



Data Disaggregation: Guidance for Educator Preparation Providers

Updated August 2026

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
About this Resource Guide	2
CAEP Accreditation Policies and Procedures Related to Disaggregation	2
Guidance on Data Disaggregation	4
General Information on Disaggregation	4
Examples of Disaggregation by Category	5
Program Level Disaggregation (Required)	5
Multi-Site/Campus Disaggregation (Required, if applicable)	8
Delivery Method Disaggregation (Required, if applicable)	10
Demographic Disaggregation	11
General Information on Demographic Disaggregation	11
Examples of Demographic Disaggregation	11
Demographic Characteristics (Flexibility provided for EPPs)	12
Small ‘n’ Disaggregation	13
General Information on Small ‘n’ Disaggregation	13
Examples of Small ‘n’ Disaggregation	13
Adjustments for small ‘n’ (Flexibility provided for EPPs)	14
Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)	16

Introduction

About this Resource Guide

This guide is intended to support Educator Preparation Providers (EPPs) in understanding CAEP expectations related to disaggregation of data. This guide provides examples and explanations as to when data must be disaggregated, and when flexibility might be appropriately used for CAEP reporting. The information contained in this guide is aligned with CAEP Accreditation Policies and Procedures and the CAEP Revised 2022 Standards Workbook.

The examples provided are meant to serve as a framework for EPPs during the Self-Study process. The examples presented are not exhaustive and should be used as a resource in addition to guidance provided within the CAEP Revised 2022 Standards Workbook. CAEP recognizes that each EPP has a unique context. Therefore, EPPs are welcome to develop evidence different from the examples presented and to select present data they believe will make the strongest case the EPP has to meet the CAEP Standards.

Within this guide, examples are provided to demonstrate various ways in which data can be disaggregated, including when specific disaggregation methods are necessary for CAEP reporting purposes, context for when to use the specific method of disaggregation, and representations of how data can be reported. **Examples of data within this guide represent one cycle of data visualized as a table.** When writing the Self-Study Report, EPPs should summarize three cycles of the most recent and consecutive data as a narrative analysis and provide data through visualizations or in other ways as relevant for reporting purposes.

CAEP Accreditation Policies and Procedures Related to Disaggregation

Annual Accreditation Report

Following initial accreditation, EPPs report data to CAEP in two primary methods; during the Annual EPP Accreditation Report (Annual Report), and during the Self-Study process.

Within the Annual Report, data are presented on CAEP Annual Accountability Measures including complete effectiveness and impact on P-12 learning and development, satisfaction of employers and stakeholder involvement, candidate competency at program completion, and ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have been prepared. Data for these measures should be disaggregated by program and by Initial Licensure-Level and Advanced Level, where appropriate. Additional information about the CAEP Annual Report can be found on the CAEP Website at <https://caepnet.org/accreditation-resources/>.

Self-Study Process

EPPs additionally report data within the Self-Study Report (SSR) during the accreditation process. Within the SSR, providers make a case for meeting each Standard component through evidence, the analysis and interpretation of evidence, and its conclusions demonstrating the component is met. EPPs are responsible for showing they have addressed the CAEP Standard component through evidence and interpretation of evidence in supporting narrative.

EPPs are encouraged to use the CAEP Revised 2022 Standards Workbook in preparation for the self-study process. Within the Workbook, CAEP has provided guidance for EPPs to support the analysis and interpretation of the evidence that EPPs should demonstrate including:

- Presenting cycles of data to ensure the EPP can adequately discuss trends within the data and for consistency of findings.
- Data should be disaggregated and presented in a manner to best inform an interpretation of patterns, trends, differences, or similarities for demographic groups or for the EPP's individual preparation programs.
- Multiple sources of data should be used to triangulate and inform different aspects of each point the EPP chooses to make in the self-study.
- Description of how the provided data inform the EPP's ability to meet the Standard component, including highlighting confirming and conflicting conclusions from the data; if disparities are identified, explain the disparities and include steps to remedy them. Illustrate how the data inform the EPP's continuous improvement.
- Make comparisons between its data and any existing benchmarks, normative comparisons to peers, or performance standards.

Additionally, CAEP Accreditation Policies and Procedures outline requirements for any CAEP review, that EPPs 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. In an EPP's application to CAEP, self-study report, annual report, as applicable, and other submissions, each program within the scope of review must be separately identified by state, if offered in more than one state, and by mode of delivery.

