



Guide to Application for CAEP Accreditation – Phase II

Table of Contents

Contents	Page
I. Guide to Completing Phase II	3
a. The Characteristics and Capacity Tables	3
b. The Six Capacity Tables	6
c. Readiness for Accreditation Self-Assessment Checklist	14
d. Composing the Rationale for Eligibility or Candidacy	20
II. CAEP's Processing of the Application in Phase I	21
e. Application process-at-a-glance	21

I. Guide to Completing Phase II

To complete Phase II of the application process, the EPP representative in charge of completing the application enters the AIMS system at AIMS.caepnet.org using the user ID and password received in the welcome letter. The EPP's profile generated in the Phase I application can be edited as needed. The Phase II application links will allow the EPP representative to view and upload the documents and information needed to complete the application. Drafts can be saved or printed at any point.

Phase II of the application process includes completion of five tables by each EPP (with an additional table for EPPs housed in organizations that are not accredited by a regional or national accrediting body recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education or the Council for Higher Education Accreditation). The tables are completed online in the AIMS system, but the shells are printed in this document so that EPPs have a sense of what will be needed to complete them.

The information provided in these tables serve two functions:

- 1) It provides a detailed description of the EPP and its programs that become part of CAEP's database and are updated annually. Knowing these characteristics helps CAEP staff plan for the accreditation review and allows for the careful selection of site visitors with the needed expertise to review the EPP.
- 2) Some of the information in the tables becomes part of the "capacity" dimension of the accreditation review.

Information on the characteristics and capacity tables is provided below. Following discussion of the capacity tables, an explanation of the [readiness checklist](#) is provided.

a. The Characteristics and Capacity Tables

As noted above, the characteristics and capacity tables provide a broad profile of the EPP's offerings and resources. The first three tables along with evidence of institutional accreditation (or completion of the final capacity table) are completed as part of Phase II of the application process. The remaining tables will need to be completed at least two years prior to the site visit. They are available to the EPP at any time, and completing them early in the process will ensure that only updating is required as the development of the self study nears completion.

These same tables are updated annually by accredited EPPs as part of CAEP's annual reporting process to maintain and continue an EPP's accreditation status. At the time of the accreditation review or diagnostic visit, the tables are updated or revised as appropriate and submitted as part of the EPP's self study or diagnostic documentation. CAEP's site visitors verify the information presented in the tables as part of the accreditation review of the EPP's capacity to provide and maintain quality EPPs.

Phase II of the application requires the following information:

TABLE 1: EPP Profile (completion required as part of the application process)

This table records a variety of characteristics of the EPP, including its affiliations and Carnegie classification. (The form in AIMS contains drop-down menus for ease of entering information.)

EPP Characteristics	Categories of response
There are a number of items, including EPP type, affiliation, Carnegie classification, etc.	

TABLE 2: Program Characteristics (completion required as part of the application process)

In this table, information about the name, enrollment, delivery method, state approval status, and other characteristics of each of the EPP’s distinct ‘certificate’ or ‘licensure’ programs is gathered. Please note that one element of the table, the program review option for each certificate or licensure program, should be determined in consultation with CAEP staff as the availability of program review options varies by state (and is detailed in the CAEP-State Partnership Agreement).

Name of program/ specialty area	Enrollment in current and 2 prior fall cycles			Degree, certificate or licensure level	Method of Delivery	State(s) in which the program is approved	Date of state approval(s)	Program Review Option **
	A Y 12	A Y 13	A Y 14					

^{**}Note: this column can be completed in consultation with CAEP staff, following completion of Phase II online. Available program review options vary by state.

TABLE 3: The Accreditation Plan for Programs by Site of Operation (completion required as part of the application process)

Given the proliferation of off-campus, satellite, and online program offerings, the detail provided in the following table is necessary to ensure that all required state approvals are in place, and to ensure that CAEP examines all aspects, locations, and delivery models for each of the EPP’s programs.

Geographic Site(s) administered by the EPP	Programs offered at each site	Is the program to be included in Accreditation review? Y or N	Is the program approved by state in which program is offered? Y or N	Notes/Comments

TABLE 4: Clinical Educator and Other Faculty Qualifications (completion required at least two years prior to a scheduled site visit)

CAEP review includes consideration of the qualifications of faculty involved in clinical and other program components. This information will be needed as part of the self study, and can be entered as early as desired; it should be updated annually.

