Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

CAEP HANDBOOK

INITIAL-LEVEL PROGRAMS 2018

May 2018

Based on *CAEP Standards for Initial-Licensure Programs*
Adopted by the CAEP Board of Directors August 2013 and Amended June 2016

NOTICE: This handbook is effective for self-study reports submitted by EPPs preparing for site visits scheduled Fall 2019-Spring 2020.

Site visits scheduled prior to Fall 2019 should review the 2016 Accreditation Handbook.

The handbook will be updated in 2019 for site visits scheduled Fall 2020 and beyond.

1140 19th Street, NW Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036 caepnet.org

The 2018 Initial-Level Handbook is published for Site Visits Fall 2019-Spring 2020, Effective May, 2018

Contents

PREFACE

The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) made a commitment in 2016 to develop a revised accreditation process. We have been fortunate to hear from educator preparation program faculty and administration, participants in CAEPCon sessions, members of the Accreditation Council, and our board members about ways to improve CAEP's procedures. This CAEP Handbook: Initial-Level Programs 2018, has been designed for you, the educator preparation provider (EPP) team, for guidance on how best to make your case for meeting the CAEP Standards for Initial Programs. We are laying out a unified accreditation process in a streamlined fashion, eliminating redundancies and providing greater clarity.

You will note that Standard 5 is presented first, with Standards 1-4 following in sequence. Standard 5 appears in this position to signify its unique role in CAEP's Accreditation Standards. The Quality Assurance System described in Standard 5 provides evidence of candidate and completer outcomes that is essential for continuous improvement.

We also provide clarity on what it means to meet Standard 1. This standard is constructed around specialized content and pedagogical content knowledge as well as the skills to apply this knowledge with all P-12 students. In addition, the handbook specifically addresses how the CAEP cross-cutting themes of diversity and applications of technology are woven throughout the CAEP Standards and it provides you with guidance on how to address these themes in your self-study report.

This handbook is meant to inform you and your colleagues, as an EPP team conducting an accreditation self-study of your programs and preparing the self-study report at the initial-licensure level. As part of the development of this resource CAEP sought input from EPPs during March, 2018. CAEP Staff have thoroughly reviewed the comments and made adjustments in this final version.

Christopher A. Koch

President

May 2018

CAEP HANDBOOK: Initial-Level Programs 2018

The CAEP Handbook: Initial-Level Programs 2018 is designed as a resource to be used by educator preparation providers (EPPs) conducting self-studies and writing self-study reports for accreditation at the initial-licensure level. It is linked, explicitly, to CAEP Standards for Initial-Licensure Programs adopted by the Board of Directors in August 2013 and amended in June 2016.

CAEP's accreditation procedures link standards and their components together with rigorous evidence. The combination creates an outcomes- and evidence-informed process that investigates the health of quality assurance systems to nurture continuous improvement and innovation. The CAEP Standards for Initial-Licensure Programs and the accreditation procedures emphasize effective clinical preparation in partnership with P-12 schools and districts, thus providing relevant experiences to address employer needs. They call for selection of capable and diverse candidates and continuous monitoring of candidate progress, providing support when needed, to ensure successful completion. And they call for proficiencies in the content knowledge candidates are preparing to teach and in candidate abilities to apply that knowledge effectively. The driving focus is the results—teachers who are prepared for classroom practice and who ensure effective opportunities for our nation's diverse P-12 student population.

Although this handbook includes excerpts and references to the 2013 CAEP Standards for Initial-Licensure Programs and to accreditation policy, changes are made from time to time in CAEP Standards and policies. These changes often have a direct effect on procedures that will guide accreditation reviews and decisions. EPPs and states will want to ensure they stay abreast of such changes, which can be found at CAEP's website.

CAEP publishes a number of guidance documents including, but not limited to the CAEP handbooks and assessment frameworks, which provide EPPs with additional information on the process and criteria used in the evaluation of evidence. In any section of this document that references or quotes CAEP bylaws, accreditation policy, or governace policy, the language of the ratified bylaws or policy shall supersede the language contained in the handbook.

A. Scope of Accreditation, Initial-Licensure Programs

Accreditation Policy Overview

Accreditation Policy Section III: Scope of Accreditation establishes the scope of accreditation for Initial-Licensure Programs. The policy, with an excerpt from its introductory paragraph, reads as follows:

> Section III. Scope of Accreditation
> [excerpt] The scope of CAEP's work is the accreditation of Educator Preparation Providers (EPP) having programs leading to certification/licensure,[1] bachelor's, master's, post-baccalaureate, and doctoral degrees in the United States and internationally. CAEP reviews the following:

[1] States use different terminology for licensure and certification.

1. All specialty licensure areas that prepare candidates to work in preschool (4 years and above) through grade 12 settings and lead to professional licensure, certification, or endorsement.
2. Programs designed for the preparation of educators for employment in P-12 schools/districts for which the state or country requires national or state program review.

Policy 3.01 Initial-Licensure Programs
[Excerpt] Initial Programs are defined by CAEP as programs at the baccalaureate or post-baccalaureate levels leading to initial licensure, certification, or endorsement that are designed to develop P-12 teachers…

Guidance

EPPs seeking accreditation submit self-study reports describing their accomplishments using the 2013 CAEP Standards (as amended, June 2016) for Initial-Licensure Programs.

B. Preparing For and Writing a Self-Study Report

Accreditation Policy Overview

Accreditation Policy Section V. Accreditation Process describes steps that make up the CAEP Accreditation process, including the submission of a self-study report (SSR) containing the EPP's evidence of meeting CAEP Standards, components and cross-cutting themes, and, for EPPs seeking continuous accreditation, evidence that any previously identified areas for improvement or stipulations from a prior accreditation decision have been addressed.

Policy 5.03 Self-Study Report (SSR)
At least nine (9) months prior to its scheduled site visit, an EPP submits a self-study report to CAEP. The site team reviews the SSR and provides feedback to the EPP through a Formative Feedback Report (FFR). The EPP is allowed to submit an addendum to the SSR in response to the FFR based on the feedback. The self-study report, formative feedback report, and addendum are submitted to the site team for review. The self-study report presents the following:

a. Complete evidence for all CAEP Standards, components and cross-cutting themes
b. Complete evidence for the capacity areas identified by the U.S. Department of Education (USED)
c. Complete evidence that each of these areas has been examined and evaluated in relation to distance-education programs if applicable

Accreditation Policy Section III, Scope of Accreditation requires that an EPP with programs at both the initial-licensure and advanced-level are to submit a single self-study report. If the SSR addresses programs at both levels, the Accreditation Council will make two separate accreditation decisions for the EPP—one at each level. The accreditation policy statements relative to a single self-study report are quoted below. [NOTE: Language explicit to a single report with two decisions is in **bold font.**]

Excerpt from Section III, Scope of Accreditation, introduction
EPPs with programs at both the initial-licensure and advanced-level are required to have all such programs reviewed on the same cycle. **The EPP will submit a single self-study report and receive two separate accreditation decisions (one for initial-licensure and one for advanced-level).**

Policy 3.01 Initial-Licensure Programs
[Excerpt] . . . **All programs offered by the EPP that fall within CAEP's scope must be submitted in a single self-study report that addresses CAEP Standards for Initial-Licensure Programs.** First-time licensure areas beyond teaching that are limited to advanced level degrees for other school professionals, such as reading specialists, are addressed in the section that follows.

See CAEP Handbook: Guidance on Self-Study Reports for Accreditation at the Advanced-Level for additional guidance on submission of a single SSR.

Guidance

The self-study process is the mechanism through which you evaluate your programs and prepare your case for accreditation. The process allows for focused reflection, includes steps for improvement, and serves as a means of accountability to your stakeholders. A self-study report documents the results from that process and demonstrates how you are meeting each of the five CAEP Standards, along with diversity and technology themes. CAEP offers the following suggestions for how you *might* proceed to conduct your self-study in relation to the CAEP Standards. Internally, you will engage collaboratively in considerable work prior to developing the narrative for the self-study report outlining the program you have designed and compiling the evidence in support of sufficiently meeting the five CAEP Standards.

B.1 Conducting self-studies

1. **Review**. You should study and understand the 2013 CAEP Standards for Initial-Licensure Programs, including the accompanying components. Use the CAEP explanations and guidelines in this document, refer to the glossary for definitions (see Appendix E and this URL: http://caepnet.org/glossary), and access www.caepnet.org for the most up-to-date guidance on evidence for the self-study report.

2. **Inventory available evidence**. Consider developing an inventory of the evidence currently used on candidate and completer performance and other CAEP requirements. Note what evidence is relied upon and used, what is not available or used, and what may still need to be collected. Determine whether each assessment has undergone a review under CAEP's Evaluation Framework for EPP Created Assessments and, if not, undertake such a review. Information from the assessment sufficiency review can help you determine what programs or practices you need to improve.

3. **Gather information, prepare evidence to be uploaded, draft tables to be completed, and review the digital SSR template**. Invest time in examining the evidence thoroughly. CAEP suggests that you begin to categorize your evidence by the standards and components where they apply. You should also refer to the digital template that has been established for you, reading through the labels that appear there with cells to be filled in to compile the digital self-study report. The sections of the

report include the following:

(I) Your overview. This contains your guide to the self-study report, including (a) the context and unique characteristics; (b) description of your organizational structure, (c) your vision, mission, and goals, and (d) your shared values and beliefs for educator preparation. You are then asked to provide data and descriptions on:

- Your host institution regional or institutional accreditation [NOTE: If your host institution is not eligible for regional accreditation, refer to accreditation policy 401.a. If your EPP is located outside of the United States, refer to accreditation policy 401.a and also 401.d found here: http://caepnet.org/~/media/Files/caep/accreditation-resources/accreditation-policy.pdf?la=en];
- Each preparation program offered (name, enrollment, degree level, certification, delivery mode, location and program review option) (Table 2);
- A table on your EPP's characteristics (Table 3);
- A table detailing qualifications of clinical faculty (by degrees, specialty, assignment, P-12 licenses and experience) (Table 4); [NOTE: See glossary definition for school-based teacher educator and university-based teacher educator]
- A "parity" table of curricular, fiscal, facility, and administrative and support capacity for quality that is used to satisfy requirements of the U.S. Department of Education and is completed by providing data relevant for your EPP that makes a comparison to a comparative entity that you determine (Table 5);
- Your identification of the sites outside of the main campus or administrative headquarters and the programs offered at each site that will be included in your accreditation review (Table 6). This information, in combination with the table of program characteristics, is used by CAEP staff and the lead site visitor to plan the site visit, including the sites that will be visited by the site team;
- A list of all the proprietary assessments that are used as evidence in the self-study report, arranged by standard (Table 7); and
- You will be prompted to provide information about your EPP-created assessment instruments (see Appendix D: CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments).

(II) The evidence and summary statement for each standard where you make the case that the standard has been met. The template will indicate the number of characters that can be inserted for each EPP summary statement. [NOTE: All of Part C of this handbook is addressed to this section of the self-study report.] Standard 1 includes disaggregated data by licensure area, and results from CAEP's Program Review with Feedback, as supplemented by the Specialized Professional Association (SPA) review with national recognition, or relevant information from state review. Standard 1 also includes information on concepts that need not be disaggregated by licensure area, in addition to program review licensure data and review results.

(III) A description of your approach to the CAEP diversity and technology themes, with cross-references to evidence relevant to explicit aspects of diversity and for applications of technology appearing in CAEP Standards 1, 2 and 3. [NOTE: Part C of this handbook concludes with suggestions for the diversity and technology narratives for the SSR.]

(IV) Responses to previously cited areas for improvement, if any.

4. **Analyze and interpret the evidence and take stock.** Analyze and interpret the evidence in relation to the 2013 CAEP Standards for Initial-Licensure Programs. Meet with stakeholders,

including P-12 districts and candidates, to review and seek feedback on what was learned from the evidence and how this evidence will guide continuous improvement efforts. Examine the degree to which assessments align with the "sufficient level" criteria in CAEP's Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments. It is at this point that your program may begin to reveal itself as somewhat different from what faculty and leaders had designed it to be. This is your opportunity to assert what you intend the defining characteristics of your programs to be, and how you intend to use evidence that will strengthen them. You can use the self-study stocktaking to point out what is special about your program.

5. **Formulate summary statements**. Draft a set of statements that makes clear what you believe you have accomplished and need to accomplish with regard to the CAEP Standards and its two crosscutting themes. These statements should be consistent with your public statements of your quality and the performance of your candidates. The statements you make in the SSR should be linked to the evidence you collected, including assessments and results.

6. **Draft and submit the self-study report**. From the evidence and information you collected, and conversations you conducted, compile a complete draft of the self-study report, including evidence and summary statements. Review the draft with stakeholders, revise as needed, and upload the final version into CAEP's digital self-study report template. Evidence should be tagged to the appropriate standard, component, and cross-cutting theme, as well as to quality indicators.

B.2 Writing the self-study report

These notes presented below represent an accumulation of conventions and suggestions that CAEP collects through its accreditation experience, including extensive conversations with EPPs whose faculty are compiling self-study reports. They relate to interpretation of "examples of evidence" that appear in the CAEP handbook and other resources, to expectations for assembling evidence and to framing compelling arguments that standards are met.

The focus note box, below, explains how the examples in the CAEP handbook should be interpreted.

CAEP focus note: Examples of Evidence

The types of evidence described in this handbook are intended only as examples. You are welcome, within CAEP guidelines, to employ different measurements from those described here and to select ones that you believe will make the strongest case that your EPP meets each standard. Whatever evidence is chosen, the purpose is to show that you addressed the concepts in the CAEP Standards in an effective way.

For all EPP-created evidence measures, providers should demonstrate the quality of the data, including their validity and reliability in the context of the CAEP Standards. You should clearly tag evidence to a specific CAEP standard and/or component. If you don't take that step, you assume a risk that site teams and reviewers will have difficulty accessing and assessing evidence in the context of specific standards or components.

This second focus note box, below, describes the essence of the "writing to standards" task. For this handbook, CAEP has taken the entire text of each standard together with its accompanying components, and, from that, identified key concepts in each standard. Those key concepts form the basis for writing to the CAEP Standards.

CAEP focus note: Writing to Standards

You assemble your evidence to demonstrate the key concepts that CAEP has identified for each standard and present your case that the standard is met. The components following each standard provide additional details that help your faculty interpret the intent and scope of the standard.

You assemble your case for a standard and write your summary statement; you select evidence that you believe will best document your case that the standard is met; and you determine how evidence relevant to additional details from components is weighted and woven into the summary statement. The narrative should not be a rewording of the standard statement or an assertion unsubstantiated by data. Submission of raw data is insufficient to show that standards are met; all data must be appropriately analyzed and significance interpreted.

For initial-licensure programs, your case that Standards 3, 4 and 5 are met requires explicit evidence in the following instances: component 3.2; all four components of Standard 4; and components 5.3 and 5.4. If you are submitting both initial-licensure and advanced-level preparation programs, see "Special Note" under Standard 5 below.

The third focus note box, below, suggests steps in building a case that a standard is met.

Your SSR constitutes an assembly of compelling evidence, making the case that standards are met and that evidence is explicitly included for the required components[2] 3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.3, and 5.4. The case should do the following:

- **Frame the argument** (i.e., what are you claiming you have achieved with respect to the standard or required evidence for a component).
- **Present the results in a way that aligns with the standard**. [NOTE: Since data collected for your own EPP purposes likely exceed what is relevant for CAEP Accreditation, try to provide direct evidence only, omitting redundant information.]
- **Describe the data sources** used to support the argument (See CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments, Appendix D, for key features of measures.)
- **Discuss the findings and implications** for subsequent action you intend to take**.**
- **Explain why the data are credible** indicators for the standard or how the data provide credible evidence related to a component. This includes discussing qualities of good evidence outlined in the CAEP Evidence Guide (such as validity and reliability) and describing methods of data analysis or interpretation.

[2] The seven listed components are designated by the CAEP Board to require evidence that meets CAEP guidelines at the component level; a decision of accreditation for seven years is only granted if the EPP meets all of the CAEP Standards and required components and is not assigned any stipulations.

- **Discuss your** completed, ongoing, and/or planned **uses of data** for continuous improvement.

These points are part of the basis for concluding sections of each standard in Part C, below, headed "Self-study prompts and reflection questions" for the standard.

B.3 General guidance on concepts in the standards and use of data as evidence in self-study reports

There are some guides about use of data and presentation of evidence that CAEP considers "general rules" for evidence. Their purpose is to help your faculty share a common understanding about the key concepts of standards and the uses of evidence, and also to ensure fairness and consistency in accreditation reviews conducted by CAEP site teams.

Faculty and administrators, state policymakers, and accrediting bodies must all make decisions about the merits of programs. These decisions should be made with the best evidence that can be obtained now, rather than the evidence we might like to have, or that might be available in the future. In its report on evaluating teacher preparation programs, the American Psychological Association wrote in *Assessing and Evaluating Teacher Preparation Programs*, "policy". "…decisions about program effectiveness need to be made consistently and fairly. Using the most trustworthy data and methods currently available at any given decision point is the optimal way to proceed."[3]

About relevance of evidence

- **Key Concepts of Standards**–The SSR should address, with evidence, the key concepts in each standard. [NOTE: Key concepts are further elaborated in Section C, below, following each standard.]

- **Phase-in Rules**–Phase-in Plans describe evidence that is planned and developing and is judged as if it were evidence. The following paragraph is excerpted from accreditation policy 1.02:

  (c) Expectations for initial-licensure programs

  For programs accredited under the CAEP Standards for Initial-Licensure Programs, rules may be applicable, as follows:

  Phase-In Rule – For site visits taking place no later than Spring 2020, an EPP's self-study report may include plans with progress steps as evidence and/or data for Standards. Starting in fall 2020, the phase-in period concludes, and the EPP's evidence and/or data are evaluated as submitted.

  Recognizing that your EPP may need additional time to develop the appropriate evidence/data required to meet CAEP Standards, CAEP has adopted "phase-in" and "transition" policies designed to assist EPPs undergoing their first review based on the CAEP 2013 Standards. This handbook provides detailed information on components of CAEP Standards for which "plans" may substitute for actual evidence/data during a developmental period, as well as the dates after which these policies are no longer effective. See Appendix B of this handbook for the years over which this provision applies, and Appendix C for guidance on contents and review of plans.

[3] Worrel, F., Brabeck, M., Dwyer, C., Geisinger, K., Marx, R., Noell, G., and Pianta, R. (2014). *Assessing and evaluating teacher preparation programs.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

To the extent they are consistent with accreditation policy 1.02, the detailed standards narratives that follow in Section C and the sufficiency criteria in Appendix A specify places where plans are an appropriate option. The Guidelines for Plans, Initial Preparation (See Appendix C, attached) describe criteria for evaluating plans. See Phase-in Schedule (Appendix B) for academic years when this applies for initial-licensure programs.

Some general rules about data quality and usefulness in making a case follow:

- **Tagging Data Quality Information**–Information describing qualitative characteristics for each item of evidence used in the self-study report should be tagged to the appropriate standard and any relevant component (in addition to 5.2). This procedure assists site teams by ensuring ready access to the assessments and other evidence you intend to have a bearing on your case for a standard.

- **Uniform Names for Tagged Evidence**–Items that are used as evidence in the CAEP Accreditation management system (i.e., self-study report evidence) should be cited in the narrative using the same name as the uploaded item.

- **Quality of Assessments**–Your own EPP-created assessments should meet or exceed the CAEP Sufficient Level as defined in the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments (see Appendix D).

- **Performance on Assessments**–Performance averages need to be at or above acceptable levels on whatever scoring guide you have created for your assessments.

- **Evidence for trends**–As a general rule, CAEP expects that your SSR will support the case for a trend by data derived from at least three points, or "cycles," during which you have administered assessments, surveys, or other measures. The reported cycles of data should be sequential and be the most recent available at the time the SSR is prepared. The frequency would depend on the data set, with some—perhaps gateway measures—administered only once per year or once per cohort of candidates or completers. Other measures might closely monitor progress during preparation more frequently. In either case, three cycles will help to affirm trends as well as the status of the phenomenon under investigation.

  Note, however, that there may be situations when only two or even one data point is available and documenting a trend is not a consideration. This is especially likely when new assessments are under development or when an assessment is modified, and the provider initiates a new data collection series within a few years of the next site visit. Both CAEP reviewers and your own faculty should consider this circumstance as evidence of continuous improvement. The SSR should include data from the original assessment along with an explanation of how the revised assessment improves upon the prior assessments (tag this explanation to components 5.2 and 5.3). It may also include plans for subsequent data collection.

7. **Disaggregation of Data**–To the extent required by accreditation policy, disaggregation of data by program, as well as by campus sites and mode of delivery, is an important element of self-study reporting, particularly for Standard 1, but also for other standards. The review of data at this level informs an overall accreditation decision by identifying variations that could provide

targets for continuous improvement efforts or may indicate consistent or differing patterns across specialty field areas within your EPP or across additional campuses, multiple sites, and for online and classroom programs. There may be variation over time or after changes to your program or context as well.

You should use your discretion about data representing small numbers (e.g., less than 10), and combine years or categories of data when necessary to protect the privacy of individual candidates.

CAEP accreditation policy supports disaggregation of data relevant to different campus sites or modes of delivery. It reads as follows:

Policy 5.08 Inclusion of Programs in Multiple Sites, including Distance Learning

(a) Required Evidence for Multiple Sites

An EPP with multiple sites must provide evidence to meet the following conditions at each site:

1. Requirements for delivery as set forth by the relevant regional accreditor(s) are met.
2. The accreditation plan satisfies the USED requirements in terms of the scope and programs to be reviewed.
3. The state/country authorizes and/or approves programs that lead to licensure, certification, or their equivalent if the state/country requires such authorization and approval.
4. The certification/licensure opportunities within and across states/countries are disclosed to candidates.
5. The quality assurance system ensures that data are sufficient to represent quality throughout the EPP.

(b) Visits to Multiple Sites

When scheduling the site visit, an EPP with multiple sites must determine, in consultation with CAEP staff and state/country partners, how the EPP's scope of authority will be defined as well as where and how the visits to multiple sites, if any, will be scheduled. Evidence in the SSR and any assessment data should be disaggregated for off-site or online programs only if the program is distinct from the other programs. Otherwise, the data and evidence from multiple sites are aggregated within respective specialty areas of study.

Some general rules about analysis of data follow:

- **Triangulation of Data**–Because all data have limitations, one means to moderate the limitations is to draw on multiple sources of data in framing the case that each standard or required component is met. Multiple sources allow you to "triangulate" data—helping you document different aspects of an element of preparation and to enrich your analyses through indications of convergence in cases where findings are mutually reinforcing.

- **Comparisons, Confirming and Conflicting Evidence**–Your analysis of data/evidence includes identification of trends/patterns, comparisons, and/or differences. You should highlight confirming and conflicting findings from data. When possible, you should make comparisons

between your data and any existing benchmarks (e.g., cut scores, criterion scores), normative comparisons to peers (e.g., pass rates across EPPs), or performance standards (e.g., competency requirements to garner "proficient" ratings on internship evaluations). These final steps generate a context for considering the implications of findings for program-related decisions and continuous improvement.

- **Analysis and Interpretation of Data**–Your analysis will include identification of trends and patterns in the data, as well as comparisons and/or differences you find in multiple measures. You will be using data and evidence to support your interpretations and conclusions.

B.4 Program review

Program review in CAEP refers to the evidence you provide under one of three program review options provided by CAEP:

1. CAEP Program Review with Feedback,
2. Specialized Professional Association (SPA) review with national recognition, or
3. State program review.

The evidence addresses candidate competence under categories that are used to group InTASC Standards and that are an integral part of CAEP's Standard 1 concepts. The four InTASC categories are: **The learner and learning; specialty field content knowledge and content pedagogical knowledge; applications of that knowledge in instructional practice; and professional responsibilities for initial teaching.**

The review is conducted in advance of the SSR, following one of the three options, so that any comments that are returned to you related to the relevance or strength of evidence for CAEP Standard 1, and any subsequent EPP actions taken in response to such comments, can be addressed before the SSR is completed and the site visit occurs. CAEP Program Review with Feedback is available for reviewing initial licensure/certification programs across all specialty areas. For any specialty licensure program for which SPA standards are available, you may elect to use the SPA review process which leads to SPA National Recognition of the program. You should check with your state regarding the requirements for program review conducted by the state and how that might meet some or all of the CAEP review for the InTASC concepts that underlie Standard 1.

See the CAEP website, http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/program-review-options, for the most up-to-date information on program review options and http://www.caepnet.org/working-together/state-partners for state agreements. Additional information about specific SPA standards is available here: http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/spa-standards-and-report-forms. And information on general SPA review policies and procedures is here: http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/spa-program-review-policies-and-procedur.

The narrative under Standard 1 in Part C of this handbook provides examples of evidence that might serve as points of reflection when you identify self-study report evidence: What evidence have you provided in program review? How was it evaluated and what feedback did you receive? What actions have you taken in response to feedback? Should you consider whether your program review evidence might be complemented in the SSR with some additional evidence that represents your candidates' proficiencies for Standard 1?

The chart that follows describes what you submit and what CAEP evaluates for Program Review with Feedback, together with the SPA and state review options. Note that in their partnership agreements with CAEP, states may select one or more program review options that will be available to providers in their state. Any provider may elect SPA review, however, even in a state not requiring it. [NOTE: when an EPP has program review data from more than one source, it makes its choice about which evidence to cite in its SSR case for Standard 1.]

Table: *Program Review Options*

Process	CAEP Program Review with Feedback	Review with National Recognition (Specialized Professional Association or SPA Option)	State Review
a. Who submits	All EPPs submit disaggregated data on all preparation programs EXCEPT for those programs selecting SPA review or state review option	EPPs that choose the SPA option	Providers in states that require state review as part of CAEP's review of Standard 1
b. Standards used for review	InTASC part of CAEP Standard 1	National standards from Specialized Professional Associations (SPA standards)	State standards
c. Provider submission of evidence	EPPs submit a report for review prior to the SSR and site visit. A transition plan for submitting the report is as follows: ***Fall 2019 site visits:*** *CAEP is piloting this process with an optional one-year submission for these visits. If the EPP choses this option the review report is due by September 1, 2018 (optional—EPP may choose to submit evidence as an addendum to the self-study report).* ***Spring 2020 site visits:*** *One-year out review report due by March 1, 2019 (required)* ***Fall 2020 site visits:*** *One-year out review report due by September 1, 2019 (required)* ***Spring 2021 site visits:*** *One-year out review report due by March 1, 2020 (required)* ***Fall 2021 site visits:*** *Two-years out review report due by September 1, 2019 (required)* ***Spring 2022 site visits:*** *Two-years out review report due by March 1, 2020 (required)* ***Fall 2022 site visits:*** *Two-years out review report due by September 1, 2020 (required)*	Three years prior to scheduled site visit, EPPs submit assessments and data for program review to separate SPAs representing specific specialty/license areas. Each SPA submission is a separate template.	Provider follows state guidelines

Process	CAEP Program Review with Feedback	Review with National Recognition (Specialized Professional Association or SPA Option)	State Review
	{NOTE: *Due date for fall visits will be September 1 and due dates for spring visits will be March 1.}* Report includes evidence of candidate proficiencies relevant to the learner and learning, specialty content and content pedagogy, instructional practice, and professional responsibilities for initial teachers. EPPs provide disaggregated data for programs offered at multiple sites and for online programs only if the program is distinct from other programs. Otherwise, the data and evidence from multiple sites are aggregated within respective specialty areas of study. EPPs describe how they use the evidence for continuous improvement.		
d. Review of evidence	CAEP trained reviewers conduct the evaluation and CAEP returns comments to the EPP and the state.	SPA-specific content specialist review; alignment of assessments, scoring guides, and data to SPA standards. SPA reviewers provide feedback to programs about the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence to meet SPA standards and receive national recognition.	State review process
e. Use of results from review	Comments are incorporated into the SSR on Standard 1, along with any EPP updates on their response. EPPs answer questions on how they used data from the feedback report for continuous improvement in the SSR.	EPPs answer questions on how they used data from SPA reports for continuous improvement in self-study under CAEP Standards.	Responses from states that are relevant to CAEP's first phase review for Standard 1 are incorporated into the EPP's SSR.

B.5 Addressing cross-cutting themes of diversity and application of technology

CAEP's Standards treat aspects of diversity and the applications of technology as "themes" that are woven through the standards and should be addressed in summary statements made for each standard.

Both are critical characteristics of quality preparation programs and both are to be addressed in self-study reports. The requirement is made explicit in the accreditation policy 5.03—which was excerpted in the Accreditation Policy Overview section at the beginning of Part B—self-study reports include "complete evidence for all CAEP Standards and cross-cutting themes."