Additional information about CAEP Accreditation Policies and Procedures and the CAEP Revised 2022 Standards Workbook can be found on the CAEP Website at <https://caepnet.org/accreditation-resources/>.

Guidance on Data Disaggregation

General Information on Disaggregation

All EPPs should be able to demonstrate the ability to disaggregate data into meaningful categories to ensure that all candidates receive the same quality of education. Disaggregation allows EPPs to identify patterns, trends and potential disparities and use those insights to inform continuous improvement.

When identifying relevant categories for disaggregation, EPPs should consider the following:

- All EPPs must disaggregate data by program and licensure level within the scope of CAEP accreditation review as indicated for CAEP Standards R1/RA1-R5/RA5.
- EPP assessment data must also demonstrate alignment to InTASC Standards for Initial-Licensure Level programs, or relevant standards for Advanced programs as indicated for CAEP Standards R1 and RA1.
- EPPs should provide the three most recent and consecutive cycles of data. Data cycles can be combined, where appropriate, such as in cases of low enrolled programs; state waivers of policies impacting data, process or requirements; disruptions in clinical practice or data collection instruments; or other contextual factors impacting data availability. In some instances, EPPs may present more than three cycles of data to provide context for unique circumstances or to demonstrate trends over time.
- EPPs operating across multiple campus sites, including those in different states, countries, or other governing authority under which the EPP operates any approved online program, must disaggregate data by location in addition to disaggregation by program and licensure level, and relevant standards, within the scope of CAEP accreditation review.
- EPPs offering programs through multiple delivery methods (e.g., distance learning, face-to-face, hybrid, or alternative route) should additionally report disaggregated data by modality.
- Programs with low enrollment (small ‘*n*’) may combine data, as appropriate, to yield usable information for continuous improvement and protect candidate privacy.
- All EPPs should demonstrate the ability to further disaggregate data by relevant demographic categories, which may vary based on institutional context or other characteristics relevant to the EPP, in order to support the EPPs Quality Assurance System (QAS) and continuous improvement efforts as indicated for CAEP Standards R5 and RA5.

Examples of Disaggregation by Category

The following examples are provided to support EPPs in identifying relevant categories for disaggregation, including when data are required to be disaggregated and possible methods for presenting information during the CAEP Self-Study Report or other report submissions as applicable. The examples shown below are for **illustrative** purposes and can be used or modified as needed based on the EPP's context.

Program Level Disaggregation (Required)

When to Disaggregate

- All EPPs must disaggregate data by program and licensure level (Initial and/or Advanced) within the scope of CAEP accreditation review.
- Program-level disaggregation allows EPPs to determine whether candidates in each program are developing necessary content and pedagogical skills, as indicated in CAEP Standard R1/RA1.
- Report data separately for each licensure program. Avoid only presenting data into a single, overall EPP-level score without also showing program-level results.

Example of Disaggregated Data

Example 1: Program Disaggregation

In the table below, data are presented for a single lesson plan assessment and are disaggregated by program showing the mean assessment score and the total number of candidates for each individual program and across the EPP as a whole. In this example the EPP offers two Initial programs: Special Education and Elementary Education.

Lesson Plan Rubric	
Program Name	Mean Assessment Score
EPP (all programs)	3.05 <i>n</i> =100
Special Education	2.9 <i>n</i> =40
Elementary Education	3.2 <i>n</i> =60

Example 2: Program and Standard Disaggregation

In the table below, data are presented for a single lesson plan assessment and are disaggregated by program and InTASC standard showing the mean assessment score. In this example, the EPP offers two Initial programs: Special Education and Elementary Education. Data reported include the total number of candidates for each program and across the EPP as a whole.

Lesson Plan Rubric		
<i>Program</i>	<i>InTASC Standard</i>	<i>Mean Assessment Score</i>
EPP (all programs)	All InTASC Standards	3.45 <i>n=100</i>
	InTASC St. 4	3.6 <i>n=100</i>
	InTASC St. 5	3.35 <i>n=100</i>
	InTASC St. 6	3.45 <i>n=100</i>
Special Education	All InTASC Standards	3.7 <i>n=25</i>
	InTASC St. 4	4.0 <i>n=25</i>
	InTASC St. 5	3.7 <i>n=25</i>
	InTASC St. 6	3.5 <i>n=25</i>
Elementary Education	All InTASC Standards	3.1 <i>n=75</i>
	InTASC St. 4	3.2 <i>n=75</i>
	InTASC St. 5	2.7 <i>n=75</i>
	InTASC St. 6	3.4 <i>n=75</i>

Example 3: Program Standard, and Demographic Disaggregation

In the table below, data are presented for a single lesson plan assessment by program, disaggregated by InTASC standard and transfer student classification showing the mean assessment score. In this example, the EPP offers one Initial program in Elementary Education.

