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What are we going to talk about today?

- New CAEP Resources
- Update on Advanced Programs
- Update on Component 3.2
- Then look at each of the CAEP Standards
For each Standard and Component

- We will look at the language then,
  - For each Component
    - Appropriate Evidence
    - Sufficient level

- I’m going to do these out of order—but we can talk about this

[My primary resource is the March 2016 Accreditation Handbook]
New Resources

- Accreditation Handbook, March 2016
- New(ish) CAEP Assessment Rubric
- New webinars
- Guidance for Plans
- Presentations from Spring CAEP Conference
- All can be found at CAEP web site/Accreditation and Program Review/CAEP Accreditation Resources
Implementation of Advanced Standards: Timeline

- Feedback on proposed policies
  - Fall 2015 – Report from Working Group
  - Feedback on Advanced Standards closed in March
  - Spring of 2016—Revision of Draft Guidelines based on feedback from the field
  - CAEP Board action in June 2016
  - Summer of 2016 – Draft of Advanced Standards Guidelines

- Fall 2016
  - Advanced Standards process in the CAEP Accreditation Handbook
  - Phase-in plan similar to the initial phase-in plan will be in place
Timeline for Submission of Advanced Level Programs

- If the EPP’s *self study* is due before September 1, 2017, the EPP *does not submit* the EPP’s advanced level programs for review. The EPP’s accreditation decision is based on initial level licensure areas only.

- These initial licensure areas include
  - Any MAT or Post-baccalaureate licensure areas that lead to initial teaching licensure

- What is not submitted before September 1, 2017
  - Add-on certifications for individuals who already have a licensure area certification
  - Any advanced level programs for already licensed teachers or administrators
Timeline for Submission of Advanced Level Programs

- If the EPP’s **self-study** is due **after September 1, 2017**, the EPP must submit their advanced level programs as well as their initial licensure programs.

- If the **EPPs site visit is in the Spring of 2018**, it will still depend on the self study due date. The self-study is submitted 8 months before the date of the site visit.

- If the **EPP’s site visit is in the fall of 2017**, the EPP’s advanced level programs **will not be submitted** for review. Only the EPP’s initial licensure areas will be submitted for review.
Process (still draft)

- One self-study report will be submitted for all programs
- There will be two sections of the Evidence Room—one for Initial and one for Advanced
- EPP will make case for meeting standard at both the Initial and Advanced Levels
- Reviewers provide an analysis of the strength of the evidence for each standard for both levels, will recommend AFIS and Stipulations
- Current recommendation is that the EPP will receive one decision from the Accreditation Council that addresses both levels
Scope (recommendations)

- Programs that would need to be reviewed at the advanced level should have the following –
  - Clear entry point for all candidates
  - Organized program of study with a progressive and coherent curriculum
  - Significant clinical component
  - Clear exit criteria or culminating experience
  - Designed to have a direct or indirect impact on P-12 learning

- If the advanced level program meets all the above criteria, the program must be submitted for review
- Programs that should be submitted
  - Degrees, tracks, content specializations, concentration, or advanced level programs beyond initial certification with emphasis on P-12 learning (direct and/or indirect)

- Programs that should always be reviewed
  - Educational Leadership specific to P-12 schools
  - Curriculum and instruction degree programs
  - MEd or MS programs specific to P-12 learning/schools
  - EdD or PhD specific to P-12 learning/schools
Update on 3.2

- The requirement that the group average performance on nationally normed ability/achievement assessments such as ACT, SAT or GRE is in the top 50% from 2016-2017 (currently frozen at this level)

- CAEP has received a commissioned report on the impact of 3.2
  - The report is on the CAEP web site on the Standard 3 page
Charge to the research group:

- To investigate the viability of CAEP’s benchmarks as identified in option 1 of component 3.2
- To inform the CAEP Board of Directors’ discussion and final action on component 3.2
- Four streams of evidence were used
  - In-depth literature review
  - Empirical data from four states
  - Extensive survey of all CAEP EPPs (national and international)
  - Interviews with selected EPP leaders
Also…..

CAEP sponsoring or has sponsored a series of focus groups on component 3.2
- AACTE
- National Board
- CAEP Conference
- State Clinic
All of this information will be evaluated by the Board at its June meeting.
Let’s talk about each Standard

But first... Let’s talk about what “the preponderance of evidence” means
Standard 4: Program Impact

- The provider demonstrates the impact of its completers on P-12 student learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools, and the satisfaction of its completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.
General Rules for Standard 4

- All phase-in requirements are met.
- All component for Standard 4 are required.
- At least three cycles of data must be submitted and analyzed. If a revised assessment is submitted with less than 3 cycles of data, the data from the original assessment should be submitted.
- Cycles of data must be sequential and be the latest available.
- EPP-created assessments should be scored at the Sufficient Level as defined on the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric.
- All components must be addressed in the self study.
4.1: Impact on P-12 Student Learning and Development
(Required)

- The provider documents, using multiple measures, that program completers contribute to an expected level of student-learning growth. Multiple measures shall include all available growth measures (including value-added measures, student-growth percentiles, and student learning and development objectives) required by the state for its teachers and available to educator preparation providers, other state-supported P-12 impact measures, and any other measures employed by the provider.
4.1 Impact on P-12 Student Learning and Development

- Direct measures of student learning and development
- Addresses diverse subjects and grades
- P-12 impact or growth data from state teacher evaluations (if available)

