaluation Team (Team Lead) will provide the EPP with a Formative Feedback Report based on the team's analysis of the EPP's case (Self-Study Report and supporting documentation furnished by the EPP). The Formative Feedback Report includes feedback on the format and content of the Self-Study Report, as determined appropriate by the Team Lead.

Following receipt of a Formative Feedback Report, an EPP has an opportunity to provide the Review Team with additional information and evidence in the form of a Self-Study Report Addendum.

Policy IV.1.06 Self-Study Report Addendum

Not later than 60 days after receipt of the Formative Feedback Report, the EPP must submit a Self-Study Report Addendum using an electronic template provided by CAEP or indicate in writing that it elects not to submit an Addendum. An Addendum may include up to 50 items of evidence not included with the Self-Study Report submission.

During this period and through the conclusion of the Site Review, the Team Lead, other team members, and CAEP staff may respond to questions or requests for guidance from the EPP; however, the EPP is ultimately responsible for understanding and adhering to the applicable CAEP policies, procedures, and Standards and should not rely on any such guidance as an official interpretation of or alternative to any requirement.

Policy IV.1.07 Solicitation of Third-Party Comments

No later than 16 weeks prior to the first day of a scheduled Site Review, both the EPP and CAEP must publicly announce the upcoming Review and the dates on which the Review will take place. Any such announcement must provide an opportunity for third-party comment in writing concerning the EPP's qualifications for accreditation, in accordance with the following:

- (a.) An EPP must establish a third-party comment period of at least 1 month. CAEP will accept third-party comments up to 6 weeks prior to the first day of a scheduled Review.
- (b.) No later than 7 days after making the required announcement, the EPP must provide CAEP with evidence of the announcement. The failure of an EPP to comply with this established timeline may result in a decision by CAEP to reschedule the Review.

- (c.) No later than 1 month prior to the first day of a scheduled Review, CAEP will provide an EPP with a copy of any third-party comments it receives and the EPP will provide CAEP with a copy of any third-party comments it receives.
- (d.) The EPP may submit a written response on any such comments to CAEP no later than 2 weeks prior to the first day of the scheduled Review.

The Evaluation Team, along with any designated observer(s) and state participant(s) which may be assigned by CAEP or in accordance with a partnership agreement entered into between CAEP and the EPP's governing authority, conducts a review of the EPP. See Section VI for information on the roles of CAEP staff, observers, and others in a Site Review.

Policy IV.1.08 Site Review

In accordance with Site Review date(s) established pursuant to Policy IV.1.01, the Evaluation Team will conduct a review of the EPP during which it will obtain sufficient information to determine if the EPP meets applicable Standards.

- (a.) The Site Review will be conducted in English even if English is not the EPP's primary language of instruction.
- (b.) The activities of the Evaluation Team include the following:
 - (i.) Examination of all evidence cited in the Self-Study Report;
 - (ii.) Interviews of EPP administrators, faculty and/or instructors, candidates, graduates, employers, and other members of the professional community as appropriate and identified in consultation with the EPP's designated CAEP coordinator;
 - (iii.) Investigations into the cited evidence, as needed; and,
 - (iv.) Certification of the existence and sufficiency of policies and procedures related to other applicable accreditation requirements pursuant to Policy II.5.02.
- (d.) During the Site Review, any team member may ask the EPP to provide additional supporting documentation (evidence) or the EPP may provide any such evidence to the team on its own accord; however, a maximum of 50 additional evidence documents may be uploaded and no additional evidence may be submitted for evaluation after 5:00 PM local time on the last full day of the Review.
- (e.) At the conclusion of the Review, the Team Lead or the Team Lead's designee will share with the EPP's designee(s) an overview of the process steps from the end of the Site Review through Accreditation Council decision and notification of the decision by CAEP's President.

Because it is the role of the Accreditation Council, not the Review Team, to make an accreditation decision, EPPs should not consider information or perspectives shared by the Review Team at this point in the process to be indicative of Areas for Improvement (AFIs) and Stipulations. After the Review Team has completed its examination and analysis of all evidence and reflected on the totality of the evidence, findings, and recommendations regarding the EPP's compliance with all applicable Standards and components is summarized in a report and all deficiencies are clearly identified.

Policy IV.1.09 Site Review Report

No later than 30 days after the conclusion of the Site Review, the Team Lead will submit the team's Site Review Report to CAEP. Following acceptance of the Site Review Report, CAEP will inform the EPP that the Site Review Report is available for review.

The Site Review Report will:

- (a.) Provide an explanation of the extent to which the EPP's compliance with all applicable Standards and other applicable accreditation requirements were verified by the Review Team through the evidence that was examined;
- (b.) Summarize observations regarding the completeness, quality, and strength of evidence provided for each Standard.
- (c.) Clearly identify any deficiencies in the EPP's compliance with Standards.

All such judgments must be made only after the Team Lead determines that the Review Team has a reasonable basis for determining that the information evaluated is accurate.

The EPP has an opportunity to respond in writing to CAEP's report on the Site Review.

Policy IV.1.10 EPP's Optional Rejoinder

No later than 30 days after the EPP receives notice the Site Review Report is available for review, the EPP may opt to submit a Rejoinder. The Rejoinder may not include new evidence (i.e., evidence not included in the Self-Study Report or already submitted to CAEP via the electronic accreditation information management system).

If the EPP elects not to submit a Rejoinder, it must expressly waive the right to submit a Rejoinder by providing CAEP with written notice of the waiver within the established timeline for submission.

Policy IV.1.11 Team Lead's Optional Response

If the EPP submits a Rejoinder within the timeline established in Policy III.2.10, the Team Lead has the option of providing a Response to the Rejoinder.

- (a.) If the Team Lead elects to provide a Response to the Rejoinder, the Response will be submitted to CAEP no later than 30 days after the date on which the EPP submitted its Rejoinder. Following acceptance of the Rejoinder, CAEP will inform the EPP that the Response to the Rejoinder is available for review.
- (b.) If the Team Lead elects not to submit a Response to the Rejoinder, they must provide CAEP with notice of that election.

Policy IV.1.12 Assignment of Accreditation Council Review Panels

Before the next Accreditation Council meeting, CAEP staff, in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair, will:

- (a.) Assign Councilors that have been confirmed as participants to Review Panels; and
- (b.) Assign each EPP on the agenda for Accreditation Council action to an Initial Review Panel and Joint Review Panel pursuant to Policy IV.1.13.

Initial Review Panels generally have 3 Councilors assigned; however, as few as 2 Councilors may constitute a properly established Initial Review Panel. Joint Review Panels are made up of 2 Initial Review Panels, one of which is the Initial Review Panel assigned for the initial review.

One member of each Review Panel is designated the Panel Chair. At his/her discretion, a Panel Chair may engage the panelists in a preliminary discussion on any case assigned to the Panel with the purpose of ensuring panelists have all information needed to prepare for the Panel meeting and, if needed, guidance on the Panel review process.

During the next regular meeting of the Accreditation Council, an Initial Review Panel assembled in accordance with Policy IV.1.13, will consider the EPP's case for Accreditation, including any third-party comments, and allow EPP testimony in support of the Self-Study Report before formulating a recommendation to grant or deny accreditation. In doing so, the Accreditation Council, including Initial and Joint Review panelists, conducts its own analysis of the Self-Study Report and supporting documentation furnished by the EPP, the Site Review Report, the EPP's response to the report, if provided, any Rejoinder, and any other appropriate information from other sources to determine whether the EPP complies with CAEP's Standards.

Policy IV.1.13 Accreditation Council Review, Decisions, and Term of Accreditation

(a.) **Initial Review Panel**

The Initial Review Panel reviews the EPP's case and makes a recommendation regarding whether an EPP meets all applicable Standards, and, if applicable, other accreditation requirements established pursuant to Policy II.5.02. In doing so, the Initial Review Panel confirms or modifies the recommendations made by the Evaluation Team.

The State Lead or designated representative (identified pursuant to any partnership agreement between CAEP and the state, country, or other governing authority under which the EPP operates) is invited to attend the Initial Review Panel session. The Evaluation Team Lead may also be asked to participate in any portion or the entirety of the Initial Review Panel meeting.

The Initial Review Panel provides the EPP an opportunity to participate in the meeting of the Panel for no more than 20 minutes, either in person or virtually. The primary purpose of this opportunity is to allow the EPP to respond to any clarifying questions the Initial Review Panel has identified through its activities, focusing first on any components for which severe or moderate deficiencies have been noted. The EPP may not present new evidence.

(b.) **Joint Review Panel**

After the Initial Review Panel concludes its review of an EPP's case, a Joint Review Panel reviews the recommendation(s) of the Initial Review Panel and either concurs with or modifies the recommendation(s).

(c.) **Accreditation Council Review and Decision; Conditions Imposed**

The accreditation decisions available to the Council, below, are further defined in Policy VII.6.02. Each has a standard term of accreditation that establishes the interval for a comprehensive re-evaluation of the EPP, conducted in accordance with the Renewal of Accreditation process (see Section IV). An EPP's term begins on the date of the final accrediting action.

- (i.) **Accreditation.** The Accreditation Council finds that the EPP has met all applicable Standards at the specified level of accreditation. The Council may identify one or more Areas for Improvement (AFIs). The EPP is given a 7-year term of accreditation, subject to full adherence to requirements for Continuing Accreditation as provided in Section VI. Continuing Accreditation. In each annual report, through the EPP's next accreditation review, the EPP must provide evidence of its efforts to address all AFIs and stipulations.
- (ii.) **Accreditation with Stipulations.** The Accreditation Council finds that the EPP has met all applicable Standards at the specified level of accreditation in spite of the identification of 1 or more serious deficiencies which shall be articulated as Stipulations. The Council may also identify one or more Areas for Improvement (AFIs). The EPP is given a 2-year term of accreditation subject to full adherence to the corrective action requirements described below

and the requirements for Continuing Accreditation as provided in Section VI. Continuing Accreditation. In each annual report, through the EPP's next accreditation review, the EPP must provide evidence of its efforts to address all AFIs and stipulations.

Corrective action is required. Before the expiration of the 2-year term, on a timeline established by CAEP, the EPP must submit a Targeted Stipulations Report demonstrating significant progress toward the complete correction of any identified Stipulation. Following submission of the Targeted Stipulations Report, the EPP must undergo a Virtual Site Review during which the Targeted Stipulations Report and related evidence is reviewed by an Evaluation Team. The Evaluation Team may also consider the EPP's Annual Reports, if any, as well as any substantive change notices, third-party comments, complaints, and reports from or information provided by other accreditors.

Not more than 30 days after the conclusion of the Review, the designated Evaluation Team Lead submits to CAEP a Stipulations Review Report with findings and 1 or more recommendations for Accreditation Council action, within the following parameters:

Full Correction of Stipulation(s) - If the Accreditation Council concludes that the EPP has completely corrected all Stipulations identified, it may remove the Stipulation(s), issue a decision of Accreditation, and extend the term of accreditation so that the EPP has the remainder of a full 7-year term (not more than 5 years beyond the initial 2-year Accreditation with Stipulations term). The Accreditation Council may also identify 1 or more new AFIs. In each annual report, through the EPP's next accreditation review, the EPP must provide evidence of its efforts to address all AFIs and stipulations.

