



**Council for the  
Accreditation of  
Educator Preparation**

## ACCREDITATION ACTION REPORT

Delaware Center for Teacher Education  
University of Delaware  
Newark, Delaware

Accreditation Council April 2020

Accreditation Application Date: 3/10/2010

*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 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence that it regularly and	The EPP provided minimal evidence to show how it

	systematically uses data for continuous improvement across all programs. (component 5.3)	systematically makes decisions based on data, identifies programmatic changes linked to data, and tracks results over time. From evidence provided in the Addendum and in interviews with faculty, accreditation team, the team found that minimal initiatives were in place to analyze assessment data and make appropriate changes. Elementary Education/Middle School Mathematics, Secondary Education English, Secondary Education Mathematics, and Secondary Education Social Studies either did not make modifications based on report or did not report their modifications to the DCTE, and their summary reports are missing from the data provided by the EPP.
2	The EPP provided limited evidence that the impact measures are shared widely, and benchmarks and trends were not reported. (component 5.4)	The EPP provided one cycle of evidence for the eight CAEP annual outcome and impact measures as evidence in AIMS; however, there was not clear evidence the EPP publicly shared the outcome and impact measures. Benchmarks and trends were not provided.

## ADVANCED LEVEL AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT AND STIPULATIONS

### STANDARD A.1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence of how the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments was used to assess proficiencies for A.1.1. (component A.1.1)	There is minimal evidence the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments was used. The EPP has provided minimal evidence of a plan to ensure the validity of the assessments and their use. In addition, the EPP has provided minimal evidence that the assessment instrument was piloted prior to administration, has described a process for analyzing and interpreting results from the assessment, or described the process for determining validity and reliability.

### STANDARD A.3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, And Selectivity

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence that there are two or more key checkpoints where progress of candidates in advanced programs is monitored after admission. (component A.3.3)	There is evidence of key checkpoints within the Ed.D. program, however criteria for program progression and how candidate advancement from admission through completion is monitored for other advanced programs is not clearly described. The EPP did not submit a CAEP sufficient Phase-In Plan for this component.

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

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence to demonstrate the	The EPP provided minimal evidence on consistency of

	interpretation of the data on EPP assessments were consistent. (component A.5.2)	data from EPP assessments. The EPP did not provide a Phase-In Plan for this component.
2	The EPP provided limited evidence that it regularly and systematically uses data for continuous improvement across all programs. (component A.5.3)	The EPP provided minimal evidence to show how it regularly and systematically assesses candidates and analyzes data, reports to stakeholders, makes decisions based on data, and identifies changes to inform possible program changes. From evidence provided in the Addendum and in interviews with faculty, accreditation team, the team found that minimal initiatives were in place to analyze assessment data and make appropriate changes. There is no formal system where there is a regular and systematic process to use data for continuous improvement across in Educational Leadership and psychology. The EPP did not provide a Phase-In Plan for this component.
3	The EPP provided limited evidence that the EPP's CAEP annual completer outcome measures are shared widely along with benchmarks and trends. (component A.5.4)	The EPP provided one cycle of evidence for the CAEP annual completer outcome measures as evidence in AIMS; however, there was not clear evidence that the EPP widely shared the outcome measures. Benchmarks and trends were not provided. The EPP did not provide a Phase-In Plan for this component.

## 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**