



**Council for the
Accreditation of
Educator Preparation**

ACCREDITATION ACTION REPORT

Department of Education
Mitchell College
New London, Connecticut

Accreditation Council April 2023

Accreditation Application Date: 7/17/2018

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.

ACCREDITATION DECISION

Accreditation with stipulations is granted at the initial-licensure level. This Accreditation status is effective between Spring 2023 and Spring 2025. The provider must demonstrate that all stipulations have been corrected within two years to continue accreditation. A stipulation documentation virtual site review will occur in Fall 2024.

SUMMARY OF STANDARDS

CAEP STANDARDS	INITIAL-LICENSURE LEVEL	ADVANCED LEVEL
STANDARD R1/RA1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge	Met	Not Applicable
STANDARD R2/RA2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice	Met	Not Applicable
STANDARD R3/RA3: Candidate Quality and Selectivity	Met	Not Applicable
STANDARD R4/RA4: Satisfaction with Preparation	Met	Not Applicable
STANDARD R5/RA5: Quality Assurance System and Continuous Improvement	Met	Not Applicable
STANDARD R6/RA6: Fiscal and Administrative Capacity	Met	Not Applicable
STANDARD R7/RA7: Record of Compliance with Title IV of the Higher Education Act	Met	Not Applicable

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 limited evidence that candidates were able to apply their knowledge of the learner and learning at the appropriate progression levels. (component R1.1)	Key concepts related to the learner and development were insufficiently addressed in the rubrics and assessments.
2	The EPP provided limited evidence that candidates can apply content knowledge and content specific pedagogy. (component R1.2)	There was inconsistent data disaggregation by cycle and/or program.
3	The EPP provided limited evidence of candidates modeling and applying technology. (component R1.3)	Evidence provided was not fully aligned to technology standards.
4	The EPP provided limited evidence to reflect how candidates demonstrated knowledge of professional responsibility. (component R1.4)	There was inconsistent data disaggregation by cycle and/or program.

STANDARD R2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided insufficient evidence that partners co-constructed mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements for clinical preparation, including technology based collaboration, and shared responsibility for continuous improvement of candidate preparation. (component R2.1)	Limited documentation was provided demonstrating collaboration with school partners that informs continuous improvement.
2	The EPP provided limited evidence that partners co-selects, prepare, evaluate, and support high-quality clinical educators, both provider- and school-based, who demonstrated a positive impact on candidates' development and diverse P-12 student learning and development. (component R2.2)	The State of Connecticut required that cooperating teachers be TEAM trained; however, there was minimal evidence regarding how clinical educators at the partner schools were prepared or evaluated on EPP assessments.

STANDARD R3: Candidate Quality and Selectivity

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence of goals and progress for recruitment of high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations that align with their mission and address local, state, regional, or national needs for hard-to-staff schools and shortage fields. (component R3.1)	The EPP provided insufficient evidence of a systematic tracking process for gathering information about local, state, and regional needs.
2	The EPP provided limited evidence of identified benchmarks or transition points to monitor candidate progression. (component R3.2)	Transition points were not clearly defined, measured, and analyzed.

STANDARD R4: Satisfaction with Preparation

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided an insufficient Transition Plan to collect data on the EPP's completers' impact on student learning. (component R4.1)	The EPP presented an insufficient Transition Plan regarding the EPP's effort to determine the effectiveness of their completers.
2	The EPP provided limited evidence that employers were satisfied with completer preparation (component R4.2)	The EPP provided two cycles of data.

3	The EPP provided limited evidence that completers were satisfied with their preparation. (component R4.3)	The EPP provided one cycle of data for a survey of completers and the data presented were difficult to interpret.
---	---	---

STANDARD R5: Quality Assurance System and Continuous Improvement

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence of internal and external stakeholder involvement in program design, evaluation, and continuous improvement process. (component R5.3)	Although internal and external stakeholders participate informally, there was limited evidence that stakeholders participate in program design, evaluation and continuous improvement at a formal level.
2	The EPP provided limited evidence of a regular and systematic review of its performance in order to inform modifications and innovations. (component R5.4)	Although the EPP had made changes based on informal discussions with stakeholders, the EPP did not regularly, systematically, and continuously track results over time and document those modifications.

	Stipulations	Rationale
1	The EPP provided no evidence of a functioning Quality Assurance System. (component R5.1)	While the EPP provided data, the EPP did not have a functioning system nor document how data entered the system, how data were reported and used in decision making.

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
Human Development Family Studies with a Concentration in Early Childhood Education Leading to Teacher Certification	Initial	Baccalaureate

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.