Significant Improvement Toward Full Correction of Stipulation(s) – If the Accreditation Council concludes that the EPP has partially corrected the identified Stipulation(s), it may, if there is evidence of significant improvement such that there are no longer serious any serious deficiencies, downgrade the Stipulation(s) to one or more AFIs, issue a decision of Accreditation, and extend the term of accreditation so that the EPP has the remainder of a full 7-year term (not more than 5 years beyond the initial 2-year Accreditation with Stipulations term). In each annual report, through the EPP's next accreditation review, the EPP must provide evidence of its efforts to address all AFIs and stipulations.

Insufficient Improvement Toward Full Correction of Stipulation(s) – If the Accreditation Council concludes that the EPP has partially corrected the identified Stipulation(s), but finds insufficient evidence of significant improvement such that serious deficiencies remain, the Stipulation(s) may not be downgraded to AFIs. The Stipulation(s) must be retained. The Accreditation Council may also identify 1 or more new AFIs. Using the preponderance of evidence standard of review prescribed in Policy II.5.01, the Council may issue a decision of: (1) Accreditation with Stipulations, if it finds that the EPP has met all applicable Standards; (2) Probationary Accreditation if it finds that the EPP has met all but 1 applicable Standard; or (3) Revocation of Accreditation if it finds that the EPP has not met 2 or more applicable Standards or has failed to fully comply with the requirements of this Policy or any other accreditation requirements. In each annual report, through the EPP's next accreditation review, the EPP must provide evidence of its efforts to address all AFIs and stipulations.

- (iii.) **Probationary Accreditation.** The Accreditation Council finds that the EPP has met all but 1 applicable Standard at the specified level of accreditation (any 1 Standard is not met). Serious deficiencies shall be articulated as Stipulations and remedied by the EPP in accordance with the provisions, above, regarding Accreditation with Stipulations. The Council may also

identify one or more AFIs. The EPP is given a 2-year term of accreditation subject to full adherence to the corrective action requirements described below and the requirements for Continuing Accreditation as provided in Section VI. Continuing Accreditation. In each annual report, through the EPP's next accreditation review, the EPP must provide evidence of its efforts to address all AFIs and stipulations.

Corrective action is required. Before the expiration of the 2-year term, on a timeline established by CAEP, the EPP must submit a Targeted Self-Study Report demonstrating that it now meets the Standard previously found to be unmet and has made significant progress toward the complete correction of any identified Stipulation(s). Following submission of the Targeted Self-Study Report, the EPP must undergo a Site Review, focused on the unmet Standard and any identified Stipulation(s), during which the Targeted Self-Study Report and related evidence is reviewed by an Evaluation. The Evaluation Team may also consider the EPP's Annual Reports, if any, as well as any substantive change notices, third-party comments, complaints, and reports from or information provided by other accreditors.

Not more than 30 days after the conclusion of the Review, the designated Evaluation Team Lead submits to CAEP a Stipulations Review Report with findings and 1 or more recommendations for Accreditation Council action-, within the following parameters:

If the Accreditation Council concludes that the EPP has met the Standard previously identified as unmet and provided evidence of significant improvement toward the complete correction of any Stipulation identified, it may issue a decision of (1) Accreditation, and extend the term of accreditation so that the EPP has the remainder of a full 7-year term (not more than 5 years beyond the initial 2-year Accreditation with Stipulations term); or (2) Accreditation with Stipulations, and extend the term of accreditation for only 2 additional years after which the EPP will be required to undergo an Accreditation with Stipulations review as described above. The Accreditation Council may also identify 1 or more new AFIs. In each annual report, through the EPP's next accreditation review, the EPP must provide evidence of its efforts to address all AFIs and stipulations.

In all other cases, the Accreditation Council must Revoke accreditation. An EPP may not be given a subsequent Probationary Accreditation decision.

- (iv.) **Revocation of Accreditation.** The Accreditation Council finds that the EPP has not met 2 or more applicable Standards.

See Policy VII.6.02 Accreditation Decisions and Notification for information on the notification CAEP issues (to an EPP, the appropriate state licensing or authorizing agency, other accreditors, and the public) following any accreditation decision.

Policy IV.1.14 Adverse Action

Any Accreditation Council decision to deny or revoke accreditation may be appealed in accordance with CAEP's Ad-Hoc Appeal Policy. Following a final accrediting action of Revocation or Denial, the EPP must wait 1 year before beginning the Initial Accreditation process.

Policy IV.1.15 Early Council Decision

In any case in which an EPP comes before the Accreditation Council for a reaccreditation decision more than 1 semester before the end of the EPP's current term of accreditation, the remainder of the current term

is rescinded, and the date of the new Council action becomes the basis for the next term of accreditation. If reaccreditation is denied, the Denial decision is effective on the date of Accreditation Council action or at the conclusion of an appeal.

To maintain accreditation, an EPP must meet all Continuing Accreditation requirements established in Section V, including but not limited to, the submission of an Annual Report and remittance of an annual fee. Any failure to meet all such requirements may result in issuance of a Warning Action notice, pursuant to Policy VII.6.03, or Adverse Action.

An accredited EPP may end its voluntarily membership with CAEP, and thus terminate or not seek renewal of CAEP accreditation status, in one of two ways, described below as Lapse of Accreditation and Voluntary Withdrawal.

Policy IV.1.16 Voluntary Withdrawal by EPP

An EPP may withdraw from the accreditation process at any time prior to the date of any Accreditation Council decision on Accreditation Status by submitting a letter of withdrawal from the EPP administrator (e.g., President, Provost, Chief Academic Officer) to the CAEP President. The EPP's Applicant Status will be terminated on the date that the letter of withdrawal is received by CAEP unless a date of withdrawal is enumerated in the letter. CAEP will not refund any fees paid prior to the date of withdrawal.

A notice of withdrawal received by CAEP after the date of any Accreditation Council decision to grant or deny accreditation is not effective, and the Council's decision will stand pending the outcome of any appeal.

Policy IV.1.17 REPEALED

When representing its accreditation to the public, an EPP must report the accreditation decision accurately, including the specific licensure level covered by the accreditation, and the address and telephone number of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation as provided on the CAEP website. The official statement to be publicly displayed on the EPP's website is provided by CAEP following Accreditation Council action, as defined by the CAEP Communication Guidelines.

Policy IV.1.18 Restrictions on Communicating Accreditation Status

An EPP awarded accreditation may elect to make its accreditation status public. In doing so, it must:

- (a.) Disclose the status accurately, including the specific academic or instructional programs covered by that status and CAEP's name, address, and telephone number;
- (b.) Adhere to CAEP's guidelines on communicating CAEP accreditation status, including terms and conditions on use of the CAEP logo; and
- (c.) Issue an immediate correction if made aware or otherwise determining that the information the EPP has released about the following is in any way incorrect or misleading:
 - a) The accreditation status of the EPP;
 - b) The contents of reports of on-site reviews; and
 - c) CAEP's accrediting actions with respect to the EPP.

CAEP staff periodically review EPP statements of accreditation to ensure the accuracy of representation. If CAEP becomes aware that an EPP is not accurately reporting its accreditation to

the public, the EPP will be contacted and directed to immediately issue a corrective communication. Failure to correct misleading or inaccurate statements may lead to Adverse Action.

V. CONTINUING ACCREDITATION

Throughout the term of accreditation, an EPP is required to remain in compliance with all applicable Standards, remit annual fees per Policy II.10.01, and submit complete Annual Reports which are a key component of the approaches CAEP uses to monitor and reevaluate accredited EPPs. An EPP having Accreditation with Stipulations or Probationary Accreditation must also comply with all associated conditions as detailed in a written Action Report distributed following the decision. The failure of an EPP to do so may lead to an Accreditation Council decision to revoke accreditation or take other corrective action.

1. Public Reporting

Policy V.1.01 Consumer Information

Through the term of accreditation, an EPP must make public information designed for use by consumers. This information, including data on the EPP's candidates and data required of institutions and programs under Title II of the Higher Education Act, must be made widely available and in accordance with the requirements of the U.S. Department of Education and other federal, state, or international governmental entities as applicable.

2. Annual Fee

Annual fees will be assessed yearly and must be paid per Policy II.10.01 described above.

3. Annual Monitoring and Reevaluation of Accredited EPPs

Policy V.3.01 Annual Accreditation Report

CAEP maintains and periodically reviews and revises annual monitoring and reevaluation expectations of accredited EPPs, as appropriate to meet the requirements of CAEP policy, recognition guidelines of the Council for Higher Education Accreditation, and federal accreditor recognition requirements. Templates to be used by EPPs in submitting an annual accreditation report are made available each year. Different templates and/or submission requirements may be used for EPPs having different accreditation status designations or at different points in the term of accreditation. The Annual Accreditation Report (Annual Report) process, along with CAEP's review of any complaint against an EPP and information provided by other accreditors, is used to monitor and evaluate an EPP's continued compliance with CAEP's Standards and accreditation requirements. The Annual Accreditation Report requires, at a minimum:

- (a.) Information demonstrating that the EPP is correcting or has corrected any conditions leading to the identification of Areas for Improvement and Stipulations from prior accreditation decisions;
- (b.) Key data and indicators, including but not limited to, fiscal information and measures of completers' effectiveness and impact on P-12 student learning; and
- (c.) Current headcount enrollment data which will be used to monitor overall growth of the EPP; and
- (d.) Report substantive changes that may affect an EPP's accreditation status or eligibility.

In January of each year, CAEP will notify an EPP with an accreditation status that the Annual Accreditation Report has been opened. Such notification may be dispatched through CAEP's electronic accreditation platform. No later than 90 days after receiving access to the Annual Report template, an EPP must submit a complete Annual Accreditation Report using CAEP's reporting form.

An EPP's Annual Accreditation Report will be reviewed and evaluated by CAEP staff and if deemed necessary, a team of volunteer Annual Report Reviewers, selected pursuant to Section VI.2, and the EPP Transparency, Accountability, and Improvement Committee of the Accreditation Council.

Following receipt of information from CAEP regarding an Annual Report deficiency, an EPP must take timely action to correct the deficiency in accordance with instructions provided by CAEP staff and, if applicable, provide any additional information requested so that CAEP can adequately monitor the growth of programs at any freestanding EPP experiencing significant enrollment growth. Any deficiency identified as serious must be corrected within a timeline established by CAEP. Evidence of an EPP's correction of any deficiency not identified as serious may be included in the EPP's next annual report.

Neither the lack of any Annual Report deficiencies nor an EPP's correction of Annual Report deficiencies are to be considered an assurance that an EPP is prepared or on track to successfully demonstrating compliance with CAEP Standards.

During every accreditation review, any Evaluation Team assigned to review the EPP and the Accreditation Council will be provided access to every Annual Report submitted by the EPP, including information on correction of deficiencies, from the date of the EPP's last full accreditation. Evaluation Team members and Councilors may consider all such information as evidence in making any accreditation decision or in instituting a Warning action.

CAEP also makes an EPP's Annual Reports, along with feedback provided by CAEP through the annual report review process, available to the state in which the EPP is located, so long as CAEP has a partnership agreement with the state.

