



**Council for the  
Accreditation of  
Educator Preparation**

## ACCREDITATION ACTION REPORT

Albertus Magnus College  
New Haven, Connecticut

Accreditation Council October 2022

Accreditation Application Date: \*

*This is the official record of the Educator Preparation Provider's accreditation status.*

*The Educator Preparation Provider should retain this document for at least two accreditation cycles.*

\* This EPP was accredited previously by NCATE or TEAC and the initial application date is not available. CAEP was established July 1, 2013.

### ACCREDITATION DECISION

**Accreditation** is granted at the initial-licensure level and the advanced level. This Accreditation status is effective between Fall 2022 and Fall 2029. The next site review will take place in Spring 2029.

### SUMMARY OF STANDARDS

CAEP Standards	Initial-Licensure Level	Advanced Level
<b>Standard R1/A1:</b> Content and Pedagogical Knowledge	Met	Met
<b>Standard R2/A2:</b> Clinical Partnerships and Practice	Met	Met
<b>Standard R3:</b> Candidate Recruitment, Progression, and Support <b>Standard A3:</b> Candidate Quality and Selectivity	Met	Met
<b>Standard R4/A4:</b> Program Impact	Met	Met
<b>Standard R5:</b> Quality Assurance System and Continuous Improvement <b>Standard A5:</b> Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement	Met	Met

### AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT AND STIPULATIONS

**Areas for Improvement:** Identified areas for improvement are addressed in the provider's annual report.

**Stipulations:** Stipulations are addressed in the provider's annual report and must be corrected within two years to retain accreditation.

## INITIAL-LICENSURE LEVEL AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT AND STIPULATIONS

### STANDARD R1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided an insufficient transition plan for ensuring candidates are able to apply knowledge of the learner and learning at progression levels. (component R1.1)	There were limited details about the core components describing the relationship of the component, timeline, resources, and data quality so that analyses can be conducted along with interpreting trends for program improvement.
2	There was limited evidence that candidates understand and can apply InTASC standards 7 and 8 to plan instruction in culturally responsive ways and utilize a variety of instructional strategies, in particular technology. (component R1.3)	The technology assessment did not meet CAEP sufficiency respective to item descriptions and rating scale. A transition plan was not provided to outline how systematic triangulation of data will indicate candidates are able to apply knowledge of diversity and equity in instructional practice and technology for enhancement of P-12 learning.

### STANDARD R3: Candidate Recruitment, Progression and Support

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP's recruitment plan did not contain a sufficient plan to increase the diversity of the candidate pool or a description of the personnel or resources available to fill any gaps. (component R3.1)	Evidence submitted for component R3.1 was insufficient as the evidence provided focused on examples of recruitment activities and initiatives instead of a well-developed, mission-aligned plan with specific measures and a plan for progress monitoring.
2	Evidence submitted indicated the EPP had not yet identified a transition point in the program when a cohort grade point average of 3.0 was achieved and monitored. (component R3.2)	Evidence submitted for component R3.2 was insufficient as the EPP completed a transition plan which is not allowed for this component.

### STANDARD R4: Program Impact

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited data to demonstrate completer effectiveness. (component R4.1)	A sufficient transition plan was provided but not an accompanying cycle of data.
2	The EPP provided limited data to demonstrate employer satisfaction. (component R4.2)	EPP provided some data on employer satisfaction of completer preparation. The EPP provided a transition plan to conduct employer focus group interviews.

### STANDARD R5: Quality Assurance System and Continuous Improvement

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP's data collection system provided limited evidence that indicates the data system was used consistently and includes procedures to share information. (component R5.1)	There was a lack of evidence in the reports or during interviews to demonstrate regularly occurring data discussions or retreats internally or across departments.

## ADVANCED LEVEL AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT AND STIPULATIONS

### STANDARD A1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The phase-in plan submitted for validating EPP-created assessments did not meet CAEP sufficiency criteria. (component A1.1)	The A1.1 phase-in plan relied on a data quality plan using the undergraduate program and was not synergistic with the professional expectations of an advanced program. The plan submitted had a limited discussion about how data quality will meet CAEP sufficiency criteria for how the EPP will assure data collection.

### STANDARD A3: Candidate Quality and Selectivity

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP's recruitment plan did not contain a sufficient plan to increase the diversity of the candidate pool or a description of the personnel or resources available to fill any gaps. (component A3.1)	Evidence submitted for component A3.1 was insufficient as the Phase-in plan did not meet CAEP criteria. Evidence provided focused on examples of recruitment activities and initiatives instead of a well-developed, mission-aligned plan with specific measures and a plan for progress monitoring.
2	Evidence was not sufficient to demonstrate that at completion, candidates have reached a high standard for content knowledge in the field of specialization, data literacy and research-driven decision making, effective use of collaborative skills, applications of technology, and applications of dispositions, laws, codes of ethics and professional standards appropriate for the field of specialization. (component A3.4)	Evidence submitted for A3.4 was insufficient as the EPP-created key assessments do not meet the CAEP Criteria for Evaluation of EPP-Created Assessments as they were missing CAEP alignment as well as reliability and validity information. A separate phase-in plan was not submitted and information in the artifacts does not meet the CAEP sufficiency criteria for Advanced-Level Preparation Phase-In.