The CAEP Standards Commission described these themes as "twin challenges" and mutually reinforcing. This is an excerpt from the commission's report:

> ". . . the Commission faced the twin challenges of developing cohorts of new educators who can lift the performance of all of our diverse P-12 students, while taking advantage of the digital age's new opportunities.
>
> . . . In fact, these two cross-cutting themes converge. Technology and digital learning in our schools can efficiently bring quality education to all P-12 students. It can address the inequitable access to essential learning technology resources in the home and the community that has too frequently been evident in schools serving diverse and economically disadvantaged students. When that inequity persists, there are profound implications for the educational and economic opportunities available for our youth. Candidates need to know how to assess specific technological inequities experienced by their students and identify and undertake strategies that improve P-12 students' access to, and skills in, using these resources.
>
> Diversity and technology are, thus, two critical areas that will require new learning and substantial innovation by preparation providers; the significant demographic and technological changes that impact their programs also influence the skills their completers must master to be effective."

This handbook has placed a section on the diversity and technology themes at the conclusion of Part C Description of Standards, and appropriate material on evidence and site team review appear at the conclusion of Appendix A, Evidence Sufficiency Criteria. Similarly, there is a section at the end of the SSR digital template. The overall case for each theme should draw in evidence used to support specific components in the CAEP Standards that relate to diversity or technology (identified in Part C, below), but would also introduce additional information that is not part of the case for meeting a particular standard or component.

C. The CAEP Standards for Initial-Licensure Programs

Guidance

The CAEP Standards for Initial-Licensure Programs (adopted by the CAEP Board of Directors August 2013 and amended June 2016), are intended to elevate the bar for the quality of evidence that the EPPs submit for accreditation. Provider evidence must demonstrate that initial-licensure program completers can meet rigorous performance expectations. In doing so, providers will advance the education profession by creating a lever for systemic improvement. These changes are both substantive and substantial. The standards:

- Rely on actions you take to develop and maintain a quality assurance system ensuring capacity for gathering and using data relevant to your own mission and goals as well as to CAEP Standards;

- Build on features of preparation in which your choices can have the greatest influence—course content and instruction; clinical experiences; candidate selection, monitoring, and academic proficiencies; and
- Challenge you to monitor your own results during preparation (to candidates' successful completion) and on-the job (to completer's classroom experiences with P-12 students).

This handbook, including concepts underlying each standard, suggestions for evidence, prompts, and reflection questions and other resources, is written to assist you in conducting your self-study and writing the self-study report. Readers of this handbook will observe, below, that Standard 5 is presented first, with Standards 1-4 following in sequence after that. Standard 5 appears in this position to signify its unique role in CAEP's Accreditation Standards. Standard 5 addresses your capacity to function effectively and to engage in continuous improvement, not simply one occurrence in each seven-year accreditation cycle. Its purpose is not solely to receive accreditation status, but for the ongoing development and success of your EPP and the candidates you serve.

The Quality Assurance System

An effective Quality Assurance System (QAS) has multiple capabilities: it houses data gathering; it has capacity to disaggregate, combine, and analyze data; it can provide context for interpreting data by showing relationships with other data; and it can describe any aspect of your operations, courses, experiences, candidates, and outcomes that your multiple measures cover. The QAS permits information to be assembled about which candidates, programs, branches, and/or technology applications have performance characteristics that warrant closer examination and identifies particular strengths and challenges. The QAS is the heart of effective management because it is the means by which you can generate information to evaluate your own progress, answer faculty questions, identify potential improvements, frame appropriate actions, and track the outcomes of changes over time. It **enables** continuous improvement.

The quality assurance and continuous improvement emphasis is consistent with the direction taken by other accreditation bodies. The Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) sets standards by which CAEP, itself, is recognized. CHEA requires that the CAEP Standards ensure accredited EPPs have "processes to determine whether quality standards are being met." In addition, CHEA calls for CAEP Standards on educational quality that respect "the institution's responsibility to set priorities and to control how the institution or program is structured and operates, and that incorporate an awareness of how programs function."

A functioning QAS is ongoing over time and across all of your activities—courses, clinical experiences, mentoring, assessment, placement, and more. The idea of a systematic, purposeful, and continuing review of data may be one that you and your colleagues have not given much attention previously. For that reason, CAEP has drafted an example list of attributes, or "indicators," describing the functions and capabilities about each standard that might characterize a well-functioning QAS. A successful QAS will enable you to have effective oversight and control of your program management and operations. The QAS indicators listed in the chart, below, have been drawn from CAEP's examination of SSRs submitted by EPPs judged to have a working QAS, and supplemented by what our review of the QAS literature suggests as best practice. You need not use any particular indicator that does not meet your needs, and these are not the only ones that you could choose to examine. They are not CAEP requirements or prescriptions. They are meant for your reflection as you generate and improve the ongoing data

necessary to modify your program continuously based on empirical evidence. When your system does what you need, then you will have compelling evidence for Standard 5.

Quality Assurance System (QAS) Indicators
Standard 1 and A.1[4]
There is a functioning process in place for **developing and revising assessments** of candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions.
The candidate **knowledge, skills, and dispositions** that are assessed align with state and national or association standards for educators.
There is a **functioning data/record management system** in place for recording, storing, and retrieving data on **candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions.**
There is a **system in place to collect, store, and review data** on candidates' **practical application** of professional knowledge and skills in field settings.
There is a functioning process in place for **regularly reviewing and monitoring** candidate progress and performance, including performance on the CAEP cross-cutting themes for diversity and applications of technology.
Standard 2 and A.2
There is a functioning mechanism in place whereby the EPP and clinical sites **collaborate** to determine the terms, structure, and content of field experiences hosted at the partner site.
EPPs and their partners **collaborate** on candidate evaluation tools and processes.
EPPs and clinical partners **regularly discuss** the terms, structure, and content of field experiences hosted at the partner site, including those that address the CAEP cross-cutting themes of diversity and applications of technology.
Clinical partners have a mechanism for **providing feedback** to the EPP on patterns in candidate strengths and needs and providing input on potential program enhancements.
There is a functioning mechanism to **ensure that clinical placements occur in diverse settings**. [NOTE: Diversity is not limited to race/ethnicity.]
There is a functioning mechanism that **manages attributes of field experiences** (e.g., breadth, depth, duration, and coherence) so that they provide **practical experience relevant to Standards 1 and A.1 and Standards 4 and A.4.**
Standard 3 and A.3
There is a mechanism in place that **manages recruitment initiatives** to attract diverse applicants from groups and in labor-market areas identified in component 3.1.
There is a system in place that **collects, stores, analyzes, actively monitors, and reviews** data relevant to Standard 3 on applicants, enrollees, and exiting candidates, including data that address CAEP's cross-cutting themes of diversity and applications of technology.
Standard 4 and A.4
There are processes in place to **collect and update contact information** and employment milestones for alumni for at least 3-years post-exit.

[4] Standard number references that begin with "A" are CAEP Standards for Advanced-Level Programs.

Quality Assurance System (QAS) Indicators
There is a functioning process in place for **developing and revising** measures of program completers' instructional practices and impact on P-12 student learning and development. (NOTE: Not required for A.4)
There is a functioning process in place for **developing and revising** measures of completer's classroom **evaluations** and/or student **perception surveys** on instructional engagement. (NOTE: Not required for A.4)
There is a functioning process in place for **developing and revising measures** of **employers' satisfaction** with the completers' preparation and performance.
There is a functioning process in place for **developing and revising** measures of **completers' satisfaction** with their preparation.
There is a system in place to **collect, store, analyze, and review data on completers** that are relevant to Standards 4 and A.4.
Standard 5 and A.5
There is a functional process in place to protect curricular integrity.
There is a functional process in place **to ensure the hiring of qualified faculty and program staff** (particularly staff involved with clinical placements).
There is a functional mechanism in place for **training faculty to collaborate** in-person or virtually, synchronously or asynchronously) to **provide feedback and input** on candidate learning, the assessment system, and program features, operations, and priorities.
The data system **collects and stores information** relevant to CAEP's 8 annual initial preparation program measures and posts them online for public access.
There is a functioning process for publicly sharing outcomes and trends (updated annually) for the 8 annual initial preparation measures (and the 6 advanced-level preparation measures).
There is a functioning process for **involving diverse stakeholders in decision making, program evaluation, and selection and implementation of improvement initiatives**.
Documentation of stakeholder inputs to specific decisions, evaluations, and/or improvement initiatives is stored and accessible.

Additional materials and modifications

Although this handbook represents CAEP's current guidance for EPPs preparing SSRs based on the CAEP Standards for Initial-Licensure Programs, much of the material in it has been available previously—in earlier handbooks, the CAEP Evidence Guide, the rationale sections of the 2013 CAEP Standards for Initial-Licensure Programs (http://caepnet.org/~/media/Files/caep/standards/caep-standards-one-pager-061716.pdf?la=en), in online questions and answers, and other CAEP resources. Some previously disseminated text (e.g., about writing SSRs in Section B, above) is brought together in one place. Appendix A details evidence sufficiency criteria, which were modified from versions available in recent CAEPCon presentations. Over several iterations of CAEP handbooks, these have evolved from "guidelines for review" to "evaluation rubrics" and now evidence sufficiency criteria. If you are familiar with those earlier CAEP resources, you will find additional clarifications and refinements in this handbook presentation:

- This handbook is adapted to specific provisions of the 2013 CAEP Standards for Initial-Licensure Programs (as amended in 2016).

- There is emphasis in Part C on assembling self-study evidence and writing reports around the concepts that CAEP has identified for each CAEP Standard taken as a whole, reading across the standard and its accompanying components. The components serve as additional references and explanations that help to interpret the whole standard. There are seven components for which evidence is required at a sufficient level: 3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.3, and 5.4.
- There are new standard-by-standard prompts and reflection questions in Part C, below. These are part of CAEP's guides as you prepare to write your SSR. They are meant to encourage discussion, collaboration, and consideration of implications around key concepts of each standard. They do this by identifying your accomplishments, the strengths and challenges you find in your self-study about each standard; the trends over time; questions about your own performance that you have investigated; and the implications for preparation courses and experiences, as well as your efforts to improve these in ongoing continuous processes. They focus on drawing evidence for the concepts together into a compelling summary case that a standard is met.

Part C, the CAEP Standards for Initial-Licensure Programs, includes

- The **full text of each standard and its accompanying components**;
- A **narrative, key concepts,** that presents the principal concepts and focal points of each standard that you should keep in mind as you frame your case that the standard is met;
- A **description, evidence examples,** representing suggestions of evidence (e.g., measures, assessments) or types of evidence that could document your accomplishments relevant to the standard; and
- **Prompts and reflection questions** that help bring together your most compelling points and evidence into your case for each standard.

To complement Part C, you will find evidence sufficiency criteria detailed in Appendix A which (a) contains suggestions for contents of your self-study report documentation; (b) describes what site teams will try to establish as they examine the self-study report; and (c) specifies criteria that site teams will apply in their evaluation of the evidence.

QUALITY ASSURANCE AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT, CAEP STANDARD 5

SPECIAL NOTE for EPPs on CAEP Standard 5

CAEP accredits EPPs, and an EPP should only respond to Standard 5 once—**not** separately for initial-licensure and for advanced-level programs. The focus is on quality assurance at the provider-level. That means, for example:

- When you demonstrate the capabilities of your QAS, that documentation should include

measures used in initial-licensure programs, and also—if you have programs at the advanced-level—other measures used in advanced-level programs.
- When you document the quality of your data, it should include measures used for initial-licensure and also—if you have programs at the advanced-level—measures used in advanced-level preparation.
- When you document continuous improvement efforts, your SSR should include measures and their use in continuous improvement across all of your programs for both initial-licensure and advanced-level.
- When you document stakeholder involvement, information on advanced-level programs should be included along with that on initial-licensure programs (if applicable).

Note: To clarify the intent and avoid duplication, the standards for advanced-level programs include additional words not found in Initial-Licensure Standard 5, component 4. The additional words are: Outcomes include completion rate, licensure rate, employment rate in the field of specialty preparation, and consumer information such as places of employment and salaries.

Standard 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement — *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.*

Quality and Strategic Evaluation

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.

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.

Continuous Improvement

5.3 **Required component[5]–***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.*

5.4 **Required component–***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.*

[5] Components 5.3 and 5.4 are two of seven components designated by the CAEP Board to require evidence that meets CAEP guidelines at the component level; a decision of accreditation for seven years is only granted if the EPP meets all of the CAEP Standards and required components and is not assigned any stipulations.

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.

Key concepts

Standard 5 occupies a pivotal position in the CAEP Standards. It describes your capacity to reach your mission and goals through purposeful analysis and use of evidence, and that same capacity provides access to evidence that informs all other CAEP standards.

Effective organizations use evidence-based quality assurance systems and data in a process of continuous improvement. These systems and data-informed continuous improvement are essential foundational requirements for CAEP Accreditation. The SSR provides an opportunity for you to describe how well your QAS is working in terms of responding to questions about the effectiveness of your preparation and your use of that capacity to investigate innovations and inform continuous improvement.

The two key concepts for Standard 5 follow:

- maintaining a quality assurance system capable of providing data output that enables quality control and continuous improvement [components 5.1, 5.2 and 5.4] and
- EPP leadership with appropriate stakeholders, and EPP management procedures that input, analyze, interpret and use information from the QAS to support continuous improvement [components 5.3 and 5.5].

Every provider has a set of procedures, processes, and structures—reporting lines, committees, offices, positions, policies—to ensure quality in hiring, admissions, courses, program design, facilities, and the like. It is the faculty's way to ensure that it has, for example, an appropriate curriculum, faculty, candidates, or program design. In an effective modern education organization, these procedures and structures are supported by a strong and flexible data generation and accessing capacity that—through disaggregation of data by demographic groups and individual preparation programs, different modes of delivery, and different campuses—can answer questions about how well an EPP's mission is accomplished and its goals met. That same system can serve, as well, to provide evidence for accreditation purposes.

Standard 5 focuses on the extent to which providers effectively ensure, and continually increase, quality. The standard is written as a way to adapt principles stated in the Baldrige Education Criteria that successful education organizations follow (emphasizing measurement of operations and results), and that the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching has described as “improvement research” in educational organizations. Those principles give particular weight to maintaining a QAS and to using the output from that system for purposes of continuous improvement:

- The QAS handles multiple measures, monitors candidate progress, the achievements of completers, and your operational effectiveness [component 5.1].
- The “multiple measures” are relevant, actionable, comprehensive, purposeful, and coherent [component 5.2].

- You routinely investigate the quality and usefulness of existing measures, and use information to make any needed adjustments that ensure your QAS is relying on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable data [components 5.2 and 5.3].
- You use data regularly. You assess performance in relation to your goals and standards; follow results over time; conduct tests of changes made in courses, selection, or clinical experiences; study natural variation across the different preparation programs you offer; and use the results to judge your progress and status, and to improve program elements.
- Finally, you share results with stakeholders [components 5.4 and 5.5] and involve them in evaluating your effectiveness, generating improvements, and identifying models to emulate [component 5.3].

Evidence examples for Standard 5

Repeating the CAEP focus note from Part B, section 2:

The types of evidence described in this handbook are intended only as examples. You are welcome to employ different measurements from those described here and to select ones that you believe will make the strongest case that your EPP has met each standard. Whatever evidence is chosen, the purpose is to show that you have addressed the concepts in the CAEP Standards in an effective way.

Provider evidence in SSRs for Standards 1 through 4 constitutes a significant demonstration of the capabilities and performance of the QAS and the credibility of your evidence. Additional and unique evidence for Standard 5 unifies and gives purpose to evidence relevant to the other four CAEP standards; it includes documentation of how you collect, monitor, report, and use data.

Examples of evidence to document that you maintain an effective QAS (Standard 5, and component 5.1)

The evidence is intended to document the capabilities of your QAS (i.e., what it can do) [component 5.1]. Documentation should show the range and quality assurance processes and measures on which you rely:

- 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 your management and policy (e.g., usefulness).
- The schedule and process for continuous review, together with roles and responsibilities of system users.
- Cross references to evidence documenting Standards 1 through 4 as evidence of the capabilities of the QAS.

Examples of evidence demonstrating data quality (Standard 5 and component 5.2)

The evidence is intended to document that measures are relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable [component 5.2]. While site teams will use information that you provide about data quality when they review your evidence for each Standard 1 through 4, the SSR for Standard 5 should not repeat that information; instead it should make a case across all of the standards and on behalf of your EPP as an organization. Documentation indicates:

- Instruments align with the construct being measured.
- Administration and scoring of assessment (items) are clearly defined.
- Interpretation of assessment (items) results is unambiguous.
- Data files are complete and accurate.
- Data results align with demonstrated quality.
- Follow principles in the CAEP Evidence Guide (See CAEP Evidence Guide, section 5)
- Convergence (e.g., correlation across multiple measures of the same construct) or consistency analyses (e.g., inter-rater reliability) are conducted accurately.
- Convergence/consistency is of sufficient magnitude and statistically significant, if appropriate.

In addition, you should cross-reference information about data quality in evidence cited for Standards 1 through 4. Those references would include such information as the following:

- 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, and
- Empirical evidence that interpretations of data are reliable and valid.

The interpretation and usage of the evidence is valid or invalid. You need to ensure that the evidence collected is likely to be useful regarding completer effectiveness, as well as aware of what "noise" is associated with these assessments and how to interpret evidence based on this knowledge.

As you plan future directions for data, you should be moving toward development of outcome measures that relate to or predict completer effectiveness.

Examples of evidence demonstrating continuous improvement (evidence is required[6] for this component) (Standard 5 and components 5.3 and 5.4)

You document regular and systematic data-driven changes [component 5.3] grounded in (a) research and evidence from the field, (b) data analyses and interpretations from your quality assurance system, and (c) changes linked to your goals and relevant standards. You present evidence supporting your case that provisions in component 5.3 are met distinctly from other information presented on meeting Standard 5 overall.

While site teams will use information that you provide about continuous improvement when they review your evidence for each Standard 1 through 4, the SSR for Standard 5 should not repeat that information; instead it should make a case across all the standards and on behalf of your EPP as an organization. The examples indicate changes are clearly connected to evidence, that tests of

[6]This is one of seven components designated by the CAEP Board to require evidence that meets CAEP guidelines at the component level; a decision of accreditation for seven years is only granted if the EPP meets all of the CAEP Standards and required components and is not assigned any stipulations.

innovations are of appropriate design, and that provider performance is systematically assessed against goals. The tests may be formal studies or informal tests of innovations (e.g., random assignment to experimental and control groups; Plan, Do, Study, Act [PDSA] cycle). Not all changes need to lead to improvement, as CAEP encourages data-driven experimentation, but changes should trend toward improvement. 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 the following:

- Baseline(s),
- Intervention,
- Tracking over time,
- Rationale for conclusions,
- Comparison(s) of results with criteria or target goals, and
- Next steps that were taken and/or are planned.

Your descriptions show appropriate and regular involvement of stakeholders and their active participation in interpretations of data from the QAS as well as considerations of potential changes, and decision making.

PHASE-IN APPLIES:

- See the CAEP Guidelines for Plans (Appendix C) for details on the format and content of phase-in plans that are permitted under accreditation policy.
- See the Initial Programs Phase-in Schedule (Appendix B) for details on the timeline for submitting "plans only," "plans plus progress" (including expectations for first data collection), and "full data."

You document results from monitoring and using the CAEP Annual Reporting Measures (evidence is required[7] for this component) (Component 5.4)

You present the evidence that component 5.4 is met distinctly from other information presented on meeting Standard 5 overall. The Annual Reporting Measures work together as indicators of your performance in relation to candidates as they complete preparation, and to completers once they are on the job. They are basic indicators of your performance sought by many external audiences—policymakers, parents, stakeholders, and the media, for example. You should give them particular priority, partly by taking steps to ensure these data are available, and partly by documenting your analysis of outcomes and contextual factors relating to interpretation of the data. The measures include those described in Standard 4 (impact measures):

1. Evidence of completer impact on P-12 student learning and development
2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness, observation instruments, and student surveys
3. Employer satisfaction and completer persistence
4. Completer satisfaction

And they include the following outcome and consumer measures for initial candidates and completers:

1. Completer or graduation rate

[7] This is one of seven components designated by the CAEP Board to require evidence that meets CAEP guidelines at the component level; a decision of accreditation for seven years is only granted if the EPP meets all of the CAEP Standards and required components and is not assigned any stipulations.

2. Licensure/certification rate
3. Employment rate
4. Consumer information [NOTE: CAEP does not use consumer information in accreditation decision making.]

Your SSR will provide analysis of trends, comparisons with benchmarks, identification of changes made in your preparation curricula and experiences, how/where/with whom results are shared, resource allocations affected by your uses of the information, and indications of future directions.

PHASE-IN APPLIES:

- See the CAEP Guidelines for Plans (Appendix C) for details on the format and content of Phase-in Plans that are permitted under accreditation policy.
- See the Initial Programs Phase-in Schedule (Appendix B) for details on the timeline for submitting "plans only," "plans plus progress" (including expectations for first data collection), and "full data."

Self-study prompts and reflection questions for Standard 5

The prompts and reflection questions, below, help focus the selection of evidence and frame your case that Standard 5 is met. They bring together the suggested steps in connecting a case for the standard (see Part B, third focus note box in B.2, above) with the key concepts for Standard 5. The concepts are:

- maintaining a quality assurance system capable of providing data output that enables quality control and continuous improvement [components 5.1, 5.2 and 5.4] and
- EPP leadership with appropriate stakeholders and EPP management procedures, that input, analyze, interpret and use information from the QAS to support continuous improvement [components 5.3 and 5.5].

The prompts that follow are intended to keep the focus on your EPP as an organization—the **EPP** quality assurance system, and the **EPP** experiences with continuous improvement. The emphasis is on the whole organization for Standard 5. This brings together and extends beyond issues of data quality and use of data for continuous improvement that are an integral part of site team review of each Standard 1 through 4.

YOUR ACCOMPLISHMENTS and YOUR CASE THAT STANDARD 5 IS MET

- **Identify key points for an evidence-based narrative stating your case that your EPP has a functioning QAS with capability to provide relevant evidence and analyses in response to faculty, leadership and stakeholder's questions about program status and quality.** Describe how well the QAS is working for you and how you know this [component 5.1]. Are you able to answer faculty questions about the adequacy of candidate preparation in particular areas (e.g., common core state standards, use of data to monitor student progress, creating assessments appropriate for different instructional purposes)? What strengths and weaknesses in the QAS do faculty find when they use data and analyses from the system? [component 5.2]. These might include, e.g.: are the data relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable? Can findings be triangulated with multiple data so they can be confirmed or found conflicting? What investigations into the quality of evidence and the validity of their interpretations does the EPP conduct?)
    - **OUTCOME MEASURES**–What have you learned from reviewing your annual outcome measures

over the past three years? These are the measures in component 5.4:

- Licensure rate,
- Completion rate,
- Employment rate, and
- Consumer information such as places of employment and initial compensation (including student loan default rates).

- **IMPACT MEASURES**—What have you learned from reviewing your annual impact measures over the past three years? These are the measures in the components of Standard 4:
  - Evidence of completer impact on P-12 student learning and development,
  - Indicators of completer teaching effectiveness: observation instruments and/or P-12 student surveys,
  - Employer satisfaction and completer persistence, and
  - Completer satisfaction.

- **Identify key points for a convincing evidence-based narrative making the case that your EPP has continuous improvement mechanisms in place and functioning:**
  [NOTE: The questions that follow were drafted by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching explicitly for EPP use in CAEP's Standard 5.]

  Continuous improvement is a social learning journey guided by disciplined inquiry. Take us through your learning-to-improve journey. What are you trying, how are you inquiring about your change efforts, what have you learned, and what are you trying next?

  - As you examine the outcomes you currently achieve (i.e., data on the first four standards), and identify gaps between current results and established standards, why is it that these results continue to occur?
  - How do you understand the problem(s) you need to solve? And what inquiries have you engaged in to help clarify this problem analysis (e.g., data analyses that might inform sources of variation in performance; in-depth interviews with current participants and recent graduates a.k.a. user-centered empathy inquiries)?
  - Based on your systematic problem analysis, what is your working theory of improvement? (e.g., what are the three to five places in your instructional system that are your high leverage improvement targets/drivers and what drivers (or areas for intervention) are thought to lead to improvements within them?
  - How has this working theory been tested? What changes have you tried and why did you focus here (looking for connection to relevant research evidence and working theory of improvement)? How do you (will you?) know if these changes are an improvement?
  - More generally, as you cycle through your processes of continuous improvement (iteratively refining your theories based on the results of the changes made) what are you learning about your instructional **system***,* and how has this helped you to refine your working theory of improvement?

  Remember we often learn most from our failures. So, if relevant, what perhaps might you have tried, found evidence that it did not work as you intended, and what did you learn from this about what to try next?

CANDIDATE KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS, CAEP STANDARD 1

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, can use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career- readiness standards.*

Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

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.

Provider Responsibilities

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 professional practice.

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]).

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).

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.

Key concepts

Standard 1 is constructed around candidates' entry level competency in specialized content and pedagogical content knowledge, as well as, the skills to apply this knowledge with all P-12 students. This standard offers the principal opportunity for you to document the competence of your candidates in terms of knowing and being able to use their professional preparation effectively through outcomes-based assessments.

The language of Standard 1 and its associated components highlight six areas in which you need to demonstrate candidate proficiencies in their specialized licensure area. Four of these are aligned with categories into which teacher standards of the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium

(InTASC) are grouped. InTASC Standards are available here: https://www.ccsso.org/resource-library/intasc-model-core-teaching-standards-and-learning-progressions-teachers-10.

Looking at all of the language of Standard 1 and its five components together, the concepts that can best serve to organize evidence for the standard are listed below. The first four are taken directly from InTASC, and the remaining two are additional priority areas for evidence in Standard 1.

InTASC categories

- **The learner and learning** (including learning differences, the context of diverse cultures, and creating effective learning environments) (part of component 1.1; also component 4.1 on impact on student learning);

- **Content knowledge**-including deep content knowledge, critical thinking, and collaborative problem solving; and instructional applications of that knowledge in the content field. (In the language of Standard 1, part of component 1.1, and components 1.3 and 1.4; also component 3.5 on exit standards);

- **Instructional practice**-including assessment and data literacy and use of assessment to advance learning. (In the language of Standard 1, part of component 1.1, and components 1.2 and 1.5; also component 3.5 on exit standards); and

- **Professional responsibilities**-including professional and ethical practice and collaboration with colleagues. (Part of component 1.1, and also component 3.6 on professional responsibilities).

The remaining two highlighted areas of Standard 1 are woven through the InTASC Standards; however, these are attributes of preparation that require you, as part of Standard 1, to place specific emphasis in your self-study documentation.

- **College and career readiness preparation** (In the language of Standard 1, and component 1.4 as well as in the InTASC categories of component 1.1); and

- **Diversity and equity**-preparing for teaching in America's diverse classrooms (In the language of Standard 1, the InTASC references in 1.1 and use of research for learning, 1.2).

Evidence examples for Standard 1

This is the primary standard in which you can assemble evidence to demonstrate the competencies of candidates, both during the initial stages of preparation and at exit. Your evidence, disaggregated by specialty licensure area, makes a case for candidate proficiency from measures such as those listed below. Evidence submissions include copies of the instruments, the tools (e.g., rubrics, criterion scores) that you have created for scoring, and information on how the evidence is consistently used for continuous improvement. The data/evidence for the standard should be required of all candidates. Moreover, concepts for CAEP Standard 1 should be addressed using multiple indicators/measures.

NOTE: As you compile evidence for a comprehensive case that Standard 1 is met, it is likely that you will include information from pre-service exit measures (as described in components 3.5 and 3.6). On the SSR the provider **should not repeat** these measures or the analyses, interpretations, and uses the EPP has made from these data. If these exit data are used as part of the evidence in your case for Standard 1, then your case for Standard 3 can provide a simple cross-reference.

CAEP provides an opportunity to submit the portion of Standard 1 evidence relevant to the four InTASC categories under the Program Review with Feedback option, or the SPA or state program review options, described in Part B, item 4, above. The material for those reviews together with any feedback received from those program review submissions by the EPP, can constitute a large proportion of the evidence for Standard 1. You will want to review the suggestions for evidence below, however, as a reminder when you consider the whole array of evidence for Standard 1. If you identify important evidence of your candidates' proficiencies, or if you believe that some evidence from the program review procedures was not fully representative of your candidates' accomplishments, then you may want to supplement program review evidence with InTASC-related additional evidence in your summary statement for Standard 1.

Your complete case that your candidates are proficient in the concepts of Standard 1 will complement program review evidence with evidence on the final two concepts described above: college and career readiness for initial teaching and diversity.

Repeating the CAEP focus note from Part B, section 2:

The types of evidence described in this handbook are intended only as examples. You are welcome to employ different measurements from those described here and to select ones that you believe will make the strongest case that your EPP has met each standard. Whatever evidence is chosen, the purpose is to show that you have addressed the concepts in the CAEP Standards in an effective way.