Clinical Educator and other Faculty Qualifications						
Name	Highest degree earned	Field or specialty area of highest degree	Program assignment(s)	Teaching assignment or role within the program(s)	P-12 certificates or licensures held	P-12 experiences including teaching or administration dates of engagement in these roles

TABLE 5: Program Parity within the Institution (completion required at least two years prior to a scheduled site visit)

Capacity Dimension	EPP description of metric(s)	EPP data	Comparative entity data (indicate the unit or entity described)	Title and description of supplemental evidence/documentation of quality for each dimension
Facilities				
Fiscal support				

Administrative support				
Candidate support services				
Candidate feedback, formal and informal				

TABLE 6: Evidence of Capacity For EPPs that are NOT housed within regionally- or nationally-accredited institutions of higher education (If this table is appropriate, completion required as part of the application process).

The information in the following table is required **only** of those EPPs housed in institutions that do **not** hold institutional accreditation from a federally recognized regional or national accreditor. EPPs housed at institutions that are regionally or nationally accredited by a federally recognized accrediting body should provide a copy of the most recent accreditation letter from that accreditor instead of completing the table.

Capacity Requirement	Evidence
Institutional (EPP) ability to meet its financial obligations	
Prepared budget for current year	
Financial projections for long-term financial sustainability	
External audit process	
Administrative structure	

b. Completing the Six Capacity Tables

The section below contains the same tables as above. These, however, contain some illustrative data; the instructions are also expanded.

Table 1: An expanded EPP profile

In AIMS, the program representative will complete a table of EPP characteristics which provides an expanded profile by which the accreditation process is managed by CAEP staff. EPP characteristics are also used in aggregate by CAEP staff in compiling CAEP’s Annual Report to the Public and used as a series of filters for dashboard comparison by the EPP itself. The AIMS

version of this table, in which the data are actually entered, has drop-down menus by which characteristics are selected and the table is completed.

Table 1: EPP Profile (completion required as part of the application process)

EPP Characteristics	Categories of response
There are a number of items, including EPP type; Carnegie classification, etc.	Online, for profit, nonprofit; Research Intensive, etc.

Table 2: Graduate/completer professional qualification

Table 2 summarizes graduates’ or completers’ eligibility for a license, certificate, professional degree, or equivalent authorization to practice as a professional educator as appropriate to the EPP’s state or national context. The EPP uploads the PDF copies of the most recent state approval letters and a PDF copy of the state’s list of state-approved programs. These letters and the list provide CAEP with the evidence that all of the EPP’s programs that are to be included in the accreditation review are state approved and that its completers are eligible for licensure, certificates, professional degrees, etc. If the EPP is located outside of the United States, then an equivalent letter of approval or letter of authority to prepare professional educators for practice should be uploaded.

In addition, the EPP representative completes the following table of program characteristics by entering the information requested for every program or program option offered by the EPP. Cross check the list with the programs listed in the EPP’s academic catalog, if any, as well as the list of state-approved registered programs, if applicable. Site visitors will reference this list during the accreditation review process. Definitions of terms are included as footnotes. The AIMS version of this table, in which the data are actually entered, has drop-down menus by which certain characteristics can be selected. Sample entries are provided to illustrate how the table is completed.

Table 2: Program Characteristics (completion required as part of the application process)

Name of program/specialty area ¹	Enrollment in current and 2 prior fall cycles ²			Degree, certificate or licensure level ³	Method of Delivery ⁴	State(s) in which program is approved ⁵	Date of state approval(s) ⁶	Program Review Option ⁷
	A Y 12	A Y 1 3	A Y 14					
Elementary Education (grades 1-6)	65	4 7	32	Post-bac (NY, NJ), initial cert (NY, NJ, AZ)	On-line	NY, NJ, AZ	4/30/08 (NY) 12/1/10 (NJ) 5/6/11 (AZ)	NAEYC
School Counselor (all grades)	8	1 0	23	MA (NY only)	Blended	NY	3/10/11	CACREP accredited

Table 3: Accreditation plan by site

This table clarifies the scope of the EPP’s proposed accreditation or developmental diagnostic review. Given the proliferation of off-campus, satellite, and online program offerings, the detail provided in the following table is necessary to ensure that all necessary state approvals are in place, and to ensure that CAEP examines all aspects, locations, and delivery models for each of the EPP’s programs. The Accreditation Plan is an EPP’s identification of the sites outside of the main campus or administrative headquarters and the programs offered at each site that will be

¹ Name of program/specialty area refers to the official name of the program into which candidates are enrolled. The name should match the state registry of approved programs and the academic catalog, if any.

