



Council for the  
Accreditation of  
Educator Preparation

## ACCREDITATION ACTION REPORT

School of Education  
Oklahoma Wesleyan University  
Bartlesville, Oklahoma

Accreditation Council October 2023  
Accreditation Application Date: 9/28/2006

*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 with stipulations** is granted at the initial-licensure level. Accreditation status is effective between Fall 2023 and Fall 2025. The provider must demonstrate that all stipulations have been corrected within two years to continue accreditation. A Stipulation Documentation virtual site review will occur in Spring 2025.

**Accreditation** is granted at the advanced level. Accreditation status is effective between Fall 2023 and Fall 2030. The next site review will take place in Spring 2030.

### 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 R1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge**

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence or Transition Plan that candidates apply critical concepts and principles of learner development, learning differences, and creating safe and supportive learning environments to work with diverse P-12 students and their families. (component R1.1)	The EPP provided articulation of the processes used with their program and interview evidence supported that the EPP has an astute awareness of how to provide quality learning and preparation experiences for their candidates. However, the EPP demonstrated an unclear understanding for presenting compelling evidence that provided clarity to support that candidates application of critical concepts and principles associated with component R1.1.

## STANDARD R2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence of how partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements for clinical preparation and share responsibility for continuous improvement of candidate preparation. (component R2.1)	The EPP provided limited evidence that primarily consisted of emails and correspondence to partner sites. The evidence did not demonstrate the systematic process in which the EPP and the Partner Schools collaborate.
2	The EPP provided limited evidence of how partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, and support high-quality clinical educators, both provider- and school-based, who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates' development and diverse P-12 student learning and development. (component R2.2)	The EPP provided limited evidence that primarily consisted of emails and correspondence to partner sites. The evidence did not demonstrate the systematic process in which the EPP and the Partner Schools collaborate.

## STANDARD R3: Candidate Recruitment, Progression, and Support

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence of systematic goals and progress for recruitment of high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations that align with their mission and address local, state, regional, or national needs for hard-to-staff schools and shortage fields. (component R3.1)	The EPP did not identify goals and progress steps toward goals of the recruitment of high-quality candidates. While some baseline demographic data were present and overarching goals were mentioned during onsite interviews, the EPP did not provide a systematic way to describe what the goals are, the strategies to achieve those goals, and/or the measures to ensure the effectiveness of the strategies in place.
2	The EPP provided limited evidence that they ensure candidates possess academic competency to teach effectively with positive impacts on diverse P-12 student learning and development. (component R3.3)	While the EPP used measures to assess competency, there was minimal evidence provided in the addendum and during onsite interviews on how a candidate's impact on diverse P-12 student learning was directly assessed. The EPP presented limited evidence of the use of systematic data for continuous improvement. This component allowed for a Transition Plan but one was not provided.

## STANDARD R4: Program Impact

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP presented limited evidence to demonstrate that	The EPP provided a Transition Plan but did not include

program completers effectively contribute to P-12 student-learning growth and apply in P-12 classrooms the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve. The EPP did not include a rationale for the data elements provided. (component R4.1)	at least one cycle of previous data or at least one cycle of pilot data aligned with revised components.
---	--

## STANDARD R5: Quality Assurance System and Continuous Improvement

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence that it maintained a functioning and sustainable Quality Assurance System that consists of valid data to support evidence-based continuous improvement. (component R5.1)	The EPP identified measures and described processes it has used to develop a Quality Assurance System. The EPP did not provide evidence of the stated data points. There was limited evidence the EPP had a system that functioned to provide data that enabled quality control and continuous improvement. It was unclear how data were systematically reported and used in decision making, and how outcomes of those decisions informed operational effectiveness of the EPP.
2	The EPP provided limited evidence of internal and external stakeholder involvement in program design, evaluation, and continuous improvement processes. (component R5.3)	While informal feedback and communication and anecdotes were noted through interviews, evidence provided on stakeholder involvement was limited to descriptions with only minimal mention of specific input and limited explanation of how it was used in continuous improvement. No recent contribution from Advisory Council members was evidenced in the documents provided nor were any members available for the onsite interviews.
3	The EPP provided limited evidence of regular, systematic, and continuous assessment of its performance against goals or that results were tracked over time in partnership with stakeholders. (component R5.4)	There was limited documentation of conclusions and/or interpretations of EPP data for systematic decision-making and programmatic improvement.

	Stipulations	Rationale
1	The EPP did not provide evidence it used reliable, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable measures to ensure interpretations of data were valid and consistent. (component R5.2)	The EPP provided no evidence of validity and reliability for EPP-created assessments.

## ADVANCED LEVEL AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT AND STIPULATIONS

### STANDARD RA1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence of disaggregated data with subsequent analysis for all advanced programs. (component RA1.2)	The EPP provided articulation of the processes used within their program and interview evidence supported the EPP's working processes provided quality learning and preparation experiences for their candidates. The EPP provided insufficient evidence that demonstrated meeting this component.

