



Council for the
Accreditation of
Educator Preparation

ACCREDITATION ACTION REPORT

College of Education
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan

Accreditation Council April 2025

Accreditation Application Date: 6/12/2009

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 with stipulations is granted at the initial-licensure level and the advanced level. This Accreditation status is effective between Spring 2025 and Spring 2027. The provider must demonstrate that all stipulations have been corrected within two years to continue accreditation. A stipulation documentation virtual site review will take place in Fall 2026.

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 R2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

Areas for Improvement	Rationale

1	The EPP provided limited evidence that partners co-constructed mutually beneficial arrangements. (component R2.1)	The EPP provided documentation of internal partnerships (e.g., CAS Methods Meetings, Supervisors' Meetings). However, the EPP's documentation of ways external partners contributed to co-constructing clinical preparation, shared responsibility for continuous improvement of candidate preparation, or how partnership activities proved beneficial for P-12 school and community partners was limited to a superintendents' luncheon, statewide initiatives, and recent activities to engage cooperating teachers in validity activities.
2	The EPP provided limited evidence that clinical educators were co-selected, prepared, evaluated, and supported. (component R2.2)	Although the EPP identified a state-wide clinical experience survey and a focus group as informing protocol, and the EPP's addendum addressed efforts to create a tracking system to monitor candidate complaints about placements, the EPP was in the early stages of developing systems related to ways the EPP co-selected, prepared, evaluated, and supported clinical educators.
3	The EPP provided limited evidence that the EPP ensured candidates were provided opportunities to utilize various modalities, work with P-12 students of varied learning needs, or practice with students of diverse backgrounds. (component R2.3)	Although the EPP described efforts to provide opportunities for candidates, and the Addendum provided evidence for the Early Childhood program, the EPP did not provide evidence of how the EPP systematically documented all candidates for all programs used various modalities, worked with P-12 students of varied learning needs, or practiced with students of diverse backgrounds.

STANDARD R4: Program Impact

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence that demonstrated completers effectively contributed to P-12 student learning growth and applied in P-12 classrooms the knowledge, skills, and dispositions their preparation were designed to achieve. (component R4.1)	Specific to P-12 student learning growth, the SSR narrative did not address measures of impact (R4.1a). Specific to evidence of applying professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions in P-12 classrooms (R4.1b) the EPP provided effectiveness scores, however the EPP did not provide analysis of effectiveness ratings results, including identifying trends, patterns, or comparisons.
2	The EPP provided limited evidence that demonstrated employers were satisfied with the completers' preparation. (component R4.2)	At the time of the virtual visit, it remained unclear how the EPP would use state or other sources of employers' satisfaction data in a way that will inform program design. During the site interview, it was confirmed that they had data for only two cycles from the state.
3	The EPP provided limited evidence that demonstrated completers perceived their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they encountered on the job and that their preparation was effective. (component R4.3)	With the addendum, the EPP provided a report named ADD_R4.3_Satisfaction of Completers. The report included data by program but not three cycles of data for all programs. The EPP provided a limited analysis for findings from four programs--Elementary Education, Special Education, English, and TESOL--yet did not address the EPP as a whole, nor identify trends, patterns, or comparisons among programs.

STANDARD R5: Quality Assurance System and Continuous Improvement

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence of a functioning Quality Assurance System that documented operational effectiveness. (component R5.1)	The EPP provided limited evidence to support how data were reported, analyzed, and used in decision making, and how the outcomes of those decisions informed programmatic improvement. Data presented were sometimes disaggregated by program and race but not gender or other EPP-determined criteria and did not provide three cycles of key assessment data for all programs.
2	The EPP provided limited evidence that the Quality Assurance System relied on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable measures. (component R5.2)	Most assessment rubrics did not meet CAEP sufficiency criteria.
3	The EPP provided limited evidence that it included relevant internal and external partners in program design, evaluation, and continuous improvement. (component R5.3)	The EPP provided limited evidence of internal and external stakeholder involvement in data review, analysis, feedback, co-creation, and continuous improvement processes. The EPP could not explicitly address how widely data were shared and who was invited to provide feedback, particularly for external partners, and to contribute to continuous improvement decisions.

	Stipulations	Rationale
1	The EPP provided no evidence that it regularly, systematically, and continuously assessed performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracked results over time, documented modifications and/or innovations and their effects on EPP outcomes. (component R5.4)	The EPP provided no evidence that it regularly or systematically assessed performance against goals. Key assessment data were not presented as part of the process for making decisions. Modifications and innovations made were not discussed as how they impacted the EPP outcomes over time.