² Current year and 2 prior years of data to include the total number of fully enrolled candidates intending to take a complete course of study to result in a license, degree, or certificate. Do not include candidates enrolled conditionally or provisionally who may not intend to complete the program.

³ State the degree to be awarded, if any, and include the level of licensure/certification for each state in which the program is approved and provided.

⁴ The drop-down menu will allow responses of online, blended, face-to-face, and other. If “other” is selected, an explanation must be entered.

⁵ It is now common for educator preparation programs to be offered across state lines and internationally. In this field enter the state(s) or country(ies) where the program has candidates enrolled.

⁶ Enter the date on which each state or country where the program is offered was fully approved to result in a degree or recommend candidates for licensure/certificate in the program/specialty area.

⁷ The program review option contains a drop-down menu that includes the name of each Specialty Professional Associations (SPAs) or organization that awards national recognition or accreditation, state program review, national authorization for international EPPs, program review with feedback, and “other”. If “other” is selected, an explanation must be entered. This column of the table can be completed in consultation with CAEP staff.

included in the EPP’s accreditation review. This information, in combination with the table of program characteristics, is used by CAEP staff and site visit team chairs/leads to plan the site visit, including the sites that will be visited by site team members. The table below includes an example of the type of information that might be included. The AIMS version of this table, in which the data are actually entered, has drop-down menus by which certain characteristics can be selected. Sample entries are provided below for illustrative purposes only.

Table 3: The Accreditation Plan for Programs by Site of Operation (completion required as part of the application process)

Geographic Site(s) administered by the EPP	Programs offered at each site	Is the program to be included in Accreditation review? Y or N	Is the program approved by state in which program is offered? Y or N	Notes/Comments
Main Campus in ABC City, NY	Elementary Education	Y	Y	
	Special Education	Y	Y	
	TESOL	Y	Y	
Branch Campus in XYZ City, NY	Elementary Education	Y	Y	
	Social Studies	N	N	Program is new and in process of state review.
Satellite Campus in DEF City, AZ	Educational Leadership	Y	Y	Online program, candidates seek reciprocity for AZ license.
	Curriculum and Teaching	N	N	Online enrichment program not leading to licensure.

Table 4: Clinical educator and other faculty qualifications

CAEP review includes consideration of the qualifications of faculty involved in clinical and other program components. This information will be needed as part of the self study, and can be entered as early as desired; it should be updated annually. Identification of the qualifications of the clinical educators who provide academic or pedagogical instruction and/or supervise field experiences as well as faculty who provide instruction not connected to field components. Qualifications are determined by academic degree, field of specialization in relation to teaching assignment, teaching or administrative licensure, and currency of experience in P-12 settings. A light-hearted example is provided below.

Table 4: Clinical Educator and Other Faculty Qualifications

Clinical Educator and Other Faculty Qualifications						
Name	Highest degree earned	Field or specialty area of highest degree	Program assignment(s)	Teaching assignment or role within the program(s),	P-12 certificates or licensures held	P-12 experiences including teaching or administration dates of engagement in these roles
Doris Daily-reader	Ed. D.	Literacy	Reading Specialist Licensure Program, Elementary Education	Literacy Methods, Assessment of Literacy Learning, Reading Methods I and II.	K-8, all subjects	Classroom teacher in grades K, 2, 3, and 4 from 1994 to 2003, Literacy Coach from 2003 to 2010.

Table 5: Sufficiency of resources to provide a quality program

This table demonstrates the EPP is adequately staffed, funded, and serviced by showing that it has parity in relation to other clinical professional preparation programs or comparable programs at the institution. The parity table of curricular, fiscal, facility, and administrative and support capacity for quality provides data relevant for the EPP and a comparative entity selected by the EPP. The comparative entity might be another clinical EPP within a university structure, a national organization, the college or university as a whole or another entity identified as a benchmark by the EPP. Sample entries are provided below for illustrative purposes only.

