



**Council for the  
Accreditation of  
Educator Preparation**

## **ACCREDITATION ACTION REPORT**

College of Health, Education, & Professional Studies  
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga  
Chattanooga, Tennessee

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 with stipulations** is granted at the advanced-level. Accreditation status is effective between Spring 2020 and Spring 2022. The provider must demonstrate that all stipulations have been corrected within two years to continue accreditation. A Stipulation Documentation virtual site visit will occur in Fall 2021.

### **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

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided insufficient evidence that candidates in all programs model and apply technology standards as they design, implement, and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning. (Component 1.5)	During interviews with secondary candidates, it was reported that many do not have opportunities to model and apply technology as it relates to student engagement. In addition, in interviews with related programs (theatre, foreign language, health and PE), and music, faculty and candidates reported that they have little opportunity to model and apply technology.

## STANDARD 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided insufficient evidence that data are shared and used to inform improvement of clinical practice. (Component 2.2).	The EPP did not provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate how data is shared with its partners and used collaboratively to make program decisions.

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

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence of a complete recruitment plan. (Component 3.1)	The recruitment plan does not include baseline data, measurable goals, or specific timelines for five years. Recruitment results are not recorded, monitored, and used in planning and modification of recruitment strategies.

## STANDARD 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence as to how data are systematically collected, analyzed, and interpreted. (Component 5.1)	There is evidence that data from multiple measures are included in the QAS, including a monitored checkpoint system to assist both faculty and candidates in managing progress through the program. Evidence regarding a system to assess completer achievements was not presented, nor was evidence presented regarding data on the EPP's operational effectiveness.
2	The EPP provided minimal documentation of verifiable, cumulative, relevant actions based on data-based evidence. (Component 5.2)	There is limited documentation that the data are consistently analyzed or assessments are consistently utilized across programs.
3	The EPP does not regularly and systematically use data for continuous improvement across all programs. (Component 5.3)	There is insufficient evidence that the EPP regularly and systematically reviews available data against goals and standards.
4	Minimal evidence was provided as to how data are used in program decision-making, resource allocation, and setting of present and future priorities. (Component 5.5)	There was insufficient evidence of meaningful stakeholder involvement in decision-making, program evaluation or selection and implementation of changes for improvement.

## ADVANCED LEVEL AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT AND STIPULATIONS

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

	Stipulations	Rationale
1	The EPP did not provide evidence for the six proficiencies or a phase-in plan for addressing the proficiencies for all advanced programs. (Component A.1.1)	The EPP provided neither data from valid and reliable instruments to indicate that their candidates demonstrate a deep understanding of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions for their professional speciality, nor a phase-in plan.

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

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP has not provided sufficient evidence for all advanced programs to show goals for its clinical activities, how the program maintains partnerships with co-construction of experiences or evaluation methods, and how the EPP shares candidate assessment results. (Component A.2.1)	The EPP did not provide sufficient evidence for the Educational Leadership program to show how P-12 partners have input on mutually agreed clinical experiences. The EPP did not provide sufficient evidence to show how they work with their P-12 partners to share analysis of data and how the EPP and its partners share accountability for program candidates. The Schools of Psychology and Reading Specialist Schools did not provide evidence.
2	The EPP provided insufficient evidence that the clinical activities for advanced programs lead to a culminating experience that is a problem-based task or research-based. (Component A.2.2)	While the EPP clinical activities in the Education Leadership program presented evidence of a culminating experience, the Schools of Psychology and Reading Specialist Schools did not provide evidence.

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

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence of goals and processes for monitoring admissions. (Component A.3.1)	Admission data are not recorded, monitored, and used in planning and modification of recruitment strategies to address state, national and local needs.

### STANDARD A.4: Program Impact

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided an incomplete plan to assess employer satisfaction with completer preparation for all advanced programs. (Component A.4.1)	The EPP's phase-in plan for employer satisfaction did not include the reading specialist or school psychology programs.
2	The EPP provided an incomplete plan to assess completer satisfaction for all advanced programs. (Component A.4.2)	The EPP's phase-in plan for completer satisfaction did not include the reading specialist or school psychology programs.

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

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence as to how data are systematically collected, analyzed, and interpreted. (Component A.5.1)	There is evidence that data from multiple measures are included in the QAS, however, evidence regarding a system to assess completer achievements was not presented, nor was evidence presented regarding data on the EPP's operational effectiveness.
2	The EPP provided minimal documentation of verifiable, cumulative, relevant actions based on data-based evidence. (Component A.5.2)	There is limited documentation that the data are consistently analyzed or assessments are consistently utilized across all programs, and the EPP did not provide a phase-in plan across all programs.
3	The EPP does not regularly and systematically use data for continuous improvement across all programs. (Component A.5.3)	There is insufficient evidence that the EPP regularly and systematically reviews available data against goals and standards, and the EPP did not provide a phase-in plan across all programs.
4	Minimal evidence was provided that data are used in program decision-making (Component A.5.5)	There was insufficient evidence of meaningful stakeholder involvement in either decision-making, program evaluation or selection and implementation of changes for improvement.

### 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]The unit's assessments do not reflect the proficiencies identified in professional and state standards. [ADV]	1. This is addressed in CAEP standard A.1.

### 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