Examples of evidence on the learner and learning (InTASC) (Component 1.1)

a. Teacher performance assessments such as teacher work samples, edTPA, Praxis Performance Assessment for Teachers (PPAT), or other evidence of candidate application or interpretation of knowledge about learner development, learning differences, and the creation of learning environments.
b. Evidence of effective instruction for all students as defined in InTASC Standards 1-3 (i.e., "implementing developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences," "applying understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards," and "creating environments that support individual and collaborative learning").

Examples of evidence for content and content pedagogy knowledge (InTASC) (Standard 1, and components 1.1 and 1.3)

a. Licensure content knowledge assessments, indicating number of times taken and score averages compared with the median for national (ETS tests and some Pearson tests) or state tests (Pearson state specific tests)

b. Your own end-of-course or end of major content exams, compared with performances of non-education candidates in your host institution
c. GRE field tests (in limited fields, such as biochemistry, cell and molecular biology, biology, chemistry, computer science, literature in English, mathematics, physics, psychology)
d. Your own major field tests
e. Licensure pedagogy assessments
f. Number of completers who have been board certified or have won awards from specialty area organizations (e.g., AERA, APA, NAESP, NASSP, ASCD) for accomplishments mentioned in Standard 1

Examples of evidence for instructional practice (InTASC) (Standard 1 and components 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3)

a. Rubrics (edTPA) or tasks (PPAT) or "high leverage practices" (e.g., ETS NOTE—an observational test on use of "high leverages" teaching practices) or your teacher work sample sources to address relevant topics such as assessing student learning, meeting needs of diverse learners, designing instruction, using assessment and data literacy to advance student learning
b. Other examples: Massachusetts Tests for Educator Licensure, Elementary General Curriculum; Pearson Foundations of Reading; Connecticut/Pearson Foundations of Reading licensure test
c. Pre-service measures of candidate impact on P-12 student learning, e.g., from methods courses, clinical experiences and/or at exit; summary of situations where pre- and post-tests are available, or examples of student-performed tasks showing evidence of learning
d. Demonstrations of candidate facility with effective use of technology in classroom practice
g. Number of completers who have been board certified or have won awards from specialty area organizations (e.g., AERA, APA, NAESP, NASSP, ASCD) for accomplishments mentioned in Standard 1

Examples of evidence on professional responsibility (InTASC) (Standard 1, component 1.1 and component 3.6)

a. Dispositional and professional development measures
b. Professional behavior and responsibility measures
c. State-required measures, e.g., on standards of ethics

Examples of evidence for college and career readiness to teach (Standard 1 and component 1.4)

a. Rubrics (edTPA), tasks (PPAT), "high leverage practices" (e.g., ETS NOTE) or EPP's teacher work sample sources to address relevant topics such as data literacy, teaching that uses deep content knowledge with problem solving and critical thinking

PHASE-IN APPLIES

- See the CAEP Guidelines for Plans (in Appendix C) for details on the format and content of Phase-in Plans that are permitted under accreditation policy.
- See the Initial Programs Phase-in Schedule (in Appendix B) for details on the timeline for submitting "plans only," "plans plus progress" (including expectations for first data collection), and "full data."

Examples of evidence on diversity and equity (Standard 1 and cross-cutting themes)

a. Extract from data on learners and learning demonstrating candidate understanding of learning differences and ways to differentiate instruction effectively
b. Extract from college-and career-readiness evidence documenting instruction in deep content

knowledge, critical thinking, and problem solving with diverse P-12 students

c. Extract from instructional practice evidence relative to candidate capacities in data literacy and use of assessments with diverse students

Self-study prompts and reflection questions for Standard 1

The prompts and reflection questions below focus the selection of evidence and help to frame your case that Standard 1 is met. They bring together the suggested steps in connecting a case for the standard (see Part B, third focus note box in B.2, above) with the key concepts for Standard 1. The concepts are:

- **The learner and learning** (including learning differences, the context of diverse cultures, and creating effective learning environments);
- **Content knowledge** (including deep content knowledge, critical thinking and collaborative problem solving; and instructional applications of that knowledge in the content field);
- **Instructional practice** (including assessment and data literacy and use of assessment to advance learning);
- **Professional responsibilities** (including professional and ethical practice and collaboration with colleagues);
- **College and career readiness preparation**; and
- **Diversity and equity**, preparing for teaching in America's diverse classrooms.

YOUR ACCOMPLISHMENTS and YOUR CASE THAT STANDARD 1 IS MET

- **Identify key points for a convincing evidence-based case that candidates are competent in the concepts that make up Standard 1.** Describe what you have done that is unique and especially effective to prepare candidates. Use evidence to address questions such as:
  - How do you know that your candidates are successful? Are they proficient in the content knowledge of their field and how to teach it?
  - How do you know your candidates are able to apply what they are learning so that their diverse P-12 students learn in pre-service clinical settings?
  - How do you know your candidates are able to demonstrate their skills in teaching at college- and career-ready levels, including a deep knowledge of content, solving problems, and critical thinking in that content, and employing their assessment and data literacy skills for P-12 student learning?
  - How do you know your candidates are ready to teach diverse learners under the different situations they may encounter on the job?
  - How do you know your candidates are proficient in applications of technology to enhance P-12 student learning?
  - How do you know your candidates can apply appropriate professional and ethical standards in their work?
  - Have you set external benchmarks for success for your program and your faculty?

- **Describe the evidence that most compellingly demonstrates your case, what you have learned from the evidence, and what conclusions and interpretations you have made.** To frame your case for Standard 1, what evidence do you have about candidate proficiencies in the key concepts addressed in the standard? What have you learned from the data? What evidence supports your case? What contrary evidence have you found and how do you explain it? What are your interpretations of the meaning of the data regarding abilities of your candidates to perform with

competence and in a professional manner? What questions have emerged that need more investigation?

- **Explain how you know that the evidence you are assembling to justify your case for Standard 1 is valid and credible.** What can you say about data validity and reliability? About data relevance for the topic that it is to inform? About its representativeness?

- **Describe the uses you are making of the evidence for Standard 1 by sharing it with stakeholders and undertaking or planning modifications in your preparation courses and experiences.**

CLINICAL PARTNERSHIPS AND PRACTICE, CAEP STANDARD 2

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice — *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.*

Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements for clinical preparation, including technology-based collaborations, and shared 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.

Clinical Educators

2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators, both EPP 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.

Clinical Experiences

2.3 The provider works with partners to design clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, 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.

Key concepts

High-quality clinical practice is a unique and critical feature for educator preparation at any level. CAEP's Initial Standard 2 encourages you:

- to provide opportunities for candidates to practice the application of course knowledge under diverse instructional conditions with students who have differing needs, and
- to do that in partnerships with close collaborators from schools and school districts, as well as other appropriate organizations.

Partnerships and clinical experiences must keep a clear focus on candidate experiences that have positive effects on P-12 student learning. The partnerships should be continued over time and should feature shared decision making about crucial aspects of preparation experiences for candidates and the managing of the partnerships among all clinical educators. [NOTE: Under CAEP's glossary definition, clinical educators include all individuals who assess, support, and develop candidates' knowledge, skills, and/or professional dispositions at some stage in the clinical experiences. Clinical educators may be EPP-based, P-12 school-based, central office personnel, community-based, or in any other setting where candidates practice practical application.]

Evidence examples for Standard 2

Standard 2 provides an opportunity for you to demonstrate that your partnerships with P-12 schools are beneficial to both parties for initial programs. That demonstration would explain how you conduct, monitor and evaluate collaborative partnerships, and how evaluations lead to changes in preparation experiences. You provide examples of beneficial collaboration and how you and schools work together. You should document the opportunities for candidates in initial preparation to practice their developing knowledge and skills, and address what faculty have learned from the relationship of culminating experiences with candidate success in instructional tasks characteristic of their field of specialization.

Note that the standard and its components do not define specific qualitative characteristics of clinical experiences. Instead they ask that you and your partners conduct clinical experiences with "sufficient depth, breadth, coherence and duration" so that candidates are well prepared to have positive impact on all P-12 students. You should collect and examine data on the clinical experiences you offer, study them, and reflect on the messages in the data as a means of making your clinical experiences still more effective.

Repeating the CAEP focus note from Part B, section 2:

The types of evidence described in this handbook are intended only as examples. You are welcome to employ different measurements from those described here and to select ones that you believe will make the strongest case that your EPP has met each standard. Whatever evidence is chosen, the purpose is to show that you have addressed the concepts in the CAEP Standards in an effective way.

Evidence of partnerships and shared responsibility (Components 2.1 and 2.2)

These partnerships can lead to mutual consideration of areas for modification in light of collected evidence from candidates and partners. They can set common expectations for candidates, review the coherence of candidate's experience across clinical and academic components, and accept accountability for results in P-12 learning. More specifically, they could include:

- Descriptions of partnerships (e.g., MOUs) along with documentation that the partnership is being implemented as described;
- Documentation of stakeholder involvement such as agendas, minutes, and videos;
- Results from stakeholder surveys or other tools for receiving input or feedback from P-12 teachers and/or administrators;
- Documentation of shared responsibilities;
- Documentation of technology-based collaborations;
- Evidence that placements, observational instruments, and evaluations are co-constructed with partners;
- Evidence that expectations for candidates during clinical experiences are co-constructed and identified on evaluation resources (e.g., hours, frequency, activities, behaviors);
- Evidence that collaborative projects or action research projects inform problems of practice that providers and partners agree are sufficiently authentic to assess readiness for professional practice;
- Records of remediation and/or counseling out; and
- Documentation of jointly structured curriculum development/design/redesign.

PHASE-IN APPLIES

- See the CAEP Guidelines for Plans (Appendix C) for details on the format and content of Phase-in Plans.
- See the Initial Preparation Phase-in Schedule (Appendix B) for details on the timeline for submitting "plans only," "plans plus progress" (including expectations for first data collection), and "full data."

Examples of clinical experience evidence (Component 2.3)

You make a case that your clinical experiences are effective in preparing candidates for initial employment in education in their field of specialization. This demonstration does not involve reiterating performance outcomes submitted under Standard 1. Instead, it establishes that (or how) the features of your clinical experiences contribute to those outcomes. The evidence might answer questions such as, "What was the effect of changing the duration or sequence of clinical activities?" or "What results have you observed from a specific emphasis on meeting individual students' needs in clinical experiences for candidates preparing to be elementary teachers that might be transferred to preparation of early childhood candidates?" The evidence is descriptive and reflective.

Evidence documents the relationship between the attributes and outcomes of clinical experiences. For example, you can

- examine clinical experiences to ensure that these experiences are deliberate, purposeful, and sequential, and are assessed using performance-based protocols;
- document clinical experience goals and operational design along with evidence that clinical

experiences are being implemented as described;
- include a scope and sequence matrix that charts depth, breadth, and diversity of clinical experiences; a chart of candidate experiences in diverse settings; evidence of how candidate progression is monitored, including counseling actions; and application of technology to enhance instruction and P-12 learning for all students;
- describe attributes of the clinical experiences (i.e., depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and/or duration) that you have learned are associated with observed outcomes; and
- describe studies conducted on any changes to clinical experiences and the results observed by your leadership and faculty.

PHASE-IN APPLIES

- See the CAEP Guidelines for Plans (Appendix C) for details on the format and content of Phase-in Plans that are permitted under accreditation policy.
- See the Initial Preparation Phase-in Schedule (Appendix B) for details on the timeline for submitting "plans only," "plans plus progress" (including expectations for first data collection), and "full data."

Self-study prompts and reflection questions for Standard 2

The prompts and reflection questions, below, focus the selection of evidence and frame your case that Standard 2 is met. They bring together the suggested steps in building a case for the standard (see Part B, third focus note box in B.2, above) with the key concepts for Standard 2. The concepts are

- providing opportunities for candidates to practice the application of course knowledge in diverse instructional settings with students who have differing needs, and
- to do that in partnerships with close collaborators from schools and school districts as well as other appropriate organizations.

YOUR ACCOMPLISHMENTS and YOUR CASE THAT STANDARD 2 IS MET

- **Identify key points for an evidence-based case that your partnerships and clinical experiences are effective in accomplishing the purposes of Standard 2.** Describe what you have done that is unique and that you believe is especially effective in partnerships and clinical experiences. What opportunities have candidates had to prepare in diverse settings and to work with students having different needs? What features of clinical experiences (e.g., depth, breadth, coherence and duration) have you studied—through comparisons across preparation programs, or more formal investigations—to improve candidate outcomes? What features of partnerships including clinical faculty participation, selection, or training have had positive effects on candidate development? What clinical experiences have enhanced completer's understanding of diversity and equity issues and their readiness to use that understanding in teaching situations? What applications of technology have prepared completers for their responsibilities on the job?

- **Describe the evidence that most compellingly demonstrates your case, what you have learned from the evidence, and what conclusions and interpretations you have made.** To frame your case for Standard 2, what evidence do you have about the effectiveness of partnerships and clinical experiences? What have you learned from the data? What supports your case? What contrary evidence have you found and how do you explain it? What are your interpretations of the data

regarding the effectiveness of your partnerships and clinical experiences—are modifications needed? What questions have emerged that need more investigation?

- **Explain how you know that the evidence you are assembling to justify your case for Standard 2 is valid and credible.** What can you say about data validity and reliability? About data relevance for partnerships and clinical experiences? About its representativeness?

- **Describe the uses you are making of the evidence for Standard 2 by sharing it with stakeholders and undertaking or planning modifications in your preparation courses and experiences.**

CANDIDATE QUALITY, SELECTIVITY, AND PROGRESS, CAEP Standard 3

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.*

Plan for Recruitment of Diverse Candidates Who Meet Employment Needs

3.1 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 addresses community, state, national, regional, or local needs for hard-to-staff schools and shortage fields, currently STEM, English-language learning, and students with disabilities.

Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement

3.2 Required component[8] – *The provider meets CAEP minimum criteria or the state's minimum criteria for academic achievement, whichever are higher, and gathers disaggregated data on the enrollment candidates whose preparation begins during an academic year.*

The CAEP minimum criteria are a grade point average of 3.0 and a group average performance on nationally normed assessments of mathematical, reading, and writing achievement in the top 50 percent of those assessed. An EPP may develop and use a valid and reliable substantially equivalent alternative assessment of academic achievement. The 50th percentile standard for

[8]This is one of seven components designated by the CAEP Board to require evidence that meets CAEP guidelines at the component level; a decision of accreditation for seven years is only granted if the EPP meets all of the CAEP Standards and required components and is not assigned any stipulations.

writing will be implemented in 2021.

Starting in the academic year 2016-2017, the CAEP minimum criteria apply to the group average of enrolled candidates whose preparation begins during an academic year. The provider determines whether the CAEP minimum criteria will be measured (1) at admissions, OR (2) at some other time before candidate completion. In all cases, EPPs must demonstrate academic quality for the group average of each year's enrolled candidates. Also, EPPs must continuously monitor disaggregated evidence of academic quality for each branch campus (if any), mode of delivery, and individual preparation programs, identifying differences, trends, and patterns that should be addressed under component 3.1, and plan for recruitment of diverse candidates who meet employment needs.

CAEP will work with states and providers to designate, and will periodically publish, appropriate "top 50 percent" proficiency scores on a range of nationally or state normed assessments and other substantially equivalent academic achievement measures, with advice from an expert panel.

Alternative arrangements for meeting the purposes of this component will be approved only under special circumstances and in collaboration with one or more states. The CAEP president will report to the board and the public annually on actions taken under this provision.

Additional Selectivity Factors

3.3 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.

Selectivity During Preparation

3.4 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.

Selection at Completion

3.5 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.

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 for practice, and relevant laws and policies. CAEP monitors the development of measures that assess candidates' success and revises standards in light of new results.

Key concepts

Standard 3 addresses the need for you to recruit and intentionally develop strong applicant pools, enrolled candidates, and completers who meet academic achievement [component 3.2] and non-academic [component 3.3] criteria and understand expectations of the profession [component 3.6]. The standard is supported by the accumulation of stable findings over several decades indicating that academic proficiencies of teachers are associated with P-12 student learning.[9] The standard and its recruitment/support provision [component 3.1] also signal shared responsibility that an educator workforce should more broadly represent the wide and growing diversity found in America's student population. While you should build strength in your candidates to ensure that each is prepared to positively impact P-12 learning prior to recommendation for licensure or certification [component 3.5], you should also monitor the progress of all candidates and take steps that ensure appropriate support for candidates who are not meeting progression gateways [components 3.1 and 3.4].

The key concepts of the standard are:

- **Recruitment of an increasingly diverse and strong pool of candidates, ensuring support for those who are at risk of falling behind, responding to and serving employer needs** [component 3.1].
- **Academic achievement, requiring evidence that meets CAEP guidelines at the component level** [component 3.2] **that can be addressed with GPA and either nationally normed assessments or other approved "substantially equivalent" assessments.**
- **Monitoring candidate progress, including candidate performance on non-academic factors which are also important contributors to successful completion of a preparation program and teaching effectively, as part of systematic program progression criteria** [components 3.3 and 3.4].
- **High EPP standards for exit requirements (1) related to content knowledge and ability to teach effectively with positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development** [component 3.5], **and (2) understanding expectations of the profession, codes of ethics, standards of practice, and relevant laws and policies** [component 3.6]. [NOTE: Evidence relevant to these components that is used by the EPP as documentation for Standard 1 can simply be cross-referenced—it should not be repeated in making the EPP's case for Standard 3.]

Evidence examples for Standard 3

Repeating the CAEP focus note from Part B, section 2: The types of evidence described in this handbook are intended only as examples. You are welcome to employ different measurements from those described here and to select ones that you believe

[9] See, for example, a paper prepared by Teacher Preparation Analytics to inform the CAEP Board with a synthesis of research related to teacher academic proficiency and P-12 student learning, along with related topics. That paper is available here: http://caepnet.org/~/media/Files/caep/standards/attachment-b-tpa-standard-3-2-report.pdf?la=en. CAEP has also summarized some of the key research findings that underlie the Standard 3 provisions on its website: http://caepnet.org/standards/standard-3/rationale. A key resource is a 2010 National Research Council study, *Preparing Teachers: Building Evidence for Sound Policy.* A PDF is available here: https://www.nap.edu/catalog/12882/preparing-teachers-building-evidence-for-sound-policy.

will make the strongest case that your EPP has met each standard. Whatever evidence is chosen, the purpose is to show that you have addressed the concepts in the CAEP Standards in an effective way.

[NOTE for component 3.2: CAEP welcomes submission of assessments for demonstrating reading, math, and/or writing achievement for review as "substantially equivalent." Submissions should follow the Guidelines for Equivalence Studies for CAEP Standard 3 : http://caepnet.org/~/media/Files/caep/standards/guidelines-for-equivalence-studies-for-c.pdf?la=en. Assessments used to demonstrate component 3.2 must be approved prior to use your self-study report.]

Examples of recruitment and support evidence (Standard 3 and component 3.1)

- A recruitment/retention plan – Documentation that you periodically examine the employment landscape—to identify shortage areas, openings, forecasts, and related information—in the community, state, regional, or national market for which you are preparing completers. An appropriate plan should document base points on current measures of (1) academic achievement, (2) diversity, and (3) provider knowledge of employment needs, and include target outcomes for each of three or more ensuing years.
- Marketing and recruitment– Evidence of meaningful, data-informed goal(s) with appropriate progress demonstrated toward reaching diverse potential candidates and ensuring effectiveness in achieving greater diversity in the candidate pools.
- Providing support – Evidence of meaningful, data-informed goal(s) with appropriate progress demonstrated toward retaining and improving the progiciencies of at-risk candidates. Evidence might include documentation from performance reviews, remediation efforts, and/or provisions illustrating your goals for candidate support [component 3.1] and monitoring of progress toward goals of providing sufficient support to candidates to facilitate successful program completion [component 3.4].
- Monitoring progress – You show results of your annual monitoring of progress toward achieving recruitment and support goals. You disaggregate data to describe gender, ethnicity, academic ability, and/or candidate fit for high-need specialty areas or communities and analyze trends. You disaggregate admissions, enrollment, and completion data by (1) relevant demographics such as race/ethnicity, SES, and sex, and (2) branch campuses (if any), mode of delivery, and individual programs.
- Continuous improvement – You conduct analyses and evaluate the adequacy of your progress toward goals, and revisit plans as needed to increase progress. Over time, there should be evidence of resources moving toward identified targets and away from low-need employment areas.

PHASE-IN APPLIES

- See the CAEP Guidelines for Plans (Appendix C) for details on the format and content of Phase-in Plans that are permitted under accreditation policy.
- See the Initial Preparation Phase-in Schedule (Appendix B) for details on the timeline for submitting "plans only," "plans plus progress" (including expectations for first data collection), and "full data."

Evidence of candidate academic proficiency (Standard 3 and component 3.2)

- Evidence is required to document candidate academic proficiency through average GPA and achievement test scores on nationally normed assessments, or approved substantially equivalent assessments, in reading and math (and by 2021 in writing). These must meet CAEP's minimum criteria described in component 3.2, but also may include your own, additional criteria. You should present evidence for your case that the component is met distinct from other information presented on meeting Standard 3 overall. Examples include:
  - Criteria for GPA and results;
  - Criteria for normed tests and results [NOTE: See list of assessments approved for demonstrating component 3.2 here: http://caepnet.org/~/media/Files/caep/standards/caep-standard-3-component-32-measures-of.pdf?la=en];
    - The CAEP list will be updated from time to time as additional assessments are approved. The background paper also contains additional explanatory information about the component 3.2 criteria and a link to guidelines for states, or EPPs or testing organizations that propose other tests, not currently on the approved list, to be documented and reviewed by CAEP; and
    - EPP criteria created for interviews or other admission or progress monitoring procedures, together with results.

PHASE-IN APPLIES

- See the CAEP Guidelines for Plans (Appendix C) for details on the format and content of Phase-in Plans that are permitted under accreditation policy.
- See the Initial Preparation Phase-In Schedule for Initial-Level Programs (Appendix B) for details on the timeline for submitting "plans only," "plans plus progress" (including expectations for first data collection), and "full data."

Examples of monitoring candidate progression, including proficiency on non-academic measures (Components 3.3 and 3.4)

Some measures of candidate progression are an important means of monitoring the path to completion. Progress monitoring involves at least two evaluations/reviews of candidate competencies during the program. Ideally, these would occur on at least two points before the final review at exit. The selected academic and non-academic proficiencies and associated monitoring should be systematic and intentional to and targeted toward guiding decision making (e.g., your interventions/remediation, referrals to student support services, counsel out of program, evaluate program effectiveness, etc.). You summarize data information on resulting actions taken to enhance candidates' development of competencies captured in these evaluations. Focal knowledge and skills development progress that could be monitored include content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, pedagogical skills, professional dispositions, integration of technology with instruction, ability to meed the needs of diverse students, and ability to teach to college- and career-readiness standards. More specifically, examples include:

- Assessments used at key points during the program (e.g., phases/stages, checkpoints); content knowledge and dispositions assessments; these could be administered serially or in parallel;
- Demonstration of evolving technology integration into practice; this could repeatedly be assessed with the same tasks and criteria for competence, or with different tasks or criteria at different points in the program; and
- Non-academic factors used during candidate admission and/or monitored during preparation

that demonstrate knowledge and use of relevant literature supporting the factors you have selected or investigated. The rationale for Standard 3 (http://caepnet.org/standards/standard-3/rationale) provides the following examples of non-academic measures of candidate quality: grit, communications skills, focus, ability to motivate, leadership, perseverance, writing, dialogue, questioning, self-assessment, and reflection. You could supply

- evidence that you base non-academic selection criteria on relevant research literature and/or investigations that you have conducted, whether quantitative or qualitative;
- a description of how you assess non-academic factors and apply them in admission or preparation decisions; and
- Measures that may be related to specific specialty licensure areas or applied to all candidates.

PHASE-IN APPLIES

- See the CAEP Guidelines for Plans (Appendix C) for details on the format and content of Phase-in Plans that are permitted under accreditation policy.
- See the Initial Preparation Phase-in Schedule (Appendix B) for details on the timeline for submitting "plans only," "plans plus progress" (including expectations for first data collection), and "full data."

Examples of exit performance and understanding professional responsibilities (Standard 3 and components 3.5 and 3.6)

You should ensure that candidates at exit have opportunities to demonstrate that they can perform effectively on tasks that are representative of those they might perform in their field of specialization after employment. Note, though, that if your evidence for exit measures (such as that described in the following two paragraphs) is used as part of the SSR case for Standard 1, that can simply be cross-referenced for Standard 3. There is no need to restate or repeat that evidence or what the EPP has concluded from it.

Your evidence documents pre-service candidate's achievement of licensure requirements, as well as their positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development. Evidence can include a list of licensure requirements along with the rate at which candidates met these requirements. Evidence can also include documentation that candidates who did not achieve the requirements were not recommended for licensure by you. You should 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; and
- 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.

Your evidence documents candidate understanding of the profession. Evidence may include

- Course materials/assessments measuring topic knowledge on codes of ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant laws and policies;
- Results of national, state, or provider-created instruments assessing candidates' understanding of special education laws (section 504 disability), codes of ethics, professional standards, and similar content; and

- Documentation of specialized training (e.g., bullying, state law).

PHASE-IN APPLIES (Component 3.6)

- See the CAEP Guidelines for Plans (Appendix C) for details on the format and content of Phase-in Plans.
- See the Initial Programs Phase-In Schedule (Appendix B) for details on the timeline for submitting "plans only," "plans plus progress" (including expectations for first data collection), and "full data."

Self-study prompts and reflection questions for Standard 3

The prompts and reflection questions below focus the selection of evidence and frame your case that Standard 3 is met. They bring together the suggested steps in connecting a case for the standard (see Part B, third focus note box in B.2, above) with the key concepts for Standard 3. The concepts are

- Recruitment of a diverse and strong pool of candidates and ensuring support for those who are at risk of falling behind [component 3.1];
- Academic achievement, for which evidence is required [component 3.2], that can be addressed with either nationally normed assessments or others that are "substantially equivalent";
- Monitoring candidate progress, including candidate performance on non-academic factors which are also important contributors to successful completion of a preparation program and teaching effectively [components 3.3 and 3.4]; and
- High EPP standards for exit requirements (1) related to content knowledge and ability to teach effectively with positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development [component 3.5] and (2) understanding expectations of the profession, codes of ethics, standards of practice and relevant laws and policies [component 3.6].

[NOTE: Evidence relevant to these components that you use as documentation for Standard 1 can simply be cross-referenced—it should not be repeated in making your case for Standard 3.]

YOUR ACCOMPLISHMENTS and YOUR CASE THAT STANDARD 3 IS MET

- **Identify key points for an evidence-based narrative stating your case that candidate recruitment, support, achievement, and progress to completion - as they comprise Standard 3 - are effective.** Describe what you have done that is unique and especially effective in recruiting and supporting candidates who are diverse, have achieved academically, and successfully complete their preparation. What is the current status of your recruitment efforts? Are you meeting your goals for diversity and academic ability? How do you know? How were these goals informed by data and how did you determine they are meaningful? Do your candidates meet the CAEP academic achievement criteria (GPA minimum of 3.0 and group average performance on nationally normed or "substantially equivalent" in the top 50 percent) at some point during their preparation? What do your data show? What have you learned about candidate progression and needed points for remediation as candidates move through preparation toward successful completion? How have you set external benchmarks for success for your recruitment, progression, and exit goals? What is your evidence about the degree to which these have been achieved? How do your assessments, monitoring processes, and program scope and sequence for developing candidates work together to ensure that candidates demonstrate ability to have positive impact P-12 student learning by exit? And that candidates have the academic and non-academic skills to be effective teachers?

- **Describe the evidence that most compellingly demonstrates your case, what you have learned from the evidence, and what conclusions and interpretations you have made.** To frame your case for Standard 3, what evidence do you have about recruitment, candidate diversity and academic achievement, and progression to completion? What have you learned from the data? What supports your case? What contrary evidence have you found and how do you explain it? What are your interpretations of the meaning of the data, particularly regarding implications for modification in your recruitment, admissions, and monitoring progress (including through non-academic measures and identifying needed support for candidates at risk)? What questions have emerged that need more investigation?

- **Explain how you know that the evidence you are assembling to justify your case for Standard 3 is valid and credible.** What can you say about data validity and reliability? About data relevance for the topic that it is to inform? About its representativeness?

- **Describe the uses you are making of the evidence for Standard 3 by involving stakeholders and undertaking or planning modifications in your preparation courses and experiences.**

RESULTS OF PREPARATION, CAEP Standard 4

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.*

Impact on P-12 Student Learning and Development

4.1 **Required component**[10] – *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.*

Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness

4.2 **Required component** – *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.*

[10] All four components of Standard 4 are among the seven designated by the CAEP Board to require evidence that meets CAEP guidelines at the component level; a decision of accreditation for seven years is only granted if the EPP meets all of the CAEP Standards and required components and is not assigned any stipulations.