If state data are not available:
- Teacher-linked student assessments from districts
- Teacher conducted action research
- Focus group and or case studies producing qualitative data
  - For EPPs using qualitative data, a qualitative research method must be identified for the analysis of the data
- Results must be reported
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Evidence</th>
<th>Minimal Level of Sufficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value-added modeling</td>
<td>• One or more measures of state-provided impact data are provided for completers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-growth percentiles</td>
<td>• Analysis &amp; interpretation of evidence are aligned to component &amp; conclusions are supported with data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student learning</td>
<td>• Context &amp; description of the source of P-12 learning data are provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State supported measures linked with teacher data</td>
<td>• Description &amp; explanation are provided on the representativeness of the data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EPPs that have access to data from states about completer impact:

- Demonstrate that they are familiar with the sources of the P-12 student learning impact data and the state’s model for preparing the data that are attributed to the EPP’s preparation program.
- Document the EPP’s analysis and evaluation of information provided on P-12 student learning.
- Interpretations of the data
- Judge the implications of the data and analyses for the preparation program
- If judged to be invalid, then use other valid evidence
Familiarity with State Provided Data (if the EPP has state data)

Consider the following:

- Proportion of the provider’s completers for whom P-12 student growth measures are available
- Level of state disaggregation of data for specific preparation fields
- Number of years associated with completer’s performance
- State criteria used to establish the minimum number of completers for whom data are provided
- Level of context provided by states for completer data (degree of attrition, high-need schools, etc.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Evidence</th>
<th>Minimal Level of Sufficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provider-conducted case studies of completers</td>
<td>• At least one measure of impact data, utilizing research-based methodology, from a purposive sample of candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completer-conducted action research</td>
<td>• Analysis &amp; interpretation of evidence are aligned to component &amp; conclusions are supported with data (qualitative and/or quantitative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships with individual school districts</td>
<td>• Context &amp; description of the source of P-12 learning data are provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of focus groups, in-depth interviews, learning communities, blogs, electronic journals, videos, and others</td>
<td>• Description &amp; explanation are provided on the representativeness of data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Component 4.1: No State Data Available

- Standard 4 requires impact data, but does not require statewide data
  - Learning objectives to measure student growth (individual completers)
    - May vary from school to school or district to district
    - Use of multiple and varied measures provides a rich picture of completers’ teaching effectiveness
    - EPPs with differing measures can contextualize results across completers and licensure areas

- CAEP is aware that evidence from EPPs in states not providing student impact will have limitations. The focus needs to be on what EPPs will learn from completers they follow into the field.
Other options available

- Teacher-linked P-12 student learning data from selected school districts or individual school
  - Purposive sample of completers (group of completers representing various licensure areas)
  - Need to be explicit about the sample being used

- Case study or action research
  - Student impact data could be aligned with teacher goals
  - Pre and post assessments could be used in lieu of state data
  - Multiple sources of impact data could be used (both qualitative and quantitative)
  - Narrative data analyzed using research-based methodology
- EPPs could form coalitions
  - Work with selected schools/districts to gather student growth data for multiple EPPs
  - Data are shared across members of the coalition
  - Could include such things as observations, interviews, blogs, hosting focus groups, student surveys, etc.
One EPP is working with a district as part of the new teacher induction process
- Will follow all new teachers in the district
- Will allow the EPP to make comparisons with other new teachers as well as their completers

Several EPPs are completing case studies with a small sample of completers
- Reflective journals/blogs
- Using other measures of teacher effectiveness including observations (virtual and live)
- Virtual meetings via Skype or GOTO meetings
- Learning communities with other first year completers
4.2: Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness (Required)

- The provider demonstrates, through structured and validated observation instruments and/or student surveys, that completers effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve.
Many of the same examples to be found for component 4.1 would apply to component 4.2 when state data are not available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Evidence</th>
<th>Minimal Level of Sufficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student surveys completed for sample of completers</td>
<td>• Observations and/or student survey assessments measure the application of professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions with teaching effectiveness and/or P-12 student learning (state data or sample of completers by EPP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completer observations by EPPs or induction mentor (face to face or virtual)</td>
<td>• Student survey return rates were at an acceptable level and inclusive of most licensure areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School based observations</td>
<td>• Validity descriptions were appropriate and specific types of validity identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations completed by coalition members and shared</td>
<td>• Interpretation of data were valid and supported by results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3: Satisfaction of Employers (Required)

- The provider demonstrates, using measures that result in valid and reliable data and including employment milestones such as promotion and retention, that employers are satisfied with the completers’ preparation for their assigned responsibilities in working with P-12 students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Evidence</th>
<th>Minimal Level of Sufficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employer satisfaction surveys (include instrument sampling,</td>
<td>• Evidence employers perceive completers’ preparation was sufficient for their job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>response rates, timing)</td>
<td>responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer satisfaction interviews (include population</td>
<td>• Appropriate provider analysis and interpretation of results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>represented, response rates, instrument content, timing)</td>
<td>• A system for the analysis, evaluation, and interpretation of data was described and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer satisfaction focus groups (include population</td>
<td>conclusions were supported by the data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>represented, response rates, instrument content, timing)</td>
<td>• Documentation is provided that the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer satisfaction case studies (include description of</td>
<td>• System was identified for gathering data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>methodology)</td>
<td>• Adequate response rates (20% or more) were achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Description was provided on the representativeness of the sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Data specific to high need schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Data specific to licensure areas were provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Comparison points for data were provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Employment milestones including promotion, employment trajectory, and retention were</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>provided for at least some completers and were analyzed appropriately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• For all narrative evidence, a research-based methodology was used for analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4: Satisfaction of Completers  (Required)