### STANDARD RA3: Candidate Quality and Selectivity

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence of setting and monitoring measurable recruitment goals to increase high-quality advanced program candidates from a broad range of backgrounds to accomplish their mission. (component RA3.1)	The EPP did not identify goals and progress toward recruitment of high-quality advanced candidates from a broad range of diverse backgrounds and diverse populations. While some goals and strategies were discussed during onsite interviews, the EPP did not provide evidence of monitoring progress towards goals. Descriptions of strategies and actions to achieve goals were not in place.
2	The EPP provided minimal evidence that demonstrated advanced candidates' competency at completion to facilitate learning with positive impact on student learning. (component RA3.4)	The EPP provided measures of competency, but the measures did not clearly evaluate the impact on student learning. A Phase-in plan was not presented to determine how measuring impact on student learning would be remedied.

### STANDARD RA4: Satisfaction with Preparation

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP presented limited evidence to demonstrate that employers were satisfied with the completers' preparation for their assigned responsibilities. (component RA4.1)	The EPP provided a Phase-in plan but did not provide detailed progress and future plans or a schedule for completion. Within the Phase-in plan, the EPP appeared to continue to have difficulty discerning between a candidate about to graduate from a program completer (that completed the program at least six months previously) and employed in a position for which they were prepared.
2	The EPP presented limited evidence to demonstrate that program completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job, and their preparation was effective. (component RA4.2)	The EPP provided a Phase-in plan but did not provide detailed plans or a schedule for completion with correct representative response. Within the Phase-in plan, the EPP appeared to continue to have difficulty discerning between a candidate about to graduate from a program completer (that completed the program at least six months previously) and employed in a position for which they were prepared.

### STANDARD RA5: Quality Assurance System and Continuous Improvement

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP provided limited evidence that it maintained a Quality Assurance System that consisted of valid data from multiple measures and supported evidence-based continuous improvement. (component RA5.1)	The EPP had not identified multiple measures to document operational effectiveness or quality assurance for the Advanced program. No processes were described. There was limited evidence the EPP had a functional Quality Assurance System to provide data that enabled quality control and continuous improvement. It was unclear how data were entered into the system, systematically reported, used in decision making, and informed operational effectiveness or programmatic improvement.
2	The EPP provided limited evidence it used relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable	The EPP provided limited evidence regarding validity and reliability procedures and no reference to

	measures to ensure interpretations of data were valid and consistent. (component RA5.2)	assessments/instruments or sufficiency criteria. An insufficient Phase-in plan for RA5.2 was supplied. No progress steps were indicated.
3	The EPP provided limited evidence of internal and external stakeholder involvement for the M.Ed. for Advanced Principal Licensure program. (component RA5.3)	While informal feedback and communication were noted through interviews, evidence provided on stakeholder involvement was limited to descriptions with only minimal mention of specific input and limited explanation of how it was used in continuous improvement. No recent contribution from Advisory Council members was evidenced in the documents provided nor were they available for the onsite interviews. There was limited evidence of how the EPP included relevant internal and external stakeholders in program design, evaluation or continuous improvement.
4	The EPP provided limited evidence of regular, systematic, and continuous assessment of its performance against goals or that results were tracked over time in partnership with stakeholders. (component RA5.4)	The EPP provided limited evidence of how continuous improvement strategies were used to assess EPP performance and make decisions. Verbal examples and anecdotal evidence were provided which did not show that program decisions were directly supported by data from the Quality Assurance System as the basis for improvement. An insufficient Phase-in plan for RA5.4 was supplied during the site review. No progress steps were indicated.

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

### Removed:

Area for Improvement or Weakness	Rationale
(1) [NCATE STD1] Advanced program (M.Ed.) candidates are not familiar with professional dispositions delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards. [ADV]	(1) This legacy AFI is addressed in CAEP Standard R3/RA3. Team recommends removal.
(2) [NCATE STD2] The unit has not implemented procedures to eliminate bias and ensure fairness, accuracy, and consistency in the assessment of candidate performance. [Both]	(2) This legacy AFI is addressed in CAEP Standard R5/RA5. Team recommends removal.
(3) [NCATE STD3] The unit does not systematically ensure diverse field experiences at the initial and advanced levels for all candidates. [Both]	(3) This legacy AFI is addressed in CAEP Standard R2. Team recommends removal.
(4) [NCATE STD3] The unit and its school partners do not jointly determine the specific placement of advanced program (M.Ed.) candidates. [ADV]	(4) This legacy AFI is addressed in CAEP Standard RA2. Team recommends removal.
(5) [NCATE STD4] Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with faculty from diverse populations. [Both]	(5) This legacy AFI is no longer required in CAEP standards. Team recommends removal.
(6) [NCATE STD5] Not all professional education faculty are actively engaged in scholarly work that is appropriate for professionals preparing teachers to work in schools. [Both]	(6) This legacy AFI is no longer required in CAEP standards. Team recommends removal.

### 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.

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:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Level</b>	<b>Degree</b>
Elementary Education	Initial	Baccalaureate
Health and Physical Education	Initial	Baccalaureate
Oklahoma Alternative Certification Program	Initial	
Secondary English Education	Initial	Baccalaureate
Secondary Math Education	Initial	Baccalaureate
Secondary Social Studies	Initial	Baccalaureate
Masters of Education- Educational Leadership	Advanced	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**