



**Council for the
Accreditation of
Educator Preparation**

ACCREDITATION ACTION REPORT

Professional Education Programs
Northern Arizona University
Flagstaff, Arizona

Accreditation Council October 2024
Accreditation Application Date: 1/23/2006

*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 and the advanced level. This Accreditation status is effective between Fall 2024 and Fall 2031. The next site review will take place in Spring 2031.

SUMMARY OF STANDARDS

CAEP STANDARDS	INITIAL-LICENSURE LEVEL	ADVANCED LEVEL
STANDARD R1/RA1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge	Met	Met
STANDARD R2/RA2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice	Met	Met
STANDARD R3/RA3: Candidate Quality and Selectivity	Met	Met
STANDARD R4/RA4: Satisfaction with Preparation	Met	Met
STANDARD R5/RA5: Quality Assurance System and Continuous Improvement	Met	Met
STANDARD R6/RA6: Fiscal and Administrative Capacity	Met	Met
STANDARD R7/RA7: Record of Compliance with Title IV of the Higher Education Act	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 R4: Program Impact

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence that program completers effectively contributed to P-12 student-learning growth or applied professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions	The EPP reported on completer effectiveness with a small sample drawn from completer assessment of K12 student learning. However, given lack of clarity about

	corresponding with teaching effectiveness. (component R4.1)	when students' learning was assessed (e.g., post-lesson), how it was assessed, and how long after the completer had begun teaching the tool was used, made it difficult to evaluate the extent to which this instrument was a valid measure of completer effectiveness.
2	The EPP provided limited evidence that employers were satisfied with completers' preparation. (component R4.2)	The EPP provided two pieces of evidence for this component. The Career Fair survey assessed candidates and not completers. The NExT Supervisor Survey provided only two cycles of data. The data were not disaggregated by completer demographics.

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 evidence of reviewing and responding to data via biennial reports. However, a review of biennial reports indicated there was a disconnect among the data analysis, action plan, and follow-up monitoring. Although there was a process for data collection and disaggregation by program as well as evidence that data were reviewed by program leaders in ITPCC which were then taken back to program faculty, there appeared to be an inconsistent analysis and use of data for continuous improvement.
2	The EPP provided limited evidence that its Quality Assurance System relied on relevant, verifiable, cumulative, or actionable measures or ensured interpretations of data were valid and consistent. (component R5.2)	The EPP provided a link to a website describing a Validity Inquiry Process (VIP). This process did not involve external stakeholders or result in any measurement of assessment reliability or validity. The EPP maintained validity was established via alignment of assessments to SPA standards.
3	The EPP provided limited evidence of internal and external stakeholder involvement in program design, evaluation, or continuous improvement. (component R5.3)	Evidence indicated the internal stakeholder group reviewed data periodically and took that data back to their respective programs, and that there was one "big meeting" a year where all data were reviewed. External stakeholders were not involved in this meeting. There was no evidence of a systematic process for collecting feedback from external stakeholders or the involvement of external stakeholders in data analysis. While there were some examples of changes made based on feedback from external stakeholders, these changes were not based on an analysis of data. The involvement of external stakeholders in program continuous improvement appeared to be limited to anecdotal feedback collected informally.
4	The EPP provided limited evidence that it regularly, systematically, and continuously assessed performance against its goals and tracked the results over time. (component R5.4)	There was limited evidence to document how data from the Quality Assurance System were used to provide the basis for continuous improvement, what modifications were made as a result of that data, and how the changes were linked to EPP goals and standards. The EPP provided evidence of reviewing and responding to data via biennial reports. These reports did not include program goals, and a review indicated for many there was a disconnect among the data analysis, action plan, and follow-up monitoring, which did not clearly show that the EPP assessed performance against its goals and

tracked the results over time.

ADVANCED LEVEL AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT AND STIPULATIONS

STANDARD RA1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence that program completers understood and applied knowledge and skills appropriate to their professional field of specialization. (component RA1.1)	While the EPP provided program-level assessments and three cycles of disaggregated data measuring the RA1.1 expectations, data quality was not established, and analysis of data was not always robust.
2	The EPP provided limited evidence that program completers had opportunities to learn and apply specialized content and discipline knowledge. (component RA1.2)	The EPP provided reports with varying levels of quality, some with insufficient assessment data, limited analysis, and goals unrelated to the assessment data.