- The provider demonstrates, using measures that result in valid and reliable data, that program completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job, and that the preparation was effective.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Evidence</th>
<th>Minimal Level of Sufficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Completer satisfaction surveys (include instrument, sampling, response rates,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timing)</td>
<td>● Evidence completers perceive their preparation was sufficient for their job responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Completer satisfaction interviews (include population represented, response</td>
<td>● Appropriate provider analysis and interpretation of results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rates, instrument content, timing)</td>
<td>● Adequate and representative sample reflected in response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Provider focus groups of employers (include population represented, response</td>
<td>● Adequate response rates (20% or more) were achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rates, instrument content, timing)</td>
<td>● Analysis and interpretation of data are aligned with the intent of the standard/component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Completer satisfaction case studies (include methodology)</td>
<td>and conclusions are supported by the data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes to Phase-In for Standard 4

The EPP develops an evidence plan to guide their accumulation of data documenting all components of Standard 4, drawing on state or district sources and their own:

- **Evidence plans** for 2016 or 2017 – EPP develops an evidence plan for components of the Standard

- Plans indicate successive movement toward relevant evidence that will document all components by 2018

- There must be at least one data point by 2018

- Plans indicate how content validity of the measures will be determined ("content validity" refers to the alignment of the assessment content with the Standard)
- **Self-Study**—plans with data are incorporated into self-study in 2017 and 2018

- EPPs provide analyses, interpretations and documentation on how results are used for program improvement.

- **Site Visitors** review evidence plans as well as data collected by the time of the visit. Areas for improvement and stipulations will be noted.

- **Follow Up**: After the final accreditation decision, EPPs will report data specific to Standard 4 in the next three Annual Reports.
CAEP would phase-in the requirement in CAEP Standard 4 that “all components” must be met.

There will be at least some evidence for each component of the Standard. Some evidence is defined as at least one data point.

The evidence must be relevant to the component – evidence is aligned with the standard.

The Accreditation Council could rule that Standard 4 as a whole is met even though there are AFIs for one or more components.
- When relevant state or district data are shared with EPP
  - Shared state data will be accepted by CAEP that the component is met (even if state data is limited or incomplete)
  - EPP must present state or district data together with the analysis, interpretation and documentation of use of results
Questions?
Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment and Selectivity

The provider demonstrates that the quality of candidates is a continuing and purposeful part of its responsibility from recruitment, at admission, through the progression of courses and clinical experiences, and to decisions that completers are prepared to teach effectively and are recommended for certification. The provider demonstrates that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation in all phases of the program. This process is ultimately determined by a program’s meeting of Standard 4.
General Rules for Standard 3:

- At least three cycles of data are required. If a revised assessment is submitted with less than 3 cycles of data, the data from the original assessment should be submitted.

- Cycles of data must be sequential and be the latest available.

- EPP created assessments should be scored at the minimal level of sufficiency.

- All components must be addressed in the self study.

- Component 3.2 is required.
Component 3.1: Recruitment

Plan for Recruitment of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs

- The provider presents plans and goals to recruit and support completion of high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations to accomplish their mission. The admitted pool of candidates reflects the diversity of America’s P-12 students. The provider demonstrates efforts to know and address community, state, national, regional, or local needs for hard-to-staff schools and shortage fields, currently, STEM, English-language learning, and students with disabilities.

- Phase-In applies
Types of Evidence

- Application, acceptance, and enrollment rates disaggregated by demographic variables such as socio-economic background, gender, ethnicity, and other background characteristics

- Strategic recruiting plan
  - Based on EPP mission and employment opportunities
  - Includes plans for outreach, numerical goals and base data, monitoring or progress

- Evidence of
  - Resources moving toward identified targets and away from low-need areas
  - Recruitment efforts at diverse high schools and/or colleges
  - Collaborative efforts with other EPPs, states, and school districts
The “Sufficient” level:

- Recruitment plan, based on mission, with baseline points and goals (including academic ability, diversity, and employment needs) for five years
- Disaggregated data on applicants, those admitted, and enrolled candidates by relevant demographics including race/ethnicity, SES, and/or sex
- Recruitment results are recorded, monitored, and used in planning and modification of recruitment strategies
- Knowledge of and action that addresses employment opportunities in schools, districts, and/or regions where completers are likely to seek employment
- STEM and ELL, special education, and hard-to-staff school needs are explicitly addressed in analysis of shortage areas
- The recruitment plan and its implementation have moved the provider toward the goal of greater candidate diversity and academic achievement
- Evidence that influence of employment opportunities on enrollment patterns is monitored
Component 3.2: Selectivity at Admission (Required)

The provider sets admissions requirements, including CAEP minimum criteria or the state’s minimum criteria, whichever are higher, and gathers data to monitor applicants and the selected pool of candidates. The provider ensures that the average grade point average of its accepted cohort of candidates meets or exceeds the CAEP minimum of 3.0, and the group average performance on nationally normed ability/achievement assessments such as ACT, SAT, or GRE:

- is in the top 50 percent from 2016-2017;
- is in the top 40 percent of the distribution from 2018-2019; and
- is in the top 33 percent of the distribution by 2020.[i]
3.2: Continued

- [Alternative 1] If any state can meet the CAEP standards, as specified above, by demonstrating a correspondence in scores between the state-normed assessments and nationally normed ability/achievement assessments, then educator preparation providers from that state will be able to utilize their state assessments until 2020. CAEP will work with states through this transition.

