

# ACCREDITATION ACTION REPORT

Indiana University - Bloomington  
Bloomington, Indiana

October 2017

*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. This accreditation status is effective between fall 2017 and fall 2024. The next site visit will take place in spring 2024.

## SUMMARY OF STANDARDS

CAEP STANDARDS	INITIAL LEVEL	ADVANCED LEVEL
STANDARD 1/A.1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge	Met	Not Applicable
STANDARD 2/A.2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice	Met	Not Applicable
STANDARD 3/A.3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, And Selectivity	Met	Not Applicable
STANDARD 4/A.4: Program Impact	Met	Not Applicable
STANDARD 5/A.5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement	Met	Not Applicable

The Educator Preparation Provider is encouraged to refer to the site visit report for strengths and additional information on findings.

## AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT AND STIPULATIONS

Areas for Improvement: Identified areas for improvement are addressed in the provider's annual report. Areas for improvement need not be publicly disclosed, but will become stipulations if they remain uncorrected by the next accreditation review.

### AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT AND STIPULATIONS

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

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP does not provide evidence that candidate dispositions are established, monitored, and acted upon consistently in all programs using valid and reliable measures.	Monitoring of criteria systematically for the purpose of tracking attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability is not fully developed into a clear process across all programs. The evaluation

		instrument that is utilized at the admission check point is not utilized within all programs, and does not appear to meet "sufficiency" on all CAEP Instrument Rubric Criteria. It is unclear how reliability is established. There is not clear evidence that triangulation of data could occur or comparison could be made between measures across different points in a candidate's program.
--	--	---

## STANDARD 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP does not provide sufficient evidence of systematic collection, analysis, and reporting of data.	While there are multiple measures that monitor candidate progress across various points in the EPP, evidence to demonstrate the presence of a quality assurance system to ensure operational effectiveness (e.g. setting priorities, EPP-wide systematic data tracking and deliberation) must be adequately developed so that changes link back to evidence and data and to track progress on all CAEP standards.

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

Removed:

Area for Improvement or Weakness	Rationale
(1) The unit does not systematically collect candidate data in the advanced programs at IUPUI (Indiana University/Purdue University, Indianapolis) campuses. [ADV] (2) Completer and employer surveys at the advanced level do not verify candidate knowledge, skills, dispositions, and impact on student learning. [ADV]	(1) SITE VISIT TEAM RECOMMENDATION: REMOVE AFI (2) SITE VISIT TEAM RECOMMENDATION: REMOVE AFI

Continued:

Area for Improvement or Weakness	Rationale
None	None

*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 document