



**Council for the  
Accreditation of  
Educator Preparation**

## **ACCREDITATION ACTION REPORT**

School of Education  
Edinboro University of Pennsylvania  
Edinboro, Pennsylvania

Accreditation Council April 2020  
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. This Accreditation status is effective between Spring 2020 and Spring 2027. The next site visit will take place in Fall 2026.

**Accreditation** is granted at the advanced-level. This Accreditation status is effective between Spring 2020 and Spring 2027. The next site visit will take place in Fall 2026.

### **SUMMARY OF STANDARDS**

<b>CAEP STANDARDS</b>	<b>INITIAL-LICENSURE LEVEL</b>	<b>ADVANCED LEVEL</b>
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**

	<b>Areas for Improvement</b>	<b>Rationale</b>
1	The EPP provided limited evidence that candidates use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession, and use both to measure their P-12 students' progress and their own professional practice. (component 1.2)	According to the SSR and Evidence (Table 23: IAP Standards Mapping), three criteria on the Instructional Assessment Plan are aligned with CAEP 1.2; however, they all relate to student learning with no reference made to candidates' use of research. Additionally, according to the SSR and Table 12: STPE Standards Mapping in the SSR Evidence, six criteria on the Student Teaching Performance Evaluation are aligned with CAEP 1.2; however, they all relate to professional responsibilities with no reference made to candidates' use of research.

## **STANDARD 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice**

	<b>Areas for Improvement</b>	<b>Rationale</b>
1	The EPP did not provide sufficient evidence that partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements, including technology-based collaborations, for clinical preparation. (component 2.1)	While the narrative in the SSR indicates many partner schools, districts, and organizations, there is limited evidence provided that shows how the partners co-construct the clinical experiences for both the field experiences and student teaching.

## **STANDARD 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, And Selectivity**

	<b>Areas for Improvement</b>	<b>Rationale</b>
1	The EPP provided limited evidence of an articulated recruitment plan specific to the Education Department including academic ability, diversity, and employment needs. (component 3.1)	Edinboro University has a Recruitment Plan and the EPP is included in that plan, although it is not specific to educator preparation.

## **STANDARD 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement**

	<b>Areas for Improvement</b>	<b>Rationale</b>
1	The EPP provided limited evidence to ensure assessment data reliability. (component 5.2)	The CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments meets the sufficient level on Administration & Purpose, Content of Assessment, Scoring, and Data Validity. Data Reliability has not been addressed.
2	The EPP provided limited evidence of regular and systematic review of data to support data-driven changes. (component 5.3)	The EPP has provided limited documentation that supports that programs have systematically and consistently reviewed data and used data or evidence to support decision-making with the required one cycle of data.
3	The EPP provided limited evidence of stakeholders involvement in evaluation, improvement and decision-making activities. (component 5.5)	While external stakeholders are convened to share ideas and provide feedback relative to partnerships, there is insufficient evidence of the co-construction and evaluation of initial program key assessments and instruments and the evaluation of data and decision-making as a result of data.

## ADVANCED LEVEL AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT AND STIPULATIONS

### STANDARD A.2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence of how partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements, including technology-based collaborations, for clinical preparation and share responsibility for continuous improvement of advanced program candidate preparation. (component A.2.1)	Evidence submitted did not provide adequate detail to determine how partners contribute to the developmental clinical settings experienced by the candidates and provide assistance to ensure that there is continuous improvement of programs.
2	The EPP provided limited evidence of working with partners to design varied and developmental clinical settings that allow opportunities for candidates to practice applications of content knowledge and skills that the courses and other experiences of the advanced preparation emphasize. (component A.2.2)	Evidence submitted, the additional evidence and narrative in the SSR addendum did not provided sufficient information about how clinical experiences are designed with partners across all advanced programs. While there is evidence of suggestions made by external partners related to program improvement, at this time there is little specific or formalized involvement of partners in the review of the advanced program.

### STANDARD A.5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence of an articulated process for regular and systematic data review to support data-driven changes. (component A.5.3)	There is evidence that the EPP has provided a plan; however, the only assessments aligned to A.1.1 (SPA assessments) have been omitted from the table of assessments yet these are included in the four-stage QAS process.
2	The EPP provided limited evidence of a quality assurance system for advanced programs that produces relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable measures. (component A.5.2)	The EPP provided limited evidence of a plan to ensure the sufficient level on the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments.

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

### Removed:

Area for Improvement or Weakness	Rationale
<p>1. [NCATE STD2] The unit does not systematically analyze candidate performance data to improve unit operations. [Both]</p> <p>2. [NCATE STD4] Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with diverse faculty members. [Both]</p> <p>3. [NCATE STD4] Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with diverse candidates. [Both]</p>	<p>1. These legacy AFIs is included in the recommended decisions in CAEP standard 2/A.2, 3/ A.3.</p>

4. [NCATE STD4] The unit does not ensure that all advanced teaching candidates have field experiences with P-12 students from different socioeconomic groups, students from diverse ethnic/racial groups, English language learners, and students with disabilities. [ADV]

## 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**