Satisfaction of Employers

4.3 **Required component** – *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.*

Satisfaction of Completers

4.4 **Required component** – *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.*

Key concepts

Standard 4 addresses the results of preparation when completers are employed in positions for which they are prepared, and evidence must be provided in the SSR for all components of Standard 4. The standard especially emphasizes the impact on P-12 student learning as measured in multiple ways, and the components collectively create a suite of measures focused on classroom instruction and results, as well as completer and employer satisfaction. The 2013 CAEP Standards draw from the principles of the Baldrige Education Criteria, which stipulate that any organization providing education services must know the results of those services. (See Key concepts section for Standard 5 at the beginning of Section C of this handbook.)

The key concepts for Standard 4 are the same as the four components:

- Teacher impact on P-12 student learning and development through multiple measures [component 4.1]
- Teaching effectiveness in the classroom through validated observations instruments and/or student perception surveys [component 4.2]
- Satisfaction with preparation as viewed by employers, including employment milestones such as promotion and retention [component 4.3]
- Satisfaction with preparation as viewed by completers [component 4.4]

The measurement challenges for Standard 4, while substantial, continue to evolve. CAEP points to three documents in particular that may help guide providers:

- CAEP's web resources contain a report from the American Psychological Association (Assessing and Evaluating Teacher Preparation Programs) on the use of assessments, observations, and surveys in educator preparation, including the use of P-12 student learning information as part of teacher evaluations.
- The CAEP Evidence Guide contains a section on options for measuring P-12 student learning in both pre-service and in-service situations, and includes information pertaining to states that make various forms of value-added data in teacher evaluations available to providers and those that do not.
- CAEP has posted a "resource" based on three different examples that EPPs have included as part of their self-study report evidence, titled CAEP Standard 4 Evidence: A Resource for EPPs.

Among the Standard 4 measures are ones for which the Gates-supported Measures of Effective

Teaching (MET) study has found a strong correlation with P-12 student learning. Teacher observation evaluations and student surveys can each inform questions about the completer's teaching behaviors and interactions with students. The remaining two components, 4.3 and 4.4, examine satisfaction of completers and employers with preparation—again, providing important, highly relevant information for providers to use in analyzing the consequences of their preparation courses and experiences. Finally, information on completer persistence and employment milestones can indicate career orientation and paths of progress that providers can use in their own plans and actions.

NOTE: The components of Standard 4 represent 4 of the "Annual Reporting Measures."

CAEP's requests for provider annual reports include a section that asks you to provide prominent and public links to the Annual Reporting Measures, including the components of Standard 4. In addition to providing a link, you are asked to summarize the posted data, analyze trends, and summarize how data were used for continuous improvement and programmatic changes. The submission of your EPP Annual Report to CAEP should provide documentation that you can summarize to address component 5.4 at the time of the SSR. In addition, trends in your cumulative reports since the last accreditation cycle will be included and interpreted as part of your SSR.

Evidence examples for Standard 4

Repeating the CAEP focus note from Part B, section 2:

The types of evidence described in this handbook are intended only as examples. You are welcome to employ different measurements from those described here and to select ones that you believe will make the strongest case that your EPP has met each standard. Whatever evidence is chosen, the purpose is to show that you have addressed the concepts in the CAEP Standards in an effective way.

PHASE-IN APPLIES to evidence for all components in Standard 4

- See the CAEP Guidelines for Plans (Appendix C) for details on the format and content of Phase-in Plans that are permitted under accreditation policy.
- See the Initial Preparation Phase-in Schedule (Appendix B) for details on the timeline for submitting "plans only," "plans plus progress" (including expectations for first data collection), and "full data."

Evidence of P-12 student impact (component 4.1)

If you have access to data in a state that uses P-12 student learning data (or data from multiple states where completers are employed), your SSR should include data on completers' contribution to student learning growth through such evidence as follows:

- Value-added modeling (VAM)
- Student growth percentiles tied to teacher (completers or provider)
- Student learning and development objectives
- State-supported measures addressing P-12 student learning and development that can be linked with teacher data
- Providers' documentation of analysis and evaluation of the evidence presented on completers' impact on P-12 student learning

If these data are available and applicable, you should demonstrate your familiarity with evidence such as the following:

1. Sources of any P-12 learning data from states on
    a. Psychometric soundness of the assessments taken by students
    b. Complementary sources of evidence
2. P-12 student data, such as the following:
    a. Proportion of your completers for whom P-12 student growth measures are available and the extent to which the reported completers are representative of all of your completers
    b. Degree of attrition (student data – provides context) from before current performance measures of P-12 students that would influence interpretations of data
    c. The manner by which student data are linked with teachers to judge the accuracy of the associated teacher data (scores should only be used for P-12 students who are taught by the provider's completers)
3. Your state's practice of reporting data, including the following information
    a. Level of the state disaggregation of data so that relevant information is available for specific preparation fields
    b. State criteria used to establish the minimum number of completers for whom data are shared with the provider
    c. State's decisions as to the number of years that completers' performance is associated with their preparation
    d. Disaggregated data provided by the state that permit comparisons for prior P-12 performances
    e. Disaggregation of data provided by the state that permit comparisons for completers teaching in similar situations, such as special education, disability, English Language Learners, attendance, and gifted.

If you are a provider that does not have access to state P-12 student learning data or are a provider that is supplementing state or district data with data on subjects or grades not covered, the following guidance applies:

- You may be eligible to meet the standard using the phase-in provisions of accreditation policy. For example, initially you create an appropriate design; then conduct a pilot data collection and analysis; and then make refinements and further data collection.
- You can maintain a continuing cycle of such studies, examining completer performance in different grades and/or subjects over time.
- You can develop case studies of completers that demonstrate the impacts of preparation on P-12 student learning and development and can be linked with teacher data; some examples follow:
    - Your own case studies of completers
    - Completer-conducted action research
    - Descriptions of partnerships with individual schools or districts
    - Description of methods and development of any assessment used
    - Use of focus groups, blogs, electronic journals, interviews, and other evidence

Evidence of teaching effectiveness–instructional proficiencies (Component 4.2)

Whereas component 4.1 focuses on student outcomes, component 4.2 focuses on the teaching

practices of completers that are associated with those outcomes. For evidence of teaching effectiveness, you should submit data on completers' classroom application of professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions promoted in the preparation program (as described in relation to Standards 1-3). These can include the following:

- P-12 student perception surveys, and/or
- classroom observations of completers using measures correlated with P-12 student learning, such as those used in the MET study, and/or
- provider-created classroom observations aligned with InTASC Standards or state standards.

If state-created student surveys and/or observation tools have been administered, the provider could rely on those measures, taking care to describe the content and how it relates to the knowledge, skills, and dispositions in the InTASC Standards and the conceptual framework of the preparation program.

For the SSR you should describe the representativeness of the data, analyze student survey and completer observation evidence, and interpret the results. Discussions of results should include any comparisons that are supported by the quantity of data; these could include comparisons of results across licensure areas at your EPP, between your completers' results and external benchmarks (e.g, district, state, national, or other relevant benchmarks), or over time.

Evidence from employers (Component 4.3)

You should submit data on indicators of employer satisfaction with completers' preparation from evidence sources such as the following:

- Employer satisfaction surveys (include instrument sampling, response rates, timing);
- Employer satisfaction interviews (include population represented, response rates, instrument content, timing);
- Employer satisfaction focus groups (include population represented, response rates, instrument content, timing); and
- Employer satisfaction case studies (include a description of methodology).

You should submit on employment milestones such as the following:

- Promotion;
- Employment trajectory;
- Employment in high-needs schools;
- Retention in
- education position for which initially hired or
- another education role by the same or a different employer; and
- Rates of achieving the next step in states with stepped certification (e.g., moving from induction-level certificate to professional-level/permanent certificate).

Evidence from completers (Component 4.4)

You should submit data on completers' perception of their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job:

- Completer satisfaction surveys (include instrument, sampling, response rates, timing);
- Completer satisfaction interviews (include population represented, response rates, instrument content, timing);

- Provider focus groups of completers (include population represented, response rates, instrument content, timing); and
- Completer satisfaction case studies (include a description of methodology).

Self-study prompts and reflection questions for Standard 4

The prompts and reflection questions, below, focus the selection of evidence and frame your case that Standard 4 is met. They bring together the suggested steps in connecting a case for the standard (see Part B, third focus note box in B.2, above) with the key concepts for Standard 4. These are measures that document

- Teacher impact on P-12 student learning and development, through multiple measures;
- Teaching effectiveness in the classroom through validated observations instruments and/or student perception surveys;
- Satisfaction with preparation as viewed by employers, including employment milestones such as promotion and retention; and
- Satisfaction with preparation as viewed by completers.

YOUR ACCOMPLISHMENTS and YOUR CASE THAT STANDARD 4 IS MET

- **Identify key points for a convincing evidence-based case that measures of P-12 student learning, teacher classroom evaluations, employer satisfaction, and completer satisfaction.** Describe what you have done that is unique and especially effective to **understand the post-preparation employment experiences of former candidates**. What can you say confidently about the performances of completers on the job with their P-12 students? In their teaching roles? What corroboration have you found from student perception surveys? What is the current status of your information from employers about their satisfaction with completers' preparation? What does information returned from your completers tell you about their satisfaction with preparation? Do the data identify elements of preparation experiences that might warrant a closer look? What external benchmark performances do you meet?

- **Describe the evidence that most compellingly demonstrates your case, what you have learned from the evidence, and what conclusions and interpretations have you made.** To frame your case for Standard 4, what evidence do you have about your completer's performance in the classroom (e.g., on P-12 student learning)? On instructional practices? On engagement with P-12 students and families? What evidence do you have from employers (including information on employment milestones such as job changes or tenure decisions? What information do you have from completers? What have you learned from the data? What supports your case? What contrary evidence have you found and how do you explain it?

- **Explain how you know that the evidence you are assembling to justify your case for Standard 4 is valid and credible.** What can you say about data validity and reliability? About data relevance for the topic that it is to inform? About its representativeness?

- **Describe the uses you are making of the evidence for Standard 4 by sharing it with stakeholders and undertaking or planning modifications in your preparation courses and experiences.**

DIVERSITY AND TECHNOLOGY CROSS-CUTTING THEMES

Diversity

America's students are diverse, individually (e.g., personality, interests, learning modalities, and life experiences) and as members of groups (e.g., race, ethnicity, ability, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, nationality, language, religion, political affiliation, and socio-economic background). To best serve America's students, EPPs must*

- *Show respect for the diversity of candidates;*
- *Provide experiences that support the candidates' commitment to diversity; and*
- *Prepare candidates to design and enact equitable and excellent experiences for all P-12 students.*

**(InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards, p. 21)*

Diversity appears explicitly in Standards 1, 2, and 3. The intent is that the concepts of diversity and equity of opportunity are addressed as part of your case that those standards are met. Also, in addition, you have your own unique contextual conditions that surround preparation—geographic location, patterns attracting candidate pools, opportunities for partnerships exhibiting different enrollments and diversity, among others. For that reason, you should analyze your own situation, determine how best to make use of the diversity you already have, and set challenging goals that move further toward the diversity found in America's P-12 classrooms and prepare your candidates for those classrooms. The CAEP diversity theme incorporates multiple perspectives, respect, and responsiveness to cultural differences, and candidate understanding of diverse contexts that your completers will encounter in their employment situations.

CAEP Standards use the term "all" students as a reference to P-12 student diversity in America, and it appears in the language of the CAEP Standards and their components. The term defines individual and group differences in the same way as the CCSSO Interstate Teaching and Assessment Support Consortium (InTASC):

(1) Individual differences (e.g., personality, interests, learning modalities, and life experiences), and
(2) Group differences (e.g., race, ethnicity, ability, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, nationality, language, religion, political affiliation, and socio-economic background) (InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards, p. 21).

The CAEP Standards make explicit references to diversity—in particular the following:

- Standard 1
  - "Candidates demonstrate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college- and career-ready standards."
  - Candidates demonstrate understanding of the InTASC Standards on "the learner and learning."

- Candidates use "research and evidence…to measure their P-12 students' progress."
- Standard 2
  - EPPs work with partners to design clinical experiences "to ensure that candidates demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students' learning and development." Diversity in students with whom candidates engage, and diversity in placements are both relevant to Standard 2.
- Standard 3
  - Providers engage in outreach efforts "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."
  - EPPs monitor disaggregated evidence from academic achievement and non-academic measures and follow candidate progress for each campus and mode of delivery, providing support for candidates who need it.

The report from the 2013 CAEP Standards Commission provided the following examples of proficiencies that candidates who complete an educator preparation program should develop:

- Incorporation of multiple perspectives to the discussion of content, including attention to learners' personal, family, and community experiences and cultural norms;
- Ability to use a variety of approaches as needed to support multiple ways for P-12 students to access knowledge, represent knowledge, and demonstrate the attainment of academic goals and competencies;
- A commitment to deepening awareness and understanding the strengths and needs of diverse learners when planning and adjusting instruction that incorporates the histories, experiences, and representations of students and families from diverse populations;
- Verbal and nonverbal communication skills that demonstrate respect for and responsiveness to the cultural backgrounds and differing perspectives learners and their families bring to the learning environment;
- Ability to interpret and share student assessment data with families to support student learning in all learning environments; and
- An understanding of their own frames of reference (e.g., culture, gender, language, abilities, ways of knowing), the potential biases in these frames, the relationship of privilege and power in schools, and the impact of these frames on educators' expectations for and relationships with learners and their families.

Self-study prompts and reflection questions for diversity

- What overall conclusions can you draw from the evidence you have provided about diversity aspects of Standards 1, 2 and 3?
- What aspects of diversity are represented in your preparation programs, experiences, faculty, and candidates? How do you make use of that diversity so that candidates will be prepared for America's classrooms?
- What challenge goals have you set for yourself and what is your progress toward achieving them?
  - For your EPP, what are the specific knowledge, skills, and dispositions (KSD) relevant to serving diverse populations and ensuring equity in opportunity that program completers will need to meet the challenges of their initial professional roles?
  - In what specific ways do you act to include those KSDs in courses and experiences?
- What evidence of candidate understanding, or change in perceptions, or skills in student

engagement can you offer to substantiate your response to the diversity theme?

Technology

Excerpt from CAEP Standards Commission Report

> Candidates need experiences during their preparation to become proficient in applications of digital media and technological capabilities. They should have opportunities to develop the skills and dispositions for accessing online research databases, digital media, and tools, and to identify research-based practices that can improve their students' learning, engagement, and outcomes. They should know why and how to help their students access and assess critically the quality and relevance of digital academic content. Preparation experiences should allow candidates to demonstrate their abilities to design and facilitate digital, or connected learning, mentoring, and collaboration. They should encourage use of social networks as resources for these purposes and to help identify digital content and technology tools for P-12 students' learning. Candidates should help their students gain access to what technology has to offer.

The technology crosscutting theme addresses incorporation of technology to improve the effectiveness of school and district functions, enhance instruction, and manage student and assessment data while engaging students in the applications of technology to learning experiences. The CAEP Standards make explicit references to applications of technology, in particular the following:

- Standard 1
  - "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."
- Standard 2
  - "Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements for clinical preparation, including technology-based collaborations."
  - "Clinical experiences, including technology-enhanced learning opportunities, are structured to have multiple, performance-based assessments at key points…to demonstrate candidates' development of the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions…associated with a positive impact on the learning and development of all P-12 students."
- Standard 3
  - "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."

Self-study prompts and reflection questions for technology

- What overall conclusions can you draw from the evidence you have provided about technology aspects of Standards 1, 2, and 3?
- How do candidates infuse technology into lesson plan development in coursework, fieldwork, and clinical practice?
- How does the EPP collaborate with partners to provide expertise on new technology in professional development for teachers in partner schools?
- How do partners collaborate with the EPP to provide expertise on new technology to candidates in coursework, fieldwork, or clinical practice?

- What performance assessments do you use to measure candidate proficiencies in technologies used at clinical partner sites?

APPENDIX A: Evidence Sufficiency Criteria

QUALITY ASSURANCE AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT (CAEP STANDARD 5)

Note: The EPP is asked to write a summary statement demonstrating the key concepts in each standard. The "Key Concept" sections in this chart are aligned with the "Key concepts" paragraphs that appear under Standard 5 in this handbook. The left column describes the evidence that EPPs include in their self-study reports for Standard 5. The center column describes what the site team does in their examination of the EPP's case for Standard 5. The right column describes evaluation criteria that the team employs or the corroboration of evidence they try to establish during their accreditation review.

Making a Case for Standard 5: Evidence Evaluation		
STANDARD 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement The provider maintains a quality assurance system [component 5.1] comprised of valid data from multiple measures [component 5.2], 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 [component 5.3], and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers [components 5.4 and Standard 4]. 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 [components 5.3 and 5.5].		
Key Concept: The provider maintains a quality assurance system capable of providing data output that enables quality control and continuous improvement. (components 5.1, 5.2 and 5.4)		
In the EPP's Self-Study Report (SSR)	**In the Site Team's Reports (FFR, SVR)**	**Evaluation Criteria**
Quality Assurance System [component 5.1] The provider describes its quality assurance system (QAS), including the EPP's program management and operations related to assuring quality. The evidence is intended to document the capabilities of the QAS (i.e., what it can do). Documentation should show the range and quality assurance processes and measures on which the EPP relies: • A description of how the evidence submitted in Standards 1-4 and other provider data are collected, analyzed, monitored, and reported.	Quality Assurance System [component 5.1] NOTE: Through its review of evidence the EPP provides for Standard 1-4, members of the CAEP site team will gain considerable understanding about the characteristics of an EPP's assessments and other measures and indicators; about the characteristics of the EPP's assessments; about the capabilities of the EPP's quality assurance system to access, assemble, and analyze data; about attributes of data quality; and about the EPP's continuous improvement efforts. These individual experiences will be brought together	Quality Assurance System [component 5.1] Demonstrations of the data management system confirm the EPP's description of how it stores and accesses data relevant to all CAEP Standards: • The provider uses evidence/data from a coherent set of multiple measures to inform, modify, and evaluate EPP's operational effectiveness. • The EPP can and does regularly use these systems to retrieve data and review results on candidate progress and completer achievements.

• 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 your management and policy (e.g., usefulness). • The schedule and process for continuous review, together with roles and responsibilities of system users. • Cross references to evidence documenting Standards 1 through 4 as evidence of the capabilities of the QAS. The EPP describes the quality management operations that it employs to ensure that it has a sufficient quantity of empirical evidence that is relevant to the CAEP Standards. It provides information about data on completers' preparedness and performance and how it sets goals for enhancing the EPP's contribution to completer effectiveness: • Pre-service measures of completer effectiveness (in SSRs for Standard 1) and in-service impact measures (in SSRs for Standard 4) are examined in relation to external benchmarks, and • Trends in completer outcome data are analyzed and interpreted appropriately.	and will have a significant influence on the team's perceptions about capabilities of the EPP's QAS and the credibility of data included in that system. The site team examines the description of the QAS and verifies that: stakeholder interviews, system demonstration, and the team's experience from evaluating standards 1-4 align with the description. The team ensures that the description provides an accurate representation of the program's assessment system, data management system, internal review processes, and relations with stakeholders.	• The EPP's assessment and data systems allow for the collection, storage, and analysis of data from multiple sources. • 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.). • The provider documents evidence of appropriate access and use by a variety of users for various purposes. • The provider evidence shows that the system has the capacity to collect, analyze, monitor, and report data/evidence on all CAEP Standards. Written documentation (e.g., website, handbooks, policies, meeting minutes) confirms the EPP's description of its quality management processes and procedures. Interviews with stakeholder groups (e.g., faculty, administrators, candidates, completers, mentor/cooperating clinical educators, employers) corroborate the provider's descriptions for the quality management indicators relevant to them. (For example, clinical educators confirm that they receive the rater training the EPP described; candidates confirm various progress monitoring activities take place as described; and partners and employers confirm that their feedback/input was used for continuous improvement.)
Data Quality (component 5.2) The EPP provides evidence that its QAS involves processes for establishing/ assuring the validity of	Data quality [component 5.2] The site team verifies that at least 75% of EPP-created assessments used in the QAS are scored at the sufficient level or above on the CAEP	Data quality [component 5.2] The measures used for each standard yield evidence that meets CAEP's expectations for

each measure it uses to generate evidence for CAEP self-study reports and that each meets CAEP's expectations for validity, reliability/ consistency, verifiability, representativeness, cumulativeness, and actionability. Make a case across all of the standards and on behalf of the EPP as an organization documenting that instruments align with the sufficient level in CAEP's Framework for Evaluation of EPP-Created Assessments, that data files are complete and accurate, and that principles of "good evidence" (See CAEP Evidence Guide, section 5) are followed. In addition, the EPP cross references information about data quality in evidence cited for Standards 1 through 4. Those references would include such information as the following: • 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, and • Empirical evidence that interpretations of data are reliable and valid.	Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments. The team verifies that, across the standards, the EPP's interpretations of evidence are consistent, accurate, and supported by data/evidence.	evidence quality (i.e., validity, reliability/consistency, verifiability, representativeness, cumulativeness, actionability). Measures constitute a coherent, and appropriate set across and within standards and allow for convergence/triangulation across measures. Interpretations of evidence (for standards 1-4) are consistent, accurate, and supported by data/evidence. At least 75% of EPP-created assessments used in the QAS are scored at the sufficient level or above on the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments, with particular attention to content validity. Reliability around the implementation of all assessments (EPP-created or otherwise), particularly inter-rater reliability or agreement at .80 or 80% or above where applicable. EPP-created surveys ask questions that align to standards.
Annual measures [component 5.4] Describe how the annual reporting measures work together as indicators of your performance along with other measures from your QAS. provide analysis of trends, comparisons with benchmarks, identification of changes made in your preparation curricula and experiences, how/where/with whom results are shared, resource allocations affected by	Annual measures [component 5.4] The team verifies that measures of completer outcomes are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, and shared widely. The team verifies that the EPP posts this information in a location that is easily accessible to stakeholders (e.g., on the EPP website where	Annual measures [component 5.4] Information on the outcome [component 5.4] and impact (Standard 4) measures is published prominently and updated annually: • Evidence that the outcome and impact measures and their trends are posted on the EPP website and shared widely in other ways along with relevant comparisons/benchmarks;

your uses of the information, and indications of future directions. The measures include those described in Standard 4 (impact measures): • Evidence of completer impact on P-12 student learning and development • Indicators of teaching effectiveness, observation instruments, and student surveys • Employer satisfaction and completer persistence • Completer satisfaction And they include the following outcome and consumer measures for initial candidates and completers: • Completer or graduation rate • Licensure/certification rate • Employment rate • Consumer information	prospective students can see it along with other prominent information about the program, in a newsletter to the partners) and reviews the results of the past few years of EPP Annual Reports submitted to CAEP.	• The SSR provides direct access to the published materials (e.g., hyperlinks, copies) and provides evidence of accurate trend analyses and comparisons with benchmarks; and • Program changes and modifications are directly linked to evidence/data from the annual reporting measures with specific examples. ○ Planned changes to the program were/are based on outcome data gathered from completers and/or their employers or data on outcomes such as completion rates, licensure rates, etc. Resource allocations correspond to program change initiatives.
Key Concept: The provider's leadership with appropriate stakeholders, and EPP management procedures that input, analyze, interpret and use information from the QAS to support continuous improvement. (components 5.3 and 5.5)		
<u>Continuous Improvement</u> [components 5.3 and 5.5] The provider describes the role that inquiry and data play in its continuous improvement process. The inquiry in which the EPP engages includes data and results derived from the self-study process and demonstrates ongoing, appropriate stakeholders (such as candidates, alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider) are involved in: • Decision making; • Program evaluation; and • Selection and implementation of changes for improvement.	<u>Continuous Improvement</u> [components 5.3 and 5.5] The site team examines the review schedules to verify that they are regular (at least annual) and that they address the main aspects of the goal, standard, or innovation. The team verifies that the review involved examining data on performance status and progress over time. The team verifies that documentation supports the EPP's statements regarding how it used data or evidence to support decision making.	<u>Continuous Improvement</u> [components 5.3 and 5.5] Written documentation (e.g., website, handbooks, policies, meeting agendas, meeting minutes) confirms that the EPP regularly and systematically: • reviews quality assurance system data, • identifies patterns across preparation programs (both strengths and weaknesses), • uses data/evidence for continuous improvement, and • systematically tests innovations. Reviews examine all major aspects of the initiative's design using all data available at the time of the review.

The EPP provides evidence that its QAS involves a process of regular and systematic review and reflection related to its goals, standards, and innovations. Describe and evidence who is involved and how. The EPP provides evidence that its review and reflection processes incorporate data and evidence on performance status and progress over time. The EPP documents regular and systematic data-informed changes [component 5.3] grounded in: (a) research and evidence from the field, (b) data analyses and interpretations from the quality assurance system, and (c) linked to the EPP's goals and relevant standards. Evidence is provided from monitoring the results of the data-informed changes and tests of innovation, including progress from baseline data, to demonstrate the degree to which each change was an improvement. The EPP describes 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 the following: • Baseline(s), • Intervention, • Tracking over time, • Rationale for conclusions, • Comparison(s) of results with criteria or target goals, and • Next steps that were taken and/or are	The site team evaluates the strength of the EPP's evidence that it uses completer outcome information for continuous improvement purposes such as in decision making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction. The site team verifies stakeholders' involvement in the evaluation, improvement, and decision-making activities. The site team verifies the process and results of improvement efforts.	Program decisions are directly supported by data or are not contradicted by available data or evidence. The examples indicate changes are clearly connected to evidence, that tests of innovations are of appropriate design, and that provider performance is systematically assessed against goals. Clear evidence that changes are data-informed, systematic, monitored, and most importantly that results of changes trend toward improvement (and that changes that did not are analyzed along with demonstration of learnings put to use). Most (80% or more) change and program modifications are linked back to evidence/data with specific examples provided and are clearly evidenced through results as improvements. 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.

planned.		EPP identifies examples of input from stakeholders and use of that input. Specific evidence of diverse stakeholder involvement is documented through multiple sources in each of the following areas: • Decision making; • Program evaluation; and • Selection and implementation of changes for improvement.

A note on Summative Evaluations of the Case for Meeting the Standard

While the site team does not make a recommendation regarding whether the standard is met, the team is tasked with notifying the Accreditation Council when their review and professional judgment suggest that the evidence submitted by the EPP is insufficient to make the case for a standard. The site team notifies the Accreditation Council and provides a written rationale. They may cite several potential AFIs or stipulations in a given standard or a combination of AFIs and stipulations in the same standard.

CANDIDATE KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS (CAEP STANDARD 1)

Note: The EPP is asked to write a summary statement demonstrating the key concepts in each standard. The "Key Concepts" sections in this chart are aligned with the "Key concepts" paragraphs that appear under Standard 1 in this handbook. The left column describes the evidence that EPPs include in their program review or SSRs for Standard 1. The center column describes what the CAEP site team do in their examination of the evidence that the EPP provides to make a case Standard 1 The right column describes evaluation criteria that the site visit team and the Accreditation Council employ or the corroboration of evidence they try to establish during their accreditation review.

Making a Case for Standard 1: Evidence Evaluation
STANDARD 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline [components 1.1 and 1.3] and, by completion, can use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards [components 1.2, 1.4, 1.5].

Using the program review evidence and response in the SSR case for Standard 1		
The CAEP Program Review with Feedback, the SPA Program Review with National Recognition, and the state review option are primary sources of evidence for Standard 1. Program review is used to collect data disaggregated by licensure/certification programs using outcomes-based assessments that may be used to address the key concepts of CAEP Standard 1. The process is completed prior to preparation of the self-study report, and the information should be made available in the SSR and EPP evidence room. Program review examines evidence that candidates have developed proficiencies in four concepts for Standard 1: a. Learners and learning b. Knowledge of specialty content and pedagogical content c. Ability to apply that knowledge in practice situations d. Professional responsibilities Forms of evidence appropriate for those concepts are described, below, along with the final two Standard 1 concepts: • college and career readiness for teaching • diversity and technology The EPP will describe in the SSR how input received from the program review option(s) has been used to address the cited conditions or gaps; and provide evidence that any conditions that are also relevant to the CAEP Standards (e.g., instrument quality) have been addressed.	The site team verifies evidence of recently conducted program level review using one of the three review options. For individual licensure/certification programs seeking SPA review option, the site visit team looks at the National Recognition status from a three year out review through SPA reports. For individual licensure/certification programs selecting the CAEP Program Review with Feedback option, the site visit team looks at the Panel Feedback Report. For individual licensure/certification programs selecting the state review option, the site visit team looks at the state report. At the time of the formative feedback review or site visit, the site team checks whether (a) the SPA input has been used to make programmatic improvements to receive full national recognition and address the key concepts of CAEP Standard 1, (b) the Panel Feedback has been used to make programmatic improvements to address any gaps in evidence for the CAEP Standard 1 key concepts, and/or (c) the state report has been used to make programmatic improvements to meet state expectations and address any gaps in evidence for the CAEP Standard 1 key concepts . The team evaluates the evidence submitted by the EPP to ensure any conditions that relate to CAEP's evidence sufficiency criteria have been resolved. The site team evaluates the EPP's	EPP has provided evidence documenting that P-12 licensure/cerification programs enrolling a majority of the EPP's candidates have achieved National Recognition from SPAs, or have other evidence -such as from a state review process or CAEP Program Review with Feedback - that demonstrates INTASC or other relevant standards have been achieved. Preponderance of evidence presented on self-study report indicate key concepts of CAEP Standard 1/A.1 are met Evidence documents that all of the licensure/certification programs meet expectations of program approval by the state and/or other regional agencies as discussed in the state's periodic review of program-level outcome data.

