

Section 1. EPP Profile Updates in AIMS

2026 Annual Accreditation Report : Annual Accreditation Report : Section 1. EPP Profile Updates in AIMS

1.1. I confirm that the EPP has listed the correct contact information for both individuals designated as "EPP Primary" and "EPP Secondary" under the Role section for the EPP.

- Agree
 Disagree

1.2. I confirm that the information displayed in the EPP Details tab (including mailing address, EPP name, Carnegie classification, EPP type, religious affiliation, language of instruction, and institutional accreditation) is up-to-date and accurately reflected in AIMS 2.0. Additionally, I confirm that the EPP Locations tab accurately reflects the EPP's main campus, as well as any associated branch campuses or auxiliary locations.

- Agree
 Disagree

1.3. I confirm that EPP s licensure area listings [including program name, degree level, licensure level, licensure (program) category, and selected program review option for your CAEP Review] are up-to-date and accurately reflected in AIMS 2.0 for all licensure areas that fall within CAEP s scope of accreditation.

- Agree
 Disagree

1.4. Does your EPP recommend candidates for licensure in more than one state/country?

- Yes - The EPP recommends candidates for licensure in more than one state/country.
 No - The EPP recommends candidates for licensure in only one state/country.

1.5. Please select all states/countries in which your EPP recommends candidates for licensure.

- Alabama-AL
 Alaska-AK
 Arizona-AZ
 Arkansas-AR
 California-CA
 Colorado-CO
 Connecticut-CT
 Delaware-DE
 District of Columbia-DC
 Florida-FL
 Georgia-GA

Hawaii-HI

- Idaho-ID
- Illinois-IL
- Indiana-IN
- Iowa-IA
- Kansas-KS
- Kentucky-KY
- Louisiana-LA
- Maine-ME
- Maryland-MD
- Massachusetts-MA
- Michigan-MI
- Minnesota-MN
- Mississippi-MS
- Missouri-MO
- Montana-MT
- Nebraska-NE
- Nevada-NV
- New Hampshire-NH
- New Jersey-NJ
- New Mexico-NM
- New York-NY
- North Carolina-NC
- North Dakota-ND
- Ohio-OH
- Oklahoma-OK
- Oregon-OR
- Pennsylvania-PA
- Rhode Island-RI
- South Carolina-SC
- South Dakota-SD
- Tennessee-TN
- Texas-TX
- Utah-UT
- Vermont-VT
- Virginia-VA
- Washington-WA
- West Virginia-WV
- Wisconsin-WI
- Wyoming-WY
- Puerto Rico-PR
- Bahrain-BH
-

Indonesia-IND

- Jordan-JO
- Kuwait-KW
- Oman-OM
- Qatar-QA
- Scotland-UK-SC
- United Arab Emirates-UAE

AR Reviewer Question 1.1 Did the EPP provide updated contacts with at least one EPP Primary and one EPP Secondary Contact?

- Yes
- No

AR Reviewer Question 1.2 Did the EPP provide updated EPP Details information including noting all EPP Locations?

- Yes
- No

AR Reviewer Question 1.3 Did the EPP provide updated information for all programs under the EPP Programs section?

- Yes
- No

AR Reviewer Question 1.4 Do the number of states/countries selected in Question 1.5 align with the response in Question 1.4 (ie.: one location if 'No' was selected, or two or more locations if 'Yes' was selected)?

- Yes
- No

Section 2. EPP s Program Graduates [Academic Year 2024-2025]

**2026 Annual Accreditation Report : Annual Accreditation Report :
Section 2. EPP s Program Graduates [Academic Year 2024-2025]**

2.1. Total number of candidates who graduated from programs that prepared them to work in P-12 settings during Academic Year 2024-2025. Enter a numeric value for each textbox below. Note that some fields will be automatically calculated or prepopulated with last year's data.

2.1.1 What is the number of graduates in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure?

For a description of the scope for initial-licensure level and advanced level programs, see Policy II in the [CAEP Accreditation Policies and Procedures](#).

Previous Year Number of initial-licensure level Graduates:

2.1.2 What is the number of graduates in advanced programs or programs leading to a degree, endorsement, or some other credential that prepares the holder to serve in P-12 schools? Please do not include those completers counted above.

For a description of the scope for initial-licensure level and advanced level programs, see Policy II in the [CAEP Accreditation Policies and Procedures](#).

Previous Year Number of advanced level Graduates:

Total number of program graduates

Previous Year Total Number of Graduates:

AR Reviewer Question 2.1. Comparing the EPP s reported completer numbers from this year to last year, has the EPP changed fee brackets with CAEP? [No EPP action is required, unless the EPP finds the reported numbers to be in error.]

