

**CAEP Conference  
Spring 2016  
Meeting CAEP Standards**

This handout presents some key features regarding how evidence for meeting CAEP Standards for Accreditation will be evaluated. These evaluation “look-fors” inform both what site visitors will seek to verify and what Accreditation Council members will use as the basis for their decisions about accreditation status as well as Areas for Improvement (AFIs) and Stipulations.

These criteria listed below can best be understood as the frame (or set of sufficiency targets for which to aim), but should not be approached by EPPs – and will not be approached by site visitors or Councilors – as a list of requirements which must all be met for the component or standard to be successfully addressed. Criteria are presented for each component and can assist with determinations of whether an AFI or stipulation is warranted, but decisions about whether standard are met are based on the preponderance of the evidence across components, with the exception of the required components which must be met for the standard in which they are situated to be considered met.

The required components are 3.2, all components of Standard 4 (4.1-4.4), and two of the *continuous improvement* components of Standard 5 (5.3 and 5.4). In the case of these components, the preponderance of evidence relates to the weight of evidence for meeting the set of sufficiency targets within the component.

To aid understanding of preponderance as it relates to the standard as a whole, each standard has a set of general rules. Those that are common across components are presented below as Common General Rules for CAEP Standards and the additional rules that are unique to each standard are presented as Special Rules for each standard.

### **Common General Rules for all CAEP Standards**

- All components of each standard must be addressed in the self study report
- 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 rubric.

### **STANDARD 1**

#### **Special Rules for Standard 1 (in addition to the [General Rules](#)):**

- All data must be disaggregated by specialty licensure area for Standard 1.
- 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.

## Standard 1 Sufficiency Criteria:

### Component 1.1

- At least three cycles of data/evidence are presented and analyzed
- All four of the InTASC categories are addressed with multiple indicators across the four categories
- InTASC category of Instructional Practice is addressed from clinical experiences
- Multiple indicators/measures specific to application of content knowledge in clinical settings are identified
- Data/evidence are analyzed including identification of trends/patterns, comparisons, and/or differences
- Interpretations and conclusions are supported by data/evidence
- Class average at or above acceptable levels on the EPP scoring guide indicators specific to the four categories of InTASC Standards for each specialty licensure area
- If applicable, demonstration that candidate performance is comparable to non-candidates 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

- At least three cycles of data/evidence are presented and analyzed
- Data/evidence document effective candidate use of research and evidence for planning, implementing, and evaluating 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
- 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

- At least three cycles of data/evidence are presented and analyzed
- 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 of 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
- Comparisons are made and trends are identified 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

- At least three cycles of data/evidence are presented and analyzed
- 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:
  - Candidate's ability to provide effective instruction for all students (differentiation of instruction)
  - Candidate's ability to have students apply knowledge to solve problems and think critically
  - Candidate's ability to include cross-discipline learning experiences and to teach for transfer of skills
  - Candidate's ability to design and implement learning experiences that require collaboration and communication skills

### Component 1.5

- At least three cycles of data/evidence are presented and analyzed
- 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

- Candidates demonstrate the ability to design and facilitate digital learning
- Candidates demonstrate the ability to track and share student performance data digitally

## STANDARD 2

### Special Rules for Standard 2 (in addition to the [General Rules](#)):

- There are no required components for Standard 2.

### Standard 2 Sufficiency Criteria:

#### Component 2.1

- Evidence that P-12 schools and EPPs have both benefitted from the partnership
- Evidence that a collaborative process is in place and is reviewed annually
- Input from P-12 teachers and/or administrators is regularly (at least twice a year) sought for candidate preparation including criteria for entry/exit into clinical experiences
- Documentation is provided for a shared responsibility model that includes the components listed
  - 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

- 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 results are shared
- EPP-based clinical educators and candidates evaluate school-based clinical educators and results are shared
- Data collected are used by EPPs and P-12 clinical educators for modification of selection criteria, determining future assignments of candidates, and changes in clinical experiences
- 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 creation of professional development opportunities on the use of evaluation instruments, professional disposition evaluation of candidates, specific goals/objectives of the clinical experience, and providing feedback

#### Component 2.3

- 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/completer performance documented in Standards 1 and 4
- Evidence documents that candidate have purposefully assessed impact on student learning and development with both formative and summative assessments in more than one clinical setting:
  - used two comparison points
  - used the impact data to guide instructional decision-making
  - modified instruction based on impact data
  - differentiate instruction
- Evidence documents that both candidates and students have used technology to enhance learning, track progress, and assess growth
- Specific criteria for appropriate use of technology are identified
- Evidence documents a sequence of clinical experiences that are focused, purposeful, and varied with specific goals
- 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)

### STANDARD 3

#### Special Rules for Standard 3 (in addition to the [General Rules](#)):

- Meeting Component 3.2 is required in order to meet Standard 3.

#### Standard 3 Sufficiency Criteria:

##### Component 3.1

- Recruitment plan, based on mission, with base points and goals (including academic ability, diversity, and employment needs) for five years
- Data on applicants, admittees, and enrolled candidates are disaggregated by relevant demographics including race/ethnicity, SES, and/or sex
- Evidence that results are recorded, monitored, and used in planning and modification of recruitment strategies
- Plan and demonstrates knowledge of and 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
- Evidence that influence of employment opportunities on enrollment patterns is monitored
- Evidence that plan and its implementation moved toward greater workforce diversity and ability

##### Component 3.2

- At least three cycles of data/evidence are presented and analyzed
- 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 measures of P-12 student learning

##### Component 3.3

- All/data evidence disaggregated by specialty licensure area, as well as aggregated
- 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

- At least three cycles of data/evidence are presented and analyzed
- Two or more measures/gateways of candidate progression (from key decision points) are documented
- Explicit criteria for monitoring/assessing with a focus on candidate development throughout preparation
- Evidence of candidates developing proficiencies in:
- 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:
  - Changes in curriculum or clinical experiences
  - Providing interventions
  - Counseling out

### Component 3.5

- [Evidence is 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

- 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.)