Table 5: Program Parity within the Institution (completion required at least two years prior to a scheduled site visit)

Capacity Dimension	EPP description of metric(s)	EPP data	Comparative entity data:	Title and description of supplemental evidence/documentation of quality for each dimension
		School of Education with an enrollment of 750 supported by 25 faculty	School of Nursing with an enrollment of 250 supported by 14 faculty	
Facilities	# of classrooms and dedicated facilities	5 SMART classrooms, 4 labs, 25 faculty offices, administrative offices, and a curriculum resource center	2 SMART classrooms, 6 labs, 14 faculty offices, administrative offices	Campus map and building maps for Education and Nursing.
Fiscal support	Annual budget	\$1,500,000 for education, not including research or sponsored program support	\$1,350,000 not including research or sponsored program support	Budgets for education and nursing with cross-tab comparison of tuition and fees for graduate and undergraduate education.
Administrative support	Organizational chart	Dean, Assoc. Dean, Asst. Dean, Field Coordinator, Director of Licensure, Assessment Coordinator, 3 Department Chairs, 10 Program Directors, 4 office	Dean, Asst. Dean, Internship Coordinator, Director of Licensure, Program Directors, 2 office assistants, 4 graduate assistants.	Organizational charts for education and nursing with cross-comparison of departments and assistantships.

		assistants, 8 graduate assistants.		
Candidate support services	List of services, # of candidates seeking services, Annual report on candidate evaluation of support services	Services provided by the School of Education for use of its candidates: Field placement office, Licensure office, ombuds-person, and advisement.	Services provided by the School of nursing for use of its students: Internship placement office, Licensure office, ombuds-person, and advisement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Table of comparative services in education and nursing • # of candidates seeking each service disaggregated by program (education only) • Summary of candidate evaluations of support services (education only)
Candidate feedback, formal and informal	Surveys and complaint policy	Faculty evaluations, exit surveys, completer surveys	Faculty evaluations	Aggregated summary of responses rating faculty teaching quality, summary of results from exit and completer surveys, summary of formal complaints.

6. Table 6 OR other evidence of regional accreditation or its equivalent.

An EPP uploads a PDF copy of its current regional accreditation letter and/or a copy of the final report to indicate institutional accreditation status. If the EPP is ineligible for regional accreditation or if there is no country equivalent of institutional accreditation, the EPP completes the *Evidence of Capacity* table which contains a list of alternative requirements that must be submitted. The information in the following table is required **only** of those EPPs housed in institutions that do not hold institutional accreditation from a federally recognized regional or national accreditor. EPPs housed at institutions that are regionally or nationally accredited by a federally recognized accrediting body should upload a PDF copy of the most recent accreditation letter from that accreditor instead of completing the table.

Table 6: Evidence of Capacity For EPPs that are NOT housed within regionally- or nationally- accredited institutions of higher education (If this table is appropriate, completion required as part of the application process).

Capacity Requirement	Suggested Evidence
Institutional (EPP) ability to meet its financial obligations	<p>The EPP uploads one of three items:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) legal entity’s 990 form (for non-profit EPPs) or 2) corporate income tax returns for the past year (for for-profit EPPs) or 3) equivalent evidence of financial health (for international EPPs).
Prepared budget for current year	<p>The EPP uploads:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the most current approved budget for the current academic or calendar year whichever is most relevant for the EPP’s context, or 2) Equivalent evidence of revenues and expenditures. <p>Budget figures must be converted to \$/US dollars if another currency is used.</p>
Financial projections for long-term financial sustainability	<p>The EPP uploads:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Revenues and expense projections for the next two years (either calendar or fiscal), including funding streams, or 2) Equivalent evidence of financial sustainability. <p>If funding is exclusively tuition-based, the EPP must upload:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Its tuition refund policy, and 2) Its teach-out plan in the case that the EPP’s programs are discontinued.
External audit process	<p>The EPP uploads:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Clean independent audits of a full set of financial statements for the EPP, or 2) Equivalent evidence of administrative budgetary oversight (for international EPPs).
Administrative structure	<p>The EPP uploads:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) A one to two page narrative describing the EPPs relationship with the legal entity in which it is housed (if any), and 2) an organizational chart.

c. Completing the Readiness Self-Assessment Checklist

An EPP completes the [Readiness for Accreditation Self-Assessment Checklist](#) as a tool to assess its readiness to provide evidence⁸ in each of the key areas required to meet CAEP standards. The completed checklist is uploaded into AIMS with a rationale for the decision regarding which track (direct or developmental) to enter.