Lesson Plan Rubric			
<i>Program</i>	<i>InTASC Standard</i>	<i>Candidate Status</i>	<i>Mean Assessment Score</i>
Elementary Education	All InTASC Standards	All Candidates	3.08 <i>n</i> =200
		Transfer	3.06 <i>n</i> =75
		Non-Transfer	3.1 <i>n</i> =125
	InTASC St. 4	Transfer	2.6 <i>n</i> =75
		Non- Transfer	3.2 <i>n</i> =125
	InTASC St. 5	Transfer	3.3 <i>n</i> =75
		Non-Transfer	2.7 <i>n</i> =125
	InTASC St. 6	Transfer	3.3 <i>n</i> =75
		Non-Transfer	3.4 <i>n</i> =125

Multi-Site/Campus Disaggregation (Required, if applicable)

When to Disaggregate

- EPPs operating across multiple campus sites, including those in different states, countries, or other governing authority under which the EPP operates any approved online program must disaggregate data by location in addition to disaggregation by program, licensure level and relevant standards within the scope of CAEP accreditation review.
 - Disaggregation by location is required when programs are offered at:
 - Multiple campuses, branch or auxiliary locations
 - Multiple states
 - Multiple international locations
- Disaggregation by campus site ensures that data are sufficient to demonstrate quality throughout the EPP.
- Data must be disaggregated separately by location and each licensure program. Avoid only presenting data into a single, overall EPP-level score without also showing program-level and location-level results.

Example of Disaggregated Data

Example 1: Multi-Site Disaggregation

In the table below, data are presented for a single lesson plan assessment and are disaggregated by location and by program, showing the mean assessment score. In this example, the EPP offers four Initial programs across five states: Science Education in Arizona only; Math Education in Virginia only; Special Education in Arizona and New Jersey; and Elementary Education in Kentucky, and North Carolina. Data are reported for each campus location and include the total number of candidates for each program and across the EPP as a whole.

Lesson Plan Rubric		
<i>Program and Location</i>	<i>Mean Assessment Score</i>	
All Locations and Programs	3.0 <i>n</i> =1,010	
Science Education	Arizona	3.9 <i>n</i> =335
Math Education	Virginia	3.4 <i>n</i> =80

Special Education	Arizona	3.8 <i>n</i> =225
	New Jersey	4.0 <i>n</i> =120
	All locations	3.7 <i>n</i> =345
Elementary Education	Kentucky	3.2 <i>n</i> =175
	North Carolina	2.7 <i>n</i> =75
	All locations	3.4 <i>n</i> =250

Example 2: Multi-Site and Standard Disaggregation

In the table below, data are presented for a single lesson plan assessment and are disaggregated by program and InTASC standard showing the mean assessment score. In this example, the EPP offers one Initial program in Elementary Education in two states: Arizona and Texas. Data reported include the total number of candidates for each program and across the EPP as a whole.

Lesson Plan Rubric			
<i>Program</i>	<i>InTASC Standard</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Mean Assessment Score</i>
Elementary Education	All InTASC Standards	All locations and Standards	3.38 <i>n</i> =200
		Arizona	2.20 <i>n</i> =75
		Texas	2.30 <i>n</i> =125
	InTASC St. 5	Arizona	3.30 <i>n</i> =75
		Texas	3.50 <i>n</i> =125
	InTASC St. 6	Arizona	3.30 <i>n</i> =75

		Texas	3.40 n=125
--	--	-------	---------------

Delivery Method Disaggregation (Required, if applicable)

When to Disaggregate

- EPPs offering programs through multiple delivery methods should report disaggregated data by modality.
 - Disaggregation by modality is required if the same program is offered through more than one delivery method, such as face-to-face, or online.
- Disaggregation by delivery method, similar to disaggregation by campus location, ensures that data are sufficient to demonstrate quality throughout the EPP.
- Data must be disaggregated separately by delivery method and each licensure program. Avoid only presenting data into a single, overall EPP-level score without also showing program-level results and modality.