Fee Brackets based on completer numbers:

1. 0-50
2. 51-150

- 3. 151-300
- 4. 301-500
- 5. 501-1000
- 6. 1000+
- 7. International

Yes

No

Section 3. Substantive Changes

[2026 Annual Accreditation Report](#) : [Annual Accreditation Report](#) : [Section 3. Substantive Changes](#)

Please report on any of the following substantive changes that may have occurred at your Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) or institution/organization since the submission of the prior year's Annual Accreditation Report.

3.1. Has there been any change in the EPP's legal status, form of control, or ownership?

Change

No Change/Not Applicable

3.2. Has the EPP entered a contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach out agreements?

Change

No Change / Not Applicable

3.3. Since the last reporting cycle, has the EPP seen a change in state program approval?

Change

No Change / Not Applicable

Change

During the 2024-2025 academic year, the EPP infrastructure restructure due to identify enrollment declines across the university. Specifically, the College of Education consolidated two of its EPP-dominated departments (Teaching & Learning, and Educational Leadership) to form the Department of Education Practice and Leadership. The licensure unit, Teacher Education and Student Services, was renamed the Office of Educator Preparation to better reflect the certification programs at the initial and advanced levels.

3.4. What is the institution s current regional accreditation status?

3.4.1. Institutional Accreditation Agency:

Southern Association of C ▼

3.4.2. Institutional Accreditation Status:

Accredited/Accreditation F ▼

3.4.3. Does this represent a change in status from the prior year?

- Change
- No Change / Not Applicable

3.5. Since the last reporting cycle, does the EPP have any other substantive changes to report to CAEP per CAEP s Accreditation Policy?

Please see Policy V.4.01 of the [CAEP Accreditation Policies and Procedures](#) document for CAEP's definition of substantive changes.

- Change
- No Change / Not Applicable

AR Reviewer Question 3.1. Please provide feedback on the EPP's substantive changes, if any.

Thank you for providing this update.

Section 4. CAEP Accreditation Details on EPP s Website

2026 Annual Accreditation Report : Annual Accreditation Report :
Section 4. CAEP Accreditation Details on EPP s Website

Please update the EPP s public-facing website to include:

1. the EPP's current CAEP accreditation status with an accurate listing of the EPP's CAEP reviewed programs, and
2. the EPP's reported data for each of the required CAEP Accountability Measures for the 2024-2025 Academic Year.

4.1. URL Link for EPP s current CAEP Accreditation Status & Reviewed Programs

In the box below, please provide the direct URL link to the EPP’s public facing webpage where its current CAEP accreditation status and a list of CAEP-reviewed programs are available.

<https://www.tnstate.edu>

4.2. CAEP Accountability Measures [2024-2025 Academic Year]

EPPs are required to provide data addressing the four CAEP Accountability Measures. These data must be collected or reported for the 2024-2025 Academic Year (September 1, 2024 – August 31, 2025) and be relevant to the requirements outlined below. Data should be clearly labeled to each of the four CAEP Accountability Measures and made publicly available with explanations that are easily understood by a general audience.

- **Measure 1 (Initial): Completer effectiveness. (R4.1)**
 - Data must address: (a) completer impact in contributing to P-12 student-learning growth AND (b) completer effectiveness in applying professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions.
- **Measure 2 (Initial and Advanced): Satisfaction of employers and stakeholder involvement. (R4.2, R5.3, RA4.1)**
 - Data provided should be collected on employers’ satisfaction with program completers.
- **Measure 3 (Initial and Advanced): Candidate competency at completion. (R3.3)**
 - Data provided should relate to measures the EPP is using to determine if candidates are meeting program expectations and ready to be recommended for licensure. (E.g.: EPP’s Title II report, data that reflect the ability of EPP candidates to meet licensing and state requirements or other measures the EPP uses to determine candidate competency at completion.)
- **Measure 4 (Initial and Advanced): Ability of completers to be hired (in positions for which they have prepared).**
 - Data provided may come from various sources, including state or EPP collected data related to completers’ employment in teaching positions for which they were prepared.

4.2.1. URL Link for EPP’s Data Display of CAEP Accountability Measures - Initial-Licensure Level

In the box below, please provide the direct URL link to the EPP’s public facing webpage where data for the required CAEP Accountability Measures for initial-licensure level programs are available. If the EPP does not offer initial-licensure level programs, then please leave this box blank.

<https://www.tnstate.edu>

4.2.2. URL Link for EPP’s Data Display of CAEP Accountability Measures - Advanced Level

In the box below, please provide the direct URL link to the EPP’s public facing webpage where data for the required CAEP Accountability Measures for advanced level programs are available. If the link is the same as for the initial-licensure level, please provide it again in this box. If the EPP does not offer advanced-level programs, then please leave this box blank.