### STANDARD A4: Program Impact

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided a plan to demonstrate employer satisfaction that did not sufficiently meet the CAEP criteria for a transition plan. (component A4.1)	The EPP provided a phase-in plan to collect employer satisfaction data that did not meet the CAEP sufficiency criteria for a plan, specifically components related to data quality.
2	The EPP provided a plan to demonstrate completer satisfaction that did not sufficiently meet the CAEP criteria for a transition plan. (component A4.2)	The EPP provided a phase-in plan to collect satisfaction data that did not meet the CAEP sufficiency criteria for a plan, specifically components related to data quality.

## AREA(S) FOR IMPROVEMENT OR WEAKNESS(ES) from previous legacy accreditor review (NCATE or TEAC)

None.

## INFORMATION ABOUT ACCREDITATION STATUSES

**Accreditation** for seven (7) years is granted if the EPP meets all CAEP Standards and components, even if areas for improvement (AFIs) are identified in the final report of the Accreditation Council.

- **Areas for Improvement (AFIs)** indicate areas which must be improved by the time of the next accreditation visit. Progress reports on remediation of AFIs are submitted as part of the Annual Report. AFIs not remediated by a subsequent site review may become stipulations.

**Accreditation with stipulations is granted for 2 years** if an EPP meets all standards but receives a stipulation on a component under any standard. Failure to submit a response to the stipulation within a two (2)-year time frame results in revocation. Failure to correct the condition leading to the stipulation within the specified two (2)-year period results in revocation or probation.

- **Stipulations** describe serious deficiencies in meeting CAEP Standards and/or components and must be brought into compliance in order to continue accreditation. All stipulations and relevant evidence are reviewed by the Accreditation Council. Failure to correct the condition leading to the stipulation results in probation or revocation of accreditation.

**Probationary Accreditation** is granted for two (2) years when an EPP does not meet one (1) of the CAEP Standards. Failure to submit a response to the stipulation within a two (2)-year time frame results in revocation. Failure to correct the condition leading to the stipulation within the specified two (2)-year period results in revocation.

## SCOPE OF ACCREDITATION

The scope of CAEP's work is the accreditation of educator preparation providers (EPPs) that offer bachelor's, master's, and/or doctoral degrees, post-baccalaureate or other programs leading to certification, licensure, or endorsement in the United States and/or internationally. (2018).

CAEP does not accredit specific degree programs, rather EPPs must include information, data, and other evidence on the following in their submission for CAEP's review:

All licensure areas that prepare candidates to work in preschool through grade 12 settings at the initial-licensure and advanced levels 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.

Depending on an EPP's submission, accreditation may be awarded at one or both of the following levels: Initial-Licensure level and/or Advanced Level.

1. **Initial-Licensure Level Accreditation** is provided at the baccalaureate or post-baccalaureate levels leading to initial-licensure, certification, or endorsement that are designed to develop P-12 teachers.
2. **Advanced Level Accreditation** is provided at the post-baccalaureate or graduate levels leading to licensure, certification, or endorsement. Advanced Level Programs are designed to develop P-12 teachers who have already completed an initial-licensure program, currently licensed administrators, or other certified (or similar state language) school professionals for employment in P-12 schools/districts. CAEP's Advanced Level accreditation does not include any advanced level program not specific to the preparation of teachers or other school professionals for P-12 schools/districts; any advanced level non-licensure programs, including those specific to content areas (e.g., M.A., M.S., Ph.D.); or Educational leadership programs not specific to the preparation of teachers or other

school professionals for P-12 schools/districts.

Information on accreditation status, terms, and any conditions provided within this directory is specific to the accreditation level(s) described above. CAEP-accredited EPPs are required to distinguish accurately between programs that are accredited and those that are not.

The following programs are included in the current accreditation cycle:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Level</b>	<b>Degree</b>
Art, K-12	Initial	Baccalaureate
Biology, 7-12	Initial	Baccalaureate
Business, 7-12	Initial	Baccalaureate
Chemistry, 7-12	Initial	Baccalaureate
English, 4-8	Initial	Baccalaureate
English, 7-12	Initial	Baccalaureate
General Science, 4-8	Initial	Baccalaureate
General Science, 7-12	Initial	Baccalaureate
History/Social Studies, 4-8	Initial	Baccalaureate
History/Social Studies, 7-12	Initial	Baccalaureate
Mathematics, 4-8	Initial	Baccalaureate
Mathematics, 7-12	Initial	Baccalaureate
Spanish, 7-12	Initial	Baccalaureate
Advanced Alternative Preparation (AAP) for Literacy Specialist in Reading/Language Arts Certification	Advanced	Endorsement

***NOTE: Neither CAEP staff, evaluation team members, nor other agents of CAEP are empowered to make or modify Accreditation Council decisions. These remain the sole responsibility of the Council itself.***

**End of Action Report**