• **For programs using the SPA option**: On the SSR the EPP also identifies any programs that have achieved SPA National Recognition. The EPP uses the SPA National Recognition status as partial evidence for meeting the key concepts of Standard 1. For programs with a status other than National Recognition (National Recognition with Conditions,[11] National Recognition with Probation, or Further Development Required, Not Nationally Recognized) from a three year out review, , the EPP will describe in the SSR how the SPA feedback has been used to address the cited conditions or gaps; and provide evidence that any conditions that are also relevant to the CAEP Standards (e.g., instrument quality) have been addressed. • **For programs using the feedback option:** On the SSR, the EPP describes how the reports received from the CAEP Program Review with Feedback have been used as partial evidence for meeting the key concepts of Standard 1. The reports are also used to make programmatic changes to address any gap or shortcoming shortcoming in the evidence for the key Standard 1 concepts. • **For programs using the state option:** On the SSR, the EPP describes how the reports	disaggregated Standard 1 data and evidence through the lens of the CAEP evidence sufficiency criteria. The CAEP site team confirms any EPP evidence provided for, or any responses received from, state review through written reports that is relevant to the InTASC categories in Standard 1.	

[11] Typical categories of conditions listed in the Guidelines on Program Review with National Recognition Using Specialized Professional Association (SPA) Standards (p. 68) include: Insufficient data to determine if SPA standards are met; Insufficient alignment among SPA standards or scoring assessments or scoring guides; Lack of quality in some assessments or scoring guides; Insufficient number of SPA standards met; SPA officially set a benchmark on state licensure test(s) that is not met.

received from state review have been used as partial evidence for meeting the key concepts of Standard 1.		
Key Concept: Candidates develop concepts and principles to understand learning differences and learners' differing needs (Components 1.1, 1.3).		
Candidates' understanding of learning and individual learners The SSR and evidence room make available all evidence provided for any program review option together with any responses received from reviewers. EPPs will want to ensure that evidence, such as that described below, is available to reviewers. The EPP's case for Standard 1 includes evidence of candidates' understanding of P-12 student growth and development and of individual differences across cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas as well as individual differences and diverse cultures and communities that ensure all students learn [Component 1.1]. Evidence might be from sources such as • course assignments or tasks • end of course assessments The EPP provides evidence of candidate abilities to apply their understanding of learning and learners in instructional situations such as • clinical experiences with one or more students • formal practice teaching with groups of students or classrooms • assessments such as edTPA, PPAT • EPP-created teacher work sample tasks relevant to learning and learners	The team evaluates the evidence submitted by the EPP to ensure any conditions that relate to CAEP's evidence sufficiency criteria have been resolved. The site team evaluates the EPP's disaggregated Standard 1 data from EPP-created instruments to verify that they meet CAEP's sufficiency criteria. The team verifies that candidate performance is sufficient in relation to performance standards, with performance at or above acceptable levels on the EPP scoring scale for instruments that measure knowledge of standards and pedagogical applications. The site team evaluates the accuracy of the EPP's interpretations and conclusions regarding performance sufficiency.	Evidence documents that the EPP-created instruments meet or exceed CAEP's sufficiency criteria. Evidence documents that the EPP uses multiple indicators/measures to assess candidate performance in relation to the InTASC learning and the learning and professional responsibility categories. The EPP's data analysis is sound with respect to professional research and data analysis practices. The EPP's interpretation of the results is consistent with the nature and magnitude of their reported findings (e.g., low scores are not interpreted as high scores; large and persistent performance gaps between programs areas are not described as reasonable). Performance is at or above acceptable levels on the EPP scoring scale for instruments that measure knowledge of standards and pedagogical applications.

In any case where some or all of this evidence is included in a Program Review with Feedback Report, SPA report or in a state program approval process, the EPP can include a reference and brief summary of that evidence in the SSR [Components 1.1 and 1.3 and InTASC Standards 6, 7, and 8].		
Key Concept: Candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and abilities to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students (language of Standard 1 and components 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5).		
In the EPP's Self-Study Report (SSR)	**In the Site Team's Reports (FFR, SVR)**	**Evaluation Criteria**
Candidates' knowledge of specialty content and content pedagogy The SSR and evidence room make available all evidence provided for any program review option together with any responses received from reviewers. EPPs will want to ensure that evidence, such as that described below, is available to reviewers. Evidence demonstrates that candidates have developed deep understanding of critical concepts and principles in their discipline using the EPP's own measures, proprietary measures if available, and state licensure measures [Standard 1, components 1.1 and 1.3]. With the EPP's own measures, candidate performances meet or exceed the sufficient level in the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments. When appropriate, comparisons are made of candidates with their institutional peers in the same courses. With proprietary and state measures, comparisons are made of candidates	CAEP's site team confirms program review evaluations and may supplement with evaluation of EPP-created instruments to verify that they meet CAEP's sufficiency criteria. CAEP's site team verifies that candidate performance is sufficient in relation to performance standards. a. Class averages are at or above acceptable levels on the EPP scoring scale for instruments that measure outcomes for content knowledge. b. Candidate performance compares well with benchmarks (e.g., licensure scores or pass rates are similar to or exceed cut sores and/or state/national averages; course assignments, tasks, assessments, or GPA are comparable to those for non-candidates in the same courses or majors). The CAEP site team evaluates the accuracy of the EPP's interpretations and conclusions regarding performance sufficiency.	Evidence documents that the EPP-created instruments meet or exceed CAEP's sufficiency criteria. Evidence documents that data from the instruments meet professional research and data analysis standards for reliability or consistency (e.g., r = .80). Evidence documents that the EPP uses multiple indicators/measures to assess candidate performance in relation to the InTASC content knowledge category. The EPP disaggregates results by specialty area. The EPP's data analysis is sound with respect to professional research and data analysis practices. Results show that candidates in each licensure area meet or exceed the reported performance standard for each measure.

with national norms, where possible, or with state norms, or with state established passing scores. In all cases, differences are analyzed and their significance interpreted. In any case where some or all of this evidence is included in a Program Review with Feedback report, SPA report or in a state program approval process, the EPP can include a reference and brief summary of that evidence in the SSR.	The team evaluates the accuracy of the EPP's analytical summary of trends/patterns, comparisons, and/or differences.	The EPP's interpretation of the results is consistent with the nature and magnitude of their reported findings (e.g., low scores are not interpreted as high scores; large and persistent performance gaps between programs areas are not described as reasonable).

Candidates' ability to use content and pedagogical knowledge effectively in instructional practice situations [Standard 1, components 1.1, 1.3 and 1.5]. The SSR and evidence room make available all evidence provided for any program review option together with any responses received from reviewers. EPPs will want to ensure that evidence, such as that described below, is available to reviewers. Evidence demonstrates that candidates have developed proficiencies to apply their content and pedagogical knowledge effectively in instruction and other interactions with P-12 students This evidence comes from cohort summaries of such sources as • Assignments or tasks from courses • Assignments or tasks from initial clinical experiences • Practice teaching (e.g., edTPA, PPAT, teacher work sample tasks) • Candidate opportunities to apply technology for instructional purposes • Content licensure exams • Pedagogical knowledge tests • Observational measures In any case where some or all of this evidence is included in a Program Review with Feedback report, SPA report or in a state program approval process, the EPP can include a reference and brief summary of that evidence in the SSR.	CAEP's site team evaluates EPP-created instruments to verify that they meet CAEP's sufficiency criteria. The CAEP site team verifies that candidate performance is sufficient in relation to performance standards: • Class averages are at or above acceptable levels on the EPP scoring scale for instruments that measure knowledge of standards and pedagogical applications. • Candidate performance compares well with benchmarks (e.g., licensure scores or pass rates are similar to or exceed cut sores and/or state/national averages; course assignments, tasks, assessments, or GPA are comparable to those for non-candidates in the same courses or majors). The site team evaluates the accuracy of the EPP's interpretations and conclusions regarding performance sufficiency. The team evaluates the accuracy of the EPP's analytical summary of trends/patterns, comparisons, and/or differences in knowledge of standards and outcome objectives applicable to P-12 settings.	Evidence documents that the EPP-created instruments meet or exceed CAEP's sufficiency criteria. Evidence documents that data from the instruments meet professional research and data analysis standards for reliability or consistency. The EPP disaggregates results by licensure area. Evidence documents that the EPP's data analysis is sound with respect to professional research and data analysis practices. Results show that candidates in each licensure area meet or exceed the reported performance standard for each measure. The EPP's interpretation of the results is consistent with the nature and magnitude of their reported findings.
Key Concept: Candidates develop concepts and principles about their professional responsibilities (Components 1.1 and, 3.6).		

Candidates' understanding of professional responsibilities The SSR and evidence room make available all evidence provided for any program review option together with any responses received from reviewers. EPPs will want to ensure that evidence, such as that described below, is available to reviewers. The SSR includes evidence of candidates' understanding of professional standards of practice, relevant laws and policies and codes of ethics, and ability to collaborate with learners, families, and colleagues to ensure learner growth. Evidence might be from course assignments or tasks, or relevant sections of state licensure requirements, or required state ethics training [Components 1.1 and 3.6]. In any case where some or all of this evidence is included in a Program Review with Feedback report, a SPA report or in a state program approval process, the EPP can include a reference and brief summary of that evidence in the SSR.	The site team evaluates the EPP-created instruments to verify that they meet CAEP's sufficiency criteria. The site team verifies that candidate performance is sufficient in relation to performance standards. Class averages are at or above acceptable levels on the EPP scoring scale for instruments that measure knowledge of standards and pedagogical applications. The CAEP site team's review of evidence verifies that the EPP's completers demonstrate their understanding of professional practice, relevant laws and policies and codes of ethics, as well as collaboration with learners, families, and colleagues. The site team evaluates the accuracy of the EPP's interpretations and conclusions regarding performance sufficiency.	Evidence documents that the EPP-created instruments meet or exceed CAEP's sufficiency criteria. The EPP's data analysis is sound with respect to professional research and data analysis practices. The EPP's interpretation of the results is consistent with the nature and magnitude of their reported findings (e.g., low scores are not interpreted as high scores; large and persistent performance gaps between programs areas are not described as reasonable).
Key Concept: Candidates are prepared for teaching at levels embedded in college and career readiness standards. (Component 1.4)		
Candidates' development of proficiencies for college- and career-readiness teaching Multiple sources are provided to document candidates' proficiencies involving design and implementation activities associated with teaching to college- and career-readiness (CCR) standards, such as: • Fostering deep content knowledge	CAEP's site team evaluates the EPP-created instruments to verify that they meet CAEP's sufficiency criteria. The CAEP site team verifies that candidate performance is sufficient in relation to performance standards. Class averages are at or above acceptable levels on the EPP scoring scale for instruments that measure knowledge of standards and pedagogical applications.	Evidence documents that the EPP-created instruments meet or exceed CAEP's sufficiency criteria. Evidence documents that the EPP's performance standards are not set lower than external benchmarks suggest they should be (e.g., at recognition instead of recall, or at understanding instead of application at exit).

• Facilitating students' problem solving and critical thinking • Promoting collaboration and communication skills • Including cross-disciplinary learning experiences that reflect real-world relationships between/integration of subject areas (e.g., science and art, math and geography, literature and history, writing across the curriculum) • Teaching for transfer/cross-context application of skills • Exhibiting data and assessment literacy and capability to apply those skills to identify P-12 student needs and to monitor their progress • Providing effective instruction for all students (e.g., differentiating instruction and/or assessment modes as needed).	The CAEP site team's evaluation of evidence verifies that disaggregated and overall performance support the conclusion that the EPP's completers effectively promote higher-order learning for all students. This includes verifying that all candidates achieved passing scores/ratings by program completion or that those who did not demonstrate these P-12-context-sensitive competencies were not granted the specialty credential. The team evaluates the accuracy of the EPP's interpretations and conclusions regarding performance sufficiency. The team evaluates the accuracy of the EPPs analytical summary of trends/patterns, comparisons, and/or differences in knowledge of standards and outcome objectives applicable to P-12 settings.	Evidence documents that data from the instruments meet professional research and data analysis standards for reliability or consistency. The EPP disaggregates results by licensure area. Evidence documents that the EPP's data analysis is sound with respect to professional research and data analysis practices. Results show that candidates in each licensure area meet or exceed the reported performance standard for each measure. The EPP's interpretation of the results is consistent with the nature and magnitude of their reported findings.
Key Concept : Candidates are prepared to advance learning for all diverse P-12 students [Components 1.1, 1.2, and 1.4].		
Candidates' diversity of experiences with learners and peers In response to CAEP's diversity theme, the SSRs summary statement for Standard 1 should provide evidence, or specific references where evidence is located elsewhere in the SSR, for these provisions: a. Candidates demonstrate skills and commitment that afford diverse P-12 students access to rigorous college-and career-ready standards [Component 1.4] b. Candidates demonstrate understanding of the InTASC Standards on "the learner and learning" [Component 1.1]	The site team verifies that the explicit diversity features of Standard 1 are addressed in the SSR, and that evidence indicates candidates demonstrate the Standard 1 diversity proficiencies.	Evidence documents that the EPP-created instruments meet or exceed CAEP's sufficiency criteria. The EPP's data analysis is sound with respect to professional research and data analysis practices. The EPP's interpretation of the results is consistent with the nature and magnitude of their reported findings.

c. Candidates use "research and evidence…to measure their P-12 students' progress" [Component 1.2]		

A note on Summative Evaluations of the Case for Meeting the Standard

While the site team does not make a recommendation regarding whether the standard is met, the team is tasked with notifying the Accreditation Council when their review and professional judgment suggest that the evidence submitted by the EPP is insufficient to make the case for a standard. The site team notifies the Accreditation Council and provides a written rationale. They may cite several potential AFIs or stipulations in a given standard or a combination of AFIs and stipulations in the same standard.

CLINICAL PARTNERSHIPS AND PRACTICE (CAEP STANDARD 2)

NOTE: The EPP is asked to write a summary statement demonstrating the key concepts in each standard. The "Key Concept" sections in this chart are aligned with the "Key concepts" paragraphs that appear under Standard 2 in this handbook. The left column describes the evidence that EPPs include in their SSRs for Standard 2. The center column describes what the site team does in their examination of the EPP's case for Standard 2. The right column describes evaluation criteria that the team employs or the corroboration of evidence they try to establish during their accreditation review.

Making a Case for Standard 2: Evidence Evaluation		
STANDARD 2: Initial Preparation Clinical Partnerships and Practice The provider ensures that effective partnerships [components 2.1 and 2.2] and high-quality clinical practice [component 2.3] 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.		
Key concept: Effective partnerships for clinical practice (Components 2.1 and 2.2)		
In the EPP's Self-Study Report (SSR)	**In the Site Team's Reports (FFR, SVR)**	**Evaluation Criteria**
The provider describes its formal and informal partnerships with entities external to the EPP	The site teams look for evidence of co-construction, shared responsibility, and mutual benefit.	Evidence documents that P-12 schools and EPPs have both benefitted from the partnership.

where candidates fulfill fieldwork requirements of the initial preparation program.[Component 2.1] The EPP provides documentation that these partnerships are operational and on how they operate, including evidence of mutually agreed upon expectations for candidate entry, activities, and exit.[component 2.1] Examples might include partnership descriptions or MOUs, stakeholder involvement, definition of shared responsibilities, technology-based collaborations, results from stakeholder surveys.	The site team looks for evidence of a shared responsibility model that involves activities such as • Collaborative development, review, or revision of instruments and evaluations • Collaborative development, review, or revision of the structure and content of clinical activities • Mutual involvement in ongoing decision making about partnership structure and operations.	Evidence documents that a collaborative process is in place and reviewed at least annually. Evidence documents the EPP shares and uses evidence of candidate performance (such as that provided for Standard 1) to improve clinical preparation continuously.
The provider supplies documentation that partners collaborate to select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain school-based teacher educators who can serve as models of effective practice and have the skills to mentor teacher candidates. [Component 2.2]	The site team looks for evidence of shared responsibility that involves activities such as • Collaborative development, review, or revision of the process for selecting and/or training clinical educators • Collaborative development, review, or revision of the process for evaluating and supporting school-based teacher educators.	Evidence documents that both school-based teacher educators and university-based teacher educators have relevant educational backgrounds and teaching credentials, and evidence of effective inservice teaching. Evidence documents that the EPP and its P-12 partners participate in the design or delivery of training for clinical educators. Evidence that this training promotes • understanding of the roles and responsibilities of clinical educators and of the clinical curriculum and • valid and reliable use of tools used to evaluate candidates. Evidence documents that the performance of clinical educators is evaluated at least annually during active service (i.e., each year in which a candidate is placed in their classroom or supervised by them in the field).

		Evidence documents that any EPP-created instruments meet or exceed CAEP's Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments (Appendix D) criteria at the sufficient level. These evaluations establish • continuing eligibility/meeting of selection criteria, and • adequate performance in the role. Evidence documents that clinical educators are supported in their role (e.g., by provision of resource materials, feedback on performance, professional development).
Key Concept: The clinical experiences foster initial candidates' development of knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to positively impact student learning. (Component 2.3)		
The provider describes how clinical experiences in the initial program are "sufficient." This could include a description of campus-based and field-based activities that involve practical applications of knowledge and skills with P-12 students in P-12 settings. The SSR may use tables to summarize key attributes of clinical experiences that clarify the types, number, duration, activities, and goals such as: • Design—deliberate, purposeful, sequential, and assessed using performance-based protocols • Attributes--depth, breadth, diversity, coherence and duration • Opportunities—for candidates to practice developing the skills they have learned in related courses (the professional skills	The site team evaluates the centrality of clinical preparation by identifying the extent to which clinical activities • are integrated into courses or connected to course content (e.g., with respect to learners and learning, content, instructional practices, and professional responsibility); • provide opportunities for candidates to develop their practice in instructional situations; • provide opportunities to work with the P-12 populations in the age group(s) relevant to the licensure area; and • provide opportunities to work in P-12 classroom settings. The site team also examines the types and duration of activities though which candidates are	Evidence documents the relationship between clinical experiences and coursework Evidence documents that all candidates have diverse clinical experiences during the program. Evidence documents that the progression of practical/clinical experiences involves opportunities for candidates to develop the skills learned in related courses, including observation, self-development and implementation strategies identified in the InTASC Standards, specialty licensure area standards, college- and career-readiness standards, and technology standards for teachers and/or students.

addressed in Standard 1 (i.e., InTASC-related and discipline-specific practices) • Results—evidence of positive impact on diverse P-12 students' learning during pre-servicepreparation. • The settings in which initial candidates gain experience applying the professional skills addressed in Standard 1 (i.e., InTASC-related and discipline-specific practices).	expected to gain practical experience before program completion. The team looks for quality evidence for clinical preparation, such as • a variety of activities or placements; • the specified goals for activities or placements that are measured and monitored; • whether the activities promote a progression of skills and responsibilities that bridge theory and practice; and • how well and how significantly clinical competencies contribute to candidate completion of the program.	
The provider demonstrates that clinical experiences foster the development of knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions appropriate to the teaching specialty, including experiences with diverse learners. [Component 2.3]	The site team evaluates evidence that clinical experiences emphasize the application of knowledge, skills, and dispositions, including evidence relevant to diverse learners, that align with • SPA, state, or national standards for professional specialties, and • technology standards for teachers and/or students (e.g., such as ISTE standards).	Evidence documents that the types, number, duration, and goals of required practical and clinical experiences substantially align with standards and provide opportunities for candidates to work with diverse learners.

A note on Summative Evaluations of the Case for Meeting the Standard

While the site team does not make a recommendation regarding whether the standard is met, the team is tasked with notifying the Accreditation Council when their review and professional judgment suggest that the evidence submitted by the EPP is insufficient to make the case for a standard. The site team notifies the Accreditation Council and provides a written rationale. They may cite several potential AFIs or stipulations in a given standard or a combination of AFIs and stipulations in the same standard.

CANDIDATE QUALITY, SELECTIVITY, AND PROGRESS
(CAEP Standard 3)

Note: The EPP is asked to write a summary statement demonstrating the key concepts in each standard. The "Key Concept" sections in this chart are aligned with the "Key concepts" paragraphs that appear under Standard 3 in this handbook. The left column describes the evidence that EPPs include in their SSRs Standard 3. The center column describes what the site team does in their examination of the EPP's case for Standard 3. The right column describes evaluation criteria that the team employs or the corroboration of evidence they try to establish during their accreditation review.

STANDARD 3: Initial Preparation Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

The provider demonstrates that the quality of candidates is a continuing and purposeful part of its responsibility from recruitment [component 3.1], at admission, through the progression of courses and clinical experiences [components 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4], and to decisions that completers are prepared to teach effectively and are recommended for certification [components 3.5 and 3.6]. 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.

Key Concept: Recruitment of a diverse and strong pool of candidates and ensuring support for those who are at risk of falling behind (component 3.1)

In the EPP's Self-Study Report (SSR)	**In the Site Team's Reports (FFR, SVR)**	**Evaluation Criteria**

The EPP submits its recruitment and retention plan (e.g., covering 5 years) that provides baseline data and a schedule for monitoring progress toward goals for admitting and supporting high-quality initial program candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations. (3.1)
• The plan includes goal(s) for both recruitment and retention that are:
  ○ clearly informed by relevant data,
  ○ presented along with a rationale for why their selection is both meaningful and feasible, and
  ○ the responsibility of a broad coalition of appropriate stakeholders.
• The strategies selected to reach goals are
  ○ Evidence based,
	The site team examines the recruitment plan for the presence of baseline data, outcome targets, and a monitoring schedule and process.
	
	The site team examines progress results for trends over time. The team's review evaluates stakeholder envolvement and whether the recruitment plan has
	• moved the provider toward greater candidate diversity and academic achievement, and
	• increased the number of completers who can meet employment needs in applicable shortage areas.
		A written plan for the EPP to be continuously improving the admitted candidate pool that:
		• provides base points and annual monitoring of characteristics related to academic ability, diversity, and employment needs; and
		• articulates a definition of diversity that aligns with P-12 districts in which EPP completers are employed; and, this definition of diversity aligns with CAEP's definition of diversity.
		
		Demonstration of distributed ownership of the plan across EPP stakeholders and appropriate partners.
		• **Recruitment** goals are supported as evidence-informed, meaningful ,and feasible given the context of the EPP.

○ Accompanied by a rationale justifying their selection, and ○ Monitored to see the degree to which they are working as intended to progress goals. • The provider presents progress results and analyses on recruitment and retention goals by year. • The provider describes any adjustments to the recruitment plan that arise from progress monitoring. (also relevant to 5.3). • Data informing the plan, selected goals and accompanying strategies are designed to serve employers' needs (connects with Components 2.1 and 4.3)		• Retention goals are supported as evidence-informed, meaningful, and feasible given the context of the EPP. The recruitment and retention goals in the plan utilize and build on the analysis of recent recruitment and retention efforts. The written plan includes strategies that are likely to achieve the plan's goals and multiple stakeholders are responsible for execution of the strategies. The EPP demonstrates serving employer needs (e.g., for STEM, ELL, or special education teachers) and responding to employment opportunities in schools, districts, and/or regions where completers are likely to seek employment. • The EPP documents the influence of employment opportunities on enrollment patterns (e.g., efforts to recruit in those areas; increases in completers in those areas). The EPP's results for recruitment and retention goals demonstrate appropriate progress from the base point and have moved the provider toward greater candidate diversity and academic achievement. Evidence includes demonstration of adjustments to the written plan if annual monitoring of goals and strategies did not show progress toward reaching goals.

The EPP describes the academic and non-academic admission criteria for initial programs, and the rationale for these criteria. (3.3) The provider submits evidence that it periodically reviews admission criteria to assess their suitability for admitting candidates who will be successful in the program and in the classroom (3.3) and meet employment needs. (3.1)	The site team looks for evidence that the EPP has reflected on the academic and non-academic criteria it uses to select candidates to admit from the pool of applicants and can justify these criteria (e.g., based on research, licensure eligibility, program demands, student supports). The site team verifies that the EPP reviews admission criteria during the accreditation cycle. The site team verifies that the EPP is aware of student demographics, as well as employment trends and opportunities in P-12 schools in the licensure areas in which it offers initial programs.	The provider specifies its requirements for prior academic achievement and other criteria it uses at entry to ensure that enrolled candidates have or show the potential to develop the abilities needed to complete the preparation program. Evidence indicates that the EPP takes into account professionally relevant background characteristics that are likely to impact program performance and employability and systematically studies and applies the connection among admissions/monitoring criteria and candidate success in the program and teaching effectiveness/retention to inform refinements. If the EPP makes exceptions to its requirements for background characteristics, it describes the candidate supports it provides that address the gaps and promote success in program completion and meeting licensure requirements as part of its retention efforts.
The EPP provides evidence that support services and counseling are afforded to candidates when needed. (3.1, 3.4)	The site team confirms that the EPP uses the results of performance/progress monitoring to guide advising and support activities (e.g., referral to student support services, remediation planning, interventions).	Documents outlining the supporting services available to assist initial program candidates to complete their program, including information provided to candidates on how to access services. Advising or remediation summaries documenting the types of services or support that initial candidates—particularly those that were struggling at progress checkpoints—have accessed within the EPP and/or the types of interventions the EPP has initiated).
Key concept: Candidates demonstrate academic achievement at admissions or some other time prior to exit (Component 3.2)		

The EPP describes its decision about when it measures the CAEP average criteria (i.e., at admissions or some other time before candidate completion), then disaggregates results on the CAEP minima (GPA and test performance) by admission year. • The EPP presents results separately for mathematics, reading, and (beginning in 2021) writing. • The EPP can use a variety of normed tests to demonstrate that candidates' average at or above the 50th percentile. See CAEP list of score values for approved tests: http://caepnet.org/~/media/Files/caep/standards/caep-standard-3-component-32-measures-of.pdf?la=en. The EPP includes evidence that it continuously monitors disaggregated results on the CAEP minima (GPA and test performance) by branch campuses, by mode of delivery (e.g., online programs) if applicable, and by licensure program.	The site team verifies that the CAEP minima are met in each academic year. The site team verifies the EPPs monitoring and conclusions about findings of candidate quality for individual preparation programs, branch campuses and/or online programs (if applicable).	These criteria comply with minimum requirements of the EPP's governing body (e.g., IHE, state education department). Disaggregated data on academic achievement metrics meet the CAEP minimum for GPA (≥3.0 average) and test performance on an approved test at the group performance level specified (http://caepnet.org/~/media/Files/caep/standards/caep-standard-3-componen20180410t154547.pdf?la=en)
Key Concept: Monitoring candidate progress, including performance on non-academic measures, demonstrating that the quality of initial program candidates is a continuing and purposeful part of the EPP's responsibility. (components 3.3 and 3.4)		

The provider describes its academic and non-academic criteria for program progression and disaggregates results on progression for each licensure area. [Components 3.3 and 3.4] The provider clearly articulates the rationale behind progression criteria and monitoring, as well as performance criteria to be met, to candidates.	The site team confirms that the EPP monitors candidate performance at multiple points after admission, ideally at critical transition points in the program (e.g., midway, or before internship, or near completion). The site team verifies that progress monitoring addresses competencies relevant to • Standard 1 (i.e., the four InTASC categories; research/assessment/data literacy; licensure area knowledge and skills, teaching CCR standards to diverse students, technology), and • EPP expectations for non-academic competencies (i.e., dispositions, professional knowledge, licensure requirements). The site team verifies stakeholder knowledge of and adherence to progression thresholds.	Documentation that illustrates how often and when the EPP monitors candidate performance (e.g., at two or more points after admission). Documentation substantiates the criteria used to determine satisfactory progress at each monitoring point, and evidences their appropriateness. Evidence that criteria for progression are shared with candidates (e.g., at orientation, in handbook, during formative evaluations) and adhered to for making decisions.
Key Concept: High EPP standards for exit requirements (1) related to content knowledge and ability to teach effectively with positive impacts on diverse P-12 student learning and development (component 3.5) and (2) understanding expectations of the profession, codes of ethics, standards of practice and relevant laws and policies (component 3.6).		
The EPP provides evidence that it has reviewed the performance record of each candidate that successfully completed the program and documented each candidate's attainment of high standards for • content knowledge in the licensure area, • effective teaching with positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development, and • understanding expectations of the profession, including laws and policies, codes of ethics and professional standards of practice. (3.5, 3.6) The EPP provides the raw data used to generate	The site team reviews evidence such as exit clearance documents that show that the listed areas were examined for satisfactory completion at the final checkpoint/prior to endorsing the candidates' eligibility for graduation and/or recommendation for licensure.	Documentation that each candidate the program recommended for a teaching credential passed all of the progress monitoring checkpoints, or remediated all deficiencies by the final checkpoint, and met the EPP's standards for exit.

the results reported in the SSR. [NOTE: If an EPP uses candidate exit evidence (from component 3.5) or professional responsibilities data (from component 3.6) as part of its case for the key concepts in Standard 1, **none of that evidence should be repeated** here. There can be a simple cross-reference in the summary statement for Standard 3.]		

