



**Council for the  
Accreditation of  
Educator Preparation**

## ACCREDITATION ACTION REPORT

School of Education and Prof'l Studies  
Central Connecticut State University  
New Britain, 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	Outcome assessments based on specialty area standards to demonstrate central concepts of content areas were not provided for all programs. (component R1.2)	Not all programs using the CAEP evidence review of Standard 1 for program review had consistent processes to demonstrate candidate outcome data aligned to program standards.

### STANDARD R2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence that its partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements for clinical preparation and share responsibility for continuous improvement of candidate preparation. (component R2.1)	Evidence submitted did not provide proof of a formal, systematic process in place that documents the regular review of current programmatic data that includes analyses across programs, includes stakeholders in the review, and then involves stakeholders in making changes for continuous improvement in candidate preparation.
2	The EPP-created survey/assessments did not meet CAEP sufficiency criteria as defined by the CAEP Criteria for Evaluation of EPP-Created Surveys and the CAEP Criteria for Evaluation of EPP-Created Assessments. (component R2.2)	The transition plan submitted for future evaluation of all EPP-created surveys and assessments was not allowed for component R2.2.

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

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence of a recruitment plan to recruit and support high quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds. (component R3.1)	The EPP provided a recruitment plan for EPP recruitment efforts and recruitment activities; however, it was not clear how the EPP will be measuring efforts and yields.

### STANDARD R4: Program Impact

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited data that employers are satisfied with the completers' preparation for their assigned responsibilities in working with diverse P-12 students and their families. (component R4.2)	The EPP did not have three cycles of data to demonstrate that employers are satisfied with their completer's preparation but did provide one cycle of data.
2	The EPP provided limited data on how it demonstrates program completers perception of their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they encounter on the job, and their preparation was effective. (component R4.3)	The EPP did not have three cycles of data to demonstrate that completers are satisfied with their preparation but did provide one cycle of data.

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

	<b>Areas for Improvement</b>	<b>Rationale</b>
1	The EPP provided limited evidence that it regularly, systematically and continuously assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards. (component R5.4)	The EPP provided limited evidence of how it supports continuous improvement through EPP procedures that gather, input, analyze, interpret and use information from the QAS effectively. The EPP provided limited documentation of changes to represent the effectiveness of continuous improvement efforts.

## ADVANCED LEVEL AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT AND STIPULATIONS

### STANDARD A1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

	<b>Areas for Improvement</b>	<b>Rationale</b>
1	The assessments used to provide evidence for A1.1 did not meet sufficiency levels from the CAEP Evaluation Framework with respect to validity and reliability. (component A1.1)	The EPP provided a description of the process, but did not provide evidence and analysis of the process being complete. The EPP provided a rich description, but did not translate this into the components of a CAEP sufficient plan.

### STANDARD A2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

	<b>Areas for Improvement</b>	<b>Rationale</b>
1	The EPP provided an insufficient plan for partners co-constructing mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements. (component A2.1)	The EPP's phase-in plan lacked specificity in addressing partner participation and establishing mutually agreeable expectations for advanced program candidate entry, preparation, and exit.

### STANDARD A3: Candidate Quality and Selectivity

	<b>Areas for Improvement</b>	<b>Rationale</b>
1	The EPP recruitment phase-in plan did not meet criteria of CAEP sufficient plan. (component A3.1)	The EPP provided a phase-in plan for implementation including steps for recording recruitment results (including yield), to monitor and use this data in planning and modification of recruitment strategies. The phase-in plan provided by the EPP did not specify annual monitoring of characteristics related to academic ability, diversity, and employment needs to move the EPP's candidate pool toward the collective diversity found across America's diverse P-12 classrooms.

### STANDARD A5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

	<b>Areas for Improvement</b>	<b>Rationale</b>
1	The EPP provided limited evidence that advanced program completer outcome measures are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision-making. (component A5.4)	The EPP provided limited evidence of how it supports continuous improvement through EPP procedures that gather, input, analyze, interpret and use information from the QAS effectively. The EPP provided limited

	documentation of changes to represent the effectiveness of continuous improvement efforts.
--	--

## 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:

Name	Level	Degree
Art Education (BSED)	Initial	Baccalaureate
Art Education (PB)	Initial	Post Baccalaureate
Elementary Education (BSED)	Initial	Baccalaureate
Elementary Education (PB)	Initial	Post Baccalaureate
English (BSED)	Initial	Baccalaureate
English (PB)	Initial	Post Baccalaureate
History/Social Studies (BSED)	Initial	Baccalaureate
History/Social Studies (PB)	Initial	Post Baccalaureate
Master of Arts in Teaching: Math; Science; English; Spanish	Initial	Master's
Mathematics (BSED)	Initial	Baccalaureate
Mathematics (PB)	Initial	Post Baccalaureate
Music Education (BSED)	Initial	Baccalaureate
Music Education (PB)	Initial	Post Baccalaureate
Physical Education (BSED)	Initial	Baccalaureate
Physical Education (PB)	Initial	Post Baccalaureate
Science Education (BSED)	Initial	Baccalaureate
Science Education (PB)	Initial	Post Baccalaureate
Special Education (MS)	Initial	Master's
Technology and Engineering Education (BSED)	Initial	Baccalaureate
Technology and Engineering Education (PB)	Initial	Post Baccalaureate
TESOL (PB)	Initial	Post Baccalaureate
World Language: Italian; Spanish; French; German (BSED)	Initial	Baccalaureate
World Language: Italian; Spanish; French; German (PB)	Initial	Post Baccalaureate
Advanced Official Certificate Program in Superintendent of Schools	Advanced	Post Master's
Master of Science in Reading and Language Arts	Advanced	Master's
Sixth-Year Certificate in Educational Leadership (Building Level)	Advanced	Specialist or C.A.S.
Sixth-Year Certificate in Reading and Language Arts	Advanced	Post Master's

***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**