- [Alternative 2] Over time, a program may develop a reliable, valid model that uses admissions criteria other than those stated in this standard. In this case, the admitted cohort group mean on these criteria must meet or exceed the standard that has been shown to positively correlate with measures of P-12 student learning and development.

- The provider demonstrates that the standard for high academic achievement and ability is met through multiple evaluations and sources of evidence. The provider reports the mean and standard deviation for the group.
Resources on CAEP Web Site: CAEP Accreditation Resources

- FAQ on Standard 3
- New webinar on March 29, 2016
- CAEP Standard 3.2: Research, Study and Analysis: A Report to the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation [under Standard 3 FAQs]
Types of Evidence

- Admission criteria, admitted candidate criteria, and enrollment pool of candidates’ criteria for GPA, for normed test, and any alternatives are presented.

- More explicitly, the EPP provides GPA, normed test, and any alternate measures separately for admission criteria, the admitted candidates, and the enrolled pool of candidates. In addition to the mean cohort GPA, the range/standard deviation, and percentage of students below 3.0 should be reported.

- For admissions at the undergraduate level, as freshmen, the CAEP “minimum criteria” should be interpreted as referring to high school GPA and “normed tests” as exemplified by ACT or SAT (or IB, or AP, or other normed measures).

- For admissions at the graduate level, the CAEP “minimum criteria” should be interpreted as referring to college GPA; the normed test might include GRE, MAT, or other college level indicators of academic achievement ability.
The “Sufficient” level:

- At least three cycles of data/evidence are presented and analyzed
- All/data evidence disaggregated by specialty licensure area, as well as aggregated
- Average score of each admitted cohort meets CAEP minima: GPA of 3.0 and performance on a nationally normed test of academic achievement in the top 50%
- OR similar average cohort performance using a state normed test, corresponding with a national normed test, of academic achievement in the top 50%
- OR EPP has a reliable, valid model in which the use of admissions criteria results in a positive correlation with academic achievement or positive impact on P-12 student learning
A note about data

Data charts should:

- Include the “N” for the data set broken out by year or semester
- Provide range or standard deviation
- Low enrollment programs (under 10 graduates over three years) can aggregate data by licensure area for three cycles
- Data requirement is for three cycles of data
  - Cycle is one independent collection of data using the assessment
  - Could be as long as three years (e.g., small programs that offer the course or clinical experience just once a year)
  - Could be short as three semesters (course or clinical experience is offered each semester)
  - Some data are required for a three year period (state licensure test scores)
Component 3.3: Additional Selectivity Factors

Educator preparation providers establish and monitor attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability that candidates must demonstrate at admissions and during the program. The provider selects criteria, describes the measures used and evidence of the reliability and validity of those measures, and reports data that show how the academic and non-academic factors predict candidate performance in the program and effective teaching.

Phase-In applies
Types of Evidence

- Description of non-academic factors actually used at admission and monitored during preparation.

- A description of how these non-academic factors are assessed and applied to admissions decisions.

- Demonstration of provider knowledge and use of relevant literature supporting factors selected and/or investigated. Criteria selection are based on relevant research literature and/or investigations conducted by the EPP including both quantitative and qualitative approaches.

- Measures may be related to specific specialty license areas or generally applied to all provider candidates.
The “Sufficient” level:

- At least three cycles of data/evidence are presented and analyzed
- Evidence of established non-academic criteria used at admission
- Rationale for established non-academic criteria makes evidence-based case (existing literature or provider investigations) for the selection and implementation
- Evidence that EPP monitors candidate progress on established non-academic criteria at multiple points and takes appropriate actions based on results
- Evidence of association/correlation of non-academic criteria with candidate and completer performance
Component 3.4: Selectivity During Preparation

The provider creates criteria for program progression and monitors candidates’ advancement from admissions through completion. All candidates demonstrate the ability to teach to college-and career-ready standards. Providers present multiple forms of evidence to indicate candidates’ developing content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and the integration of technology in all of these domains.
Types of Evidence

- Evidence that candidate progress is measured at two or more points during preparation (including decision points on candidate retention, assessments, provider interventions, the results, and provider explanations for actions taken) for candidates’ development of the following knowledge/skills:
  - Ability to teach to college- and career-ready standards
  - Content knowledge
  - Pedagogical content knowledge
  - Pedagogical skills
  - Integration of technology

- Use of assessments that monitor candidate proficiencies, including impact on P-12 student learning, at various points during their developmental preparation experiences (standardized measures where they are available, or periodic measures, designed and conducted by the provider to supplement other measures).
The “Sufficient” level:

- The provider documents two or more measures/gateways of candidate progression (from key decision points).

- The provider presents explicit criteria for monitoring/assessing with a focus on candidate development throughout preparation.