Policy V.3.02 Continued Compliance with Standards

Failure to maintain compliance with all applicable Standards will be considered cause for immediate initiation of an Accreditation Council decision to revoke accreditation by issuing a directive that the EPP bring itself into compliance within a period of time specified by the Accreditation Council.

The period of time specified for an EPP to take corrective action and come into compliance will not exceed:

- (a.) 12 months, if the longest program offered by the EPP is less than 1 year in length;
- (b.) 18 months, if the longest program offered by the EPP is at least 1 year, but less than 2 years, in length;
or
- (c.) 2 years, if the longest program offered by the EPP is at least 2 years in length.

If the EPP does not bring itself into compliance within the specified period, the Accreditation Council will take immediate Adverse Action unless it, for good cause, extends the period for achieving compliance.

CAEP may consider any concerns raised about an EPP by any nationally recognized accrediting agency as evidence of any EPP's failure to maintain compliance. The CAEP President may request, and the Accreditation Council may consider, a report from any such accreditor that describes the nature of the issues giving rise to concerns.

If the Accreditation Council determines that a Virtual Site Review or On-Site Review is required in order to verify that an EPP has come into compliance, it may require a Special Review and the EPP must undergo the Review within the timeline specified by the Council and remit payment for CAEP's invoice of all costs directly associated with the Review.

4. Notice of Any Substantive Change; Approval Process

Policy V.4.01 Substantive Change

- (a.) Any EPP that relies on CAEP to perform the Title IV gatekeeper role as required pursuant to the federal Higher Education Act, must obtain Accreditation Council approval of any of the substantive changes identified below before CAEP will include the changes in the accreditation status previously granted to the EPP. Any other EPP must report any such change to CAEP within 30 days and in the EPP's next Annual Report.
 - (i.) Any substantial change in the established mission or objectives of the EPP or the institution under which it operates;
 - (ii.) Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP or the institution under which it operates;
 - (iii.) The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure from existing offerings of educational programs, or method of delivery, from those that were offered when CAEP last reviewed the EPP;
 - (iv.) Any change in a course or program which results in any course or program being provided by an entity other than the EPP;
 - (v.) The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from that which is included in the EPP's current accreditation;
 - (vi.) A change in the way an institution measures candidate progress – including whether the institution measures progress in clock hours or credit-hours, semesters, trimester, or quarters, or uses time-based or non-time-based methods;
 - (vii.) A substantial increase in the number of clock or credit hours awarded for successful completion of a program;
 - (viii.) If CAEP's accreditation of an EPP enables the EPP to seek eligibility to participate in Title IV, HEA programs, the entering into a contract under which an institution or organization not certified to participate in the Title IV, HEA programs offers more than 25 percent of one or more of the accredited EPP's educational programs;
 - (ix.) If CAEP's accreditation of an EPP enables it to seek eligibility to participate in Title IV, HEA programs, the establishment of an additional location at which the EPP offers at least 50 percent of an educational program and which is considered a Branch Campus. The addition of such a location must be approved by CAEP unless CAEP determines, and issues a written determination stating that the institution has:
 - (B) Successfully completed at least 1 cycle of accreditation of maximum length offered by CAEP and 1 renewal, or has been accredited for at least 10 years;
 - (C) At least 3 additional locations that CAEP has approved; and
 - (D) Met criteria established by CAEP indicating sufficient capacity to add additional locations without individual prior approvals, including at a minimum satisfactory evidence of a system to ensure quality across a distributed enterprise that includes--
 - i. Clearly identified academic control;
 - ii. Regular evaluation of the locations;
 - iii. Adequate faculty, facilities, resources, and academic and candidate support systems;
 - iv. Financial stability; and
 - v. Long-range planning for expansion.
 - (x.) The acquisition of any other institution or any program or location of another institution; and

- (xi.) The addition of a permanent location at a site at which the institution is conducting a teach-out for candidates (students of the EPP) of another institution that has ceased operating before all candidates have completed their program of study.
- (b.) Any EPP that relies on CAEP to perform the Title IV gatekeeper role as required pursuant to the federal Higher Education Act, must obtain Accreditation Council approval of any of the substantive changes.

Following any determination by the EPP Transparency, Accountability and Improvement Committee of the Accreditation Council that the changes made or proposed by an EPP are or would be so extensive as to impose significant challenges on the EPP in complying with all applicable CAEP Standards and requirements, the Accreditation Council may take action to require CAEP to conduct a new comprehensive evaluation of the EPP. At the discretion of the Accreditation Council, any such evaluation may include a Virtual Review or On-Site Review.

If approval of a substantive change is required, the EPP Transparency, Accountability, and Improvement Committee, within 90 days of CAEP's receipt of the substantive change notification, will convene and make a recommendation for Accreditation Council action to approve or deny approval of the change. If approval is granted, the Accreditation Council decision must specify a future date on which the change will be included in the EPP's accreditation.

5. Good Cause Extension

📖 Policy V.5.01 Timeline Modifications; Good Cause Extension; Term Changes

- (a.) **Timeline Modification.** In cases where the accreditation process timeline established by CAEP cannot be met due to CAEP's scheduling constraints or unexpected circumstances encountered by the EPP, the CAEP President may approve a revised timeline.
- (b.) **Timeline Waiver at Request of EPP; Optional 1-Year Good Cause Extension.** Notwithstanding paragraph (a.), an EPP that cannot complete its Self-Study Report in compliance with the timeline established in Policy IV.1.03, may request an extension of the submission deadline of up to 1 year. The EPP must provide sufficient justification to demonstrate need for an extension. Any such request must be received by CAEP no later than 30 days before the originally established submission deadline. CAEP may seek additional information from the EPP and may solicit input from the state or other governing authority if applicable. Any such extension is granted at the discretion of the CAEP President and will be communicated in a "timeline waiver" letter establishing a revised timeline for all accreditation actions from Self-Study Report submission through the Accreditation Council decision.

If the approval of an extension of the submission deadline necessitates an extension of the EPP's term of accreditation, the President may approve a Good Cause Extension of not more than 1 year.

CAEP must receive any such request no earlier than 24 months and no later than 12 months prior to the EPP's Site Review semester.

- (c.) **Good Cause Extension of More than 1 Year.**

Any Good Cause Extension request that, if granted, would result in an extension of the EPP's current term of accreditation by more than 1 year, may only be approved by the Accreditation Council on a motion from the EPP Transparency, Accountability, and Improvement Committee, if the Committee and Council find that one of the following factors is appropriate justification for an extension:

- (i.) State or federal standards or legislation requiring significant programmatic change;

(ii.) The EPP has recently undergone or is planning to undergo a substantive change as described in Policy V.4.01; or

(iii.) Other extenuating circumstances, such as an Act of God, natural disaster, or civil unrest.

CAEP must receive any such request no earlier than 24 months and no later than 12 months prior to the EPP's Site Review semester. No Good Cause Extension will be granted if such approval would result in an extension of term by more than 2 years.

(d.) The state, country, or other governing authority under which the EPP operates must provide a letter of support for any Good Cause Extension. The lack of demonstrated support will be considered grounds for denial of the request.

(e.) If a Good Cause Extension is granted, the term of accreditation granted through the subsequent review will be reduced by the length of the extension. For example, upon the expiration of a one-year extension, the EPP's next term of accreditation will be shortened by 1 year.

(f.) An administrative fee will be applied to all Good Cause Extension applications. In addition, the EPP will be charged for any expense already incurred by CAEP (including non-refundable travel costs incurred for a Site Review) at the time a Good Cause Extension is requested and granted.

(g.) Any Good Cause Extension granted to an EPP will be made public by CAEP on its website.

Policy V.5.02 Merger and Acquisition

(a.) **Merger**

If 2 or more CAEP-accredited EPPs merge, subject to the approval of the state, country, or other governing authority under which the surviving EPP operates, the next Review will be scheduled to take place on the timeline established for the Review of the EPP with the shortest remaining term.

(b.) **Program Acquisition**

If a CAEP-accredited EPP assumes control of 1 or more programs that were previously operated by another CAEP-accredited EPP, the programs within CAEP's Scope of Accreditation will be submitted by the acquiring EPP in its next scheduled Review.

If the acquiring EPP is not CAEP-accredited, any programs it assumes that were evaluated as part of a CAEP accreditation review and decision of the EPP previously operating the program may, subject to written approval by CAEP, the CAEP-accredited EPP, and the state, country, or other governing authority under which both EPPs operate, benefit from the previous EPP's CAEP accreditation for not more than 2 years from the date of the acquisition. As such, if the CAEP-accredited EPP that previously operated the program allows a graduate of the program to receive a diploma from that EPP, the graduate will be considered to have graduated from a CAEP-accredited EPP.

As appropriate, CAEP staff will provide timely notice to any SPA undertaking a review of an EPP subject to this policy on mergers and acquisitions.

Policy V.5.03 Teach-Out Plan

CAEP may request and review the teach-out plan and/or teach-out agreement of an EPP either as part of its substantive change report, in relation to merger plans, or in the event of a final accreditation action to revoke accreditation.

If CAEP receives recognition from the U.S. Secretary of Education, CAEP will require an EPP to submit a teach-out plan to CAEP for approval upon the occurrence of any of the following events:

- (a.) The U.S. Secretary notifies CAEP that the Secretary has initiated an emergency action against the EPP or the institution under which the EPP operates, in accordance with section 487(c)(1)(G) of the HEA, or an action to limit, suspend, or terminate an EPP or institution participating in any title IV, HEA program, in accordance with 487(c)(1)(F) of the HEA, and that a teach-out plan is required;
- (b.) The state, country, or other governing authority under which the EPP operates notifies CAEP that it has initiated action against the EPP or the institution under which the EPP operates and such action, if approved, will limit, suspend, or terminate the authority's approval of the EPP or institution;
- (c.) An institutional accreditor, an institution, or an EPP notifies CAEP that action against the institution has been initiated to limit, suspend, or terminate the institution's accreditation; or
 - (d.) The EPP notifies CAEP that it intends to cease operations entirely or close a location that provides one hundred percent of at least 1 program, including if the program is being moved and is considered by the Secretary to be a closed school.

In reviewing and approving any such plan, CAEP will evaluate the plan to ensure that it provides for the equitable treatment of candidates, specifies additional charges, if any, and provides for the notification to the candidates of any additional charges. CAEP may require an EPP to enter into a teach-out agreement as part of a teach-out plan. Upon approval by CAEP of any teach-out plan for an EPP that is accredited by another recognized accrediting agency, CAEP will notify that agency of its approval.

An accredited EPP may end its voluntarily membership with CAEP, and thus terminate or not seek renewal of CAEP accreditation status, in one of two ways, described below as Lapse of Accreditation and Voluntary Withdrawal.

Policy V.5.04 Voluntary Withdrawal by an EPP

An EPP may withdraw from the Renewal of Accreditation process at any time prior to the date of any Accreditation Council decision to deny or revoke Accreditation by submitting a letter of withdrawal from the EPP administrator (e.g., President, Provost, Chief Academic Officer) to the CAEP President. The EPP's accreditation will be terminated on the date that the letter of withdrawal is received by CAEP unless a date of withdrawal is enumerated in the letter. The EPP will be charged for any expense already incurred by CAEP (including, but not limited to, Evaluation Team travel) at the time of the withdrawal.