ADVANCED LEVEL AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT AND STIPULATIONS

STANDARD RA2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence that demonstrated partners co-constructed mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships and shared responsibility for continuous improvement of candidate preparation at the advanced level. (component RA2.1)	Other than conducting superintendents' luncheons to share information, the EPP did not provide evidence of external school-based clinical educators contributing to co-constructing mutually beneficial P-12 and community arrangements, nor share responsibility for continuous improvement of candidate preparation.
2	The EPP provided limited evidence that demonstrated partners worked together to design varied and developmental clinical experiences that allowed opportunities for candidates to practice applications of content and knowledge aligned with the CAEP six professional competencies. (component RA2.2)	Although the EPP's educational leadership and reading programs showed some evidence of intentionally designing variation in experiences, the EPP did not address how the provider worked with external partners to design varied and developmental clinical experiences aligned with the CAEP six professional competencies detailed in component RA1.1.

STANDARD RA3: Candidate Quality and Selectivity

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
--	-----------------------	-----------

1	The EPP provided limited evidence to demonstrate recruitment of high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds that aligned with the EPP's mission. (component RA3.1)	Although the EPP described efforts to revise the educational leadership programs' recruitment plan and identified goals, the EPP did not provide evidence of systematically evaluating strategies for the Reading program.
2	The EPP provided limited evidence of monitoring the progress of candidates at the advanced level. (component RA3.3)	The EPP provided limited evidence of monitoring their candidates' progression. Key assessment data for the Educational Leadership programs were limited, and use of candidate progression through transition points was indiscernible. The Reading program presented key assessment data; however, the majority of data only consisted of two cycles of data and were not disaggregated for race/ethnicity, gender, or other categories relevant to the EPP's mission and recruitment plans.
3	The EPP provided limited evidence that demonstrated the impact on diverse P-12 students' learning and development through the application of CAEP's six generic professional skills. (component RA3.4)	The EPP provided limited evidence for completer competency. Some program data presented for candidates at the time of program completion did not consist of three cycles of recent data and were not disaggregated by program (e.g., two leadership tracks), race/ethnicity, or other demographic items relevant to the EPP's recruitment plan. The EPP did not directly address CAEP's six generic professional skills as identified in RA1.1 in the EPP's key assessments used to monitor candidate progress by the time of completion except for two limited mapping activities: one set educational leadership programs (EMU_K12_Leadership_MA_BSA_Quality_Assurance_Goals), which incorrectly tagged CAEP "6 standards"--rather than RA1.1--onto NELP rubrics and a mapping activity for the Reading program (ADD_RA1.1_Task_4_Reading; ONSITE_RA1_Reading_6_Proficiencies_RA1.1), with no explicit mapping to rubric outcomes. Neither set of programs addressed outcomes and analyses aligned with RA1.1.

STANDARD RA4: Satisfaction with Preparation

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence that demonstrated employers were satisfied with the completers' preparation for their assigned responsibilities. (component RA4.1)	The EPP did not provide evidence for all programs; Although the EPP provided two cycles of employer satisfaction data for the two educational leadership program, the EPP provided no data for the Reading program. The EPP's narrative addressed claims with no data source other than anecdotal information.
2	The EPP provided limited evidence that demonstrated program completers perceived their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job, and their preparation was effective. (component RA4.2)	The EPP did not provide evidence for all programs: the educational leadership programs included limited recent cycles, and limited information about presented data. The Reading program did not address completer satisfaction.

STANDARD RA5: Quality Assurance System and Continuous Improvement

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence of a functioning Quality Assurance System that consisted of valid data from multiple measures and supported continuous improvement that was	The EPP provided limited evidence of a functioning Quality Assurance System. The EPP was in the formative stages of developing a revised Quality

	sustained and evidence based. (component RA5.1)	Assurance System to collect, analyze, and make decisions based on the data.
2	The EPP provided limited evidence that the Quality Assurance System relied on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable measures. (component RA5.2)	The EPP did not provide three administrations of disaggregated data by program, race, gender, and any EPP-determined categories were not submitted for all advanced programs. The EPP's protocol for testing validity and reliability lacked explicit methodologies aligned with best practices. Some assessment tools did not meet CAEP sufficiency criteria for EPP-created assessments and surveys.
3	The EPP provided limited evidence that internal and external stakeholders were involved in program design, evaluation, and the continuous improvement process. (component RA5.3)	The EPP provided limited evidence of stakeholder involvement, including external partners. The Educational Leadership program provided some evidence of stakeholder involvement in the continuous improvement process; however, the Reading program did not provide evidence of stakeholder involvement in the continuous improvement process.