Example of Disaggregated Data

In the table below, data are presented for a single lesson plan assessment and are disaggregated by program and delivery method, showing the mean assessment score. In this example, the EPP offers four Initial programs all in a face-to-face format. In addition, one program, Elementary Education, is offered both online and face-to-face. Data are reported for each program and by subcategory of online and face to face for Elementary to distinguish each delivery method. Data also include the total number of candidates for each program and across the EPP as a whole.

Lesson Plan Rubric	
<i>Program</i>	<i>Mean Assessment Score</i>
EPP (all programs and modalities)	3.2 n=200
Science Education	3.7 n=20
Math Education	2.9 n=20
Special Education	3.2 n=60

Elementary Education (online)	3.1 <i>n=50</i>
Elementary Education (face-to-face)	3.2 <i>n=50</i>
Elementary Education (all)	3.15 <i>n=100</i>

Demographic Disaggregation

General Information on Demographic Disaggregation

CAEP recognizes the unique context and characteristics of EPPs and the need to provide flexibility in levels of demographic disaggregation. Additionally, the level of demographic disaggregation reporting is provided at the discretion of the EPP in accordance with state, local, federal policy, legislation or executive orders. As such, if policy restrictions limit an EPP's ability to disaggregate by certain demographic categories, the EPP should describe the level in which data are able to be disaggregated. CAEP acknowledges that EPPs may be limited to reporting data at a "high level" which refers to reporting demographic information in broader, aggregate groups rather than at more detailed levels. For example, an EPP may be able to report overall candidate demographics by race/ethnicity or gender across the entire EPP but not further disaggregate data within each individual program due to policy restrictions or limitations due to small enrollment.

EPPs should be able to demonstrate the ability to disaggregate by further subgroups to show all populations are receiving the same quality of education. For example, EPPs should explain the context of disaggregation within the Self-Study report and, if needed, demonstrate the ability to further disaggregate during the site review interview process or explanation of the EPP's Quality Assurance System (QAS). Flexibility can be extended to EPPs to disaggregate by categories identified as relevant by the EPP, such as by first generation, transfer status, or other contextual factors.

Examples of Demographic Disaggregation

The following examples are provided to support EPPs in identifying relevant categories for disaggregation, including when data are required to be disaggregated and possible methods for presenting information during the CAEP Self-Study Report or other report

submissions as applicable. The examples shown below are for **illustrative** purposes and can be used or modified as needed based on the EPP's context.

Demographic Characteristics (Flexibility provided for EPPs)

When to Disaggregate

- EPPs should demonstrate ability to disaggregate by relevant categories or contextual factors at the discretion of the EPP. Categories might include:
 - First generation students
 - Transfer status
 - Pell eligibility
 - Veteran status
 - High-need recruitment areas
 - Program pathway (e.g., "Grow Your Own", registered apprenticeships, or alternative certification)
 - Other EPP defined populations
- EPPs should identify specifically why contextual factors or demographic categories were identified for disaggregation and align data and analysis with the EPPs Quality Assurance System (QAS).
- When consideration disaggregation for recruitment purposes, specifically R3.1/RA3.1, recruitment plans can be designed for EPP or program specific needs (such as hard to staff areas or regional or local needs, or pathway).
- Support stemming from disaggregation are provided for the betterment of all candidates and all programs.
- Flexibility is also extended to EPPs serving specific populations (such as such as single sex institutions not being able to disaggregate by gender as only one group is served) however, the EPP should demonstrate disaggregation by other important contextual factors.

Example of Disaggregated Data

In the table below, data are presented for a single lesson plan assessment and are disaggregated by program and EPP-identified criteria to disaggregated data by first generation candidates showing the mean assessment score. In this example, the EPP offers two Initial programs in Elementary Education and Special Education. Data also include the total number of candidates for each program and across the EPP as a whole.

Lesson Plan Rubric		
Program	Mean Assessment Score	
All Programs	First Generation	3.5 n=110

	Non-First Generation	2.65 <i>n=185</i>
	All Candidates	3.07 <i>n=400</i>
Special Education	First Generation	3.7 <i>n=35</i>
	Non-First Generation	2.6 <i>n=60</i>
	All Candidates	3.2 <i>n=200</i>
Elementary Education	First Generation	3.3 <i>n=75</i>
	Non-First Generation	2.7 <i>n=125</i>
	All Candidates	3.3 <i>n=200</i>

Small ‘n’ Disaggregation

General Information on Small ‘n’ Disaggregation

CAEP additionally acknowledges that EPPs may have programs of varying enrollments. Generally, a small ‘n’ is considered a $n < 10$. EPPs should use discretion about data representing small numbers and can combine years or categories of data when necessary to protect the privacy of individual candidates or to yield usable data for analysis.