A notice of withdrawal received by CAEP after the date of any Accreditation Council decision to deny or revoke accreditation is not effective, and the Council's decision will stand pending the outcome of any appeal.

When an EPP fails to submit its Self-Study Report or to undergo any scheduled Review without having requested and had approved a Good Cause Extension pursuant to Policy V.5.01, the EPP's accreditation will be considered to have lapsed at the end of the current term of accreditation and the EPP must begin the Initial Accreditation process in order to attain accreditation again.

VI. CAEP VOLUNTEERS

CAEP's Initial Accreditation and Renewal of Accreditation are voluntary processes carried out with the assistance of hundreds of unpaid volunteers. The primary roles of volunteers, described in this Part, are:

- Annual Report Reviewers;
- Review Team Members (Reviewers);
- Review Team Leaders (Team Leads), and
- Accreditation Council Members (Councilors).

This Part also includes information on the participation of others – Observers and CAEP staff, in CAEP's review of any EPP.

CAEP's cadre of volunteers have extensive experience in and offer a variety of perspectives on, educator preparation. They include academic and administrative personnel, educators and practitioners, and representatives of the public. Every volunteer in service has met minimum qualifications, successfully completed role-specific training (including cultural competence training), and agreed to adhere to CAEP's Code of Conduct, policies, and procedures. CAEP administers a volunteer evaluation process through which any volunteer may provide feedback on the performance of another volunteer and make recommendations to CAEP regarding training, technical assistance, and support.

CAEP's commitment to diversity means that the Accreditation Council, in selecting volunteers for various roles, will strive to do the following:

- Obtain and maintain equitable representation of ethnicity, race, gender, religion, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, exceptionality, age, geographic region, roles and professional background, and type and size of organizations for which volunteers work; and,
- Balance representation from the various stakeholder groups of higher education representatives, P-12 practitioners, employers, policy makers, public, student, and at-large representatives.

All volunteers are expected to provide CAEP with timely notification of any change in their qualifications, relevant professional affiliations, and contact information. CAEP may disclose the identity of any volunteer, along with information on such volunteer's professional affiliations and assignment of duties, to the U.S. Department of Education, CHEA, state and other governing bodies, and other CAEP volunteers.

1. Code of Conduct

The Code of Conduct for volunteers is made up of several policies and related procedures. The failure of any volunteer to comply with any aspect of the Code of Conduct will be considered grounds for removal from duty.

Policy VI.1.01 Code of Ethics

Every CAEP volunteer is expected to maintain the highest standards of ethical behavior, which include, but are not limited to, the following:

- (a.) Conducting oneself professionally, with truth, accuracy, and fairness;
- (b.) Preparing oneself thoroughly for every assignment,

- (c.) Through individual and group activities, pursuing a full and accurate understanding of all facts relevant to each EPP being reviewed and any other duties undertaken, including engaging in deliberations; expressing dissenting views and opinions, as appropriate; and arriving at conclusions independently.
- (d.) Carrying out all assigned duties with collegiality. Collegiality refers to behavior that is professional, cooperative and respectful. Respectful disagreement and infrequent or isolated incidents of discord should not be designated as non-collegial behavior. Civil discussion related to differences of opinion and diverse views are crucial to fulfillment of CAEP's vision and mission. Examples of behaviors that are antithetical to collegiality include demeaning others, bullying, discrimination in any form, and intimidation.
- (e.) Not accepting a consulting assignment related to any EPP's accreditation during the term of service or for 1 year after service with CAEP has ended, except as permitted pursuant to Policy VI.1.05;
- (f.) Declaring any potential conflict or competing interest, and taking all necessary action to resolve the conflict or issue;
- (g.) Maintaining confidence throughout the accreditation processes and on behalf of all participants, including not sharing any information that might compromise the integrity of an accreditation decision;
- (h.) Successfully completing CAEP training in preparation for any responsibilities to be undertaken, including training on the Standards, policies and procedures, and cultural competence;
- (i.) Maintaining accreditation materials and records in accordance with the requirements of Governance Policy, related guidance, and training
- (j.) Not showing bias or prejudice against an EPP being reviewed or others involved in the accreditation process; and
- (k.) Not accepting gifts, bribes, or anything of value that may give the appearance of favor or partiality in any decisions rendered regarding CAEP's affairs, activities, and policies.

CAEP maintains and fosters an environment in which all volunteers are treated with decency and respect. Therefore, CAEP prohibits discrimination and all forms of harassment including, but not limited to, sexual and racial harassment. No form of discriminatory or harassing conduct towards any volunteer, employee, EPP, or other person will be tolerated. CAEP is committed to enforcing this at all levels within CAEP, and any volunteer who engages in discrimination or harassment will be subject to immediate removal from volunteer activities. All investigations of harassment claims are conducted by the CAEP Compliance Officer and in alignment with Section II.5 Complaints.

Policy VI.1.02 Conflicts of Interest

Every CAEP volunteer is expected to maintain relationships and practices in their CAEP activities that do not demonstrate conflicts of interest. They conduct CAEP business, including their private business and financial affairs that might impinge upon CAEP, in a manner that can withstand the sharpest scrutiny by those who would seek to find conflicts and, thus, they exclude themselves from CAEP activities for any reason that may represent an actual or perceived conflict of interest.

(a.) Non-Exhaustive List of Conflicts of Interest

- (i.) Current employment, of the volunteer or any immediate family member of the volunteer, by an EPP under review, including as a consultant;
- (ii.) Prior employment (within the last 10 years), of the volunteer or any immediate family member of the volunteer, in a staff, faculty, or administrator role, by an EPP under review;

- (iii.) Consideration for employment (within the last 10 years), of the volunteer or any immediate family member of the volunteer; in a staff, faculty, or administrator role, by an EPP under review;
- (iv.) Current enrollment, of the volunteer or any immediate family member of the volunteer, in an EPP under review;
- (v.) Current or prior (within the last 5 years) service on a statewide or national decision-making board or committee that considered an EPP under review;
- (vi.) Prior employment (within the last 7 years) as a CAEP staff member;
- (vii.) Current participation in a common consortium or special research relationship with an EPP under review;
- (viii.) Prior authorship of, or current work toward, jointly authored research or literature with a faculty member at the EPP under review;
- (ix.) Current or prior advisement of a doctoral candidate who is now enrolled in or member of faculty of the EPP under review;
- (x.) Prior service as a commencement speaker for or receipt of an honorary degree from the institution, or otherwise profited or appeared to benefit from service to the institution or the EPP under review; and
- (xi.) Current affiliation with another accreditor or purveyor of standards regarding EPP quality which are competitive to the CAEP Standards.

Any volunteer having a disqualifying conflict of interest or feeling any degree of impartiality regarding an assignment to participate in any aspect of an EPP's Review due to bias or prejudice, must issue a recusal from participation in any CAEP activities regarding the matter and abstain from participating in any decision on the matter. This requires a case-by-case examination of the relevant facts and circumstances and action as follows:

- A volunteer must disclose to CAEP staff any actual or possible conflict of interest.
 - Prior to assignment to any Review Team, a volunteer is asked to identify any conflicts of interest, real or perceived, with the EPP to which assignment is proposed to be made. A prospective Review Team member who has disclosed a conflict of interest with regard to any EPP review will not be assigned to the EPP's Review Team. CAEP staff will confirm receipt of the conflict disclosure and note the disclosure and subsequent action (decision not to assign) in the case record.
 - Prior to reviewing any Annual Report submitted by an EPP, an Annual Report Reviewer is asked to identify any conflicts of interest, real or perceived, with the EPP. An Annual Report Reviewer who has disclosed a conflict of interest with regard to any EPP will not be assigned to review that EPP's Annual Report. CAEP staff will confirm receipt of the conflict disclosure and note the disclosure and subsequent action (decision not to assign) in the case record.
 - Prior to participating in any Accreditation Council deliberation on an EPP – including as a member of a Committee or Panel - a Councilor is asked to identify any conflict of interest, real or perceived, with the EPP. A Councilor who has disclosed a conflict of interest with regard to any EPP is required to recuse him/herself from any deliberations on the EPP and must refrain from engaging in any communication with other CAEP volunteers regarding the EPP throughout the EPP's accreditation process and until the final accrediting action has been made public. The volunteer must also abstain from participating in any vote regarding the EPP throughout the EPP's accreditation process and until the final accrediting action has been made public.

- The minutes of any meeting at which a matter related to the conflict of interest is to be considered shall note: the disclosure; that the policy on identification of a conflict was followed; the determination; and that these procedures for handling a conflict of interest were followed.
- If needed in order to determine whether or not a conflict of interest exists, the Accreditation Council Chair and/or Vice-Chair will confer with the volunteer and CAEP's legal counsel.

Policy VI.1.03 Personal Agendas

CAEP volunteers must not advance personal agendas in the conduct of accreditation activities by applying personal or partisan interpretations of CAEP policies. They must exclude themselves from participating in CAEP activities if, to their knowledge, there is some predisposing factor that could prejudice them with respect to CAEP's affairs, activities, or policies.

Policy VI.1.04 Compensation or Gifts

CAEP volunteers may not request or accept any compensation or gifts of substance from an EPP being reviewed or anyone affiliated with the EPP. Gifts of substance include briefcases, tickets to athletic or entertainment events, and so forth. Small tokens such as key chains, magnets, or cups may be presented to the Evaluation Team if appropriate to an EPP culture.

Policy VI.1.05 Consulting

CAEP volunteers may engage in consultative, informational, or collegial activities with an EPP seeking CAEP accreditation; however, in doing so, they must disclose they do not represent CAEP. Any CAEP volunteer who engages in any such activities is required to abstain from voting on any matter pertaining to the EPP or making any decision related to the EPP, including decisions on Annual Reports or participating in an on-site review or virtual review of an EPP. No CAEP volunteer may use their position with CAEP in marketing or otherwise offering any consultative services for financial or inappropriate personal or professional gain while actively serving and for 1 year after their service.

Policy VI.1.06 Confidentiality

Every CAEP volunteer is given access to sensitive information and must protect the confidentiality of this information. Specifically, each volunteer must:

- treat as confidential non-public information they have access to in carrying out activities on behalf of CAEP; and
- share information and perceptions with discipline and care and not publicly discuss the particulars of any accreditation review, deliberation, or decision.

Accreditation Councilors are further required to keep confidential the EPPs assigned to their panel(s) for review.

2. Reviewers Eligible for Assignment to an Evaluation Team or Service as an Annual Report Reviewer

Reviewers are identified, elected, and assigned to service as an Evaluation Team Member or Annual Report Reviewer on the basis of their professional experience, prior experience

with CAEP, and professional responsibility. Reviewers understand the value of CAEP accreditation, the Standards on which accreditation is awarded, and the function of EPPs within the broader context of educator preparation.

Policy VI.2.01 Qualifications

A Reviewer must, at the time of election, demonstrate or provide references to the Evaluation Team Selection and Oversight Committee affirming that the individual is:

- (a.) Respected by peers through involvement in professional, civic, and other activities;
- (b.) Academically qualified, such as having earned a graduate degree in a discipline related to educator preparation;
- (c.) An effective communicator, including the ability to communicate clearly and concisely in writing; and
- (d.) Professional, including a history of acting without bias, maintaining confidentiality, adhering to established timelines and processes, and exercising balanced judgment.