STANDARD RA3: Candidate Quality and Selectivity

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence presenting goals and progress evidence for recruiting high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations that aligned with their mission. (component RA3.1)	While the EPP provided a recruitment plan and evidence that data were shared with stakeholders at biennial meetings, it was unclear as to how the EPP monitored and used results to plan and, as appropriate, modify recruitment goals.

STANDARD RA4: Satisfaction with Preparation

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence of program completer satisfaction with their preparation as relevant to their responsibilities. (component RA4.2)	The EPP provided additional cycles of data for both School Psychology and Educational Leadership. However, there were limited data for participants in the leadership superintendent program. In addition, there was limited evidence that the EPP analyzed and used these data.

STANDARD RA5: Quality Assurance System and Continuous Improvement

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence of a functioning Quality Assurance System. (component RA5.1)	The EPP provided evidence of reviewing and responding to data via biennial reports. The EPP provided three cycles of aggregated data in the biennial reports and three cycles of disaggregated data against some assessments in the SSR. It was challenging to discern the actionable nature of the data due to issues related to data quality and staging. Quality of biennial reports was inconsistent. Findings and action plans provided in the biennial reports were not aligned with data analysis. Systems supporting review of and response to data were not fully realized.

2	The EPP provided limited evidence that its Quality Assurance System relied on relevant, verifiable, or actionable measures or ensured interpretations of data were valid and reliable. (component RA5.2)	The EPP provided a link to a website describing a Validity Inquiry Process (VIP). This process did not involve external stakeholders or result in any measurement of assessment reliability or validity. The EPP maintained validity was established via alignment of assessments to SPA standards. The EPP was not able to establish that assessments were verifiable or met CAEP expectations for quality of EPP-created assessments.
3	The EPP provided limited evidence of involving external stakeholders in advanced program design, evaluation, or continuous improvement. (component RA5.3)	The EPP described faculty engagement in terms of faculty meetings and professional initiatives (e.g., RSRC, AASP, IHD). However, no evidence was provided of external stakeholder involvement in program continuous improvement beyond anecdotal feedback.
4	The EPP provided limited evidence that it was making program decisions supported by data. (component RA5.4)	The EPP provided evidence of review of data over time relative to SPA standards through biennial reports. However, the quality of biennial reports was inconsistent and program findings and action plans were not aligned with data analysis.

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:

Program Name	Licensure Level	Degree
Art Education	Initial-Licensure Level	Baccalaureate
Early Childhood Education and Early Childhood Special Education	Initial-Licensure Level	Baccalaureate
Educational Leadership - K-12 Administration	Advanced Level	Doctorate
Educational Leadership - Principal Pre K-12	Advanced Level	Master's
Elementary Education	Initial-Licensure Level	Baccalaureate
Elementary Education - Certification	Initial-Licensure Level	Master's
Health Sciences - Physical Education	Initial-Licensure Level	Baccalaureate

Music Secondary Education	Initial-Licensure Level	Baccalaureate
Physical Education Path to Certification	Initial-Licensure Level	Post Baccalaureate
Principal	Advanced Level	Endorsement only
School Psychology	Advanced Level	Specialist or C.A.S.
Secondary Education - Biology	Initial-Licensure Level	Baccalaureate
Secondary Education - Chemistry	Initial-Licensure Level	Baccalaureate
Secondary Education - Earth Science	Initial-Licensure Level	Baccalaureate
Secondary Education - English	Initial-Licensure Level	Baccalaureate
Secondary Education - General Science	Initial-Licensure Level	Baccalaureate
Secondary Education - History and Social Studies	Initial-Licensure Level	Baccalaureate
Secondary Education - Mathematics	Initial-Licensure Level	Baccalaureate
Secondary Education - Physics	Initial-Licensure Level	Baccalaureate
Secondary Education - Spanish	Initial-Licensure Level	Baccalaureate
Special and Elementary Education	Initial-Licensure Level	Baccalaureate
Special Education - Early Childhood Special Education with Certification	Initial-Licensure Level	Master's
Special Education - Mild/Moderate Disabilities Certified	Initial-Licensure Level	Master's
Superintendent	Advanced Level	Post Master's
Teaching Science with Certification	Initial-Licensure Level	Master's

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