Examples of Small ‘n’ Disaggregation

The following examples are provided to support EPPs in identifying relevant categories for disaggregation, including when data are required to be disaggregated and possible methods for presenting information during the CAEP Self-Study Report or other report submissions as applicable. The examples shown below are for **illustrative** purposes and can be used or modified as needed based on the EPP’s context.

Adjustments for small ‘n’ (Flexibility provided for EPPs)

When to Disaggregate

- EPPs should demonstrate ability to disaggregate by relevant categories or contextual factors at the discretion of the EPP.
- Data for programs with low enrollment may be combined and a rationale provided. For example, EPPs can choose to combine data across multiple cycles or years (e.g., 2020–2024) to create a larger sample for reporting. Data may also be combined with similar programs (e.g. secondary education or science programs).
- If data are combined, EPPs should include a rationale for aggregation and align data and analysis with the EPPs Quality Assurance System (QAS).
- Data should not be combined without explanations.

Example of Disaggregated Data

Example 1: Combining Similar Programs

In the table below, data are presented for a single lesson plan assessment and are disaggregated by program, showing the mean assessment score and the total number of candidates for each program and across the EPP as a whole. In this example, the EPP offers six Initial programs: Biology, Chemistry, Elementary Education, Math Education, Physics, and Special Education. Biology, Chemistry, and Physics are all low enrolled programs, with less than 3-5 candidates in each program, and the EPP has combined each of these subcategories into one program group for Science Education.

Lesson Plan Rubric	
Program Name	Mean Assessment Score
EPP (all programs)	3.25 <i>n</i> =100
Secondary Science <i>[includes Biology (n=5), Chemistry (n=2), and Physics (n=3)]</i>	3.3 <i>n</i> =10
Math Education	3.8 <i>n</i> =10
Special Education	2.9 <i>n</i> =20
Elementary Education	3.0 <i>n</i> =60

Example 2: Combining Data Across Multiple Years

In the table below, data are presented for a single lesson plan assessment and are disaggregated by program, showing the mean assessment score and the total number of candidates for each program and across the EPP as a whole. In this example, the EPP offers three Initial programs: Biology, Chemistry, and Physics Education. The EPP has combined data across multiple years (2022-2026) for low enrolled programs -Biology and Chemistry- to yield usable data for analysis. In this instance, more than three cycles of data are presented to demonstrate trends over time.

Lesson Plan Rubric		
Program Name	Mean Assessment Score	
EPP (all programs)	2022-2023	3.4 <i>n=5</i>
	2023-2024	3.4 <i>n=5</i>
	2024-2025	3.5 <i>n=14</i>
	2025-2026	3.5 <i>n=16</i>
Biology Education 2022-2023, <i>n=2</i> 2023-2024 <i>n=0</i> 2024-2025 <i>n=5</i> 2025-2026 <i>n=3</i>	3.2 <i>n=10</i>	
Chemistry Education 2022-2023, <i>n=0</i> 2023-2024 <i>n=0</i> 2024-2025 <i>n=3</i> 2025-2026 <i>n=6</i>	3.6 <i>n=10</i>	
Physics Education	2022-2023	3.3 <i>n=3</i>
	2023-2024	3.3 <i>n=5</i>
	2024-2025	3.7 <i>n=6</i>
	2025-2026	3.6 <i>n=7</i>

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)

Does all data need to be disaggregated?

EPPs offering programs within the scope of CAEP accreditation are expected to present the three most recent consecutive cycles of data for Standards R1/RA1-R5/RA5. Standard R5/RA5, focuses how the EPPs Quality Assurance System (QAS) demonstrates ongoing monitoring, analysis and continuous improvement across standards. As such, data across successive administrations should represent how the EPPs Quality Assurance System (QAS) supports the disaggregation of data by licensure area, program, and other contextual factors identified by the EPP. Not all data are required to be disaggregated in the same manner. Data may be combined or aggregated, when relevant, to identify trends, to create a larger sample for reporting and analysis.

When can data be combined or aggregated?