Interested individuals may apply for selection to several volunteer positions using CAEP's electronic application. CAEP may solicit candidates interested in serving in an Annual Report Reviewer role, as needed. In addition, anyone may recommend an individual for consideration by submitting a letter of recommendation to CAEP in accordance with procedures provided in CAEP's solicitation for candidates. Upon the receipt of any such recommendation, CAEP staff will contact the individual recommended and provide information about the role and responsibilities, eligibility requirements, and application process.

Working from application materials submitted, and requesting additional information as needed, staff verify the qualifications of individuals and confirm interest in service.

CAEP maintains a list of qualified applicants and provides it to the Evaluation Team Selection and Oversight Committee of the Accreditation Council as needed for the Committee's nomination of individuals for election by the Council.

Through the solicitation, nomination, and election and training processes, CAEP ensures that academic and administrative personnel, educators, and practitioners are represented among the Evaluation Team Members and Annual Report Reviewers in service.

Policy VI.2.02 Election and Reelection; Term of Service

The Accreditation Council shall elect or reelect a Reviewer by Majority Vote and, in doing so, shall specify the Reviewer role to which each individual is assigned – Evaluation Team Member, who shall be eligible for assignment to a Virtual Site Review Evaluation Team or On-Site Evaluation Team, or Annual Report Reviewer. An individual may not be elected to concurrent service in both roles. Notwithstanding the restriction on Councilor participation provided for in Policy VII.5.01, a Councilor may participate in an Accreditation Council meeting by electronic means, as defined in Bylaws, in order to vote on the Committee's motion for the election of any qualified individual to the role of Reviewer.

A Reviewer may be elected for a term of not more than 3 years. There is no cap on the number of consecutive terms to which a Reviewer may be elected.

Policy VI.2.03 Training of Reviewers

Prior to engaging in service as a Reviewer, an individual must successfully complete CAEP-approved training activities which shall include training on the CAEP Standards, policies and procedures specific to

the specific Reviewer role, and cultural competence. A designated finance reviewer is required to complete training only on Standard 6 and is not eligible to serve as an Evaluation Team Lead.

Prior to selection by CAEP staff as an Evaluation Team Lead, a Reviewer must successfully complete training specific to the Evaluation Team Lead role.

Policy VI.2.04 Reviewer Roles and Responsibilities: Annual Report Reviewer; Review Team Member; Review Team Lead

(a.) Annual Report Reviewer

Annual Report Reviewer responsibilities include the following:

- (i.) Successfully complete Annual Reviewer training and accompanying evaluation;
- (ii.) Maintain full understanding of the CAEP Standards, and any revisions made to the Standards;
- (iii.) Maintain full understanding of all Accreditation policies and procedures, and any revisions made to policies and procedures;
- (iv.) Maintain a deep working knowledge of the Handbook or Workbook in effect for any review, and any revisions made to the Handbook or Workbook;
- (v.) Complete assignments in a timely manner;
- (vi.) Respond to requests from CAEP staff in a timely manner;
- (vii.) Remain accessible and responsive to CAEP as directed through the Annual Report review period;
- (viii.) Retain written notes in a safe and secure location in accordance with guidelines and policies regarding the retention of accreditation material; and
- (ix.) Adhere to the CAEP Code of Ethics and policies on conflict of interest and confidentiality.

(b.) Evaluation Team Member

An Evaluation Team Member is expected to participate fully in the accreditation review, to perform assignments thoroughly and in a timely manner, and to assume full responsibility for all background preparation required to conduct an accreditation review.

Evaluation Team Member responsibilities include the following:

- (i.) Successfully complete all trainings and complete all assessments as required for the role;
- (ii.) Maintain full understanding of the CAEP Standards, and any revisions made to the Standards;
- (iii.) Maintain full understanding of all Accreditation policies and procedures, and any revisions made to policies and procedures;
- (iv.) Maintain a deep working knowledge of the Handbook in effect for any review and any revisions made to the Handbook;
- (v.) Review the Self-Study Report and evidence submitted by the EPP and formulate a plan for verifying accuracy of the information provided;
- (vi.) Review supplemental evidence submitted by the EPP;
- (vii.) Provide written analysis of evidence and suggestions for citing AFIs and/or Stipulations, as appropriate and in collaboration with the Evaluation Team;

- (viii.) Participate fully in the formative evaluation process and the Site Review as appropriate;
- (ix.) Complete assignments in a timely manner;
- (x.) Respond to requests from CAEP staff and the Evaluation Team Lead in a timely manner;
- (xi.) Refrain from recommending, reporting, or communicating to the EPP whether or not the EPP meets CAEP's Standards;
- (xii.) Remain accessible and responsive to CAEP as directed leading up to the Accreditation Council decision, including participation in the Accreditation Council Panel review, if needed;
- (xiii.) Retain written notes in a safe and secure location until the final accrediting action is rendered;
- (xiv.) Participate in a minimum of 1 Accreditation review per year; and
- (xv.) Adhere to the CAEP Code of Ethics and policies on conflict of interest and confidentiality.

(c.) Evaluation Team Lead

An Evaluation Team Lead is expected to participate fully in the accreditation review and lead the Evaluation Team Members, to perform assignments thoroughly and in a timely manner, and to assume full responsibility for all background preparation required to conduct an accreditation review.

In addition to the Evaluation Team Member responsibilities provided above, an Evaluation Team Lead is expected to do the following:

- (i.) Establish and maintain a professional and courteous tone to the review;
- (ii.) Ensure that all Evaluation Team Members on the team understand their respective assignments and expectations;
- (iii.) Provide written feedback and requests for clarification and additional evidence as needed;
- (iv.) Lead and participate fully in the formative evaluation process and the Site Review;
- (v.) Lead the Evaluation Team deliberations and resolve disputes;
- (vi.) Contact CAEP staff immediately if problems arise during the Review;
- (vii.) Remain accessible and responsive to CAEP as directed leading up to the Accreditation Council decision, including participation in the Accreditation Council Panel review, if needed; and
- (viii.) Complete evaluation of all Evaluation Team Members.

Policy VI.2.05 Assignment of Reviews to an Evaluation Team

(a.) Evaluation Team Selection

- (i.) **Selection by CAEP** - Prior to assignment, CAEP ensures volunteers have taken all required training and assessments and completed a conflict of interest form. Volunteers are then assigned based on availability taking into consideration the diversity of the team composition, experience level, and types of institutions represented.
- (ii.) **Selection by State or Other Governing Authority** - Pursuant to any partnership agreement entered into between CAEP and the state, country, or other governing authority under which the EPP operates, the authority may appoint 1 or more Evaluation Team Members. Any such Reviewer is to participate fully in Review activities, including meetings, interviews, data gathering, team deliberations, and votes. Any Reviewer appointed by a governing authority must have successfully completed CAEP training specifically provided for Evaluation Team

Members prior to participating on any Evaluation Team. The costs related to the participation of any such individual in a Review are covered by the state, country, or other governing authority.

(b.) Team Lead Selection

From among Review Team Members selected by CAEP, CAEP staff select a Team Lead taking into consideration factors of prior experience and history of service as a Review Team Member and Team Lead, including leadership, timely completion of assignments, Site Visit Report quality, and, to the degree possible, experience with the type of provider under review.

At CAEP's discretion, not more than 1 CAEP staff member may be assigned to attend a Site Review. In any such instance, the role of staff is to support the Evaluation Team and to provide interpretation of CAEP policies and procedures. Staff do not participate in the writing of the Site Review Report, other than correcting grammatical or typographical errors and providing policy background, and do not provide input on or vote on the recommendations of the team for Areas for Improvement or Stipulations. CAEP is responsible for the costs of the participation of any staff.

 **Policy VI.2.06 Removal of a Reviewer**

(a.) Removal from Volunteer Pool

A Reviewer may be removed from the volunteer pool at any time for cause, which includes failure to adhere to policies and procedures, failure to support the consistent application of CAEP Standards, or failure to fulfill the responsibilities of the role (e.g., completing reports or responding to requests in a timely manner).. Any evidence considered cause for removal will be reviewed by the CAEP President, in consultation with the designated CAEP Compliance Officer. If cause for removal is found to exist, the President shall immediately direct staff to strike the volunteer from the roster of volunteers available for assignment and advise the Evaluation Team Selection and Oversight Committee of the Accreditation Council of any such removal.

(b.) Removal from a Review Team

(i.) Removal for Cause

A CAEP Vice President or Accreditation Director may remove an Evaluation Team Member from any EPP Review assignment at any time for cause, including failure to adhere to policies and procedures, failure to support the consistent application of CAEP Standards, or failure to fulfill the responsibilities of the role (e.g., completing reports or responding to requests in a timely manner).

An Evaluation Team Member may also be removed from an Evaluation Team assignment pending the investigation of a complaint in which the Reviewer is implicated. If the EPP to which a Reviewer is assigned has any serious concerns regarding the conduct of the Reviewer, a formal complaint and request for removal, if applicable, should be submitted to CAEP in accordance with Policy II.15.02.

In the case of a removal of a Review Team Member for cause, the EPP is notified of the removal. The Chair, Vice-Chair, and Evaluation Team Selection and Oversight Committee of the Accreditation Council are also notified and provided with the reason for removal.

(ii.) Removal not for Cause

A CAEP Vice President or Accreditation Director may adjust the size or composition of the Review Team assigned to any EPP without cause at any point prior to the scheduled Formative

Feedback meeting. If removal of an Evaluation Team Member is needed after this point in time, it will be conducted in consultation with the President and Vice President.

The EPP is notified of the removal within 5 days.

Policy VI.2.07 Resignation

A Reviewer may resign from service at any time by written notice to CAEP staff or the Chair of the Accreditation Council. The resignation shall be effective at the time specified in the notice, or upon receipt if no time is specified. Acceptance of a resignation shall not be necessary to make it effective. Accreditation system access is revoked immediately upon resignation.

3. Review Observers

CAEP allows other individuals (not serving in the role of an Evaluation Team Member pursuant to Section VI.2 above) to serve as an Observer on CAEP's review of an EPP. The selection and participation of any observer must be in accordance with the provisions included below. An EPP may contest the assignment of an Observer if it can demonstrate the existence of a real or perceived conflict of interest.

Policy VI.3.01 Observers

Any Review Team assigned to review an EPP may be joined by 1 or more designated Observers assigned in accordance with the following:

(a.) Representative of a State, Country, or Governing Authority

The state, country, or other governing authority under which the EPP operates, if permitted pursuant to a partnership agreement entered into between CAEP and the governing authority, may assign 1 or more staff member or accreditation consultant as an Observer. One Observer assigned by an international governing authority may be charged by that authority with providing country context and clarifying country-specific requirements.

The state, country, or governing authority is responsible for the costs of the participation of any Observer assigned to an EPP Review.

(b.) Representative of the American Federation of Teachers and the National Education Association

The state affiliates of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) or the National Education Association (NEA), in the United States may each assign not more than 1 association member or staff as an Observer. To be eligible for assignment, an individual must be actively engaged in school activities at the pre-collegiate level including, but not limited to, work as an elementary or secondary teacher or administrator. The NEA or AFT state affiliate is responsible for the costs related to the attendance of an Observer assigned to any EPP review.