## STANDARD 4

### Special Rules for Standard 4 (in addition to the [General Rules](#)):

- All components for Standard 4 must be met for the standard to be considered met.
- All phase-in requirements are met.

### Standard 4 Sufficiency Criteria:

#### Component 4.1

- One or more measures of state-provided impact data are provided at the in-service level (multiple measures are required)
- **OR** at least two measures of impact data, utilizing research-based methodology, from a representative or purposive sample of candidates are provided at the in-service level (cases studies, action research, etc.)
- Analysis and interpretation of evidence are appropriate and conclusions are supported by data
- Context and description of the source of P-12 learning data are provided
- Description and explanation are provided on the representativeness of the data

#### Component 4.2

- Observation and/or student survey assessments measure the application of professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions associated with teaching effectiveness
- Observation utilized a representative sample inclusive of most licensure areas
- Survey return rates were at acceptable levels (20% or above) and inclusive of most licensure areas in the EPP
- Validity descriptions were appropriate and specific types of validity were identified
- Interpretations of data were valid and supported by results

#### Component 4.3

- Evidence employers perceive completers' preparation was sufficient for their job responsibilities
- Appropriate provider analysis and interpretation of results
- A system for the analysis, evaluation, and interpretation of data was described and conclusions were supported by the data
- Documentation is provided that the
  - System was identified for gathering data
  - Adequate response rates (20% or more) were achieved
  - Description was provided on the representativeness of the sample

- Data specific to high need schools
- Data specific to licensure areas were provided
- Comparison points for data were provided
- Employment milestones including promotion, employment trajectory, and retention were provided for at least some completers and were analyzed appropriately

#### **Component 4.4**

- Evidence completers perceive their preparation was sufficient for their job responsibilities
- Appropriate provider analysis and interpretation of results
- Adequate and representative sample reflected in response
- Adequate response rates (20% or more) were achieved
- Analysis and interpretation of data are appropriate and conclusions are supported by the data
- Documentation is provided that
  - the system was identified for gathering data,
  - adequate response rates (20% or more) were achieved
  - the description was provided on the representativeness of the sample
  - multiple comparison points (where possible) and/or trends over time were identified

### **STANDARD 5**

#### **Special Rules for Standard 5 (in addition to the [General Rules](#)):**

- Components 5.3 and 5.4 are required.
- All phase-in requirements are met.

#### **Standard 5 Sufficiency Criteria:**

##### **Component 5.1**

- Evidence/data from a coherent set of multiple measures are used to inform, modify, and evaluate EPP's operational effectiveness
- Evidence the system operations and data are regularly reviewed
- Evidence the system has the capacity to collect, analyze, monitor, and report data/evidence on all CAEP Standards
- Evidence that the system supports disaggregation of data by specialty licensure area and other dimensions (e.g., over time, by race/ethnicity, gender, etc.)
- System supports the ability to monitor operational effectiveness (e.g., setting program priorities and data tracking)

##### **Component 5.2**

- At least 75% of EPP created assessments used in quality assurance system are scored at the minimal level of sufficiency as defined by the CAEP Assessment Rubric
- Documentation that EPP-created assessments (except for surveys) have:
  - established content validity
  - inter-rater reliability or agreement at .80 or 80% or above (except for surveys)
  - for surveys, questions align to standards
- Documentation that evidence (as defined in CAEP Evidence Guide) is:
  - Relevant (related to standard)
  - Verifiable (accuracy of sample)
  - Representative (specificity on sample characteristics)
  - Cumulative (generally 3 cycles or more)
  - Actionable (in a form to guide program improvement)
  - Documentation that interpretations of evidence are consistent, accurate, and supported by data/evidence

**Component 5.3**

- Documentation that EPP regularly and systematically does the following:
  - reviews quality assurance system data
  - identifies patterns across preparation programs (both strengths and weaknesses)
  - uses data/evidence for continuous improvement
  - 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
- Documentation of explicit and appropriate investigation of selection criteria used for Standard 3 in relation to candidate progress and completion
- Evidence that data-driven changes are ongoing and based on systematic assessment of performance and/or innovations result in overall positive trends of improvement for EPPs, their candidates, and P-12 students

**Component 5.4**

- CAEP's 8 outcome and impact measures are appropriately monitored and reported together with the following:
  - Accurate analysis of trends
  - Comparisons with benchmarks
  - Evidence of corresponding resource allocations
  - Future direction is informed by data
- Evidence that the 8 outcome and impact measures and their trends are posted on the EPP website and in other ways widely shared
- Program changes and modifications are directly linked to evidence/data with specific examples

**Component 5.5**

- Specific evidence of diverse stakeholder involvement is documented through multiple sources in each of these areas:
  - Decision-making
  - Program evaluation
  - Selection and implementation of changes for improvement
- EPP identifies at least two examples of input from stakeholders and use of that input