- Or evidence of developing proficiencies of candidates at two or more measures/gateways of candidate progression (from key decision points) in:
  - Ability to teach to college- and career-ready Standards
  - Content knowledge
  - Pedagogical content knowledge
  - Pedagogical skills
  - Integration of use of technology
Results and stated candidate progressions criteria align with evidence of actions taken such as the following:
- Changes in curriculum or clinical experiences
- Providing intervention
- Counseling outs
Component 3.5: Selection At Completion

Before the provider recommends any completing candidate for licensure or certification, it documents that the candidate has reached a high standard for content knowledge in the fields where certification is sought and can teach effectively with positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development.
Types of Evidence

- Pre-service evidence of positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development.

- Cross-reference to relevant evidence provided for component 1.1 on candidate competence and 1.3 on alignment with specialty area standards.

The evidence must include evidence of candidates’ positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development such as the following:

- Pre-service measures of candidate impact on P-12 student learning such as during methods courses, clinical experiences, and/or at exit.

- Capstone assessments (such as those including measures of pre-service impact on P-12 student learning and development as well as lesson plans, teaching artifacts, examples of student work and observations or videos judged through rubric-based reviews by trained reviewers) that sample multiple aspects of teaching including pre- and post-instruction P-12 student data.
The “Sufficient” level:

- [Evidence the same as that for 1.1]

- Evidence of effective teaching including positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development for all candidates as noted in Standard 1.
Component 3.6:

**Before** the provider **recommends** any completing candidate for licensure or certification, it **documents** that the candidate **understands** the expectations of the profession, including codes of ethics, professional standards of practice, and **relevant laws and policies**. CAEP monitors the development of measures that assess candidates’ success and revises standards in light of new results.

Phase-In applies
Types of Evidence

Documentation of candidate understanding of the profession:

- Provider measure of topic knowledge of codes of ethics, professional standards or practice and relevant laws and policies, based on course materials/assessments

- Results of national, state, or provider-created instrument to assess candidates’ understanding of special education laws (section 504 disability) code of ethics, professional standards, and similar content.

- Evidence of specialized training (e.g., bullying, state law, etc.)
The “Sufficient” level:

- Evidence documents candidates’ understanding of codes of ethics and professional standards of practice

- Evidence that candidates have knowledge of relevant laws and policies (e.g., 504 disability provisions, education regulations; bullying, etc.)
Questions?
The provider ensures that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to demonstrate positive impact on all P-12 students’ learning and development.
General Rules for Standard 2

- At least 3 cycles of data. If a revised assessment is submitted with less than 3 cycle of data, then data from the original assessment should also be provided.
  - Cycles of data must be sequential and the latest available.

- EPP-created assessments should be rated at the level of “sufficient”.

- All components must be addressed in the self-study.
  - There are no components in standard 2 that MUST be met.
Component 2.1: Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

- Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements, including technology-based collaborations, for clinical preparation and share responsibility for continuous improvement of candidate preparation.

- Partnerships for clinical preparation can follow a range of forms, participants, and functions. They establish mutually agreeable expectations for candidate entry, preparation, and exit; ensure that theory and practice are linked; maintain coherence across clinical and academic components of preparation; and share accountability for candidate outcomes.
Possible types of evidence

- Memoranda of Understanding or Agreement (MOU/A)
- Common expectations for all candidates developed by partners and EPP
- History of collaboratively designed observation/evaluation tools
- Field experience/clinical practice handbooks (section specific to the partnerships, NOT the entire handbook)
- Schedule of joint meetings between partners and purpose/topics covered in the meetings, description of outcomes of those meetings
- Alignment of coursework with field experiences and expectations, providing opportunities for candidates to observe and implement effective teaching strategies linked to coursework
2.1: Sufficient Level

- All general rules for the standard are met.
- The provider presents evidence that P-12 schools and EPPs have both benefitted from the partnership.
- The provider presents evidence that a collaborative process is in place and is reviewed annually.
- The provider regularly (at least twice a year) seeks input from P-12 teachers and/or administrators on candidate preparation, including developing or refining criteria for entry/exit into clinical experiences.
Providers document a shared responsibility model that includes these components:

- Co-construction of instruments and evaluations
- Co-construction of criteria for selection of mentor teachers
- Involvement in on-going decision-making
- Input into curriculum development
- EPP and P-12 educators provide descriptive feedback to candidates
- Opportunities for candidates to observe and implement effective teaching strategies linked to coursework.
Component 2.2: Clinical Educators

- Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators, both provider- and school-based, who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates’ development and P-12 student learning and development. In collaboration with their partners, providers use multiple indicators and appropriate technology-based applications to establish, maintain, and refine criteria for selection, professional development, performance evaluation, continuous improvement and retention of clinical educators in all clinical placement settings.
Possible Types of Evidence

- Criteria for management and evaluations of clinical faculty
  - Performance evaluations are shared
  - Records of counseling out of clinical educator roles

- Clinical educator training/coaching in person and online

- Joint curriculum/professional development/design/redesign

- Surveys of clinical educators and candidates of quality and consistency
  - Data are collected and used for modifying clinical experiences
Sufficient Level

- EPP and P-12 clinical educators and/or administrators co-construct criteria for selection of clinical educators and make co-selections.

- School-based clinical educators evaluate EPP-based clinical educators and candidates and share results.

- EPP-based clinical educators and candidates evaluate school-based clinical educators and share results.
- EPPs and P-12 clinical educators use data collected to modify selection criteria, determine future assignments of candidates, and make changes in clinical experiences.

- Supervisory resources and professional development opportunities are available on-line to ensure access to all clinical educators.