4. Accreditation Council Members

The primary roles of Accreditation Council members (Councilors) are to establish policies for CAEP accreditation and make accreditation decisions. Qualifications of Councilors; policies and procedures regarding their selection, training, resignation, and removal; and other specifics of their responsibilities and activities are included in Section VII below.

The Accreditation Council is composed of volunteer Councilors nominated, qualified, and elected in accordance with the provisions of this section.

Policy VI.4.01 Number of Councilors

Not less than once every 3 years, the Executive Committee of the Accreditation Council, acting upon a recommendation of the CAEP President, will review the number of projected cases to be considered and set the number of Councilors needed to carry out the required reviews.

Policy VI.4.02 Public Representatives

At the time of any election of 1 or more Councilors, the Accreditation Council will ensure that at least 1 and not fewer than 7 percent of Councilors currently in service shall be designated a representative of the public in accordance with Policy VI.4.03.

Pursuant to Bylaws, a Councilor designated as a representative of the public must, throughout the period of service as a Councilor, be a Representative of the Public as defined by the U.S. Department of Education for accrediting agencies seeking to be recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education. This means that any such individual shall be a person who is not –

- (a.) An employee, member of the governing board, owner, or shareholder of, or consultant to, an institution or program that is accredited by CAEP or has applied for CAEP accreditation;
- (b.) A member of any trade association or membership organization related to, affiliated with, or associated with CAEP; or
- (c.) A spouse, parent, child, or sibling of an individual identified in paragraphs (a.) or (b.).

To facilitate compliance with the public representative requirement, CAEP maintains a list of all trade associations and membership organizations with which it has a relationship, affiliation, or association. Prior to any election, CAEP staff will survey Councilors to determine compliance with this requirement and to assist the Accreditation Councilor Nominating Committee in carrying out its charge. A Councilor designated as a Public Representative must promptly notify CAEP if the Public Representative criteria in paragraphs (a.) – (c.), above, are no longer satisfied. Resignation from the Council may be required if needed for CAEP to maintain the minimum level of public representation on the Council.

Regardless of the number of Councilors in service at any time, CAEP strives to ensure that the Council, as a whole, reflects the diversity of CAEP's member EPPs and that of the constituents they serve. As the number of CAEP-accredited EPPs has continued to grow, it is also a priority to have the Council composed largely of individuals who have had prior experience in applying the CAEP standards – as an evaluation team member (site visitor) or evaluation team lead; a representative of a CAEP-accredited EPP (e.g., Dean, accreditation director, assessment director), or a representative of a K-12 district or school whose district or school has established and maintains a partnership with a CAEP-accredited EPP. The CAEP Board of Directors may establish targets for the representation of individuals with such expertise on the Council.

Policy VI.4.03 Qualifications

Except for representatives of the public (as defined in Policy VI.4.02), at the time of election, a Councilor must have had prior experience as a CAEP review participant (i.e., evaluation team member, observer, or designated EPP representative) during the 2 year period preceding nomination, and meet at least 1 of the following criteria:

- (a.) Current or prior experience as an employee or contractor to a CAEP-accredited EPP (preferably within the 2 year period preceding nomination), such as a Dean, assessment or accreditation coordinator, or staff member assigned responsibility for overseeing the EPP's accreditation review by CAEP;

- (b.) Current or prior experience as an employee of K-12 district or school that has established and maintained a partnership with a CAEP-accredited EPP and whose responsibilities (preferably within the 2 year period preceding nomination) include oversight of educators; or
- (c.) Current or prior experience (preferably within the 2 year period preceding nomination) as an employee or other leader (e.g., policy maker, education program administrator, board member) of an education agency or educator licensing body operated by a local or state government, country, or other governing authority under which one or more CAEP-accredited EPPs operate.

CAEP staff verify the qualifications of individuals considered for nomination, and, as needed, present recommended nominees to the Accreditation Councilor Nominating Committee. Such committee shall not put forward for election, and the Accreditation Council shall not elect as a Councilor, any individual who, at the time of election, is currently serving as a CAEP Review Team member or Ad-Hoc Appeal Panel member unless the Councilor term is such that the individual’s service as a Review Team member or Appeal Panel member will have ended prior to the first date of service as a Councilor.

📖 Policy VI.4.04 Election and Reelection; Term of Service

The Accreditation Council shall elect or reelect a Councilor by a Majority Vote. Notwithstanding the restriction on Councilor participation provided for in Policy VII.5.01, a Councilor may participate in an Accreditation Council meeting by electronic means, as defined in Bylaws, in order to vote on the Committee’s motion for the election of any qualified individual to the Council.

A Councilor may be elected for a term of not more than 3 years. A term of less than 3 years may be assigned at the request of the prospective Councilor or as otherwise deemed necessary by the Committee to maintain an adequate number of Councilors in service, staggered terms, and adherence to any targets established by the CAEP Board of Directors for the composition of the Council and representation of Councilors having certain types of experience. If recommended for reelection to a second consecutive term, the second term may not result in the period of consecutive service as a Councilor exceeding 6 years. At the conclusion of a second consecutive 3-year term, a Councilor may only be considered eligible for subsequent election following a 1 year absence from the Council.

Any time that it is determined that an election of one or more Councilors conducted by the Council results in the Council’s composition deviating from representation targets established by the Board, the President will report such deviation to the Board and the Board may by majority vote elect and/or remove Councilors as needed to bring the composition into alignment with targets.

CAEP staff collect and maintain a current resume or curriculum vitae for each Councilor and Alternative Councilor which may be made publicly available, along with the identity, and current professional affiliation of each. Councilors and Alternative Councilors must provide an up-to-date resume or curriculum vitae upon request by CAEP staff.

📖 Policy VI.4.05 Appointment, Term, and Voting Rights of Alternate Councilors

The Executive Committee of the Accreditation Council shall, by Majority Vote, appoint a former Councilor to serve as an Alternate Councilor (“Alternate”) from a list maintained by the Accreditation Council Nominating Committee, when the number of Councilors available for the review of cases falls below the minimum of 3 Councilors per review case. An Alternate is called into service, as needed, for a single meeting, during which the Alternate will serve as a Councilor with full Councilor voting rights. An Alternate may be called for consecutive meetings without limitation.

The Accreditation Council Nominating Committee, with the assistance of CAEP staff maintains a list of former Councilors who may be called upon, as needed, to serve as an Alternate Councilor. An Alternate Councilor need not be appointed during a meeting of the Accreditation Council. Staff will update the list not less than annually to remove any individual who no longer meets the qualifications for service as a Councilor and to collect an up-to-date CV or resume for any individual appearing on the list of potential alternates.

Policy VI.4.06 Training of Councilors

Prior to engaging in any decision-making process as a representative on the Accreditation Council, Councilors must successfully complete CAEP-approved training activities which shall include training on the CAEP Standards, policies, and procedures specific to the Councilor role, and cultural competence. The failure of a Councilor to complete all initial training required by CAEP within 1 year of election to the Council will be cause for removal pursuant to Policy VI.4.07.

Policy VI.4.07 Removal of Councilors

Any Councilor, Alternate, or Officer of the Accreditation Council may only be removed from service for cause, including a failure to:

- adhere to policies and procedures;
- participate in 2 consecutive regular Accreditation Council meetings;
- support the consistent application of CAEP Standards; or
- fulfill the responsibilities of the role (e.g., completing reports or responding to requests in a timely manner).

A Majority Vote of the Councilors then in service is required for removal Accreditation system access is revoked immediately upon removal.

Policy VI.4.08 Resignation

A Councilor, Alternate, or Officer may resign from service at any time by written notice to CAEP staff or the Chair of the Accreditation Council. The resignation shall be effective at the time specified in the notice, or upon receipt if no time is specified. Acceptance of a resignation shall not be necessary to make it effective. Accreditation system access is revoked immediately upon resignation.

VII. ACCREDITATION COUNCIL GOVERNANCE

1. Authority and Governance

The Accreditation Council (Council), CAEP's primary accreditation decision-making body, is granted its authority by the Board of Directors. In addition to making accreditation decisions and monitoring the compliance of accredited-EPPs with CAEP Standards and policies, the Council is responsible for adopting, amending, and keeping up-to-date written statements of accreditation-related policies, and implementing them with fairness and consistency.

Policy VII.1.01 Independence of Decision Making

Neither the CAEP Board, acting as a body, nor any individual Director with voting rights on the Board is permitted to participate in any Review, panel deliberation, or accreditation decision on an EPP's accreditation status. This includes any portion of a review and decision, including panel proceedings and appeals.

The Council Chair, who is a voting member of the Board of Directors, has no voting rights on Council matters but may facilitate the voting process by calling for motions, putting the question before the Council, announcing the result of a vote, etc.

Policy VII.1.02 Charge

The Accreditation Council is charged with the following:

- (a.) Promulgate and implement policies including, but not limited to, policies on the qualifications and selection of Evaluation Team members, conflicts of interest, confidentiality, and the review, evaluation, and accreditation of EPPs inside and outside the United States, in accordance with the CAEP Standards, Bylaws, and, as applicable, with regard to the continuing accreditation of legacy-accredited EPPs, NCATE Standards, and TEAC quality principles;
- (b.) Review, provide feedback to CAEP staff on, and implement procedures regarding the activities of the Accreditation Council including, but not limited to, the nomination and election of Councilors, evaluation of Councilors, selection of Evaluation Team Members and Annual Report Reviewers, investigating complaints against EPPs, and carrying out the Council's decision-making processes;
- (c.) Carry out Panel reviews of EPP cases and render accreditation decisions;
- (d.) Engage in a systematic process of monitoring EPP compliance and improvement throughout the term of accreditation, including through an Annual Report process and other means;
- (e.) Through decision-making, authorize CAEP staff to publish accreditation decisions and all related information required to be made public by these policies and procedures, Bylaws, Governance Policy, or an action approved by the Board;
- (f.) Develop and administer a quality assurance system to ensure the fairness and consistency in decision-making and ongoing improvement of CAEP accreditation.

Policy VII.1.03 Recognition and Oversight of Legacy-Accredited EPPs

CAEP recognizes an EPP previously accredited by NCATE and TEAC (referred to as legacy accreditation) through the length of the respective accreditation term per the last accreditation decision made by NCATE and TEAC, a Commission, or by the CAEP Accreditation Council, except that any such legacy accreditation is subject to Probation or Revocation if the EPP fails to meet requirements for Continuous

Accreditation or pursuant to Policy VII.6.04 Adverse Action. A decision of the Accreditation Council to deny accreditation to an EPP will be considered as evidence of failure to maintain Continuous Accreditation and may lead to revocation of legacy accreditation if the term of such accreditation has not expired.

2. Composition

Pursuant to Policy VI.4.01, the size of the Council is adjusted periodically in response to fluctuations in the number of EPPs in the review process. Pursuant to Section VI.4, every Councilor is required to meet eligibility requirements; successfully complete training on the CAEP Standards, policies, and procedures; conduct one's professional and personal affairs in accordance with the Code of Conduct; and support the CAEP mission through the fair and consistent application of CAEP Standards.

3. Officers

The Council has 2 officers – 1 elected by Councilors from among Council members and 1 elected by the Board.

