



**Council for the
Accreditation of
Educator Preparation**

ACCREDITATION ACTION REPORT

State of Connecticut Office of Higher Education
Connecticut Alternate Route to Certification
Hartford, Connecticut

Accreditation Council April 2023
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

Probationary Accreditation is granted at the initial-licensure level. Standard R4 was found not met by the Accreditation Council. This accreditation status is effective between Spring 2023 and Spring 2025. The provider must demonstrate that Standard R4 is met and all stipulations cited have been corrected within two years to continue accreditation. A probationary accreditation site review will take place no later than Fall 2024.

SUMMARY OF STANDARDS

CAEP STANDARDS	INITIAL-LICENSEURE 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	Not Met	Not Applicable
Rationale for Standard R4 at the initial-licensure level being found Not Met: No data was provided for completer effectiveness and satisfaction of employers and completers.		
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 R2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	There was limited evidence that the EPP prepared and evaluated high-quality clinical educators, both provider and school-based. (component R2.2)	The EPP provided limited evidence, one cycle of data, that it evaluated both provider and school-based clinical educators and limited evidence that they utilized evaluation data for program improvement.
2	There was limited evidence that the EPP designed and implemented clinical experiences, utilizing various modalities, of sufficient breadth and diversity to ensure candidates demonstrated their developing effectiveness and positive impact on diverse P-12 students' learning and development. (component R2.3)	The EPP provided limited documented evidence, beyond interviews, of ensuring clinical experiences for all candidates in different settings or with diverse P-12 student populations.

STANDARD R3: Candidate Quality and Selectivity

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence for recruitment of candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations that align with their mission. (component R3.1)	The EPP provided limited evidence of goals and progress towards goals in purposeful recruitment of a diverse candidate pool.

STANDARD R4: Satisfaction with Preparation

	Stipulations	Rationale
1	The EPP did not monitor completer impact on student growth and application of professional skills. (component R4.1)	The EPP did not collect and analyze data on completer impact on student growth and application of professional skills nor provide a CAEP-sufficient Transition Plan.
2	The EPP did not demonstrate the extent to which employers were satisfied with the preparation of EPP completers for their assigned responsibilities. (component R4.2)	The EPP had taken initial steps to assess employer satisfaction but has not yet fully implemented a CAEP-sufficient instrument or provided relevant data from other sources.
3	The EPP did not demonstrate that program completers perceived their preparation as relevant and effective. (component R4.3)	The EPP provided no evidence that they systematically collect or analyze data on how completers employed in the field perceived the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.

STANDARD R5: Quality Assurance System and Continuous Improvement

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence of a functioning Quality Assurance System. (component R5.1)	The EPP provided a graphic that illustrated its Quality Assurance System, but there was limited evidence that it was a sustainable system. The QAS had the capability of disaggregating data by licensure area/program, race/ethnicity, and other dimensions identified by the EPP, but the EPP did not disaggregate data other than by licensure area. There was limited input from external stakeholders, but the EPP did use the results of data collection to enhance program elements.

2	The EPP provided evidence that they included internal stakeholders, but provided no evidence of external stakeholders in program design, evaluation, and continuous improvement processes. (component R5.3)	The EPP had multiple internal stakeholders for the evaluation of the program, but no external stakeholders were involved in the program design, evaluation, and continuous improvement process.
3	The EPP provided limited evidence they regularly, systematically, and continuously assessed performance against its goals, tracked results over time, documented modifications and/or innovations and their effects. (component R5.4)	The EPP provided the Gen-4 Program Improvement Plan 2020-23 that outlined four goals, but the EPP provided limited evidence on their continuous improvement process, including how often the EPP met to discuss continuous improvement (1-cycle of the End of the Year/Professional Development Day) and specific actions the EPP had taken based on the information they had received.

	Stipulations	Rationale
1	The EPP provided no evidence that the Quality Assurance System relied on relevant and verifiable measures. Additionally, there was limited evidence that the measures are cumulative and actionable measures. (component R5.2)	The EPP did not provide evidence of validity or reliability of EPP-created assessments. Most instruments did not have cumulative data as only one, sometimes two, cycles of data were provided. In addition, the data were not actionable as the EPP provided limited analysis and did not disaggregate data by demographic factors, other than program areas.

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
Business Education, 7-12	Initial	Endorsement Only
English, 7-12	Initial	Endorsement Only
Family and Consumer Science Teacher Certification, PK-12	Initial	Endorsement Only
Mathematics, 7-12	Initial	Endorsement Only
Music, PK-12	Initial	Endorsement Only
Sciences (Biology, Chemistry, Earth Science, General Science, & Physics)	Initial	Endorsement Only
Technology Education, PK-12	Initial	Endorsement Only

World Languages (French, German, Italian, Latin & Classical Humanities, Mandarin Chinese, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish, & Other World Languages)	Initial	Endorsement Only
--	---------	------------------

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