<https://www.tnstate.edu>,

AR Reviewer Question 4.1. Did the EPP provide a weblink that displays its current accreditation status and an accurate list of programs included during the most recent CAEP (NCATE/TEAC) accreditation review?

- Yes
 No

AR Reviewer Question 4.2. Did the EPP provide a direct weblink to its website where the EPP's display of data for the CAEP Accountability Measures is available to the public?

- Yes
 No

AR Reviewer Question 4.3. Are the CAEP Accountability Measures clearly identified and tagged? (Includes header identifying the CAEP Accountability Measures and sub-headings/tags to each of the four measures as defined by CAEP)

- Yes
 No

AR Reviewer Question 4.4. Do the data, tagged to each of the four CAEP Accountability Measures, appear to be collected using appropriate data collection instruments/procedures for the relevant CAEP Component?

- Yes
 No

AR Reviewer Question 4.5. Does the data for the CAEP Accountability Measures reflect data collected in the 2024-2025 Academic Year? (*If data are currently unavailable, does the EPP provide a placeholder statement that details why data are unavailable, and an expected timeline for when updated data will be shared?)

- Yes
 No

AR Reviewer Question 4.6. Has the EPP shared and explained the relevance of each of its data

measures in a way that can be easily understood by the public?

- Yes
- No

AR Reviewer Question 4.7. Has data been disaggregated and shared at the program level? Did the EPP separate its Initial Level Program data and Advanced Level Program data for the CAEP Accountability Measures? [*Relevant to EPPs that receive/will receive CAEP accreditation at both the initial and advanced level.]

- Yes
- No

Section 5: Areas for Improvement and/or Stipulations

[2026 Annual Accreditation Report](#) : [Annual Accreditation Report](#) :
[Section 5: Areas for Improvement and/or Stipulations](#)

Summarize EPP activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the areas cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report. The EPP will continue to report its action and progress on addressing its AFI(s) and/or stipulations until the EPP's next CAEP Accreditation Site Review.

To write your summary, please click the edit button next to each AFI/stipulation to edit the AFI/stipulation. Once there, please provide narrative in the "2026 Annual Accreditation Report Summary/Narrative and Supporting Documents" box at the bottom of the page.

If you do not have any AFIs or stipulations listed, please mark this section complete.

AR Reviewer Question 5.1. Has the EPP summarized its activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the area cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report? [As a reminder: The EPP will continue to report its action and progress on addressing its AFI(s), weaknesses and/or stipulations until the EPP's next CAEP Accreditation Site Review.]

- Yes
- No

AFI/Stipulation

Component	Type	Status	Rationale
-----------	------	--------	-----------

RA4.2 Satisfaction of Completers	AFI	Open	The EPP provided one cycle of data and did not provide evidence of analyzing or using data to inform program improvement. The EPP did not provide a Phase-in plan.
RA3.4 Competency at Completion	AFI	Open	The EPP did not provide evidence of candidate impact on diverse P-12 student learning. Limited evidence was provided showing candidate competency at completion. Evidence was not disaggregated by program, race, and gender. The Phase-in plan was insufficient.
RA3.2 Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully	AFI	Open	Limited evidence was provided showing that the EPP gathered data to monitor candidate progress from admission to completion. The EPP provided an insufficient Phase-in plan.
RA2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation	AFI	Open	While program leaders were able to discuss how relationships with partners work, there was limited evidence that partners co-construct the clinical experiences of advanced candidates in each of the four programs.
RA1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	AFI	Open	The EPP provided limited evidence of aligning assessments or analyzing data for CAEP RA1.1 Data were presented inconsistently and did not allow for comparison across programs or analysis of trends over time. The EPP provided an insufficient plan to address CAEP RA1.1.
R4.2 Satisfaction of Employers	AFI	Open	The EPP provided data to assess this component, but had not analyzed, disaggregated, or used the data to make decisions.