	Stipulations	Rationale
1	The EPP provided no evidence that it systematically used data for continuous improvement, operational effectiveness, and that continuous improvement initiatives were tracked and evaluated for effectiveness and impact. (component RA5.4)	The EPP provided insufficient evidence that it regularly or systematically assessed performance against goals. Key assessment data were not presented as part of the process for making decisions. Modifications and innovations made were not discussed as how they impacted the EPP outcomes over time.

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

Removed:

Area for Improvement or Weakness	Rationale
(1) [CAEP 2] The EPP does not have a plan to co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators. (Component 2.2) [ITP]	(1) Covered in Standard R2.
(2) [CAEP 2] The EPP does not have a plan to design clinical experiences of depth, breadth, and sufficient diversity to ensure that candidates demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students' learning development. (Component 2.3) [ITP]	(2) Covered in Standard R2.

Continued:

Area for Improvement or Weakness	Rationale
None	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 were included in the current accreditation cycle:

Program Name	Licensure Level	Degree
Bilingual Education K-12 (French, German, Japanese, Spanish)	Initial-Licensure Level	Baccalaureate
Business, Marketing, Management & Technology	Initial-Licensure Level	Baccalaureate
Business, Marketing, Management, & Technology	Initial-Licensure Level	Post Baccalaureate
Career and Technical Education (Occupational Areas)	Initial-Licensure Level	Baccalaureate
Communication & Theater Arts Teaching (Speech)	Initial-Licensure Level	Baccalaureate
Communication & Theater Arts Teaching (Speech)	Initial-Licensure Level	Post Baccalaureate
Educational Leadership (K-12 Administration)	Advanced Level	Specialist or C.A.S.
Educational Leadership (K-12 Administration)	Advanced Level	Master's
Elementary Education	Initial-Licensure Level	Baccalaureate
Elementary Education	Initial-Licensure Level	Post Baccalaureate
Engineering & Technology Workforce Education	Initial-Licensure Level	Baccalaureate
Engineering & Technology Workforce Education	Initial-Licensure Level	Post Baccalaureate
English as a Second Language	Initial-Licensure Level	Endorsement only
English - Secondary Education	Initial-Licensure Level	Baccalaureate
English - Secondary Education	Initial-Licensure Level	Post Baccalaureate
English - Secondary Education	Initial-Licensure Level	Master's
Mathematics - Secondary Education	Initial-Licensure Level	Post Baccalaureate
Mathematics - Secondary Education	Initial-Licensure Level	Master's
Mathematics - Secondary Education	Initial-Licensure Level	Baccalaureate
Psychology Teaching	Initial-Licensure Level	Endorsement only
Reading Specialist	Advanced Level	Master's
Science: Secondary Education (Integrated Science, Biology, Chemistry, Earth Science, and Physics)	Initial-Licensure Level	Baccalaureate
Science: Secondary Education (Integrated Science, Biology,		

Chemistry, Earth Science, and Physics)	Initial-Licensure Level	Post Baccalaureate
Science: Secondary Education (Integrated Science, Biology, Chemistry, Earth Science, and Physics)	Initial-Licensure Level	Master's
Social Studies (Social Studies, History, Geography, Economics, and Political Science)	Initial-Licensure Level	Baccalaureate
Special Education: Autism Spectrum Disorders	Initial-Licensure Level	Baccalaureate
Special Education: Autism Spectrum Disorders	Initial-Licensure Level	Master's
Special Education: Cognitive Impairments	Initial-Licensure Level	Baccalaureate
Special Education: Cognitive Impairments	Initial-Licensure Level	Master's
Special Education: Emotional Impairments	Initial-Licensure Level	Baccalaureate
Special Education: Emotional Impairments	Initial-Licensure Level	Master's
Special Education: Learning Disabilities	Initial-Licensure Level	Baccalaureate
Special Education: Learning Disabilities	Initial-Licensure Level	Master's
World Languages K-12 (French, German, Japanese, Spanish)	Initial-Licensure Level	Baccalaureate
World Languages K-12 (Arabic, Chinese, French, German, Japanese, Spanish)	Initial-Licensure Level	Post 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