Please consult the [CAEP Standards](#) and the [CAEP Evidence Guide](#) in conducting the self-assessment using the tables below. As you complete the self-assessment checklist, please bear in mind the following information on phasing in CAEP requirements under its new (2013) standards.

CAEP recognizes that the 2013 standards require, in some places, new evidence that has not been required or collected in the past. Accordingly, CAEP has created developmental expectations for EPPs with visits during the transition period (2014 and 2015) and for EPPs with visits in the first two years after the standards become required (those with visits in 2016 and 2017).

- ***EPPs with visits in 2014 and 2015*** may present plans in the self study for collecting the required evidence and, once approved by the CAEP Accreditation Council, will present in their annual reports their progress in implementing these plans along the approved timeline.
- ***EPPs with visits in 2016 and 2017*** may also present plans in their self study in lieu of unavailable data and in addition will be expected to provide evidence of implementation in their self study.

EPPs which do not have access to state P-12 student learning data and EPPs that are supplementing state or district data with data on subjects or grades not covered should refer to the CAEP Evidence Guide.

In each case, site visitors will investigate the EPP's capacity to carry out and implement the plans with progress to-date.

In light of the preceding paragraphs, some data elements may be appropriately in the planning or development stage at the time of an initial site visit, per the schedule described above.

In each row, comment on the EPP's current state of data collection using the following rubric.

- ✓ *Undeveloped* indicates that the EPP does not have any evidence of this requirement.
- ✓ *In development* indicates that the EPP has evidence in progress but does not have any data or has not implemented the requirement.
- ✓ *Developed* indicates that the EPP has evidence of this requirement and some data following implementation but may not have multiple measures that have been analyzed, compared, or benchmarked.

A sample, completed checklist is provided below for illustrative purposes only.

⁸ Evidence is defined by CAEP as the documentation, multiple and valid measures, and analysis provided as the basis for and proof of an educator preparation provider's (EPP) claims related to CAEP's standards

To be ready to meet CAEP Standard 1:

Requirement	Undeveloped	In Development	Developed
Expected proficiencies for all of the EPP's initial teacher preparation programs in:			
(1) The learner and learning			Proficiencies are defined for all of these areas and assessment measures are developed.
(2) Content			
(3) Instructional practice			
(4) Professional responsibility			
At least two years of data on candidates' demonstrated, progressively developing proficiencies as described above will need to be available at the time the self study is submitted for accreditation review.		Only one administration of the assessments is available at this time.	

To be ready to meet CAEP Standard 2:

Requirement	Undeveloped	In Development	Developed
A detailed description of or plan for developing deep clinical ⁹ partnerships.		Memorandum of understanding is in progress.	
A table of clinical educator ¹⁰ and clinical placement characteristics			Characteristics of clinical educators and

⁹ Clinical practice is defined by CAEP as hands-on, practical applications and demonstrations of professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions through field-based assignments, tasks, activities, and assessments in a variety of settings.

¹⁰ Clinical educator is defined by CAEP as all Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) and P-12-school-based individuals, including classroom teachers, who assess, support, and develop a candidate's knowledge, skills, or professional dispositions at some phase in the clinical experiences.

			placements are available for the past 2 years.
At least two years of data on candidates' progressively developing teaching skills, including impact on P-12 student learning as described above will need to be available at the time that the self study is submitted for accreditation review.		Only one administration of the assessments is available at this time.	

To be ready to meet CAEP Standard 3:

Requirement	Undeveloped	In Development	Developed
A description of or plan for admissions selectivity criteria and recruitment.			Admissions selectivity and recruitment are described.
At least two years of data on selectivity at program completion including capstone performances and the EPP's measures of impact on P-12 student learning as described above will need to be available at the time the self study is submitted for accreditation review.		Only one administration of the assessments is available at this time.	
At least two years of data on selectivity at admission and at completion including capstone performances and the EPP's measures of impact on P-12 ¹¹ student learning as described above will need to be available at the time that the self study is submitted for accreditation review.		Only one administration of the assessments is available at this time.	