R3.3 Competency at Completion	AFI	Open	Further information, data, and analysis were needed from the EPP for competency at completion. Data for TEAM Observations were not disaggregated by gender and race and some candidates may not have been evaluated by this assessment. No analyses were provided describing any disparities. The Transition Plan was insufficient.
R2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation	AFI	Open	Discussions indicated that while conversations take place with partners about the preparation of candidates, there was little documentation of how this generated actionable feedback.
RA3.3 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	AFI	Open	The EPP provided limited data for transition points for the advanced programs. Supports for candidates were discussed as beginning in the Fall 2022 Semester, but no information on the supports were provided. The Phase-in plan was insufficient.
RA3.1 Recruitment	AFI	Open	The EPP provided an insufficient Phase-in plan for recruitment.
RA1.2 Provider Responsibilities	AFI	Open	The EPP provided limited evidence of aligning assessments or analyzing data for CAEP RA1.2. Data were presented inconsistently and did not allow for analysis of trends over time.
R4.3 Satisfaction of Completers	AFI	Open	The EPP provided data addressing satisfaction of completers within the TDOE Report Cards. Three years of aggregated data were provided but were not analyzed, and the use of data to drive continuous improvement was unclear.
R4.1 Completer Effectiveness	AFI	Open	The Addendum provided 3 cycles of data. Data were partially analyzed, but not disaggregated. It was unclear how the EPP

utilized the data and results.

R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression	AFI	Open	The EPP provided some data for transition points (e.g., EdTPA, Praxis Content, GPA). However, other data were not evident (e.g., Praxis CORE, Admission Interview, and Signature Formative Assessment). Data for TEAM Observations were not disaggregated by gender and race. No analyses were provided describing any disparities.
R1.4 Professional Responsibility	AFI	Open	The EPP provided limited evidence of using the lens of InTASC 9 and 10 in their assessment alignment or data analysis. Data were presented inconsistently and did not allow for comparison across programs or analysis of trends over time.
R1.2 Content	AFI	Open	The EPP provided limited evidence of InTASC 4 and 5 in their assessment alignment or data analysis. Data were presented inconsistently and did not allow for comparison across programs or analysis of trends over time.
RA4.1 Satisfaction of Employers	Stipulation	Open	The EPP did not provide sufficient evidence to show that each advanced program was systematically collecting, analyzing, and using employer satisfaction data/feedback derived directly from those who employed program completers and who witnessed a completer s application of their preparation in a professional setting.

R5.2 Data Quality	Stipulation	Open	Evidence was not found that the Quality Assurance System demonstrated reliance on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable measures for assessments or feedback. After the addendum and the site review, there was no evidence found that a systematized process had been established and used to ensure that EPP-created assessments and surveys met CAEP sufficiency criteria. There was no documentation found of steps taken to establish instrument validity and reliability.
R1.3 Instructional Practice	AFI	Open	The EPP provided limited evidence of InTASC 6, 7, and 8 in their assessment alignment or data analysis. Data were presented inconsistently and did not allow for comparison across programs or analysis of trends over time.
R1.1 The Learner and Learning	AFI	Open	The EPP provided limited evidence of InTASC 1, 2, and 3 in their assessment alignment or data analysis. Data were presented inconsistently and did not allow for comparison across programs or analysis of trends over time.
RA5.3 Stakeholder Involvement	AFI	Open	The EPP provided no evidence to support that they involved external stakeholders (e.g., alumni, practitioners, school and community partners, employers) in program evaluation and the continuous improvement process. The EPP made significant progress for RA5.3 since 2023 but evidence was limited given the 2-year timeframe.

RA5.2 Data Quality	Stipulation	Open	<p>There was no evidence that a systematized process had been established and used to ensure that EPP-created assessments and surveys met CAEP sufficiency criteria. There was no documentation of steps taken to establish instrument validity and reliability.</p>
R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement	AFI	Open	<p>In the SSR, the EPP provided no evidence to support that they involve external stakeholders (e.g., alumni, practitioners, school and community partners, employers) in program evaluation and the continuous improvement process. The EPP provided additional evidence in the addendum and during the site review, it was confirmed that the EPP collaborated with alumni, practitioners and school partners. The EPP made significant progress since 2023, but evidence was limited due to the 2-year timeframe.</p>
R5.4 Continuous Improvement	AFI	Open	<p>In the SSR, the EPP did not provide evidence of the processes to systematically review, analyze, and interpret assessment and feedback data to identify patterns across programs, use data for continuous improvement, and test innovations or modifications. Addendum evidence was provided that the EPP continuously assessed performance against goals, and it was confirmed during the site review interview with faculty. The EPP made significant progress since 2023, but evidence was limited due to the 2-year timeframe.</p>

RA5.4 Continuous Improvement	AFI	Open	The EPP did not provide evidence of the processes to systematically review, analyze, and interpret assessment and feedback data to identify patterns across programs, use data for continuous improvement, and test innovations or modifications. The EPP made significant progress for RA5.4 since 2023 but evidence was limited given the 2-year timeframe.
------------------------------	-----	------	---

Items per page: 10 1 25 of 25 < >

Section 6. EPP s Continuous Improvement & Progress on (advanced level) Phase-in Plans and (initial-licensure level) Transition Plans

**2026 Annual Accreditation Report : Annual Accreditation Report :
Section 6. EPP s Continuous Improvement & Progress on (advanced level) Phase-in Plans and (initial-licensure level) Transition Plans**

6.1. Summarize any data-driven EPP-wide or programmatic modifications, innovations, or changes planned, worked on, or completed in the last academic year.