A note on Summative Evaluations of the Case for Meeting the Standard

While the site team does not make a recommendation regarding whether the standard is met, the team is tasked with notifying the Accreditation Council when their review and professional judgment suggest that the evidence submitted by the EPP is insufficient to make the case for a standard. The site team notifies the Accreditation Council and provides a written rationale. They may cite several potential AFIs or stipulations in a given standard or a combination of AFIs and stipulations in the same standard.

RESULTS OF PREPARATION
(CAEP Standard 4)

Note: The EPP is asked to write a summary statement demonstrating the key concepts in each standard. The "Key Concept" sections in this chart are aligned with the "Key concepts" paragraphs that appear under Standard 4 in this handbook. The left column describes the evidence that EPPs include in their SSRs for Standard 4. The center column describes what the site team does in their examination of the EPP's case for Standard 4. The right column describes evaluation criteria that the team employs or the corroboration of evidence they try to establish during their accreditation review.

Making a Case for Standard 4: Evidence Evaluation

STANDARD 4: Program Impact

The provider demonstrates the impact of its completers on P-12 student learning and development [component 4.1], classroom instruction [component 4.2] and schools, and the satisfaction of its completers [component 4.4] with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.

Key Concept: The provider demonstrates the impact of its initial preparation program completers on P-12 student learning and development (Component 4.1).

In the EPP's Self-Study Report (SSR)	In the Site Team's Reports (FFR, SVR)	Evaluation Criteria
The provider describes the measures used to assess completers' impact on student learning. This includes a description of the context and source of P-12 learning data. The provider presents results from measures of student learning and development for completers 1-3 years post-exit. The data selected should be direct measures of student learning and development and should provide information on completers up to 3 years from program completion to make the case that completers positively impact student learning. Examples may include but are not limited to one or more of the following: • learning growth measures derived from standardized testing, • pre- and post-assessments, • Student growth percentiles, • teacher evaluations or teacher effectiveness scores that include a student achievement component that can be separately identified, • student learning and development objectives, • value-added measures, and/or • classroom-based research (e.g., action research, case studies, etc.) including pre- and post-assessments of students' learning.	The site team verifies that completer performance is sufficient in relation to performance standards. The site team evaluates any EPP-created instruments to verify that they meet CAEP's sufficiency criteria. The site team's review of evidence verifies that disaggregated and/or overall performance supports the conclusion that the EPP's completers (across licensure areas) have a positive impact on student learning. The team evaluates the accuracy of the EPP's interpretations and conclusions regarding performance sufficiency. The team evaluates the accuracy of the EPP's analytical summary of trends/patterns, comparisons, and/or differences.	The provider disaggregates results for completer impact by year-out (e.g., 1st, 2nd, 3rd) if sample size is at least 10 per group. If disaggregation is not supported, the EPP discusses trends and exceptions in the data, and provides the disaggregated data to the site team. For teacher evaluations or teacher effectiveness scores that include a student achievement component that can be separately identified, the provider can report the average proportion and range interval of available points that the completers attained (e.g., 22 out of 25 [or 88%] of points allotted to achievement). Representative samples capture, at minimum, data from all licensure areas offered by the EPP. Providers describe the representativeness of the data they have collected on completer impact and describe the characteristics of the sample. Any EPP-created measures used to gather data for component 4.1 meet or exceed the sufficient level in the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments. The provider's analysis is accurate, and its conclusions regarding completers' accomplishments are supported by evidence.

The provider describes the sample utilized. The sample used should cover most if not all licensure areas. Providers that do not have access to students' standardized test results present results from measures collected using a research-based methodology with a representative or purposive sample. Appropriate sample size and licensure group proportions can be estimated using power or margin of error calculations. Potentially helpful resources on sample size can be found here: http://www.tools4dev.org/resources/how-to-choose-a-sample-size/ (or any EPP preferred research design handbook that addresses sampling). The provider demonstrates that EPP-created measures of student achievement and/or impact on student learning meet or exceed the sufficient level in the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments. The provider interprets the results, draws conclusions, makes comparisons, and analyzes trends regarding completer impact on student learning. This analysis addresses performance over time and across licensure areas.		Disaggregated and/or overall performance supports the conclusion that the EPP's completers (across licensure areas) have a positive impact on student learning
Key Concept: The provider demonstrates the impact of its initial preparation program completers on classroom instruction and schools. (component 4.2)		
In the EPP's Self-Study Report (SSR)	**In the Site Team's Reports (FFR, SVR)**	**Evaluation Criteria**
The provider presents evidence that its on-the-job completers teach effectively—displaying knowledge, skills, and dispositions fostered in the preparation program. The provider presents results from measures of teaching effectiveness for completers 1-3 years post-exit.	The site team evaluates any EPP-created instruments to verify that they meet CAEP's sufficiency criteria. The site team verifies that the return rate for surveys is at least 20%. If it is not, the team	Any EPP's student P-12 surveys and teaching observation tools used to gather data for component 4.2 meet or exceed the sufficient level in the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments.

• The evidence comes from measures of completer teaching effectiveness: observations and/or P-12 student surveys. • The provider describes the instruments, including how the content relates to the knowledge, skills, and dispositions in the InTASC Standards and the conceptual framework of the preparation program. Providers who do not have access to state data present results from measures collected using a research-based methodology, utilizing a representative or purposive sample. • Samples need not be representative at every data collection cycle. Providers can sample purposively, building toward representativeness. [NOTE: Sampling should be more systematic and progressive than a series of convenience samples would likely produce.] • The provider demonstrates that EPP-created student surveys and teaching observations meet or exceed the sufficient level in the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments. • The provider describes the representativeness of the data. The provider interprets the results, draws conclusions, makes comparisons, and analyzes trends regarding teacher effectiveness. This analysis addresses performance over time, across licensure areas, and in relation to benchmarks (if any).	determines whether a viable plan for increasing response rates has been presented. The site team verifies that completer performance is sufficient in relation to performance standards or benchmarks reported by the EPP. The site team's review of evidence verifies that disaggregated and/or overall performance supports the conclusion that the EPP's completers (across licensure areas) teach in a manner consistent with the InTASC Standards (at the appropriate level of progression) or the research literature on teaching effectiveness that was cited by the EPP in the SSR. The team evaluates the accuracy of the EPP's interpretations and conclusions regarding performance sufficiency.	Survey return rates were at acceptable levels (20% or above) and inclusive of most licensure areas in the EPP. Providers describe the representativeness of the data they have collected on completer impact and describe the characteristics of the sample. The provider disaggregates results for completer impact by year-out (e.g., 1st, 2nd, 3rd) if sample size is at least 10 per group. If disaggregation is not supported, the EPP discusses trends and exceptions in the data, and provides the disaggregated data to the site team. The provider's analysis is accurate, and conclusions regarding the teaching effectiveness of its completers are supported by evidence.

Key Concept The initial preparation provider documents the satisfaction of its completers' employers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation, including retention and promotion as indicators. (Component 4.3)		
The EPP provides results from measures that assess the employers' satisfaction with program completers who completed the program 1-3 years prior to the point when the data are collected. • This can include alumni who completed the program less than one full year prior to data collection if they have been employed as a teacher for at least six months. • Questions should be specific enough to identify employer's satisfaction with aspects of completer's preparation such as addressing diverse needs of individual students, use of assessment for learning, use of data about students and their progress, and working with colleagues. The EPP describes the methodology of its completer satisfaction study. This includes a discussion of sampling procedures and sample characteristics, data collection procedures and timeline, and data analysis. The EPP examines the results for trends/patterns and differences. This can include reviewing results disaggregated by licensure area and/or by work site characteristics for completers in the same licensure area (e.g., secondary mathematics teachers at suburban, inner-city, or charter schools). The EPP submits documentation of employment milestones, including promotion, employment	The site team evaluates any EPP-created instruments to verify that they meet CAEP's sufficiency criteria. The site team evaluates the adequacy of the EPP's documentation which should include the following: • A description of the process for gathering data; • Response rates (20% or more of those invited to participate); and • A description of the representativeness of the sample (which program areas are represented, in what proportion to the program sizes). The team evaluates the appropriateness of interpretations and conclusions related to comparisons or trends/patterns such as those involving specific licensure areas, time points (e.g., year 1, year 2), or settings (e.g., high-need schools).	Any measures used to gather data for component 4.3 meet or exceed the sufficient level in the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments. Results show that the majority of responding employers report that completers were sufficiently prepared for specific aspects of their job responsibilities (such as addressing diverse needs of individual students, use of assessment for learning, use of data about students and their progress, and working with colleagues). The sample is representative of the completer population, or purposive with a plan for expansion toward representativeness over time. The data analysis is appropriate for the data type and quantity. The interpretations and conclusions do not overgeneralize the findings to non-sampled groups of employers or completers or if the return rate is low. Data related to employment milestones (including promotion, employment trajectory, and retention) and analyses/interpretations of these data are appropriate and support completers' positive impact on P-12 students and schools.

trajectory, and retention for at least some completers and conducts appropriate analyses.		
Key Concept: The provider demonstrates the satisfaction of its initial preparation program completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation. (Component 4.4)		
In the EPP's Self-Study Report (SSR)	**In the Site Team's Reports (FFR, SVR)**	**Evaluation Criteria**
The EPP provides results from measures that assess the satisfaction of program completers who completed the program 1-3 years prior to the point when the data are collected. • This can include alumni who completed the program less than one full year prior to data collection if they have been employed as a teacher for at least six months. • Questions should be specific enough to identify completer's satisfaction with aspects of their preparation such as addressing diverse needs of individual students, use of assessment for learning, use of data about students and their progress, and working with colleagues. The EPP describes the methodology of its completer satisfaction study. This includes a discussion of sampling procedures and sample characteristics, data collection procedures and timeline, and data analysis. The EPP examines the results for trends/patterns and differences. This can include reviewing results disaggregated by specialty area and/or by work site characteristics for completers in the same licensure area (e.g., elementary teachers at traditional public and charter schools).	The site team evaluates the EPP-created instruments to verify that they meet CAEP's sufficiency criteria. The site team evaluates the adequacy of the EPP's documentation which should include the following: • A description of the system for gathering data; • Response rates (20% or more of those invited to participate); • A description of the representativeness of the sample (which program areas are represented, in what proportion to the program sizes); • Data specific to high-need schools; • Data specific to specialty field; and • Comparison points for data.	Any measures used to gather data for component 4.4 meet or exceed the sufficient level in the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments. Results show that the majority of responding completers report that they were sufficiently prepared for specific aspects of their job responsibilities (such as addressing diverse needs of individual students, use of assessment for learning, use of data about students and their progress, and working with colleagues). The sample is representative of the completer population, or purposive with a plan for expansion toward representativeness over time. The data analysis is appropriate for the data type and quantity. The interpretations and conclusions do not overgeneralize the findings to non-sampled groups of completers.

A note on Summative Evaluations of the Case for Meeting the Standard

While the site team does not make a recommendation regarding whether the standard is met, the team is tasked with notifying the Accreditation Council when their review and professional judgment suggest that the evidence submitted by the EPP is insufficient to make the case for a standard. The site team notifies the Accreditation Council and provides a written rationale. They may cite several potential AFIs or stipulations in a given standard or a combination of AFIs and stipulations in the same standard.

DIVERSITY AND TECHNOLOGY CROSS-CUTTING THEMES

Note: The EPP is asked to write a response to each theme. The "Key Language" sections in this chart are aligned with the paragraphs that appear under the cross-cutting themes in the pages of the handbook above. The left column describes the evidence that EPPs include in their self-study reports, the center column describes what the site team does in their examination of the EPP's case, and the right column describes evaluation criteria that the team employs or the corroboration of evidence they try to establish during their accreditation review.

Responding to CAEP's cross-cutting themes: Diversity and Applications of Technology		
DIVERSITY *America's students are diverse, individually (e.g., personality, interests, learning modalities, and life experiences), and as members of groups (e.g., race, ethnicity, ability, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, nationality, language, religion, political affiliation, and socio-economic background).** *To best serve America's students, EPPs must:* • *Show respect for the diversity of candidates;* • *Provide experiences that support the candidates' commitment to diversity; and* • *Prepare candidates to design and enact equitable and excellent experiences for all P-12 students.* **(InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards, p. 21)*		
Key Concept: EPP diversity actions show respect for diversity of candidates, support the candidates' commitment to diversity, and prepare candidates to design and enact equitable experiences for all P-12 students.		
In the EPP's Self-Study Report (SSR)	**In the Site Team's Reports (FFR, SVR)**	**Evaluation Criteria**
The SSR should contain EPP responses to those aspects of diversity and equity that are explicitly addressed in Standards 1, 2, and 3. These are summarized in Part C of the handbook section on diversity and technology themes. Standard 1:	The site team verifies that the explicit aspects of diversity in CAEP Standards 1, 2, and 3 (as listed in the column to the left) are addressed by the EPP.	Explicit documentation that candidates can identify individual needs of P-12 students during diverse clinical experience opportunities provided by the preparation program, including interpretation of, and

• Extract from data on learners and learning demonstrating candidate understanding of learning differences and ways to differentiate instruction effectively • Extract from college-and career-readiness evidence documenting instruction in deep content knowledge, critical thinking and problem solving with diverse P-12 students • Extract from instructional practice evidence relative to candidate capacities in data literacy and use of assessments with diverse students Standard 2: • Extract from data on work with partners to design clinical experiences ensuring effectiveness with all P-12 students Standard 3: • Accomplishments on recruitment of diverse candidates • Evidence from academic achievement, non-academic, and candidate progress measures • Evidence of support for candidates who need it In the digital template, the EPP should provide a summary of its evidence across Standards 1, 2, and 3 and add a brief overall analysis and interpretation of its response for those standards.		action based on, student records and student assessments. Documentation that candidates develop effective strategies for teaching diverse learners, including teaching critical thinking and problem solving in their subject content field. Evidence that partnerships explicitly address how clinical experiences will provide diverse opportunities for candidates to engage with P-12 students. Evidence that all candidates are progressing toward high exit standards and that support is provided for candidates who need it. Indicators of progress and completion are disaggregated for subgroups of the candidate pool so that differences across subgroups can be analyzed, considered and acted upon. In response to aspects of diversity addressed explicitly in CAEP's standards, the self-study report shows that the EPP has considered its accomplishments and areas where improvement is needed and taken appropriate action.
Through the procedures that an EPP uses to review its status, determine its responsibilities, and establish and	Site team members could randomly interview candidates who are near completion to ask about the actual experiences they have had and the	Evidence that the EPP has explicitly described and considered the aspects of diversity it currently has and has set more

review progress against its mission and goals, the EPP's SSR: • describes the particular features of its own diversity, and • the challenge goals it has set for itself to more fully prepare candidates for effective engagement with diverse P-12 students.	extent to which they feel prepared for future employment facing diverse P-12 students.	demanding diversity and equity goals to achieve for the future. Confirmation that candidates' experiences are consistent with the EPPs' case for addressing the diversity theme.
The EPP shows • results from items in EPP or proprietary assessments that describe candidate proficiencies with various diversity situations and engaging students with differing needs, and • trends over time and/or comparisons with state or national norms or other benchmarks.	The site team reviews assessment results and evaluates the instruments used with the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-created Assessments (see Appendix D).	Evidence that candidates develop knowledge and skills that can help children across diversity categories learn effectively
The EPP states what it has learned from its own continuous improvement review • about its status in meeting diversity challenges across preparation, and • about its progress toward its own mission and goals.	The site team evaluates the extent to which the EPP is systematically gathering information about its own diversity goals and progress and using them for continuous improvement.	Evidence of explicit monitoring of the EPP's status in meeting diversity challenges, about their progress, and consideration of improvements.
APPLICATION OF TECHNOLOGY *Candidates model and apply technology for design, implementation, and assessment learning experiences to engage students and improve learning.*		
Key Concept: Candidates develop abilities to apply technology to engage students and improve learning.		
In the EPP's Self-Study Report (SSR)	**In the Site Team's Reports (FFR, SVR)**	**Evaluation Criteria**
The SSR should contain EPP responses to those aspects of technology applications that are explicitly addressed in Standards 1, 2, and 3. These are summarized in Part C of the handbook section on diversity and technology themes. Standard 1 • Extract on candidates applying technology standards for engagement of P-12 students Standard 2 • Extract on role of technology in co-constructed	The site team verifies that the explicit aspects of technology applications in CAEP Standards 1, 2, and 3 are addressed by the EPP.	Explicit documentation of candidates' applications of technology for enhancement of P-12 learning

clinical situations • Extract on technology-enhanced learning opportunities and P-12 student responded in clinical experiences Standard 3 • Extract indicating integration of technology in measures used to monitor candidate progression from content and pedagogical knowledge, and instructional skills. In the digital template, the EPP should provide a summary of its evidence across Standards 1, 2, and 3 and add a brief overall analysis and interpretation of its response for those standards.		Documentation that EPPs and their partners integrate use of technology applications in clinical collaborations and candidate experiences. Evidence that technology is an effective tool for monitoring candidate progression. The SSR provides a synthesis of technology applications and effectiveness, as perceived by the EPP In response to aspects of technology addressed explicitly in CAEP's standards, the self-study report shows that the EPP has considered its accomplishments and areas where improvement is needed and taken appropriate action.

APPENDIX B: Phase-In Schedule for Initial-Level Programs

***This chart replaces all previous guidance on the phase-in of standards for review of programs at the initial teacher licensure level.**	**CAEP Standards required for all accreditation self-study reports, reviews, and decisions.**

Accreditation policy 1.02, CAEP Standards, supports the implementation transition during which EPPs may need additional time to develop appropriate evidence/data. These phase-in provisions apply only to the components listed below. For each, additional information on the collection and reporting of evidence and data is included in the corresponding Evidence Sufficiency Criteria tables contained in the CAEP Handbook Initial-Level Programs 2018.

Self-study reports for site visits taking place **prior** to Fall 2018 may utilize Phase-in Plans (without the required progress steps or requirements fully in place described below).

For any site visit due to the EPP's request for an extension or other EPP-related that is delayed or postponement, The SSR must meet the requirements provided in this table for the semester in which the site visit actually takes place – not the semester in which the site visit was originally to take place.

The Phase-in (accreditation policy 1.02(a) on Initial Teacher Licensure) indicated in subsequent columns of this chart may be used for the below components of the CAEP standards, according to the timing of the EPP's site visit.	Site Visit Fall 2018 or Spring 2019	Site Visit Fall 2019 or Spring 2020	Site Visit Fall 2020 or Spring 2021	Site Visit Fall 2021 or Spring 2022
4 College and Career Ready Preparation • **1.4 College- and Career- Ready Preparation** • **2.1 Clinical Partnerships** • **2.2 Clinical Faculty** • **2.3 Clinical Experiences; Associating Completer Outcome with Clinical Experiences** • **3.1 Recruitment** • **3.2 Academic Achievement*** • **3.3 Use of Non-Academic Measures for Candidate Selectivity and Development** • **3.4 Candidate Progress During Preparation** • **3.6 Professional and Ethical Preparation** • **4.1 P-12 Student Learning and Development Data; Alternative where no state P-12 Student Growth Data are Available** • **4.2 Teacher Observation Evaluations and Student Perception Surveys** • **4.3 Employer Satisfaction with Preparation and Employment Persistence of Completers** • **4.4 Completer Satisfaction with Preparation** • **5.3 Continuous Improvement; Testing Innovations as Part of Standard 5 Continuous Improvement** • **5.4 CAEP Outcome Measures: Licensure, Completion, Placement, Consumer Information**	Self-study report includes plans and progress steps (including evidence/data, if any)	Self-study report includes plans and progress steps (including at least one cycle of data reported)	Evidence requirements are fully in place – allowance for plans ended *NOTE: Per component 3.2, the requirement for evidence of writing achievement begins Spring 2021.	Evidence requirements are fully in place – allowance for plans ended *NOTE: Per component 3.2, the requirement for evidence of writing achievement is in effect.

APPENDIX C: Guidelines for Plans, Initial preparation

INTRODUCTION

CAEP's accreditation policy 1.02 includes a phase-in provision that allows educator preparation providers (EPPs) submitting self-study reports some additional time to collect the appropriate evidence/data related to designated components of the CAEP Standards for Initial-Licensure Programs. See Appendix B for the schedule of years when aspects of the phase-in apply. For Site visits through Spring 2020, the self-study report may include plans and progress steps (including evidence/ data, if any are available) on the components of the CAEp standards designated in Appendix B.

While this policy is in effect, CAEP's site teams and Accreditation Council reviews **will accept as evidence** plans (or plans + evidence or reporting, as required), together with any implementation steps that had occurred by the time of the site visit.

These Guidelines for Plans are to help EPPs understand CAEP's expectations under the phase-in rules for self-study reports submitted during the transition period described above and further elaborated in Appendix B of the handbook for initial preparation. These guidelines also describe essential aspects of the site teams' investigation of self-study reports as well as options that the Accreditation Council will consider in reaching accreditation decisions.

What CAEP components are covered by the phase-in rules? Preparation providers take responsibility for identifying evidence to document their arguments that standards are met. Plans and their implementation may be used as evidence to document aspects of educator preparation that were not typical of accreditation evidence before 2013 CAEP Standards for Initial-Licensure Programs. Below is a list of components of CAEP initial standards covered by the phase-in rules:

- **1.4 College- and Career-Ready Preparation**
- **2.1 Clinical Partnerships**
- **2.2 Clinical Faculty**
- **2.3 Clinical Experiences; Associating Completer Outcome with Clinical Experiences**
- **3.1 Recruitment**
- **3.2 Academic Achievement**
- **3.3 Use of Non-Academic Measures for Candidate Selectivity and Development**
- **3.4 Candidate Progress During Preparation**
- **3.6 Professional and Ethical Preparation**
- **4.1 P-12 Student Learning and Development Data; Alternative where no state P-12 Student Growth Data are Available**
- **4.2 Teacher Observation Evaluations and Student Perception Surveys**
- **4.3 Employer Satisfaction with Preparation and Employment Persistence of Completers**
- **4.4 Completer Satisfaction with Preparation**
- **5.3 Continuous Improvement; Testing Innovations as Part of Standard 5 Continuous Improvement**
- **5.4 CAEP Outcome Measures: Licensure; Completion; Placement; Consumer information**

GUIDELINES

1. GUIDELINES FOR EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROVIDERS

These Guidelines for Plans describe (1) EPP responsibilities when they prepare plans and use them as evidence in self-study reports; (2) guides for CAEP site visitors in reviewing Phase-in Plans; and (3) guides for Accreditation Council decisions that make use of Phase-in Plans as indicators of expected and initial data/evidence.

A Phase-in Plan describes an overall goal and design to gather evidence for continuous improvement and accreditation. Phase-in Plans and progress steps that are submitted as accreditation evidence for site visits as shown in the Appendix B schedule **will be reviewed as evidence** for CAEP Accreditation purposes. Here are key attributes of the content of plans:

RELATIONSHIP TO STANDARD OR COMPONENT

- An explicit link of the intended data/evidence to the standard or component it is meant to inform; self-studies will tag the evidence to the appropriate standard; and
- A description of the content and objective of the data/evidence collection.

TIMELINE AND RESOURCES

- Detailing of strategies, steps, and a schedule for collection through full implementation, and indication of what is to be available by the time the site visit;
- Specification of additional data/evidence that will become available in the calendar years following accreditation until completion of the Phase-in Plan steps;
- Reporting from at least one data collection by calendar 2019 in Self-Studies submitted for 2020; and
- A description of the personnel, technology, and other resources available; institutional review board approvals, if appropriate; and EPP access to data compilation and analysis capability.

DATA QUALITY

- A copy of the collection instrument if it is available, together with information called for in CAEP instrument review rubrics;
- Description of procedures to ensure that surveys and assessments reach level 3 or above on the CAEP assessment rubric;
- Steps that will be taken to attain a representative response, including the actions to select and follow up a representative sample (or, a purposeful sample if that is appropriate for the data collection) and actions to ensure a high response rate;
- Steps to ensure content validity and to validate the interpretations made of the data; and
- Steps to analyze and interpret the findings and make use of them for continuous improvement.

2. GUIDELINES FOR REVIEW BY SITE VISITORS

Site visitors review plans. Their responsibility is to document the following:

RELATIONSHIP TO STANDARD OR COMPONENT

- That there is a specific connection with provisions of a CAEP standard or a component; and
- That the plan makes a compelling argument that the data/evidence would be an appropriate and

strong measure of the standard or component.

TIMELINE AND RESOURCES

- That any scheduled steps included in the plan before the site visit have occurred and are satisfactory. Site visitors determine
  - That arrangements made, and data collected, are consistent with specifications in the plan and/or that changes are appropriate to the circumstances;
  - That available data have been interpreted and used for continuous improvement by the EPP in ways appropriate to the stage of implementation of the plan;
  - That implementation steps and any available data suggest that the evidence compiled under the plan will be valid and sufficient for the intended purpose;
  - That there will be at least one data collection that can be reported in calendar 2019;
  - That the plan can realistically be accomplished within the resources available to the EPP (regarding personnel, technology, access, or other resources).

DATA QUALITY

- That survey and assessment instruments included in plans are reviewed under the CAEP assessment rubric and site teams judge whether those instruments are consistent with the CAEP level 3 rubric or above, for example
  - That the instruments will provide information directly relevant to the standard or component, (if an assessment, it has content validity);
  - That the instruments use questions that are clear and unambiguous;
  - That the instruments are administered at specified points during the preparation experiences that are appropriate for the standard or component being informed; and
  - That the instruments are scored by evaluators who are trained in using the instrument.
- That any survey or assessment can reasonably be expected to achieve a representative response and have an appropriately high response rate;
- That the plan specifies appropriate measures to ensure quality of the planned data; and
- That appropriate analyses will be conducted with the data/evidence and appropriate interpretations are likely to be made.

3. GUIDELINES FOR ACCREDITATION ACTION UNDER THE PHASE-IN RULES

The CAEP Accreditation Council Review Panels conduct an initial cumulative review and determine the degree to which each standard has been met and also the sufficiency of evidence for components, basing their conclusions on the preponderance of evidence. The panels determine areas for improvement or stipulations and make recommendations for the Accreditation Council. Using the Phase-in Plans along with any other EPP-provided evidence, results from the site visitors' review, and recommendations from the CAEP Commissions, the Accreditation Council makes the final accreditation decision.

- The Accreditation Council actions occur as part of CAEP consideration of the cumulative evidence for each standard:
  - Review and analysis of the Phase-in Plan and any available data/evidence under the plan serve in place of data/evidence for the phase-in period.
- If deficiencies are found in the plans, instruments or implementation, there can be an area for improvement or stipulation—depending on severity:
  - If the deficiency is in a particular measure that is one of the multiple measures under a

standard, an area for improvement may be cited;

- If the plan covers all the evidence for a particular component or standard, an area for improvement may be cited or a stipulation may be specified; and
- If the plan covers any one of these components—3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.3, and/or 5.4—a deficiency will result in a stipulation. If the deficiency is severe, it may result in a standard not met.

APPENDIX D: Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments

For use with Educator Preparation Provider (EPP)-Created Assessments, including subject and pedagogical content tests, observations, projects, assignments, and surveys

For use by EPPs to evaluate their assessments and by CAEP site teams to review evidence in self-study submissions

CAEP uses the term "assessments" to cover content tests, observations, projects or assignments, and surveys. All of these assessment forms are used with candidates. Surveys are often used to gather evidence on aspects of candidate preparation and candidate perceptions about their readiness to teach. Surveys are also used to measure the satisfaction of graduates or employers with preparation and the perceptions of clinical faculty about the readiness of EPP completers.

Assessments and scoring guides are used by faculty to evaluate candidates and provide them with feedback on their performance. Assessments and scoring guides should address relevant and meaningful attributes of candidate knowledge, performance, and dispositions, aligned with standards. Most assessments that comprise evidence offered in accreditation self-study reports will probably be used by an EPP to examine candidates consistently at various points from admission through the exit. These are assessments that all candidates are expected to complete as they pass from one stage of preparation to the next, or that are used to monitor the progress of candidates' developing proficiencies during one or more stages of preparation.

CAEP site teams will follow the guidelines in this evaluation tool, and it can also be used by EPPs when they design, pilot, and judge the adequacy of the assessments they create.