Policy VII.3.01 Officers

The Accreditation Council has a Chair and Vice-Chair as its officers.

(a.) Chair of the Accreditation Council

The Chair of the Accreditation Council is elected by the CAEP Board of Directors from among the Directors. The Chair's term of office runs concurrent with their term as a Director on the CAEP Board or until a replacement has been elected by the Board. The Chair is not a Councilor and is not entitled to vote on Accreditation Council matters.

(b.) Vice-Chair of the Accreditation Council

The Vice-Chair of the Accreditation Council is elected by a Majority Vote of the Councilors present at a duly convened meeting. The Vice-Chair's term of office is 2 years, after which the Vice-Chair may be elected to not more than 1 additional consecutive term as Vice-Chair. The Vice-Chair may remain on the Accreditation Council through the end of his/her term as Vice-Chair even if he/she is not eligible for re-election as a Councilor due to the term limits imposed pursuant to Policy VI.4.04.

4. Committees

The standing committees of the Council are composed of only Councilors. The Council Chair and Vice-Chair assign Councilors to Committees, with the exception of the Executive Committee, as vacancies arise, taking into consideration the preferences of Councilors and CAEP's commitment to diversity and representation.

Committees are convened during the Council's regular meetings and may meet between Council meetings as needed.

Policy VII.4.01 Committees

The Accreditation Council has 6 standing Committees and may, by Majority Vote, establish any other committee deemed necessary to carry out the responsibilities of the Council or in response to priorities established by the Board or Council.

(a.) EPP Transparency, Accountability, and Improvement Committee

The EPP Transparency, Accountability, and Improvement Committee oversees the ongoing compliance monitoring processes, including reports and recommendations made by Annual Report Reviewers and CAEP staff, and recommends to the full Accreditation Council the preparation, development, or creation of a Warning Action as necessary to ensure EPP compliance with CAEP Standards, policies, and procedures. The Committee also reviews and approves or denies EPP requests for Good Cause Extensions of longer than one year. The Committee is also responsible for reviewing volunteer applications for Annual Report Reviewers and recommending a list of nominees for election by the Accreditation Council.

The Committee elects a Chair from among its members to serve for a term of 2 years or through the end of his/her term as Councilor, whichever is shorter. During any meeting of the Committee, a Chair who is unable to participate may designate as presiding officer for the meeting another Committee member or the CAEP staff liaison. If the office of Committee Chair is vacated prior to a meeting at which a new Chair is to be elected, the CAEP staff liaison may open the meeting and, as a first order of business, call for an election to fill the vacancy.

(b.) Policy Committee

The Policy Committee is responsible for reviewing and making recommendations to the Accreditation Council on proposed changes to Accreditation policies and providing input on procedures. In addition, the Policy Committee reviews all motions from any other Committee placed on the agenda for action by the Council.

The Council Vice-Chair serves as the Chair of the Policy Committee throughout their term as Vice-Chair. In the Chair's absence, the CAEP staff liaison to the Policy Committee or Chair's designee serves as presiding officer.

(c.) Evaluation Team Selection and Oversight Committee

The Evaluation Team Selection and Oversight Committee is responsible for reviewing volunteer applications and making nominations to the Accreditation Council for the election of qualified Evaluation Team Members pursuant to Policy VI.2.02.

The Committee elects a Chair from among its members to serve for a term of 2 years or through the end of his/her term as Councilor, whichever is shorter. During any meeting of the Committee, a Chair who is unable to participate may designate as presiding officer for the meeting another Committee member or the CAEP staff liaison. If the office of Committee Chair is vacated prior to a meeting at which a new Chair is to be elected, the CAEP staff liaison may open the meeting and, as a first order of business, call for an election to fill the vacancy.

(d.) Accreditation Councilor Nominating Committee

The Accreditation Councilor Nominating Committee is responsible for reviewing volunteer applications and making nominations to the Accreditation Council for the election of qualified Councilors. The Committee also maintains a list of former Councilors who are eligible and have expressed an interest in serving as an Alternate Councilor. The list of Alternate Councilor candidates will be provided to the Executive Committee of the Accreditation Council upon a request by that Committee.

The Committee elects a Chair from among its members to serve for a term of 2 years or through the end of his/her term as Councilor, whichever is shorter. During any meeting of the Committee, a Chair who is unable to participate may designate as presiding officer for the meeting another Committee member or the CAEP staff liaison. If the office of Committee Chair is vacated prior to a meeting at which a new Chair is to be elected, the CAEP staff liaison may open the meeting and, as a first order of business, call for an election to fill the vacancy.

(e.) Executive Committee

The Executive Committee is responsible for making time-sensitive decisions on behalf of the Accreditation Council, as needed, between meetings; however, the Committee shall not make or amend any accreditation decision. Actions of the Committee include but are not limited to the following:

- (i.) Receiving reports, negative evaluations, or complaints against CAEP that involve any CAEP volunteer and recommending or taking action as appropriate.
- (ii.) As appropriate, takes action on a complaint against an EPP made pursuant to Policy II.15.02.
- (iii.) Following each meeting of the Accreditation Council, reviewing and approving recommendations from CAEP staff for non-substantive changes needed to correct inaccuracies in Action Reports; however any proposed edit to an Action Report that would result in the addition or deletion of an AFI or Stipulation, a change in the Accreditation decision, or a change in an EPP's term is a substantive change and, as such, must be approved by the Council pursuant to Policy II.18.01 on reconsideration of Council action.
- (iv.) Pursuant to Policy VI.4.01, setting the number of Councilors.
- (v.) Pursuant to Policy II.18.01, deciding whether to approve any recommendation from the CAEP President for reconsideration of a decision.
- (vi.) Reviewing Reviewer evaluation reports compiled by CAEP staff and recommending action as appropriate.

The Executive Committee is made up of the Chair (ex officio), Vice-Chair (ex officio), and not more than 3 additional Accreditation Councilors elected using the approval voting method. Any vacancy shall be filled with the election of a Councilor in good standing upon the nomination of any Councilor then in service. Any Councilor so elected shall serve a 2-year term on the Committee and is subject to a limit of 2 consecutive terms on the Executive Committee. Notwithstanding Policy VII.4.01(f), an Executive Committee member may remain on the Accreditation Council through the end of his/her Executive Committee term.

(f.) Committee Charges

At the start of CAEP's fiscal year, the Chair of the Accreditation Council, in conjunction with the Vice-Chair and designated CAEP staff liaison, shall provide each Committee, with the exception of the Complaints Committee and Executive Committee, with its charge.

(g.) Staff Liaison

The CAEP President will assign a CAEP staff liaison to each Committee.

5. Council and Committee Action: Meetings; Quorum, Voting

Policy VII.5.01 Meetings

The Accreditation Council is convened for 2 regular meetings per year at such places and times as the Chair or Vice-Chair may designate, subject to the approval of the President. At the request of the Chair or a majority of the members of the Accreditation Council then in service, a special meeting may be called.

A Committee of the Council is convened as needed at the discretion of the Committee Chair and on the request of the staff liaison.

Pursuant to Bylaws, a Councilor may participate in a meeting of the Accreditation Council or a Committee by electronic means, such as telephone and Internet conference, by which all persons participating in the

meeting are able to communicate with each other, and such participation shall constitute presence in person at the meeting.

Policy VII.5.02 Meeting Notice

The Accreditation Council Chair will give each Councilor at least 15 days' notice of the place and time for any regular or special meeting of the Council. Pursuant to Bylaws, whenever such notice is required to be given to any Councilor, it may be given by postal (first-class or express mail with postage prepaid), electronic means (limited to e-mail or facsimile transmission), or courier service (charges prepaid), to the Councilor's address (or to the Councilor's e-mail address or facsimile number) appearing on CAEP's records. Notice shall be effective when received. Any Councilor may waive the right to receive timely notice of any meeting, either before or after the time for notice. A Councilor's attendance at any meeting shall constitute waiver of notice, excepting attendance to object at the beginning of the meeting to the transaction of business on the ground that the meeting was not lawfully called or convened.

A Committee Chair or the staff liaison to the Committee, at the direction of the Chair, will give each Committee member at least 3 days' notice of the place and time for any Committee meeting not scheduled to take place during a regular meeting of the Council. Any such notice or waiver of notice is in accordance with the paragraph above.

Policy VII.5.03 Written Action in Lieu of Meeting

Pursuant to CAEP Bylaws, any action by the Accreditation Council or a Committee of the Council may be taken without a meeting by use of a ballot. The ballot must set forth each proposal, the number of responses needed to meet the quorum requirements, the percentage of approvals necessary to approve each matter, and the date by which to return the ballot. The approval of any action is valid if the number of votes cast at least equals the quorum requirement for a meeting and the number of approvals at least equals the number of approvals that would be required at a meeting.

Policy VII.5.04 Quorum and Voting Requirements

At any meeting of the Accreditation Council or any Committee, a majority of the members of the body then in service must participate in order to establish a quorum.

Unless specified otherwise in this document, a Majority Vote of the Councilors present at any duly convened Council or Committee meeting is required for a motion to carry. Proxy voting is not permitted.

Policy VII.5.05 Restriction on the Participation of Councilors

If the EPP for which a Councilor is currently employed is under consideration by the Accreditation Council, the Councilor will be restricted from participating in their role as Councilor at the meeting at which the Council is expected to make a decision regarding the EPP's accreditation. Such restriction is not required with regard to Accreditation Council consideration of a motion for Good Cause Extension under Policy V.5.01.

Any absence from an Accreditation Council meeting resulting from this required restriction may not be used as cause for removal of a Councilor.

Any Councilor restricted for participation under this section will not be counted as a "voting member of the Accreditation Council then in service" for purposes of establishing a quorum or for action to remove a Councilor.

Representatives of the public comprise not less than one-seventh of the Council's membership. No other members of the public, including representatives of EPPs scheduled for Council action, are permitted to participate in, observe, or otherwise attend any Council meeting unless invited or given permission to do so.

Policy VII.5.06 Observers and Guests

At the discretion of the Executive Committee of the Accreditation Council, observers and invited guests may attend designated portions of a meeting of the Council. Any observer or guest must agree in writing to comply with CAEP's confidentiality policy prior to attending any Council meeting. The presiding officer may at any time require the removal of all observers and guests from the Council's meeting site (physical or virtual).

6. Accreditation Decisions and Corrective Action Notices; Notification

The Accreditation Council makes an accreditation decision based on CAEP's review of an EPP's compliance with Standards for Initial-Licensure Preparation or Standards for Advanced-Level Preparation. Separate action is required for an accreditation decision at each level. Action may also follow from CAEP's investigation of a complaint made against an EPP or from a Committee determination that the EPP has failed to come into compliance with all applicable Standards, policies, or procedures within the time prescribed for corrective action.

Notice of all accreditation decisions is made in accordance with policies designed to address requirements of CHEA and the U.S. Department of Education.

Policy VII.6.01 Due Diligence

Before reaching any accreditation decision, the Council must have a reasonable belief that:

(a.) The review process has been conducted in compliance with applicable policies and procedures governing the review and effective mechanisms for evaluating an EPP's compliance with CAEP Standards; and

(b.) For any accreditation decision other than a decision following a 2-year Accreditation with Stipulations or Probationary Accreditation term, the EPP has undergone at least 1 On-Site Review during which a Review Team obtains sufficient information to determine if the EPP complies with CAEP Standards.