Combining or aggregating data may be appropriate in some situations to address limitations in data collection, support meaningful analysis, or protect candidate privacy. Examples may include:

- Low enrollment or small ‘n’
- Clinical practice disruptions
- Partnership interruptions or placement issues
- Data gaps due to no enrollment or low participation/responses
- State waiver of policies impacting data, process, or requirements
- Issues related to the EPPs Quality Assurance System (R5.2/RA5.2)

When data are combined or aggregated, EPPs should explain the rationale and provide context and describe how data are used within the EPPs Quality Assurance System (QAS).

When is flexibility allowed in identifying cycles of data?

CAEP recognizes that some EPPs may experience circumstances impacting the availability or consistency of data cycles. A ‘cycle’ of data can be defined by the EPP, typically identified as either a semester or academic year. Flexibility may be appropriate in situations such as the use of older data cycles due to enrollment gaps, partial data cycles resulting from program changes, data from multiple instruments, lower response rates or participation, or other disruptions affecting data collection. EPPs should provide context for the situation and explain how the data are used toward continuous improvement.

Should EPPs provide context when describing data or unique situations?

Yes. In all instances, data should be contextualized to explain the EPPs circumstances, any limitations or factors affecting interpretation or analysis of data, why data have been combined or aggregated, and describe how findings are used for continuous improvement. Providing context helps reviews understand how the EPP interprets and uses data within the Quality Assurance System (QAS).

When reporting data for multiple programs, how should data be disaggregated?

Data, at minimum, should be disaggregated by program, licensure level, and relevant standards. For example, EPPs with programs at both the Initial and Advanced licensure level should disaggregate by program, InTASC standard for Initial programs, and relevant standards for Advanced programs. For EPPs with programs at only the Initial or Advanced license level, data should be disaggregated by program and standards relevant to the licensure level.

If the EPP operates in multiple states, how should data be disaggregated?

EPPs operating at multi-state or multi-site locations including those in different states, countries, or other governing authority under which the EPP operates any approved online program, should disaggregate data by program, location/site, licensure level, and relevant standards.

If the EPP offers programs through more than one delivery method, how should data be disaggregated?

EPPs offering programs through multiple delivery methods (e.g., online, face-to-face, or alternative route) should disaggregate data by program, delivery method/modality, licensure level, and relevant standards. If an EPP offers programs across both multiple locations and multiple modalities, data should be disaggregated by program, location, delivery method/modality, licensure level, and relevant standards.

If a program does not have enrollment across more than one cycle of data, how can this information be presented?

EPPs may combine multiple years of data to create a relevant sample for analysis and reporting. Generally, a sample, or 'n', of 10 or more is considered sufficient. In some cases, EPPs may present more than three cycles of data to provide context or support analysis. For example, a program with no enrollment during the 2023-2024 year may combine data from each academic year between 2022-2026.

What can EPPs do if there are limitations on demographic disaggregation of data due to local, state, or federal legislation or policies?

CAEP has provided flexibility in cases where EPPs may experience restrictions due to laws, policies, or executive orders impacting disaggregation of data by demographic category. EPPs should explain any restrictions and disaggregate data to the level permitted by policy. For example, an EPP may be permitted to report overall EPP-wide demographic distributions by race or ethnicity but may not be permitted to further disaggregate program-level data by these categories. EPPs should describe disaggregation methods and provide context for how data are used for continuous improvement.

Is disaggregation by race and ethnicity required by CAEP?

The CAEP Revised 2022 Standards Workbook references disaggregation by race/ethnicity and gender. However, CAEP recognizes that EPPs operate within differing institutional context and has provided flexibility in specific demographic categories used for analysis and reporting. EPPs can identify demographic categories as relevant to their EPP context, which may include race or ethnicity or other demographic categories. For example, a single-type school such as a single-sex institution, or a Historically Black College or University (HBCU) may choose to focus disaggregation and analysis on first generation status, gender, or transfer population based on institutional context or recruitment priorities.

What are ‘EPP-defined criteria’ related to demographic disaggregation?

“EPP-defined criteria” refers to contextual categories or sub-groups identified by the EPP as meaningful and relevant for analysis within their own institutional context and Quality Assurance System (QAS). Examples might include:

- First generation candidates
- Transfer status
- Pell eligibility
- Veteran status
- High-need recruitment areas
- Program pathway (e.g., “Grow Your Own”, registered apprenticeships, or alternative certification)
- Other EPP defined populations

EPPs should identify specifically why contextual factors or demographic categories were identified for disaggregation and explain how data are used to inform analysis, recruitment, candidate support, and continuous improvement efforts.