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES **BELOW** SUFFICIENT LEVEL	**CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL**	EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES **ABOVE** SUFFICIENT LEVEL
-	**1. ADMINISTRATION AND PURPOSE** (informs relevancy)	**+**
a. Use or purpose are ambiguous or vague. **b.** There is limited or no basis for reviewers to know what information is given to candidates. **c.** Instructions given to candidates are incomplete or misleading. **d.** The criterion for success is not provided or is not clear.	**a.** The point or points when the assessment is administered during the preparation program are explicit. **b.** The purpose of the assessment and its use in candidate monitoring or decisions on progression are specified and appropriate. **c.** Instructions provided to candidates (or respondents to surveys) about what they are expected to do are informative and unambiguous. **d.** The basis for judgment (criterion for success, or what is "good enough") is	**a.** The purpose of the assessment and its use in candidate monitoring or decisions are consequential. **b.** Candidate progression is monitored and information is used for mentoring. **c.** Candidates are informed how the instrument results are used in reaching conclusions

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES **BELOW** SUFFICIENT LEVEL	**CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL**	EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES **ABOVE** SUFFICIENT LEVEL
	made explicit for candidates (or respondents to surveys). **e.** Evaluation categories or assessment tasks are aligned with CAEP, InTASC, national/professional, and state standards.	about their status and/or progression.
- **a.** Indicator alignment with CAEP, InTASC, national/ professional or state standards is incomplete, absent, or only vaguely related to the content of standards being evaluated. **b.** Indicators fail to reflect the degree of difficulty described in the standard. **c.** Indicators not described, are ambiguous, or include only headings. **d.** Higher level functioning, as represented in the standards, is not apparent in the indicators. **e.** Many indicators (more than 20% of the total score) require judgment of candidate proficiencies that are of limited importance in CAEP, InTASC, national/professional, and/or state standards.	**2. CONTENT OF ASSESSMENT** (informs relevancy) **a.** Indicators assess explicitly identified aspects of CAEP, InTASC, national/professional, and state standards. **b.** Indicators reflect the degree of difficulty or level of effort described in the standards. **c.** Indicators unambiguously describe the proficiencies to be evaluated. **d.** When the standards being informed address higher level functioning, the indicators require higher levels of intellectual behavior (e.g., create, evaluate, analyze, and apply). For example, when a standard specifies that candidates' students "demonstrate" problem solving, then the indicator is specific to candidates' application of knowledge to solve problems. **e.** Most indicators (at least those comprising 80% of the total score) require observers to judge consequential attributes of candidate proficiencies in the standards. [NOTE: the word "indicators" is used as a generic term for assessment items. For content tests, the term refers to a question. For projects or assignments, it refers to a prompt or task that the candidate is to perform. For an observation, an indicator might be a category of performance to observe or a specific aspect of candidate performance that a reviewer would record. For a survey, an indicator would stand for a question or statement for which a response is to be selected.]	**+** **a.** Almost all indicators (95% or more of the total score) require observers to judge consequential attributes of candidate proficiencies in the standards.
WHEN THE INSTRUMENT IS AN ASSESSMENT: Use Sections 1 and 2, above, then sections 3, 4 and 5, below. **WHEN THE INSTRUMENT IS A SURVEY: Use Sections 1 and 2, above, then sections 6 and 7, below.**		

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES **BELOW** SUFFICIENT LEVEL	**CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL**	EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES **ABOVE** SUFFICIENT LEVEL
- **a.** Rating scales are used instead of rubrics; e.g., "level 1= significantly below expectation" "level 4 = significantly above expectation." **b.** Proficiency Level Descriptors (PLDs) do not align with indicators. **c.** PLDs do not represent developmental progressions. **d.** PLDs provide limited or no feedback to candidates specific to their performance. **e.** Proficiency level descriptors are vague or not defined and may just repeat the language from the standards.	3. **SCORING** (informs reliability and actionability) **a.** The basis for judging candidate performance is well defined. **b.** Each Proficiency Level Descriptor (PLD) is qualitatively defined by specific criteria aligned with indicators. **c.** PLDs represent a developmental sequence from level to level (to provide raters with explicit guidelines for evaluating candidate performance and for providing candidates with explicit feedback on their performance). **d.** Feedback provided to candidates is actionable—it is directly related to the preparation program and can be used for program improvement as well as for feedback to the candidate. **e.** Proficiency level attributes are defined in actionable, performance-based, or observable behavior terms. [NOTE: If a less actionable term is used such as "engaged," criteria are provided to define the use of the term in the context of the category or indicator.]	**+** **a.** Higher level actions from Bloom's or other, taxonomies are used in PLDs such as "analyzes" or "evaluates."
- **a.** Description of or plan to establish reliability does not inform reviewers about how it was established or is being investigated. **b.** Described steps do not meet accepted research standards for reliability. **c.** No evidence, or limited evidence, is provided that scorers are trained, and their inter-rater agreement is documented.	**4. DATA RELIABILITY** **a.** A description or plan is provided that details the type of reliability that is being investigated or has been established (e.g., test-retest, parallel forms, inter-rater, internal consistency) and the steps the EPP took to ensure the reliability of the data from the assessment. **b.** Training of scorers and checking on inter-rater agreement and reliability are documented. **c.** The described steps meet accepted research standards for establishing reliability.	**+** **a.** Raters are initially, formally calibrated to master criteria and are periodically formally checked to maintain calibration at levels meeting accepted research standards. **b.** A reliability coefficient is reported.

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES **BELOW** SUFFICIENT LEVEL	**CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL**	EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES **ABOVE** SUFFICIENT LEVEL
Described steps do not meet accepted research standards for reliability.		
- **a.** Description of or plan to establish validity does not inform reviewers about how it was established or is being investigated. **b.** The type of validity established or investigated is miss-identified or not described. **c.** The instrument was not piloted before administration. **d.** Process or plans for data analysis and interpretation are not presented or are superficial. **e.** Described steps do not meet accepted research standards for establishing validity. For example, validity is determined through an internal review by only one or two stakeholders.	**5. DATA VALIDITY** **a.** A description or plan is provided that details steps the EPP has taken or is taking to ensure the validity of the assessment and its use. **b.** The plan details the types of validity that are under investigation or have been established (e.g., construct, content, concurrent, predictive) and how they were established. **c.** If the assessment is new or revised, a pilot was conducted. **d.** The EPP details its current process or plans for analyzing and interpreting results from the assessment. **e.** The described steps meet accepted research standards for establishing the validity of data from an assessment.	**+** **a.** Types of validity investigated go beyond content validity and move toward predictive validity. **b.** A validity coefficient is reported.

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES **BELOW** SUFFICIENT LEVEL	**CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL**	EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES **ABOVE** SUFFICIENT LEVEL
- **a.** Questions or topics are not aligned with EPP mission or standards. **b.** Individual items are ambiguous or include more than one subject. **c.** There are numerous leading questions. **d.** Items are stated as opinions rather than as behaviors or practices. **e.** Dispositions surveys provide no evidence of a relationship to effective teaching.	**6. SURVEY CONTENT** **a.** Questions or topics are explicitly aligned with aspects of the EPP's mission and also CAEP, InTASC, national/professional, and state standards. **b.** Individual items have a single subject; language is unambiguous. **c.** Leading questions are avoided. **d.** Items are stated in terms of behaviors or practices instead of opinions, whenever possible. **e.** Surveys of dispositions make clear to candidates how the survey is related to effective teaching.	**+** **a.** Scoring is anchored in performance or behavior demonstrably related to teaching practice. **b.** Dispositions surveys make an explicit connection to effective teaching.
- **a.** Scaled choices are numbers only, without qualitative descriptions linked with the item under investigation **b.** Limited or no feedback provided to the EPP for improvement purposes **c.** No evidence that questions/items have been piloted	**7. SURVEY DATA QUALITY** **a.** Scaled choices are qualitatively defined using specific criteria aligned with key attributes. **b.** Feedback provided to the EPP is actionable. **c.** EPP provides evidence that questions are piloted to determine that candidates interpret them as intended and modifications are made if called for.	**+** **a.** EPP provides evidence of survey construct validity derived from its own or accessed research studies.

Criteria listed below are evaluated during the stages of the accreditation review and decision making:

- EPP provides evidence that assessment data are compiled and tabulated accurately.
- Interpretations of assessment results are appropriate for the items and resulting data.
- Results from successive administrations are compared (for evidence of reliability).

APPENDIX E: Guidelines on CAEP Program Review with Feedback--Initial Licensure Programs

NOTE: These guidelines are for educator preparation provider (EPP) submissions under the CAEP Program Review with Feedback option only.

The purpose of the CAEP Program Review with Feedback option is to allow providers the opportunity to submit their program level evidence (assessments, data, and analysis for each licensure program) and receive comments ("feedback") that the EPP can consider prior to preparation of documentation for Standard 1 in their self-study report.

The guidelines will be used by EPPs preparing for site visits beginning in fall 2019. The EPP will provide evidence disaggregated by licensure/ certification program for instruments evaluating candidates' entry level competency in the InTASC categories that are integral of the CAEP Standard 1 concepts—the learner and learning; specialty field content knowledge and content pedagogical knowledge; applications of that knowledge in instructional practice; and professional responsibilities for initial teaching.

A panel of content area specialists will review the reports and provide feedback to the EPP on the readiness of the evidence for CAEP Standard 1. The feedback received from CAEP Program Review with Feedback, and any subsequent EPP actions taken in response to that feedback, should be included in the Self-Study Report, as a case for addressing CAEP Standard 1, overall.

The timeline for the adoption of the guidelines for EPPs is as follows:

> **Fall 2019 site visits:** For this semester only the One-year out review report is optional. If EPPs choose to submit for review prior to submission of their self-study submissions are due by September 1, 2018 (optional—EPP may choose to submit evidence as part of the self-study report).
>
> **Spring 2020 site visits:** One-year out review report due by March 1, 2019 (required)
> **Fall 2020 site visits:** One-year out review report due by September 1, 2019 (required)
> **Spring 2021 site visits:** One-year out review report due by March 1, 2020 (required)
>
> **Fall 2021 site visits:** Two-years out review report due by September 1, 2019 (required)
> **Spring 2022 site visits:** Two-years out review report due by March 1, 2020 (required)
> **Fall 2022 site visits:** Two-years out review report due by September 1, 2020 (required)
>
> **NOTE:** *Due date for fall visits will be September 1 and due dates for spring visits will be March 1.*

A. General Instructions on Providing Evidence: CAEP Review with Feedback Option

- Provide two cycles of data collected from each evaluation instrument, beginning with the most recent application (at time of self-study reporting/ addendum to the Formative Feedback Report/ site visit EPP will provide three cycles of data as evidence for CAEP Standard 1).

- Report the data disaggregated by degree levels and program tracks (e.g., baccalaureate, post-baccalaureate, alternate routes, master's, doctorate), and by licensure areas (Spanish, French, Chinese, Chemistry, Biology, Earth Science, etc.) that are being addressed in a report.
- Assessment data should be disaggregated for branch campuses and/or on-line programs only if the program is distinct from the other programs in the same licensure area offered by the EPP. Otherwise, the data and evidence from multiple sites are aggregated within respective specialty areas of study.
- EPP-created assessments will use the CAEP Evaluation Framework for documentation of evidence.
- The assessments must demonstrate candidates' entry level competency in the InTASC categories that are integral of the CAEP Standard 1 concepts—the learner and learning; specialty field content knowledge and content pedagogical knowledge; applications of that knowledge in instructional practice; and professional responsibilities for initial teaching in each licensure or certification area.

  Note: The CAEP concepts are derived from and directly aligned with the InTASC categories (see component 1.1), so those categories and the InTASC standards that comprise them can be used to provide additional contextual information about the scope of the concepts. [InTASC standards with their related descriptions, together with indicators of performances, essential knowledge and critical dispositions, are available here: https://www.ccsso.org/sites/default/files/2017-12/2013_INTASC_Learning_Progressions_for_Teachers.pdf
- The key assessments should be required of all candidates in the program reported on this form.
- Assessments, scoring guides/rubrics and data charts should be aligned with the CAEP Standard 1 components addressed to meet the concepts of learner and learning, content and content pedagogical knowledge, instructional practice, and professional responsibilities for educators in each licensure area.
- This means that the concepts in the standards should be apparent in the assessments and in the scoring guides/rubrics to a depth, breadth, and specificity that aligns with relevant aspects of the InTASC standards.
- Data tables should also be aligned with the Standard 1 concepts.
- Data should be presented, in general, at the same level it is collected rather than being reported as a cumulative score.
- In the description of each assessment below, organize the assessments into the following areas to be aligned with the key concepts in CAEP Standard 1:
  - Evidence of deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of the discipline as represented through candidates' content and content pedagogical knowledge in each area of licensure or certification
  - Evidence of candidates' ability to apply that knowledge in instructional practice in each specialty area
  - Evidence of understanding of learner and learning (CAEP Standard 1 component on learner development, learning differences, and learning environments)
  - Evidence of professional responsibility (CAEP Standard 1 component on professional learning and ethics, leadership, and collaboration)

  Note that in some disciplines, content knowledge may include or be inextricable from professional knowledge. If this is the case, assessments that combine content and professional knowledge may be considered "content knowledge" assessments for the purpose of this report.

B. Instructions on Documenting Assessments:

For each assessment, the compiler should prepare one document that includes the following items:

- The assessment tool itself or a rich description of the assessment. The description may vary by specialty area, while the evaluation criteria remain the same for the common assessments. Provide a brief description of the assessments' use in the program. This is often the instructions provided to candidates.
- A description of how this assessment specifically aligns with the standards it is cited for in Section II. Cite Standard 1 concepts explicitly.
- The scoring guide/rubric for the assessment (by specialty licensure program).
- Data charts that provide candidates' performance data derived from the assessments (disaggregated by specialty licensure program);
- A brief analysis of the data findings (by specialty licensure program) including:
  - how that data provides evidence of candidates' mastery of the InTASC criteria
  - how the data are used for making program improvement

In this section, list the proprietary or EPP-created assessments that are being submitted as evidence for meeting the key CAEP Standard 1 concepts. There is no minimum number of EPP-created or proprietary assessments that may be used for CAEP Program Review with Feedback option.
If your state does not require a licensure test in the content area, you may substitute an assessment that documents candidate attainment of content knowledge. For each assessment, indicate the name, the type of the assessment, whether it is EPP-created or proprietary, and when it is administered in the program.

It is possible that one assessment applies to multiple concepts and components under CAEP Standard 1.

C. Utilizing Program Level Findings to Document Continuous Programmatic Improvement

Describe what changes or additions have been made to your program (by licensure area and across licensure areas) based on the analysis of the evidence regarding the following:

- Candidates' knowledge of content
- Candidates' ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions
- Candidates' effects on student learning

APPENDIX F: CAEP Glossary

Terms in this glossary may also be defined or referenced in policy. As such, the information provided below is subject to change as policy is amended. In the event of consistencies between this Glossary and policy, policy prevails.

Ability.

Competence in an activity or occupation because of one's skill, training, or other qualification. For CAEP purposes it is the demonstrated competence to be hired in one's field of preparation.

Accreditation.

(1) A process for assessing and enhancing academic and educational quality through voluntary peer review. CAEP accreditation informs the public that the educator preparation provider (EPP) has met state, professional, and institutional standards of educational quality. (2) The decision rendered by CAEP when an EPP meets CAEP's standards and requirements.

Accreditation Action Report.

The final report completed by the Accreditation Council and official record of an educator preparation provider (EPP) accreditation status. It informs the EPP of the decision of the Accreditation Council, including the EPP's accreditation status, standards met or unmet, any cited areas for improvement and/or stipulations, and the Accreditation Council's rationale for its decisions.

Accreditation Council.

The governance body that grants or withholds accreditation of an educator preparation provider (EPP), based on the review of findings of an initial review panel and a joint review team. The Council also certifies whether or not the accreditation process followed CAEP's policies and procedures.

Accreditation Cycle.

The length of time between site visits, generally two to seven years, based on the Educator Preparation Provider's (EPP) accreditation status.

Accreditation Eligible.

One of the two statuses of an educator preparation provider (EPP) upon completion of the CAEP application process. Accreditation eligible indicates that an EPP is seeking accreditation for the first time and will submit its self-study and engage in its accreditation review within a five year period.

Accreditation Information Management System (AIMS).

CAEP's data collection and management system used by (1) educator preparation providers (EPPs) to submit and access reports and forms; (2) CAEP staff to monitor the accreditation process, site visitor assignments and reports, program reviews, annual reports, and state

partnership agreements; and (3) CAEP site visitors and Accreditation Council members as a workspace to review and complete assignments related to accreditation and/or governance.

Accreditation Pathways.

The three approaches to the accreditation process available to educator preparation providers (EPPs) that guide the format of the self-study, the process of formative evaluation, and the emphasis of a site visit. The three pathways available under CAEP are: Inquiry Brief (IB), Selected Improvement (SI), and Transformation Initiative (TI).

Accreditation Plan.

An educator preparation provider's (EPP's) identification of sites outside of the main campus or administrative headquarters and the programs for the preparation of educators that are offered at each site. This information is used by CAEP staff and site visit team chairs/leads to plan the site visit, including the sites that will be visited by team members in-person or via technology.

Accreditation Status.

The public recognition that CAEP grants to an Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) to indicate the outcome of (1) an EPP's application to CAEP, or (2) the accreditation review. The outcome of an application to CAEP can be either accreditation eligible or candidate for accreditation. The outcome of an accreditation review can be accreditation for five or seven years, probation, denial, or revocation.

Accredited.

The accreditation status of an educator preparation provider (EPP) that meets all of CAEP's standards and other requirements. The term for a fully accredited EPP is seven years.

Actionable.

Sufficiently detailed and relevant to directly indicate or clearly suggest a course of action. Information is actionable if it supplies the who, what, when, where, and why that allows one to determine how to change current practice(s) to achieve the intended goal.

Add-on Programs.

Add-on programs are designed for educators who hold valid teaching licensure and are seeking to add additional teaching field(s); Or,

Programs that lead to licensure but for which the licensing authority (e.g., state or country) does not require completion of an internship for eligibility. Add-on programs do not lead to a degree (but may lead to a certificate). Add-on programs require a licensure examination or an assessment of candidate proficiency to understand and apply knowledge and skills in the specialty licensure area that provides access to employment in a P-12 setting.

Add-on programs will be reviewed under CAEP Standard A.1, component A.1.1, and require the EPP to submit evidence of candidate content knowledge documented by state licensure test scores or other proficiency measures.

Advanced-level Programs.

Educator preparation programs 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 preparation program, currently licensed administrators, other certificated (or similar state language) school professionals for employment in P-12 schools/districts.

Adverse Action.

The revocation or denial of accreditation when it is confirmed that an educator preparation provider's (EPP's): (1) fails to meet one CAEP Standard after a review for initial accreditation; (2) fails to meet two or more CAEP Standards after a review for reaccreditation; (3) fails to continue to meet CAEP's application requirements; (4) falsely reports data and/or plagiarizes information submitted for accreditation purposes; (5) fails to submit annual reports, annual dues, or other documents required for accreditation; and/or (6) results from an investigation into valid complaint in which it is determined that the CAEP Standards are no longer being met.

All P-12 Students.

Defined as children or youth attending P-12 schools including, but not limited to, students with disabilities or exceptionalities, students who are gifted, and students who represent diversity based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, language, religion, sexual identification, and/or geographic origin.

Annual Fees.

The payment required each year by an educator preparation provider (EPP) to retain its accreditation status, to have access to AIMS for annual report submission, and to support CAEP activities as outlined in its mission and strategic plan.

Annual Report.

A yearly update submitted through AIMS by an educator preparation provider (EPP) in which, the EPP provides CAEP with a summary of: (1) provider information; (2) progress on removing any areas for improvement/stipulations; (3) substantive changes; (4) links to candidate performance data on its website; (5) eight annual measures of program outcomes and impact; and (6) pathway specific progress, as requested.

Appeal.

CAEP's process of reconsideration of denial or revocation of accreditation upon request by an educator preparation provider (EPP).

Appeals Committee.

A committee of the Accreditation Council from which a panel of reviewers are drawn to review an appeal.

Appeals Panel.

The five-member group appointed from the Appeals Committee by the CAEP President to review an appeal.

Appendix E.

A table included as part of the accreditation self-study for the Inquiry Brief pathway in which an inventory of the evidence available to demonstrate candidate achievement is recorded and is audited during the site visit.

Applicant.

The status of an educator preparation provider (EPP) that has completed its Phase I Application while its Phase II Application to CAEP is being completed or is under review.

Area for Improvement (AFI).

A statement written by a site visit team or the Accreditation Council that identifies a weakness in the evidence for a component or a standard. A single AFI is usually not of sufficient severity that it leads to an unmet standard. Areas for improvement should be remediated by the end of the accreditation term and progress toward improvement is reported annually in the annual report.

Assessment.

An ongoing, iterative process consisting of four basic steps: 1. Defining learning outcomes; 2. Choosing a method or approach and then using it to gather evidence of learning; 3. Analyzing and interpreting the evidence; and 4. Using this information to improve student learning (adapted from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges glossary).

Attributes.

Qualitative and dispositional characteristics (such as credentials, knowledge, beliefs, attitudes, etc.)

Audit for Inquiry Brief.

A site visitor team's examination and verification of the Inquiry Brief selfstudy/ supporting evidence presented by the educator preparation provider (EPP) to make its case for accreditation.

Audit Task.

One of a series of activities related to a CAEP standard that is undertaken by site visitors. An audit task is composed of a *target* statement or table from the self-study report and a *probe.*

Benchmark.

A point of reference or standard of excellence in relation to which something can be compared and judged. A specific level of student performance may serve as the benchmark that candidates are expected to meet at a particular point in time or developmental progression (adapted from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges glossary).

Board of Directors.

The governance body responsible for policy development; the financial affairs of CAEP; and the election of CAEP's board members, committee members, and co-chairs of the Council.

Bylaws.

The standing rules governing the regulation of CAEP's internal affairs.

CAEP (Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation).

A nonprofit and nongovernmental agency that accredits educator preparation providers (EPPs). CAEP was created with the October 2010 adoption of a motion to consolidate the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) by the boards of the two organizations. CAEP became operational on July 1, 2013.

CAEP Coordinator.

An educator preparation provider (EPP) representative designated by the EPP as the primary recipient for CAEP related communications.

Candidate.

An individual engaged in the preparation process for professional education licensure/certification with an Educator Preparation Provider (EPP).

Candidate for Accreditation.

An accreditation status achieved after completion of Phase II application to CAEP during which an educator preparation provider (EPP) engages in a developmental/diagnostic evaluation of its readiness to engage in an accreditation review.

Capacity.

An educator preparation provider's (EPP) stated, reviewed and evaluated ability to deliver and maintain its obligations related to (1) the high quality preparation of candidates for professional roles/licensure/certification; (2) continuous improvement; and/or (3) transformation.

Case Analysis.

An analysis included in the Inquiry Brief site visit review that is focused on the CAEP Standards of the educator preparation provider's (EPP) case for accreditation. The analysis cites evidence in the record that is consistent or inconsistent with CAEP's requirements and standards, including whether or not there are credible rival hypotheses for evidence put forward in the EPP's self study report.

Case Study.

For CAEP a case study is a systematic study of some aspect of preparation that posits a problem of practice, identifies a means to address it, frames appropriate measures, gathers data, and analyzes results for the purposes of preparation improvement and/or accreditation evidence.

Certificate Level.

A professional educator preparation program that provides the courses for a specific certificate or license, but does not lead to an academic degree.

Certificate/Licensure.

An official document issued by a state agency that an individual meets state requirements to (1) teach at a specific level or for a specialized discipline/population of students (e.g. middle grades, biology, English Language Learners, etc.); or (2) serve in a specific education role in a school (e.g. principal, reading specialist, etc.).

Certification.

The process by which a governmental agency or nongovernmental organization grants professional recognition to an individual who meets specified qualifications/requirements. (See *Certificate* and/or *Certification/Licensure Level*.)

Claims.

The statements in the *Inquiry Brief* self-study report to describe how an educator preparation provider (EPP) meets CAEP standards in preparing competent, caring, and qualified educators (i.e., teachers, administrators, and other school professionals).

Clarification Questions.

A set of questions about the Inquiry Brief self-study report that are prepared as part of the formative evaluation that need clarification in writing before the site visit begins. These questions are included, with the educator preparation provider's answers, in the site visit report and may lead to follow-up tasks during the visit.

Clinical Educators.

All educator preparation provider (EPP) and P-12-school-based individuals, including classroom teachers, who assess, support, and develop a candidate's knowledge, skills, or professional dispositions at some stage in the clinical experiences.

Clinical Experiences.

Guided, hands-on, practical applications and demonstrations of professional knowledge of theory to practice, skills, and dispositions through collaborative and facilitated learning in field-based assignments, tasks, activities, and assessments across a variety of settings. These include, but are not limited to, culminating clinical practices such as student teaching or internship.

Clinical Practice.

Student teaching or internship opportunities that provide candidates with an intensive and extensive culminating field-based set of responsibilities, assignments, tasks, activities, and assessments that demonstrate candidates' progressive development of the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions to be effective educators.

Code of Ethics.

Guidelines for the appropriate behavior of CAEP board members, Commission members, Accreditation Council members, committee members, site visitors, program reviewers, and staff as they conduct CAEP business. CAEP's code of ethics can be accessed in the CAEP *Policy and Procedures Manual*.

Code of Good Practice.

The seven statements accepted by members of the Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors (ASPA) that define ideal behaviors of national accreditors in the conduct of their work. (See http://www.aspa-usa.org)

Coherence.

Logical interconnection; overall sense or understandability.

Cohort.

A group of candidates or program completers admitted, enrolled, or graduated at the same time, e.g., a class entering in a fall semester or a class graduating in the spring semester.

Commission.

One of three governing bodies that make recommendations for an EPP's accreditation based on standards being met and identifies areas for improvement and/or stipulations for presentation to CAEP's Accreditation Council. Each Commission also certifies whether CAEP followed its policies and procedures. An educator preparation provider (EPP) is assigned to the Commission that is responsible for the accreditation pathway selected by the EPP: the Continuous Improvement (CI) Commission, the Inquiry Brief (IB) Commission, or Transformation Initiative (TI) Commission.

Complaint Review Committee.

A committee of the Accreditation Council with responsibility for reviewing and taking action on valid complaints against an educator preparation provider (EPP) or CAEP.

Complaints.

The formal submission of documents and other materials to support an allegation (1) that an educator preparation provider (EPP) no longer meets one or more of the CAEP standard(s); (2) that CAEP did not follow its established policies and procedures; or (3) that a member of CAEP's staff violated CAEP policies or procedures, including but not limited to its code of conduct.

Completer.

Any candidate who exited a preparation program by successfully satisfying the requirements of the educator preparation provider (EPP).

Compliance.

Presenting sufficient evidence of meeting the standards or requirements of a regulatory or accrediting body.

Component.

Sub-indicators of a standard that elaborate upon and further define a standard. CAEP uses its components as evidence categories that are summarized by the educator preparation provider (EPP) and reviewed by the site visit team in order to assign areas for improvement or stipulations that lead to a peer judgment of whether or not a standard is met.

Confidentiality.

A policy statement to which site visitors, councilors, and staff are required to adhere. The policy includes expectations that individuals will not to disclose or discuss information from an educator preparation provider's (EPP) self-study, related evidence, interviews, or CAEP's decision-making process outside of the formal accreditation process meetings.

Conflict of Interest.

Any association, relationship, business arrangement, or circumstance related to an applicant for accreditation by anyone involved in the accreditation process that might suggest to disinterested and objective referees that his or her actions were contrary to CAEP policy; contrary to its stated duties to its clients, members, and stakeholders; or for personal gain or the gain of family, close friends, or non-CAEP associates.

Consumer Information.

Information about the status and trends of outcomes for completers that should be available for prospective candidates, parents of applicants, employers of completers, parents of P-12 students and generally for the public.

Content Knowledge.

The acquisition and understanding of facts, truths, or principles associated with the academic disciplines that are taught at the elementary, middle, and/or secondary levels, or a professional field of study such as special education, early childhood education, school psychology, reading, or school administration.

Continuing Accreditation.

The accreditation process for an educator preparation provider (EPP) to renew its accredited status.

Continuous Improvement.

A process of gathering information about all aspects of preparation activities and experiences, analyzing that information (looking for patterns, trends, making comparisons with peers), identifying what works and what seems to be troubled, making adjustments, and repeating the cycle.

Continuous Improvement (CI) Commission.

The CAEP governing body that is responsible for determining the standards that are met by an educator preparation provider (EPP) in the continuous improvement pathway.

Continuous Improvement (CI) Pathway.

One of the three CAEP accreditation pathways in which an educator preparation provider (EPP) provides evidence that standards are met. The focus of the self study is on the ways the EPP has been strengthened and the improved quality of its completers since the previous accreditation visit.

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP).

A nonprofit and nongovernmental agency that accredits educator preparation providers (EPPs). CAEP was created with the October 2010 adoption of a motion to consolidate the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) by the boards of the two organizations. CAEP became operational on July 1, 2013.