¹¹ P-12 student learning refers to preschool through grade 12, a US-based representation of primary and secondary education levels. For international entities seeking accreditation, an equivalent span should be used that reflects entry into formal education and the level at which a student can exit to enter higher education.

To be ready to meet CAEP Standard 4:

Requirement	Undeveloped	In Development	Developed
Two years of data on completers' (not candidates'):			
(1) Impact on P-12 student learning ¹²	Data on graduates are not available.		
(2) Teaching effectiveness			
(3) Employer satisfaction survey	Employer surveys are not developed.		
(4) Completer satisfaction survey		Only one administration of the assessments is available at this time.	
At least two years data as described above will need to be available at the time the self study is submitted for accreditation review. Those data will be updated annually by all accredited EPPs.			

To be ready to meet CAEP Standard 5:

Requirement	Undeveloped	In Development	Developed
A detailed description of regular and systematic assessment of:			
(1) The EPP's performance data			A description of the assessment system and its
(2) Use of data for continuous improvement			

¹² There is guidance on CAEP's website about the alternatives that are acceptable if the state or country does not have a system for attributing teacher impact on student learning, or there is not a system in place to assess teacher effectiveness once the teacher is in the classroom.

			intended use of data is completed.
Two years of data related to:			
(1) The EPP's performance		Only one administration of the assessments is available at this time.	
(2) Use of data for continuous improvement			
A description of measures of completers' (not candidates') impact on P-12 student learning	Data on graduates are not available, measures are not developed.		

To be ready to meet CAEP Standards overall:

Requirement	Undeveloped	In Development	Developed
Evidence of the integration of diversity ¹³ throughout all programs			Can be provided. Diversity proficiencies are defined and assessed.
Evidence of the integration of technology throughout all programs			Can be provided. Technology proficiencies are defined and assessed.
Data across all standards that use/are:			

¹³ Diversity is defined by CAEP as (1) Individual differences (e.g., personality, interests, learning modalities, and life experiences), and (2) group differences (e.g., race, ethnicity, ability, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, nationality, language, religion, political affiliation, and socio-economic background) (InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards, p. 21).

(1) Multiple measures		Assessment measures that meet these criteria. However, comparability, analysis, and use are not fully demonstrated with only one administration of most measures.	
(2) Comparable/benchmarked			
(3) Analyzed and shared			
(4) Used for improvement			
(5) Meet the criteria for quality			
<p>Ability to submit annual reporting¹⁴ data in the eight designated categories, which include the four categories that appear in Standard 4 (above), as well as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Graduation rates 2. Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements 3. Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they were prepared 4. Student loan default rates and other consumer information 	These data are not available.		

When the checklist is completed, the results of the self-assessment can be analyzed using the following guidelines:

Strongly consider entering *candidacy for accreditation*:

1. When many desired data sources remain undeveloped, and it appears uncertain whether or not two years of data related to one or more CAEP standards when the Self-study Report is completed. Going the ‘developmental’ route and starting with *candidacy* status would make sense in this case. During the developmental/diagnostic visit, the site visit team will provide feedback on evidence and data quality, including those data sources that are still under development or being refined.
2. When four or more of the data characteristics or annual reporting data categories noted in the area of meeting CAEP’s standards overall are determined by the EPP to be *undeveloped* or *in*

¹⁴ Annual report requirements are outlined on the CAEP website.

development. During the developmental/diagnostic visit the site visit team will provide feedback on the data categories across all of the standards, the status of the EPP's readiness for annual reporting, and the degree to which the integration of diversity and technology is systemic and assessed.

Consider entering *candidacy for accreditation*:

1. When the EPP is confident that it will have data sets (two years minimum) related to the CAEP standards at the time the self study is completed, but the data characteristics and data quality are determined by the EPP to be *undeveloped* or *in development*.
2. When two years of data are determined by the EPP to be *in development* or *developed* for standard 4 and standard 5, but the related data characteristics noted in the area of meeting CAEP's standards overall are determined by the EPP to be *undeveloped* or *in development* for these two standards.
3. When the required categories for annual reporting are *undeveloped* or *in development* and
 - a. there are other areas throughout the standards that are *in development* or *undeveloped*,
 - b. or data characteristics are determined to be *in development*.