- All clinical educators receive professional development and are involved in creating of professional development opportunities on the use of evaluation instruments, evaluating professional disposition of candidates, setting specific goals/objectives of the clinical experience, and providing feedback.
Component 2.3: Clinical Experiences

- The provider works with partners to design clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration to ensure that candidates demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students’ learning and development.

- Clinical experiences, including technology enhanced learning opportunities, are structured to have multiple performance-based assessments at key points within the program to demonstrate candidates’ development of the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, as delineated in Standard 1, that are associated with a positive impact on the learning and development of all P-12 students.
Possible Types of Evidence

- Evidence documents that all candidates have active clinical experiences in diverse settings
  - Description of clinical experience goals and operational design and documentation that clinical experiences are implemented as described

- Scope and sequence matrix is provided that charts the depth, breadth, and diversity of clinical experiences

- Experiences are deliberate, purposeful, sequential, and assessed using performance-based protocols.

- Evidence documents the relationship between clinical experiences and coursework (coherence)
This is an idea as a way to demonstrate depth, breadth and coherence, etc.

- CAEP is proposing that for this Component the EPP fill out several charts:
  - Types of Clinical Experiences
    - Duration and diversity experiences
    - Objectives for each clinical experience
    - Assessments aligned with objectives
    - Any required use of technology
    - Same information for licensure areas

- Look at the powerpoint presentation for Standard 2 in the Spring 2016 CAEP Conference
Possible Types of Evidence

- Evidence documents that candidates have used technology to enhance instruction and assessment
  - Use of technology is by both candidates and students
  - Specific criteria for appropriate use of technology are identified
- Clinical experiences are assessed using performance-based criteria
  - Candidates are assessed and monitored throughout the program with data supporting increasing levels of candidate competency
  - Clinical experiences are assessed using performance-based criteria
  - Evidence documents a sequence of clinical experiences that are focused, purposeful, and varied with specific goals for each experience
Sufficient Level

- Evidence documents that all candidates have active clinical experiences in diverse settings.

- Attributes (depth, breath, diversity, coherence, and duration) are linked to student outcomes and candidate performance. Standard 1 evidence shows that candidates have purposefully assessed impact on student learning using both formative and summative assessments in more than one clinical setting and have:
  - used two comparison points,
  - used the impact data to guide instructional decision-making,
  - modified instruction based on impact data, and
  - have differentiated instruction.

- Evidence documents that both candidates and students have used technology to enhance learning
Evidence documents that candidates have used technology to track student progress and growth.

Specific criteria for appropriate use of technology are identified.

Evidence documents a sequence of clinical experiences with specific goals that are focused, purposeful, and varied.

Clinical experiences include focused teaching experience where specific strategies are practiced.
Clinical experiences are assessed using performance-based criteria.

Candidates are assessed throughout the program with data supporting increasing levels of candidate competency.

Evidence documents the relationship between clinical experiences and coursework (coherence).
Over-arching questions reviewers will ask

- Are candidates having direct experiences in a variety of settings with P-12 students? How have candidates learned whether the students are learning?

- Is there evidence that the curriculum is integrated across courses and clinical experiences –emphasizing the same topics, illustrating the same perspectives?

- Is there evidence that collaboration between EPP and school faculty is yielding constructive learning experiences for candidates?

- Are the opportunities for candidates to practice and reflect advancing candidate preparation as intended?

- Are there assessments at key points to demonstrate candidate developing skills, knowledge and dispositions? What evidence do the assessment show specific to candidate growth?
Questions?
Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

- The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career readiness standards.
General Rules for Standard 1

- All data must be disaggregated by specialty licensure area for Standard 1.
- At least three cycles of data must be submitted and analyzed. If a revised assessment is submitted with less than 3 cycles of data, data from the original assessment should be submitted.
- Cycles of data must be sequential and be the latest available.
- EPP-created assessments should be scored at the CAEP Sufficient Level as defined on the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric.
- All components must be addressed in the self study.
- Evidence from Standard 1 is cited in support of continuous improvement and part of an overall system of review (Standard 5).
- There are no required components for Standard 1.
Component 1.1

- Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the 10 InTASC standards at the appropriate progression level(s) in the following categories: the learner and learning; content; instructional practice; and professional responsibility.
Possible Types of Evidence
EPP-created

- Clinical experience observation instrument
- Lesson and unit plans
- Portfolios
- Teacher work samples
- GPA (for courses specific to the learner such as developmental psychology, motor development, etc.)
- Dispositional and professional responsibility data
- Comparisons of education and other IHE attendees on provider end-of-major projects or demonstrations (if applicable to provider);
- End-of-key-course tests

- Pre-service measures of candidate impact on P-12 student learning such as during methods courses, clinical experiences, and/or at exit

- Capstone assessments (such as those including measures of pre-service impact on P-12 student learning and development as well as lesson plans, teaching artifacts, examples of student work and observations or videos judged through rubric-based reviews by trained reviewers) that sample multiple aspects of teaching including pre-and post-instruction

- P-12 student data
Possible state-created

- Relevant surveys or assessments

- Licensure measures, such as
  - Praxis and/or Pearson online, Pearson/State
  - Pedagogical content knowledge licensure test such as Praxis PLT
  - Proprietary assessments that may or may not be required by the state (such as edTPA and PPAT)
  - Other examples: Massachusetts Tests for Educator Licensure, Elementary General curriculum; Pearson Foundations of Reading; Connecticut/Pearson Foundations of Reading licensure test
- Other specialty content tests
- GRE field tests (limited fields: biochemistry, cell and molecular biology, biology, chemistry, computer science, literature in English, mathematics, physics, psychology); ETS major field tests
Sufficient level

- All four of the InTASC categories are addressed with multiple indicators across the four categories.