The Council may postpone panel consideration and Council decision-making following an accreditation review until all outstanding fees have been paid.

Policy VII.6.02 Accreditation Decisions

Decisions available to the Council and standard terms of accreditation to be awarded, unless otherwise established in an agreement entered into between CAEP and 1 or more state agency or entity (referred to as a partnership agreement), are as follows:

(a.) Accreditation

Accreditation is granted for a term of not more than 7 years pursuant to Policies III.2.13 and IV.1.13.

(b.) Accreditation with Stipulations

Accreditation with Stipulations is granted for a term of not more than 2 years and with conditions for the removal of Stipulations pursuant to Policies III.2.13 and IV.1.13.

(c.) Probationary Accreditation

Probationary Accreditation is granted for a term of not more than 2 years and with conditions for achieving good standing through a demonstration that all applicable Standards are met pursuant to Policies III.2.13 and IV.1.13.

A program or institution placed on Probation continues in accredited status. However, Probation is a serious status which endangers accreditation. A Probation action requires an EPP to respond by stated deadlines to the Council's decision report and letter outlining the basis of the Probation action. An EPP on Probation is considered not in good standing.

(d.) Denial of Accreditation

Accreditation may be denied at the conclusion of any Initial Accreditation process in which the EPP is determined not to have met 2 or more applicable Standards pursuant to Policies III.2.13 and IV.1.13.

(e.) Revocation of Accreditation

Accreditation may be revoked at the conclusion of any Renewal of Accreditation process in which the EPP is determined not to have met 2 or more applicable Standards pursuant to Policies III.2.13 and IV.1.13; or upon a determination by the Council that an EPP has failed to come into compliance with Accreditation Standards or policies after a period of Corrective Action established pursuant to Policy VII.6.03.

Policy VII.6.03 Warning Action

The Council, by Majority Vote, may issue a Warning to an EPP if there is credible evidence that an accredited EPP fails to:

- (a.) Maintain adequate compliance with CAEP Standards;
- (b.) Adhere to policies and procedures; or
- (c.) Respond by stated deadlines to any requirement, conditions, or notices issued by the Council.

Evidence leading to a Warning may include, but is not limited to, findings resulting from the review or investigation of a complaint against the EPP; credible evidence obtained by CAEP staff or the Council; action taken by a national accreditor, state, country, or other governing authority; or the EPP's inadequate response or failure to respond to reporting requirements issued by the EPP Compliance Monitoring Committee, Executive Committee, or Council.

Any failure to comply with the terms or conditions of a Warning Action will be grounds for Adverse Action.

Policy VII.6.04 Adverse Action

The Accreditation Council must immediately initiate Adverse Action against an EPP if the EPP is determined not to have met 2 or more applicable Standards or fails to comply with other accreditation requirements. Prior to initiating Adverse Action, the Council may require the EPP to take appropriate action to bring itself into compliance with CAEP Standards and requirements within a prescribed period of time which may be not more than 12 months, if the longest program offered by the EPP (whether a program or institution) is less than 1 year in length, not more than 18 months if the EPP's longest program is at least 1 year but less than 2 years in length; or not more than 2 years if the EPP's longest program is at least 2 years in length.

Any of the following decisions is an Adverse Action for which the EPP is afforded due process as defined in CAEP's Ad-Hoc Appeal Policy:

- (a.) Denial of Accreditation; and
- (b.) Revocation of Accreditation.

Prior to taking Adverse Action to revoke accreditation, the Council may require that a special Virtual or On-Site Review be conducted.

7. Postponement Authority

Notwithstanding the approval or denial of any request made by an EPP for a Good Cause Extension, the CAEP President may postpone any EPP Site Review and/or the presentation of an EPP's case to the Accreditation Council, under the following circumstances.

Policy VII.7.01 Postponement of a Site Review

CAEP may postpone the Site Review or other review of any EPP if CAEP becomes aware of any issue that, in CAEP's determination, poses a threat to the quality, integrity, or safety of a scheduled Site Review or is likely to result in a Site Review that is not able to be carried out in full accordance with this Policy and/or established procedures. The failure of CAEP, including the Evaluation Team, to meet established deadlines may be cause for postponement. However, there shall be no postponement if the threat or challenge is the result of any action or inaction on the part of the EPP. A postponed Site Review will be rescheduled to take place as soon as is feasible following resolution of the issue(s) that led to the postponement.

Policy VII.7.02 Postponement after a Site Review

CAEP may, following completion of a Site Review, postpone the Accreditation process of any EPP if CAEP becomes aware of any issue that, in CAEP's determination, poses a threat to the integrity of the decision-making process or the inability for that process to be carried out in full accordance with this Policy and/or established procedures. The failure of CAEP, including any Panel of Reviewers or the Accreditation Council as a whole, to meet established deadlines may be cause for postponement. However, there shall be no postponement if the threat or challenge is the result of any action or inaction on the part of the EPP. CAEP's exercise of this authority shall result in the postponement of the presentation of the EPP's case to the Accreditation Council until the next scheduled Accreditation Council meeting, or longer if justified.

Policy VII.7.03 Public Notice of Postponement

Any postponement granted to an EPP will be made public by CAEP on its website.

With any postponement approved under Policy VII.7.01 or VII.7.02, the term of Accreditation may be extended only with the approval of the Accreditation Council on a recommendation of the EPP Transparency, Accountability and Improvement Committee. The EPP must remain in good standing or be subject to Adverse Action.

8. Modification of Accreditation Policies

Policy VII.8.01 Modification of Accreditation Policies

The Accreditation Council may, by Majority Vote on a motion from the Policy Committee, amend the policies provided within this document. Any such amendment will not take effect until accepted by the CAEP Board of Directors pursuant to the CAEP Bylaws. The Board may, on its own accord, by a two-thirds vote, amend any Accreditation policy.

As a general rule, amendments are considered for approval by the Accreditation Council during its Fall meeting, and considered by the Board of Directors in December of the same year, so that amendments take effect on January 1 of the following year. After initial consideration, through a pre-approval process, the Policy Committee and Accreditation Council may authorize CAEP's publication of proposed amendments for public comment. CAEP staff will subsequently post proposed amendments for public comments. A call for public comments should establish a comment period of not less than 30 days and, among other things, seek input or concerns on the extent to which Accreditation Policy, including proposed amendments: (1) supports the autonomy of an EPP in determining academic quality as it relates to the mission of the EPP; and (2) supports an EPP's implementation of innovative practices. Following the close of a public comment period, the Policy Committee may take action to seek Accreditation Council adoption of amendments.

General Timeline	
January - March	Changes to Accreditation Policy and Procedures considered by CAEP staff and the Policy Committee of the Accreditation Council
Late March – May	Pre-Approval Process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed amendments are considered by the Policy Committee • Policy Committee recommends Accreditation Council authorization of publication for public comment • Following Accreditation Council authorization of publication for public comment, CAEP establishes a public comment period of at least 30 days and issues a call for public comment
May – August	Public comment period CAEP staff review comments and prepare summary with any suggested changes for Committee discussion
August – September	Committee considers changes in response to public comment and recommends Accreditation Council approval, as appropriate
October	Accreditation Council considers approval of amendments to Accreditation Policy and Procedures
December	CAEP Board of Directors considers approval of amendments to Accreditation Policy and Procedures
January 1	Any amendments approved by the Board take effect

9. Notice of Accreditation Decisions, Warning Actions, and EPP Decisions to Withdraw or Lapse

Policy VII.9.01 Maintenance of Records

The Accreditation Council, other CAEP volunteers, and CAEP staff must create and maintain, in accordance with CAEP’s records retention policy, complete and accurate records of at least the following:

- (a.) The last full accreditation review of each EPP including any Site Review Report; the EPP’s response to a Review Report; any reports of special or targeted reviews conducted between regular reviews, and a copy of the EPP’s most recent Self-Study Report; and
- (b.) All decisions made through the EPP’s affiliation with CAEP, or its predecessor accrediting agencies NCATE and TEAC, regarding the Accreditation of the EPP and substantive changes, including all correspondence that is significantly related to those decisions.

Policy VII.9.02 Notice to EPPs, Appropriate Licensing or Authorizing Agencies, Other Accrediting Agencies, the U.S. Secretary of Education, and the Public

With any accreditation decision, Warning Action, withdrawal or lapse, notice is required to be provided by CAEP and, in some instances, the EPP, in accordance with the following:

(a). Notice to be provided by CAEP:

Decision or Action	Notice To:				
	EPP	Appropriate State licensing or authorizing agency (or appropriate governing authority for international EPPs)	Any Institutional or Programmatic Accreditor Whose Accreditation Extends to the EPP	The U.S. Secretary of Education (to be provided only if CAEP is recognized by the Secretary)	Public
Accreditation (following the Initial Accreditation Process or Renewal of Accreditation Process)	No later than 30 days after the decision date	No later than 30 days after the decision date	No later than 30 days after the decision date	No later than 30 days after the decision date	No later than 30 days after the decision date
Probationary Accreditation (Final Decision)	No later than 30 days after the decision date	Concurrent with notification provided to the EPP	Concurrent with notification provided to the EPP	Concurrent with notification provided to the EPP	Within 1 business day of CAEP’s notice to the EPP
Initiation of Adverse Action (Revocation or	No later than 30 days after the decision date	Concurrent with notification provided to the EPP	Concurrent with notification provided to the EPP	Concurrent with notification provided to the EPP	Within 1 business day of CAEP’s notice to the EPP

Denial of Accreditation)	(includes information on appeal policies)				
Revocation of Accreditation	No later than 30 days after the decision date	Concurrent with notification provided to the EPP	Concurrent with notification provided to the EPP	Concurrent with notification provided to the EPP	Within 1 business day of CAEP's notice to the EPP
EPP's Voluntary Withdrawal from Accreditation		Within 10 business days of receiving notification from the EPP	Within 10 business days of receiving notification from the EPP	Within 10 business days of receiving notification from the EPP	Upon request
EPP's Voluntary Lapse of Accreditation		Within 10 business days of lapse	Within 10 business days of lapse	Within 10 business days of lapse	Upon request

(b). Notice and disclosure obligations of EPPs:

An EPP must disclose CAEP's actions in accordance with the following:

Decision or Action	Notice to All Current and Prospective Candidates (Students of the EPP)	No later than 60 days after the decision, disclose to the U.S. Secretary of Education (only if CAEP is recognized by the Secretary), any appropriate State licensing or authorizing agency (or appropriate governing authority for international EPPs), and any institutional or programmatic accreditor whose accreditation extends to the EPP:
Probationary Accreditation (Final Decision)	Within 7 business days of receipt of notice from CAEP	A brief statement summarizing the reasons for CAEP's decision and the official comments the EPP may wish to make with regard to that decision, or evidence that the EPP has been offered the opportunity to provide official comments
Final Decision – Adverse Action (Revocation or Denial of Accreditation)	Within 7 business days of receipt of notice from CAEP	A brief statement summarizing the reasons for CAEP's decision and the official comments the EPP may wish to make with regard to that decision, or evidence that the EPP has been offered the opportunity to provide official comments