



Council for the
Accreditation of
Educator Preparation

ACCREDITATION ACTION REPORT

School of Education
New Mexico Highlands University
Las Vegas, New Mexico

Accreditation Council April 2020
Accreditation Application Date: 9/13/2006

*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 is granted at the initial-licensure level. This Accreditation status is effective between Spring 2020 and Spring 2026. The next site visit will take place in Fall 2025.

Accreditation is granted at the advanced-level. This Accreditation status is effective between Spring 2020 and Spring 2026. The next site visit will take place in Fall 2025.

SUMMARY OF STANDARDS

CAEP STANDARDS	INITIAL-LICENSURE LEVEL	ADVANCED LEVEL
STANDARD 1/A.1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge	Met	Met
STANDARD 2/A.2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice	Met	Met
STANDARD 3/A.3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, And Selectivity	Met	Met
STANDARD 4/A.4: Program Impact	Met	Met
STANDARD 5/A.5: 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 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence to ensure that candidates	The ability of the EPP to ensure candidates model and

model and apply technology standards as they design, implement and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning; and enrich professional practice. (component 1.5)

apply technology standards is not clearly defined or systematic. The EPP does require candidates to complete a Technology Integration Plan. However, it is a designed to assess candidates understanding through a philosophical and planning approach and not direct observation of candidates' competencies.

STANDARD 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, And Selectivity

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence of plans and goals to recruit and support completion of high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations to accomplish their mission (component 3.1).	The EPP provides limited evidence of a recruitment plan with baseline points and goals including academic ability, diversity, and employment needs.

STANDARD 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence of consistent and regular use of a quality assurance system to collect and analyze assessment performance data against program goals and relevant standards, nor evidence of a system, beyond anecdotal accounts, of using results to evaluate program decisions and the assessment system itself (component 5.3).	There is a lack of documentation that the provider regularly and systematically reviews quality assurance system data, identifies patterns across preparation programs (both strengths and weaknesses), uses data/evidence for continuous improvement, and tests innovations.

ADVANCED LEVEL AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT AND STIPULATIONS

STANDARD A.1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence to ensure candidates demonstrate their proficiencies to understand and apply knowledge and skills appropriate to their professional field of specialization. (component A.1.1)	Assessments do not meet CAEP sufficient criteria identified in the Framework for EPP-Created Assessments and plans submitted to ensure CAEP sufficient criteria are met lack detail needed to meet specific guidelines for plans submitted as evidence in the CAEP Advanced Handbook. The plan the EDLD program submitted for future data collection did not follow the CAEP Advanced Handbook p.68 Appendix C Guidelines for Plans.

STANDARD A.2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence that partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements for clinical preparation and share accountability for advanced program candidate outcomes.	There was limited evidence of collaboration for goal setting and collaborative evaluation of candidates.

	(component A.2.1)	
2	The EPP provided limited evidence of working with partners to design varied and developmental clinical settings. (component A.2.2)	There was limited evidence that the EPP worked with partners to design varied and developmental clinical settings proficiencies.

STANDARD A.4: Program Impact

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided insufficient data from all advanced programs for reporting employer satisfaction (component A.4.1)	Advanced standards indicate that employer survey data are provided. Limited employer data were available for the counseling program but none were reported from employers for the educational leadership program.
2	The EPP provided insufficient data from advanced programs for reporting completer satisfaction (component A.4.2)	Advanced standards indicate that completer survey data are provided. Only a single iteration of data were available for both advanced programs. No evidence of how data were used to inform improvement efforts.

STANDARD A.5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited documentation that interpretations of data are valid and reliable or plans for doing so (component A.5.2).	For its advanced programs, the EPP lacked empirical evidence demonstrating the content validity and IRR of the EPP-created assessments that were not surveys, nor had CAEP-sufficient plans to do so.
2	The EPP provided limited evidence of consistent and regular use of a quality assurance system that allows for systematic collection and analysis of assessment performance data against program goals and relevant standards, nor evidence of a system, beyond anecdotal accounts, of using results to evaluate program decisions and the assessment system itself (component A.5.3).	Evidence of all the elements of a quality assurance system and the flow of its data through the system are not fully delineated by the EPP. Specifically, there is a lack of documentation that the provider regularly and systematically reviews quality assurance system data, identifies patterns across preparation programs (both strengths and weaknesses), uses data/evidence for continuous improvement, and tests innovations. The EPP did not demonstrate a regular, comprehensive, and formal quality assurance system as it pertains to its advanced programs.

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

Removed:

Area for Improvement or Weakness	Rationale
1. [NCATE STD2] There is limited evidence to show that the unit uses technology to support the systematic collection and analysis of data at the advanced level. [ADV] Recommend remove.	1. The EPP has adopted Via by Watermark in Fall 2018 as an assessment system for the collection and utilization of data from key and capstone assessments. Via is linked to the university's learning management system, Brightspace, so that candidates and assessors can access Via through Brightspace to submit assignments and complete assessments. This allows for a seamless integration with the

2. [NCATE STD4] Unit assessments indicate that approximately 40 percent of advanced candidates in Educational Leadership and Counseling do not demonstrate diversity proficiencies. [ADV] Recommend remove.

3. [NCATE STD3] The unit does not make field experiences and clinical practice placements in collaboration with P-12 partners. [Both] Recommend remove.

4. [NCATE STD4] The unit does not systematically ensure that all candidates have field experiences and clinical practice in diverse P-12 settings. [Both] Recommend remove.

5.[NCATE STD5] The unit lacks sufficient evidence that professional education faculty members are actively engaged in scholarship. [Both] Recommend remove.

courses in Brightspace and for assessment grades to automatically transfer to Brightspace. Completer and employer surveys, as well as collection of references for the Application to the EPP, are administered using SurveyMonkey.

2. The EPP provided evidence of advanced program candidates meeting diversity proficiencies through their assessment of disposition and course assignments and demonstrations.

3. Through addendum and onsite evidence, the EPP demonstrated collaborative efforts with their P-12 partners in the placement of field and clinical candidate placements. The EPP works with district and school-based personnel to determine appropriate placements for their candidates within schools and clinical placements. This has also been address through the current onsite CAEP report.

4. The EPP provided a field scope and sequence table that provided evidence of placements in diverse P-12 settings. Demographic information was provided on schools that verified diversity of school placements. Candidates and graduate were also able to verify placements in diverse settings.

5.This expectation is no longer required with present CAEP standards.

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 visit 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 level 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.

NOTE: Neither CAEP staff, site visitors, 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