



Council for the
Accreditation of
Educator Preparation

ACCREDITATION ACTION REPORT

Department of Education
Oakwood University
Huntsville, Alabama

Accreditation Council April 2023

Accreditation Application Date: 5/2/2006

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

Probationary Accreditation is granted at the initial-licensure level. Standard R5 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 R5 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-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	Not Met	Not Applicable
Rationale for Standard R5 at the initial-licensure level being found Not Met: The EPP had AFIs for R5.1 and R5.3, with stipulations in R5.2 and R5.4.		
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 of the candidates' ability to apply their knowledge of the learner and learning at the appropriate progression levels. (component R1.1)	There was limited evidence and data collected to assess candidates' ability to apply their knowledge of the learner and learning. Data collected did not appear to be utilized for possible indications of the qualities of the EPP and/or related to performance on InTASC standards.
2	The EPP provided limited evidence that candidates were able to apply their knowledge of content at the appropriate progression levels. (component R1.2)	There was limited data related to candidates' ability to apply their content knowledge of content at appropriate progression levels. It was unclear how the data collected was utilized to inform programmatic decisions and/or alignment with InTASC standards.
3	The EPP instruments used to assess candidates' ability to apply their knowledge of instructional practices were inconsistent and insufficient. (component R1.3)	The EPP presented evidence of multiple opportunities for candidates to apply their knowledge of instructional practice, but instruments used to assess and collect data on candidates' ability to apply knowledge of instructional practices were inconsistent and insufficient.

STANDARD R2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence supporting the preparation and evaluation of clinical educators who positively impacted candidate development and diverse P-12 student learning. (component R2.2)	There was limited evidence documenting the training provided to clinical educators and how evaluations of clinical educators were used to promote continuous improvement.
2	The EPP school partners had limited participation in the design of clinical experiences. (component R2.3)	There was limited evidence that school partners worked with the EPP to design clinical experiences.

STANDARD R3: Candidate Quality and Selectivity

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence related to the monitoring of progress toward recruitment goals and the analysis and interpretation of recruitment plan outcomes. (component R3.1)	There was no written analysis or interpretation of how the data for the recruitment plan was used to modify strategies and outcomes.
2	The EPP provided limited evidence of how candidate progress was monitored from admission to completion. (component R3.2)	The EPP provided evidence in a data checklist; however, there was limited evidence related to how the EPP monitored and evaluated candidates' progress from admission to completion.

STANDARD R4: Satisfaction with Preparation

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited data to demonstrate employer satisfaction. (component R4.2)	The EPP provided only two cycles of employer satisfaction data. No supplemental data were provided.
2	The EPP provided limited data to demonstrate completer satisfaction. (component R4.3)	The EPP provided two cycles of completer satisfaction data. No supplemental data were provided.

STANDARD R5: Quality Assurance System and Continuous Improvement

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	There was limited evidence that the EPP aligned assessments to the InTASC standards. (component R5.1)	Systematic disaggregation of data analysis for InTASC standards was not apparent in the reports.
2	There was limited evidence of the involvement of stakeholders in the co-construction of assessments and feedback. (component R5.3)	Interviews with stakeholders did not corroborate the co-construction and feedback of key assessments.

	Stipulations	Rationale
1	There was no evidence of how the EPP demonstrated content validity and reliability for EPP-created assessments. (component R5.2)	The EPP-created assessments did not meet CAEP sufficiency criteria in order for data quality to be valid and reliable. Rubrics were not benchmarked and aligned to standards.
2	There was no evidence that the EPP regularly, systematically, and continuously assessed performance against its goals and relevant standards, documented modifications and/or innovations and their effects on EPP outcomes. (component R5.4)	There was no evidence that the EPP analyzed programmatic data to use for continuous improvement.

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
Elementary Education	Initial	Baccalaureate
English & Language Arts Education	Initial	Baccalaureate
Mathematics Education	Initial	Baccalaureate
Social Studies Education	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.

End of Action Report