Credibility.

The quality of being believable or worthy of trust.

Cross-cutting Themes.

Overarching emphases on diversity and technology that are threaded throughout the standards and reflect the Commission's perspective that they need to be integrated *throughout* preparation experiences.

Cumulative.

For CAEP purposes, measures of candidate performance that increase or grow across successive administrations. Measures gain credibility as additional sources or methods for generating them are employed. The resulting triangulation helps guard against the inevitable flaws associated with any one approach. The same principle applies to qualitative evidence whose "weight" is enhanced as new cases or testimonies are added and when such additions are drawn from different sources. In sum, the entire set of measures used under a given Standard should be mutually reinforcing.

Curriculum.

Courses, experiences, and assessments for preparing educator candidates to teach students at a specific age level, to teach a specific subject area, or to work as another school professional such as a principal, school library media specialist, or superintendent.

Cut Score.

A score or rating that is designated as the minimally acceptable level of performance on an assessment.

Data.

Information with a user and a use that may include individual facts, statistics, or items of information. For CAEP purposes, data include results of assessment or information from statistical or numerical descriptions of phenomena, status, achievement, or trends.

Deep Understanding.

Knowledge of a particular thing to such a degree that it implies skill in dealing with or handling something, comprehension, and personal interpretation.

Denial.

The accreditation decision when an educator preparation provider's (EPP) case for initial accreditation fails to meet one or more CAEP standards.

Dependability.

Worthy of trust; reliable.

Discipline.

A branch of knowledge, typically studied in higher education, that becomes the specific subject area in which a teacher specializes (such as history), or the professional field in which an educator practices (such as educational administration).

Dispositions.

The habits of professional action and moral commitments that underlie an educator's performance (InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards, p. 6.)

Distance Education.

A formal educational process in which instruction occurs when the learning and the instructor are not in the same place at the same time. Distance learning can occur through virtually any media and include asynchronous or synchronous modes as well as electronic or printed communications.

Diverse.

Showing a great deal of variety; very different, as in diverse clinical placements (See *Diversity*).

Diversity.

(1) Individual differences (e.g., personality, interests, learning modalities, and life experiences),and (2) group differences (e.g., race, ethnicity, ability, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, nationality, language, religion, political affiliation, and socio-economic background) (InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards, p. 21).

Dues.

The yearly financial assessment paid by a member to maintain its partnership agreement and/or collaborative representation in CAEP's governance system.

Educator.

Anyone who directly provides instruction or support services in P-12 or higher education settings.

Educator Preparation Provider (EPP).

The entity responsible for the preparation of educators including a nonprofit or forprofit institution of higher education, a school district, an organization, a corporation, or a governmental agency.

Effectiveness.

Adequacy to accomplish a purpose; producing the intended or expected result. For CAEP purposes effectiveness includes the impact that a candidate or program completer has on P-12 student learning.

Elements.

A component or constituent of a whole or one of the parts into which a whole may be resolved by analysis. For CAEP purposes these are the components of a program including academic, pedagogical, clinical and other elements that constitute the total preparation program.

Endorsement.

An addition to an educator's license or certification that officially sanctions an educator's fulfillment of preparation requirements to teach a subject different from that specified on the original license/certificate, to work with another group or age level of students, or to provide professional services in schools.

Ethics.

The moral principles that govern a person's or group's behaviors.

Evidence.

The intentional use of documentation, multiple and valid measures, and analysis provided as support for and proof of an educator preparation provider's (EPP) claims related to CAEP's standards.

Extension.

A change in the term of accreditation that results because of a good cause delay or postponement of an Educator Preparation Providers' (EPP's) site visit.

Faculty.

The personnel, including both employees and partners of the educator preparation provider (EPP) who assess, support, and develop a candidate's knowledge, skills, and/or professional dispositions within the scope of the educator preparation program. Note that this includes academic as well as clinical faculty, and EPPbased educators as well as P-12 partner educators. EPPs may include personnel referred to as coaches, mentors, or development team members.

Fees.

The yearly financial assessment paid by (1) an educator preparation provider (EPP) to maintain its accreditation status; (2) a state to maintain its partnership agreement; or (3) an affiliated organization/agency to maintain its collaborative representation in CAEP's governance system.

Field Experiences.

Early and ongoing practice opportunities to apply content and pedagogical knowledge in P-12 settings to progressively develop and demonstrate their knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

Formative Evaluation.

A process that provides feedback to an educator preparation provider (EPP) as it progresses through the accreditation process. The offsite reviews of evidence and the self study provides feedback to all EPPs several months before the onsite visit.

Good Cause.

Reasons that are beyond the control of an Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) such as a change in state regulations or a natural disaster.

Good Cause Extension.

A request made by an educator preparation provider (EPP) requesting an extension to its accreditation term for a 'good cause' for a period up to one year in consultation with the state/country partner because of reasons that are beyond the control of the EPP, such as a change in state regulations, natural disaster, new state or national standards or legislation, changes in EPP leadership, or other extenuating circumstances.

Good Faith Effort.

In philosophy, the concept of good faith (Latin: *bona fides*, or *bona fide* for "*in* good faith") denotes sincere, honest intention or belief, regardless of the outcome of an action.

Governance.

The system of management that defines policy, provides leadership, guides oversight of the accreditation and administrative policies, procedures and resources of CAEP.

Group Average.

The GPA and standardized test scores are averaged for all members of a cohort or class of admitted candidates. Averaging does not require that every candidate meet the specified score. Thus, there may be a range of candidates' grades and scores on standardized tests.

High Quality Candidates.

The rigorous qualifications of candidates at admission, exit and throughout a preparation program as judged through selective criteria on a recurring basis by EPPs.

Holistic.

For CAEP purposes, a judgment of overall performance on a CAEP standard that reflects the understanding that the standard has a meaning or interpretation that is more than the sum of its components.

Innovation.

Implementation of something new or different in the preparation of educators that leads to the improvement of teaching and support of student learning.

Inquiry Brief.

Inquiry Brief, the accreditation pathway undertaken by an educator preparation provider (EPP) to evaluate itself against the CAEP standards with a research monograph style self-study that focuses on broad-based faculty engagement in investigation of candidate performance with an emphasis on the quality of the evidence used to evaluate candidate performance and to improve program quality. Accreditation pathways will not be applicable after fall 2018 site visits.

Institutional Accreditation.

The summative evaluation of a college or university against the standards of an institutional or regional accreditor, such as the Higher Learning Commission.

Institutional Standards.

Standards set by an educator preparation provider (EPP) that reflect its mission and identify important expectations for educator candidate learning that may be unique to the EPP.

Internal Academic Audit.

Review processes used by an educator preparation provider (EPP) in the Inquiry Brief Pathway to ascertain the proper functioning of its Quality Assurance System (QAS). The focus, methods, and findings of the internal audit are presented in the Brief and the implications of the findings for continuous improvement of the QAS and program features are discussed.

International Accreditation.

Educator preparation providers (EPPs) incorporated in or primarily operating in countries outside of the United States may seek CAEP accreditation. International institutions must meet all of CAEP's standards and policies; however, in some cases adaptation may be made to accommodate national or cultural differences while preserving the integrity of the CAEP process (adapted from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges glossary).

Internship.

Full-time or part-time supervised clinical practice experience in P-12 settings where candidates progressively develop and demonstrate their knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

Job Placement Rates.

The number and percentage of a cohort of admitted candidates or program completers who accepted jobs as teachers or other school professionals in a school after completing of a preparation program.

Joint Review Team.

The working group of the Accreditation Council comprised of two review panels that reviews the accreditation materials and the Review Panels' reports to develop recommendations for accreditation status of their assigned educator preparation provider cases for presentation to the Accreditation Council.

Knowledge Base.

The empirical research, disciplined inquiry, informed theory, and wisdom of practice that serves as the basis for requirements, decisions, and actions of an educator preparation provider (EPP).

Lapse.

A term used to refer to the accreditation status of an Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) when the site visit is not hosted on schedule and no request for an extension or withdrawal from accreditation have been filed.

Lead Site Visitor.

The head of the site visit team, appointed by CAEP staff, who manages the accreditation review process of the Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) from the point of the formative review/audit through the site visit and up to the point of review by the Accreditation Council.

License.

An official document issued by a state agency that an individual meets state requirements to (1) teach at a specific level or for a specialized discipline/population of students (e.g. middle grades, biology, English Language Learners, etc.); or (2) serve in a specific education role in a school (e.g. principal, reading specialist, etc.). (See *Licensure* or *Licensure Level*).

Licensure.

The process by which a governmental agency or nongovernmental organization grants professional recognition to an individual who meets specified qualifications/requirements. (See *Licensure Level*.)

Licensure Level.

A professional educator preparation program that provides the courses for a specific certificate or license but that does not lead to an academic degree.

Measures.

The variety of observation and assessment tools and methods that are collected as part of a research effort.

Members of CAEP.

Stakeholders that are educational organizations, states, and other agencies or parties committed to CAEP's mission and strategic plan.

Metric.

A method of measuring something, or the results obtained from this.

Misleading or Incorrect Statements.

Misrepresentation of an educator preparation provider's (EPP's) accreditation status or the use of accreditation reports or materials in a false or misleading manner.

Mission.

An important goal or purpose accompanied by strong conviction that underlies the work of an educator preparation provider.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

An affiliate of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) that has accredited professional education units or programs since it was founded in 1954. NCATE consolidated with TEAC in 2013 to form CAEP.

National Recognition.

The status granted specific educator preparation programs that meet the standards of a specialized professional association (SPA) that is a member of CAEP.

Norming.

In assessment of candidate learning, a process of training raters to evaluate products and performances consistently, typically using criterion-referenced standards and rubrics (adapted from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges glossary).

Norm-referenced.

Testing or assessment in which candidate performance is judged in relation to the performance of a larger group of candidates, not measured against a pre-established standard. See criterion-referenced (adapted from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges glossary).

Operating Procedures.

The document that outlines the step-by step implementation of the CAEP policies that guide CAEP's day-to-day activities.

Parity.

The equity of an educator preparation provider's (EPP) budget, facilities, equipment, faculty and candidate support, supplies, and other elements of the EPP compared to the resources available to similar programs at the institution or organization that houses the EPP.

Parsimony.

Measures or metrics that are limited in number but powerful in information. For CEP purposes, the fewest number of measures or metrics that make a compelling case for meeting a standard.

Partner.

Organizations, businesses, community groups, agencies, schools, districts, and/or EPPs specifically involved in designing, implementing, and assessing the clinical experience.

Partnership.

Mutually beneficial agreement among various partners in which all participating members engage in and contribute to goals for the preparation of education professionals. This may include examples such as pipeline initiatives, Professional Development Schools, and partner networks.

Part-Time Faculty.

Professional education faculty who have less than a full-time assignment in the professional education unit. Some part-time faculty are full-time employees of the college or university with a portion of their assignments in the professional education unit. Other part-time faculty are not full-time employees of the institution and are commonly considered adjunct faculty. *See Adjunct Faculty and Professional Education Faculty.*

Pedagogical Content Knowledge.

A core part of content knowledge for teaching that includes: core activities of teaching, such as figuring out what students know; choosing and managing representations of ideas; appraising, selecting and modifying textbooks; deciding among alternative courses of action and analyzing the subject matter knowledge and insight entailed in these activities.

Pedagogical Knowledge.

The broad principles and strategies of classroom instruction, management, and organization that transcend subject matter knowledge.

Pedagogical Skills.

An educator's abilities or expertise to impart the specialized knowledge/content of their subject area(s).

Peer Review.

A self-regulation process by which the quality of an institution, organization, educator preparation provider (EPP), school, or other entity is evaluated by individuals who are active participants in the profession. CAEP accreditation is a peer review process.

Performance Assessment.

Product- and behavior-based measurements based on settings designed to emulate real-life contexts or conditions in which specific knowledge or skills are actually applied.

Performance Data.

Information, both quantitative and qualitative, derived from assessments of educator candidate proficiencies as demonstrated in practice.

Petition.

The document prepared by an educator preparation provider (EPP) to explain the grounds for an appeal following denial or revocation of accreditation.

Preponderance of Evidence.

An overall confirmation that candidates meet standards in the strength, weight, or quality of evidence. This preponderance is based on the convincing evidence and its probable truth or accuracy, and not simply on the amount of evidence. (See evidence).

Probationary Accreditation.

The continuing accreditation decision rendered by the Accreditation Council when an educator preparation provider (EPP) fails to meet one of CAEP's standards.

Probationary Visit.

The site visit that occurs after the Accreditation Council puts an educator professional provider (EPP) on probation for failing to meet one of CAEP's standards.

Probes.

Specific methods employed/actions taken by an educator preparation provider (EPP) during the internal audit of the IB Pathway to verify alignment between operational expectations and operational reality. In addition, Site Visitors use probes during examination of the IB self study evidence to verify the credibility and accuracy of cited evidence and to gather additional information pertinent to assessing the strength of an EPP's case for CAEP accreditation.

Professional Community.

The continuing accreditation decision rendered by the Accreditation Council when an educator preparation provider (EPP) fails to meet one of CAEP's standards.

Professional Development.

Opportunities for educators to develop new knowledge and skills through professional learning activities and events such as in-service education, conference attendance, sabbatical leave, summer leave, intra- and inter-institutional visitations, fellowships, and work in P-12 schools.

Professional Development School (PDS).

A specially structured school in which Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) and P-12 school clinical educators collaborate to (1) provide practicum, field experience, clinical practice, and internship experiences; (2) support and enable the professional development of the educator preparation provider (EPP) and P-12 school clinical educators; (3) support and enable inquiry directed at the improvement of practice; and (4) support and enhance P-12 student achievement.

Professional Learning Communities (PLCs).

Educators committed to working collaboratively in ongoing processes of collective inquiry and action research in order to achieve better results for students they serve. CAEP supports PLCs for a variety of stakeholders.

Proficiencies.

Demonstrated abilities to perform some part of what is described by standards.

Program.

A planned sequence of academic courses and experiences leading to a degree, a recommendation for a state license, or some other credential that entitles the holder to perform professional education services in schools. Educator preparation providers (EPPs) may offer a number of program options (for example, elementary education, special education, secondary education in specific subject areas, etc.).

Program Approval.

A separate status from National Recognition provided by SPAs, program approval is the distinction granted by a state government agency when an educator preparation provider (EPP) program meets the state's standards and/or requirements. Program approval can encompass continuous review or one-time approval.

Program Completer.

Any candidate who exited an educator preparation program by successfully satisfying the requirements of the Educator Preparation Provider (EPP). (See *Completer*.)

Program Review with Feedback.

The process by which CAEP assesses the quality of licensure areas data offered by an educator preparation provider (EPP) under Standard 1. This review results in feedback for states, EPPs, and site visitors on the quality of evidence presented at the specialty licensure area level.

Program Review with National Recognition.

The process by which CAEP, in collaboration with its specialized professional associations (SPAs), assesses the quality of programs offered by educator preparation providers (EPPs). EPPs that select this program review option are required to submit their programs for review by SPAs as part of the accreditation process unless otherwise specified by the state partnership agreement with CAEP.

Program Reviewers.

Peer volunteers who review specialized educator licensure areas against the standards of Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs) and provide feedback to the state and site visitors.

Progressions/Progressive Development.

Descriptions of increasingly sophisticated ways of thinking about and enacting teaching practice that suggest trajectories of growth that both depend upon learning from experience and are influenced by support from mentors, interaction with colleagues, and engagement in ongoing professional learning. (InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards, p. 50)

Protocol.

Expectations for actions, behaviors, or reports, similar to etiquette (for example, CAEP protocol dictates that at the end of a site visit the lead site visitor meets with the head of the educator preparation provider to share team findings) (adapted from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges glossary).

Provider.

An inclusive term referring to the educator preparation provider (EPP) that is the sponsoring organization for preparation, whether it is an institution of higher education, a district- or state-sponsored program, or an alternative pathway organization.

Public Disclosure.

(1) A CAEP policy to ensure that an educator preparation provider (EPP) maintains its accreditation status, candidate performance data, and accreditation information available on the EPP's website for access by current and prospective candidates, parents, faculty, school professionals, and others. (2) A CAEP policy to ensure that CAEP maintains the accreditation status of EPPs and other accreditation information on its website.

Qualitative Measures.

Assessments or analyses that can be reported narratively and numerically to provide in-depth study of an individual, classroom, or school. Qualitative assessments include, but are not limited to, in-depth interviews, focus groups, observations, case studies, and ethnographic studies.

Quality Assurance System.

Mechanisms (i.e., structures, policies, procedures, and resources) that an educator preparation provider (EPP) has established to promote, monitor, evaluate, and enhance operational

effectiveness and the quality of the educator preparation provider's candidates, educators, curriculum, and other program requirements.

Quantitative Measures.

Assessments or analyses that can be reported numerically and sometimes generalized to a larger population. Common quantitative measures include surveys (online, phone, paper), observation and other evaluative forms, and tests.

Rationale.

A statement or argument that provides a justification for a selection, decision, or recommendation.

Relevance.

A principle of evidence quality that implies validity, but goes beyond it by also calling for clear explanation of what any information put forward is supposed to be evidence of and why it was chosen. This principle also implies that there is a clear and explicable link between what a particular measure is established to gauge and the substantive content of the Standard under which it is listed.

Reliability.

The degree to which test scores for a group of test takers are consistent over repeated applications of a measurement procedure and hence are inferred to be dependable and repeatable for an individual test taker. A measure is said to have a high reliability if it produces consistent results under consistent conditions.

Reliable and Valid Evidence.

The credibility of the results from assessment and evaluation measures.

Reliable and Valid Model.

For CAEP purposes (p. 17 of the Commission report), a case study that is presented to meet one or more of CAEP's standards in which key outcomes and processes are gauged, changes and supporting judgments are tracked, and the changes presented are actually improvements. To be reliable and valid as a model, the case study should have followed CAEP's guidelines in identifying a worthwhile topic to study, generated ideas for change, defined the measurements, tested solutions, transformed promising ideas into sustainable solutions that achieve effectiveness reliably at scale, and shared knowledge.

Remand.

Returning a case for accreditation to a new team for a second full review when there is no consensus on the recommendations of the joint review team by the Accreditation Council.

Representative.

The extent to which a measure or result is typical of an underlying situation or condition, not an isolated case. If statistics are presented based on a sample, evidence of the extent to which the sample is representative of the overall population ought to be provided, such as the relative

characteristics of the sample and the parent population. If the evidence presented is qualitative—for example, case studies or narratives, multiple instances should be given or additional data shown to indicate the typicality of the chosen examples. CAEP holds that sampling is generally useful and desirable in generating measures efficiently. But in both sampling and reporting, care must be taken to ensure that what is claimed is typical and the evidence of representativeness must be subject to audit by a third party.

Requirements.

CAEP's expectations other than those contained in the standards, including criteria for eligibility or candidacy, paying annual fees, submitting annual reports, publishing educator candidate performance data on websites, etc.

Retention Rates.

Comparison of the number of candidates who entered a program against the number who completed the program and were recommended for certification or licensure. Retention rates may also be collected for the number of new teachers who begin work in schools and who are still working in specified subsequent years.

Review Panel.

A 3-4 person group selected from an Accreditation Council that examines the selfstudy, site visitors' report, and other accreditation documents related to an educator preparation provider's (EPP) case for accreditation. The Review Panel makes a recommendation to the Joint Review Team of the Accreditation Council on the standards that are met and confirms or revises areas for improvement and/or stipulations.

Revocation.

The continuing accreditation decision made by the Accreditation Council to revoke an accredited status when the Accreditation Council has determined that the educator preparation provider (EPP) no longer meets two or more CAEP standards.

Rigor.

In education, refers both to a challenging curriculum and to the consistency or stringency with which high standard for learning and performance are upheld (adapted from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges glossary).

Rubric.

A tool for scoring candidate work or performances, typically in the form of a table or matrix, with criteria that describe the dimensions of the outcomes down the left-hand vertical axis, and levels of performance across the horizontal axis. The work of performance may be given an overall score (holistic scoring) or criteria may be scored individually (analytic scoring). Rubrics are also used for communicating expectations (adapted from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges glossary).

Satisfaction.

For CAEP purposes, the degree of confidence and acceptance that a preparation program was satisfactory, dependable, and true to its purpose by an employer or candidate.

Scoring Rubric.

The established criteria, including rules, principles, procedures, and illustrations, used in scoring responses to individual items that do not provide enumerated responses from which test takers make a choice.

Selected Improvement Pathway.

One of three CAEP accreditation pathways in which an educator preparation provider (EPP) provides evidence that the CAEP Standards are met. The self study includes a data driven plan for improvement on a focal area selected by the EPP. Accreditation pathways will not be applicable after fall 2018 site visits.

Self Study.

The process and document that an Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) creates/undergoes to evaluate its practices against CAEP standards.

Shared Accountability.

A policy for holding Educator Preparation Providers (EPPs), P-12 schools and teachers mutually responsible for students' and candidates' learning and academic progress.

Signature Assessment.

An embedded assessment method using an assignment—either the identical assignment or multiple assignment all constructed according to a common template— cross multiple courses or sections of courses. A sample of candidates' work products is then examined using a rubric to arrive at judgments about the quality of candidate learning across the course or program (adapted from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges glossary).

Site Visit.

The two-to-three days in which site visitors conduct their summative review of an educator preparation provider's (EPP) self-study report and evidence on location at the EPP's campus or organizational headquarters.

Site Visitors.

Evaluators who review educator preparation providers (EPPs) that submit a selfstudy for one of CAEP's accreditation pathways. Site visitors examine the EPP against the evidence presented to make the case for meeting the CAEP standards. Site visitors are selected from nominations by CAEP members, EPPs, states, and others; they must successfully complete training.

Site Visitors Report.

The document prepared by site visitors during and/or following the site visit that verifies the evidence presented in the self-study report written by the educator preparation provider (EPP) to identify which evidence supports each CAEP standard and which evidence is inconsistent with the CAEP standard.

Specialized Professional Association (SPA).

A member of CAEP that is a national organization of teachers, professional education faculty, and/or other school professionals who teach a specific content area (e.g., mathematics or social studies), teach students at a specific developmental level (i.e., early childhood, elementary, middle level, or secondary), teach students with specific needs (e.g., special education teachers), or provide services to students (e.g., school counselors, school psychologists, or principals).

Stakeholder.

Partners, organizations, businesses, community groups, agencies, schools, districts, and/or EPPs interested in candidate preparation or education.

Standardized Test Scores.

The numerical expression of a student's or educator candidate's performance on an examination that was administered and scored consistently across all of the test takers who took the same examination. This consistency permits a more reliable comparison of student or educator candidate performance across test takers.

Standards.

Normative statements about educator preparation providers (EPPs) and educator candidate practices, performances, and outcomes that are the basis for an accreditation review. Standards are written in broad terms with components that further explicate their meaning. (See *Professional Standards*).

State Partnership Agreement.

A formal agreement between a state and CAEP that defines the state's recognition of accreditation decisions, the program review options available to educator preparation providers (EPPs) within the state, and the relationship between CAEP accreditation and state program approval. The agreement outlines the state's presence and role in accreditation visits.

State Program Review.

The process by which a state governmental agency reviews a professional education program to determine if it meets the state's standards for the preparation of school personnel.

STEM.

Science, technology, engineering and mathematics.

Stewardship.

The responsible oversight and protection of something considered worth caring for and preserving.

Stipulation.

A statement written by a site visit team or review panel which is confirmed by the Accreditation Council as a deficiency related to one or more components or a CAEP standard. A stipulation is of sufficient severity that a standard is determined to be unmet. For educator preparation

providers (EPPs) seeking to continue their accreditation, a stipulation must be corrected within two years to retain accreditation. For EPPs seeking initial or first accreditation, a stipulation leading to an unmet standard will result in denial of accreditation.

Strategic Evaluation.

A component of CAEP Standard 5 (Provider Quality, Continuous Improvement, and Capacity) that refers to an educator preparation provider's (EPP's) use of a variety of methods and processes to provide timely, credible, and useful information that can be acted upon to increase its organizational effectiveness and its impact on its completers' ability to support and improve P-12 student learning.

Structured.

A quantitative research method commonly employed in survey research to ensure that each interview is presented with exactly the same questions in the same order; that answers can be reliably aggregated; and that comparisons can be made with confidence between sample subgroups or between different survey periods. For CAEP purposes the terms is used in the context of structured observation instruments and structured student surveys.

Student.

A learner in a P-12 school setting or other structured learning environment but not a learner in an educator preparation program.

Student Learning.

The academic achievement of P-12 students. Educator preparation providers (EPPs) should prepare educator candidates to analyze student learning and data related to student learning and to be able to develop instructional experiences that improve student learning.

Student Surveys.

Questionnaires about the performance of teachers and other school professionals that are completed by P-12 students. Student surveys are one of the measures that an educator preparation provider (EPP) could use to demonstrate the teaching effectiveness of its candidates and completers.

Student Teaching.

Extensive and substantive clinical practice in P-12 schools for candidates preparing to teach.

Subject Matter Knowledge.

See *Content Knowledge*.

Substantive Change.

Any change in the published mission or objectives of the organization or educator preparation provider (EPP); the addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure in terms of either content or delivery from those that were offered when the EPP was most recently accredited; a change from contracting with other providers for direct instructional

services, including any teach-out agreements. Substantive changes are reported by EPPs in their annual report to CAEP.

Summary of the Case.

The site visitors' explication of the case the educator preparation provider (EPP) has made for accreditation.

Support Services for Candidates.

The provision of academic advising and systems that facilitate and encourage academic success; personal counseling services; employment assistance; financial aid guidance; the protection of student records; and extracurricular activities (e.g., student organizations, clubs, and professional activities) that are based on well-defined purposes that serve the educational needs of educator candidates.

Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC).

An affiliate of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) that has accredited professional education programs since it was founded in 1997. TEAC consolidated with NCATE in 2013 to form CAEP.

Teacher Enhancement Program.

A post baccalaureate program for licensed teachers.

Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA).

An ongoing process for measuring teacher candidates' performance. CAEP expects these assessments to be validated based on state and national professional standards, to be reliably scored by trained evaluators, and to be used for continuous improvement of educator preparation.

Teach-out Agreement.

An agreement between accredited educator preparation providers (EPPs) and its candidates that will provide a reasonable opportunity for candidates to complete their program of study if the EPP stops offering its educational program before all enrolled candidates have completed the program.

Teach-out Plan.

A written document that describes the process for the equitable treatment of candidates when an educator preparation provider (EPP) ceases to operate a program before all candidates have completed their courses of study.

Team Chair.

See *Lead Site Visitor*.

Technology.

The tools and techniques available through computers, the Internet, telecommunications, and multimedia that are used by educator preparation providers (EPPs) for instruction and the

input, storing, processing, and analyzing of data in quality assurance systems. Educator candidates should be able to demonstrate that they use technology to work effectively with students to support student learning.

Third-party Comment.

Testimony from members of the professional community or the public about the quality of the educator preparation provider (EPP) and its programs.

Time Frames for Achieving Compliance.

The maximum number of years an educator preparation provider (EPP) has to come into compliance when its accreditation cycle is less than seven years or CAEP finds a violation of its standards has occurred.

Title II.

A requirement of the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008 that educator preparation providers (EPPs) report the performance of teacher candidates on state licensure tests along with other data.

Title IV.

A requirement of the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008 and its predecessor that colleges and universities must be accredited by an institutional accrediting body recognized by the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Education for their students to be eligible for federal financial aid.

Training.

The formal and informal preparation of Board members, Council members, Commission members, site visitors, volunteers, consultants, and staff for their CAEP roles and responsibilities.

Transparency.

Openness in communications about the accreditation process, documents prepared for accreditation, and the outcomes of the accreditation review.

Triangulation.

A technique that reinforces conclusions based on data from multiple sources.

U.S. Department of Education.

The federal agency that administers programs that cover every area of education and range from preschool education through postdoctoral research, including the recognition of accrediting agencies such as CAEP.

U.S. Department of Education Recognition.

A designation by the U.S. Department of Education that an accreditation agency is a reliable authority for determining the quality of education or training provided by the institutions of higher education and the higher education programs they accredit.

Validity.

The extent to which a set of operations, test, or other assessment measures what it is supposed to measure. Validity is not a property of a data set but refers to the appropriateness of inferences from test scores or other forms of assessment and the credibility of the interpretations that are made concerning the findings of a measurement effort.

Value-added Measures.

For CAEP purposes, assessments that provide evidence of P-12 students' intended educational outcomes as measured by standardized tests and other assessments. For CAEP purposes, VAM should demonstrate the change over time of intended educational outcomes that is attributable to teacher preparation programs.

Verifiable.

The degree to which a measure or result is able to be independently confirmed or substantiated. This is partly a matter of whether the process of creating the current value of the measure is replicable, and if repeating the process would yield a similar result. This principle implies reliability, but goes beyond it to require transparency and full documentation—whether sufficient information is available to enable any third party to independently corroborate what was found.