Strongly consider becoming *accreditation eligible*:

1. When an EPP is confident that it will have at least two years of data related to the CAEP standards at the time the self study is completed, and that the data will be of sufficient quality.
2. When four or more of the data characteristics or annual reporting data categories noted in the area of meeting CAEP's standards overall are determined by the EPP to be *developed*.
3. When the required categories for annual reporting are *developed* and
 - a. most, if not all, other areas throughout the standards are *developed*,
 - b. or data characteristics throughout the standards are determined to be *developed*.

These considerations should guide the EPP as it prepares its rationale for selecting the direct (*Accreditation Eligible*) or developmental (*Candidacy*) track. CAEP staff will consult with EPPs as needed as they make the determination.

d. Composing the Rationale for Eligibility or Candidacy

When the readiness checklist is completed, the EPP will be prompted to provide a rationale for its request to be given the status of accreditation eligible or candidate for accreditation.

As a reminder, an EPP seeking accreditation for the first time must meet all CAEP standards to be accredited. For this reason, CAEP designed two possible entry points into accreditation: eligibility and candidacy.

- **Accreditation eligibility** status is the appropriate starting point for EPPs that judge themselves to be ready to engage directly in an accreditation review and are confident that they will have sufficient evidence that they meet all five CAEP's standards within five years.
- **Candidacy for accreditation** status is the appropriate starting point for EPP's that opt to enter the developmental diagnostic process in order to ensure that they are better prepared to address all of CAEP's standards successfully in their accreditation bid.

The rationale should be an analysis and interpretation of the checklist itself. What does the EPP now know about itself after completing the checklist? How many items are developed? In development? Are data available to meet four of the eight annual measures? Do you feel confident in the EPP’s ability to meet all CAEP standards? Are there gaps that would benefit from a period of further development followed by a developmental/diagnostic visit?

Because the application to CAEP is a new process, there is no standard outline or template for the EPP’s rationale. However, some general guidelines to keep in mind are:

1. The rationale should address the checklist and the evidence only.
2. No new evidence can be mentioned that was not requested as part of the checklist.
3. Limit the rationale to a concise, well-organized narrative analysis of the checklist and evidence.
4. Submit the rationale, along with Phase II application materials, including the completed checklist through the Accreditation Information Management System (AIMS)

When in doubt about what to include in the rejoinder, consult:

- ✓ CAEP staff for general guidelines, or
- ✓ CAEP IT staff for technical support.

II. CAEP’s Processing of the Application in Phase II

Upon completion of Phase II, CAEP staff will review the EPP’s completed application and contact the EPP if any additional information is needed or is in need of clarification or revision.

a. CAEP’s application process-at-a-glance

Steps	EPP actions	CAEP actions
1. Phase I of CAEP Application	<u>Only if applying for first-time accreditation</u> , EPP prepares and submits Phase I of the application.	CAEP staff consults with the EPP, as needed, to complete Phase I. CAEP finance staff receives application fee. CAEP IT staff generates AIMS user ID and password. CAEP accreditation staff sends welcome letter. ↺ ↻
2. Phase II of CAEP Application	EPP submits capacity tables, Readiness Checklist, required evidence and rationale through AIMS	CAEP staff reviews Phase II application to ensure it is complete and contacts the EPP with any questions within 30 days. ↺ ↻
3. ARM review	No EPP action required	Annual Report and Monitoring (ARM) Committee reviews Phase II of the CAEP application materials (tables, checklist, evidence and rationale) and makes preliminary recommendation to the Accreditation Council to award the applicant status as accreditation

		eligible or as a candidate for accreditation; or to reject the application.
4. Accreditation Council Review	No EPP action required	The Accreditation Council awards the applicant status as accreditation eligible or as a candidate for accreditation, or rejects the application. CAEP staff notifies the EPP of the decision.
<p>If the EPP is awarded <i>eligibility</i>, an accreditation visit is scheduled and the EPP follows the guidelines for Continuous Improvement, Inquiry Brief or Transformation Initiative self study. Guidelines are located on the CAEP website at www.caepnet.org.</p> <p>If the EPP is awarded <i>candidacy</i>, a diagnostic visit is scheduled and the EPP follows the guidelines for an Inquiry Brief Proposal or a Continuous Improvement diagnostic self study. Guidelines are located on the CAEP website at www.caepnet.org.</p>		

Key: ↻ signifies the process continues until there is consensus among the parties