This is an opportunity to share targeted continuous improvement efforts your EPP is proud of. Focus on one to two major efforts the EPP made and the relationship among data examined, changes, progress with any Transition Plans (initial-licensure level) and/or Phase-in Plans (advanced level), and studying the results of those changes.

In the previous reporting cycle, the EPP described itself as "essentially begun recalibrating and rebuilding" a candid and productive acknowledgment that the organization had identified its foundational gaps and committed to addressing them with intention. The Quality Assurance System (QAS) was named as the most pressing structural challenge, and the EPP was direct about the fact that its early attempts at data-driven management had not succeeded. That honesty is itself a marker of institutional maturity, and it set the stage for the deliberate, multi-year improvement work that this entry documents.

What the EPP described as a beginning has now produced measurable results. The three-year cycle of 2022 2023 through 2024 2025 represents a complete arc: from diagnostic acknowledgment of systemic weakness, through the hard work of building infrastructure and piloting processes, to the present state in which data are flowing through the QAS with regularity, programs are closing improvement loops with documented evidence, and the EPP's

2026 Data Retreat "From Data to Bloom: Growing Stronger Programs Together" (April 17, 2026) stands as a capstone demonstration of what a functioning continuous improvement culture looks like in practice.

The framework below organizes the EPP's improvement work across five thematic domains mirroring the QAS structure already described in the previous year's entry and traces each domain across three distinct phases of development:

" Year 1 Recalibration and Infrastructure (2022 2023): Diagnosing root causes, selecting platforms, and establishing the thematic QAS framework across six data domains: Students, Processes and Procedures, Faculty, Curriculum, Support, and Partnerships.

" Year 2 Systems Build and Pilot Testing (2023 2024): Operationalizing the QAS through Nuventive, running first full-cycle data collections, identifying gaps in clinical practice and advanced program reporting, and integrating district partner data.

" Year 3 Evidence and Validation (2024 2025 into 2025 2026): Producing and acting on multi-cycle data to close improvement loops, make strategic program decisions, demonstrate candidate outcome growth, and present a fully operational quality culture at the 2026 Data Retreat.

AR Reviewer Question 6.1. Has the EPP shared its continuous improvement initiatives, AND (if applicable) provided CAEP with an update regarding the EPP's progress on its advanced level phase-in plans and/or initial level transition plans?

Yes

No

Section 7: Feedback for CAEP & Report Preparer's Authorization

2026 Annual Accreditation Report : Annual Accreditation Report :
Section 7: Feedback for CAEP & Report Preparer's Authorization

7.1. [OPTIONAL] Does the EPP have any questions about CAEP Standards, CAEP sufficiency criteria, or the CAEP accreditation process generally?

[04.21.2026] The EPP has addressed the weblink issues identified in Section 4. In terms of Section 5, the EPP improperly posted 2026 responses in 2025 fields. This has been corrected so the reporting is strictly reflecting 2026 updates, with previously blank fields (from AR 2025) remaining empty.

7.2. Preparer's authorization. By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2026 EPP Annual Report, and that the details provided in this report and linked

webpages are up-to-date and accurate at the time of submission.

I am authorized to complete this report.

I understand that all the information that is provided to CAEP from EPPs seeking initial accreditation, continuing accreditation, or having completed the accreditation process is considered the property of CAEP and may be used for training, research, and data review. CAEP reserves the right to compile and issue data derived from accreditation documents.

See [CAEP Accreditation Policies and Procedures](#).

Acknowledge

Semester of EPP s next CAEP Site Review

This is listed for informational purposes only. If you notice an issue with this information, please reach out to CAEP staff.

Next Visit Date [Semester] - Initial-Licensure Level

Spring ▼

Next Visit Date [Year] - Initial-Licensure Level

2027 ▼

Next Visit Date [Semester] - Advanced Level

Spring ▼

Next Visit Date [Year] - Advanced Level

2027 ▼

AR Reviewer Question 7.1. If the EPP asked any questions, please respond to the questions below.

Insert text here ...

AR Reviewer Question 7.2. The EPP report preparer indicated that they were authorized by the EPP to complete the 2026 EPP Annual Report and that the details provided in this report and linked webpages were up to date and accurate at the time of submission.

- Yes
-

No