- The InTASC category of Instructional Practice is addressed from clinical experiences.

- Multiple indicators/measures specific to application of content knowledge in clinical settings are identified with performance at or above the acceptable level on rubric indicators.

- Analysis of data/evidence includes identification of trends/patterns, comparisons, and/or differences.

- Data/evidences supports interpretations and conclusions.

- Class average at or above acceptable levels on the EPP scoring guide indicators specific to the four categories of InTASC Standards.
- If applicable, providers demonstrate that candidate performance is comparable to non-candidate performance in the same courses or majors.

- Specialty licensure area performance indicates competency and is benchmarked against the average licensure area performance of other providers (comparisons are made with scaled scores and/or state/national data when available).
Component 1.2

Providers ensure that candidates use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession and use both to measure their P-12 students’ progress and their own professional practice.
Measures or Types of Evidence

- Work sample
- Provider-created or proprietary assessments
- Pre- and post-data and reflections on the interpretation and use of data
- Portfolio (including assessment of assignments made to students and artifacts produced)
Sufficient Level

- Data/evidence document effective candidate use of research and evidence for planning, implementing, and evaluating P-12 students’ progress, with performance at or above acceptable level on rubric indicators.

- Data/evidence document effective candidate use of data to reflect on teaching effectiveness and their own professional practice with performance at or above the acceptable level on rubric indicators.

- Data/evidence document effective candidate use of data to assess P-12 student progress and to modify instruction based on student data (data literacy), with performance at or above acceptable level on rubric indicators.
Component 1.3

Providers ensure that candidates apply content and pedagogical knowledge as reflected in outcome assessments in response to standards of Specialized Professional Associations (SPA), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), states, or other accrediting bodies (e.g., National Association of Schools of Music – NASM).
Types of Evidence

- SPA reports
- Other specialty area accreditor reports
- Specialty area-specific state standards achieved OR evidence of alignment of assessments to other state/national standards
- Number of completers who have been awarded National Board Certified Teacher (NBCT) status by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS)
Sufficient Level

- The provider presents at least one source of evidence that candidates apply content and pedagogical knowledge at specialty licensure area levels (SPA or state reports, disaggregated specialty licensure area data, NBCT actions, etc.).

- A majority (51% or above) of SPA program reports have achieved National Recognition.

- OR documentation is provided on periodic state review program level outcome data.
- Answers specific to specialty licensure area questions are complete and supported by an analysis and accurate interpretation of specialty licensure area data.

- The providers makes comparisons and identifies trends across specialty licensure areas based on data.

- Assessments submitted for the Program Review with Feedback option are at the minimal level of sufficiency.
Component 1.4

Providers ensure that candidates demonstrate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college- and career-ready standards (e.g., Next Generation Science Standards, National Career Readiness Certificate, Common Core State Standards).
Types of Evidence

- Observational instruments
- Lesson or unit plans
- Work samples
- Portfolios (such as edTPA or PPAT)
Sufficient Level

- Multiple indicators/measures specific to evaluating proficiencies for college- and career-readiness are scored at or above the EPP scoring guide indicators at the minimal level of sufficiency (acceptable level):
  - candidates’ ability to provide effective instruction for all students (differentiation of instruction).
  - candidates’ ability to have students apply knowledge to solve problems and think critically.
  - candidates’ ability to include cross-discipline learning experiences and to teach for transfer of skills.
  - candidates’ ability to design and implement learning experiences that require collaboration and communication skills.
Component 1.5

Providers ensure that candidates model and apply technology standards as they design, implement, and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning; and enrich professional practice.
Types of Evidence

- Clinical experience observation instrument
- Lesson or unit plan assessments
- Portfolios
- Work sample with exhibition of applications and use of technology in instruction
- Technology course signature project/assignment.
Exiting candidates model and apply technology standards (e.g., ISTE) in coursework and clinical experiences.

Candidates demonstrate knowledge and skill proficiencies including accessing databases, digital media, and/or electronic sources with performance at or above the acceptable level on rubric indicators.

Candidates demonstrate the ability to design and facilitate digital learning with performance at or above the acceptable level on rubric indicators.

Candidates demonstrate the ability to track and share student performance data digitally with performance at or above the acceptable level on rubric indicators.
Questions?
Standard 5

The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates’ and completers’ positive impact on P-12 student learning and development.

The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers’ impact on P-12 student learning and development.
General Rules

- All phase-in requirements are met.
- Components 5.3 and 5.4 are required.
- At least three cycles of data must be submitted and analyzed. If a revised assessment is submitted with less than 3 cycles of data, the data from the original assessment should be submitted.
- Cycles of data must be sequential and be the latest available.
- EPP-created assessments should be scored at the CAEP Sufficient Level as defined on the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric.
- All components must be addressed in the self study.
Component 5.1

The provider’s quality assurance system is comprised of multiple measures that can monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness. Evidence demonstrates that the provider satisfies all CAEP standards.
Types of Evidence
Document the QA System

- A description of how the evidence submitted in Standards 1-4 and other provider data are collected, analyzed, monitored, and reported.

- Evidence of system capabilities including support for data-driven change (e.g., data can be disaggregated by specialty license area and/or candidate level as appropriate), application across and within specialty license areas, and ability to disaggregate data by relevant aspects of EPP management and policy (e.g., usefulness).

- Schedule and process for continuous review, together with roles and responsibilities of system users.
Sufficient Level

- The provider uses evidence/data from a coherent set of multiple measures to inform, modify, and evaluate EPP’s operational effectiveness.

- The provider submits evidence that it regularly reviews system operations and data.

- The provider evidence shows that the system has the capacity to collect, analyze, monitor, and report data/evidence on all 2013 CAEP Standards.
- Provider evidence documents that the system supports disaggregation of data by specialty licensure area and other dimensions (e.g., over time, by race/ethnicity, gender, etc.).

- Provider evidence shows that the system supports the ability to monitor operational effectiveness (e.g., setting program priorities and data tracking).

- The provider documents evidence of appropriate access and use by a variety of users for various purposes.
Component 5.2

- The provider’s quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations of data are valid and consistent.
Types of Evidence

Documentation for assessment instruments and data files

- Description of developmental steps in constructing instruments
- Empirical/analytical data supporting the use of the instrument for its intended purposes
- Formal study of the alignment of instruments with their intended goals
- Implementation procedures and context
- Empirical evidence that interpretations of data are consistent and valid
- If applicable, results of optional Early Assessment Evaluation review of instruments and scoring guides and actions taken as a result.
Sufficient Level

- At least 50% of EPP created assessments used in the quality assurance system are scored at the minimal level of sufficiency as defined by the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric.

- Documentation that EPP-created assessments (except for surveys) have –
  - established content validity, and
  - inter-rater reliability or agreement is at .80 or 80% or above (except for surveys)
  - for surveys, questions align to standards.
Provider documents that evidence (as defined in the CAEP Evidence Guide) is characterized by the following attributes:

- relevant (related to standard)
- verifiable (accuracy of sample)
- representative (specificity on sample characteristics)
- cumulative (generally 3 cycles or more), and
- actionable (in a form to guide program improvement).
Provider documents that interpretations of evidence are consistent, accurate, and supported by data/evidence.
Component 5.3 (Required)

- The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes.
Types of Evidence

- Providers document regular and systematic data-driven changes drawn on research and evidence from the field and data analyses from the provider’s own evidence from its quality assurance systems and from the 2013 CAEP Standards, as well as changes tied to provider’s goals and relevant standards.

- Well-planned tests of selection criteria and each data-driven change to determine whether or not the results of the changes are improvements should include:
  - baseline(s),
  - intervention,
  - tracking over time
  - rationale for conclusions
  - comparison(s) of results, and
  - next steps taken and/or planned.

- If applicable, providers document use of results of optional Early Instrument Evaluation review; base next steps on test from component 2.3.
Sufficient Level

- The provider documents that it regularly and systematically
  - reviews quality assurance system data,
  - identifies patterns across preparation programs (both strengths and weaknesses),
  - uses data/evidence for continuous improvement, and tests innovations.

- Most (80% or more) change and program modifications are linked back to evidence/data with specific examples provided.
- Evidence/data from Standards 1 through 4 are cited and applied.

- The provider documents explicit investigation of selection criteria used for Standard 3 in relation to candidate progress and completion.

- The provider documents evidence that data-driven changes are ongoing and based on systematic assessment of performance, and/or that innovations result in overall positive trends of improvement for EPPs, their candidates, and P-12 students.
Component 5.4 (Required)

Measures of completer impact, including available outcome data on P-12 student growth, are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction.
Types of Evidence

Providers document results from monitoring and using the CAEP 8 annual reporting measures as defined in the EPP Annual Report call and in state partnership agreements.

- **Impact measures:**
  1. P-12 student learning/development
  2. Observations of teaching effectiveness
  3. Employer satisfaction and completer persistence
  4. Completer satisfaction

- **Outcome measures:**
  5. Completer or graduation rate
  6. Licensure rate
  7. Employment rate
  8. Consumer information. (CAEP does not use consumer information in accreditation decisions)
Other evidence of EPP impact apart from the eight (8) annual measures.

For above evidence, include
- analysis of trends,
- comparisons with benchmarks,
- indication of changes made in EPP preparation curricula and experiences,
- how/where/with whom results are shared
- resource allocations, and
- future directions.
CAEP’s eight (8) outcome and impact measures are systematically monitored and reported together with
- relevant analysis of trends
- comparisons with benchmarks
- evidence of corresponding resource allocations,
And
- alignment of results to future directions anticipated.

Evidence that the eight (8) annual outcome and impact measures and their trends are posted on the EPP website and in other ways widely shared.

Program changes and modifications are linked to EPP’s own evidence/data for topics described in the eight (8) annual measures.
Component 5.5

The provider assures that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider, are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence.
Types of Evidence

- Providers document that stakeholders are involved.
- Describe stakeholders and roles as relevant to specific examples of shared decision making and results, and evaluation, and selection and implementation of changes for improvement.
Sufficient Level

- Provider documents specific evidence of diverse stakeholder involvement through multiple sources in each of the following areas:
  - decision-making,
  - program evaluation, and
  - selection and implementation of changes for improvement.

- EPP identifies at least two examples of input from stakeholders and use of that input.
Questions?