

Standard 4/A.4

Program Impact

Tatiana Rivadeneyra, Ed.D.
Accreditation Director,
Site Visitor Development and EPP Accreditation
tatiana.rivadeneyra@caepnet.org

Malina Monaco, Ph.D.
CAEP Lead Site Visitor
mkmonaco@ncsu.edu



Kansas City, Missouri
March 2018

SESSION OVERVIEW

- CAEP Initial and Advanced Standards 4/A.4
- Suggested evidence, evidence sufficiency criteria, and additional CAEP resources available.
 - *Content will reference the evidence sufficiency criteria (handouts)*

CAEP Standard 4/A.4

4.1

- *Impact on P-12 Student Learning and Development*

4.2

- *Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness*

4.3

A.4.1

- *Satisfaction of Employers*

4.4

A.4.2

- *Satisfaction of Completers*

EVIDENCE SUFFICIENCY: RESOURCES

CONSULT:

- Evidence Sufficiency Criteria
 - Evaluation Criteria for Self-Study Evidence - Standard 4
 - [CAEP Guidelines for Plans](#) for phase-in plan content
 - F18-S20 **can** present plans with progress data
 - Site visits in F20 and beyond are **not eligible** for phase-in
- Assessment Sufficiency Criteria
 - [CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments](#)

Guidance for Standard 4/A.4

- Key concepts in standard and components are addressed
- At least three cycles of data that are sequential and most recent available
- Admission statistics are disaggregated by academic year
 - Also for main and additional campuses, on site and online programs (if applicable)
- Data/evidence analysis includes discussion of trends/patterns, comparisons, and/or differences.
- EPP-created assessments (if any) meet CAEP assessment sufficiency criteria

Special for Standard

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

Standard 4: Context and Purpose

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** [component 4.3], and the **satisfaction of** its **completers** [component 4.4] with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.

EPPs that have access to data from states about completer impact should:

- Describe data sources and model/formula
- Describe EPP's analysis and evaluation the information
- Interpret data and judge implications

- If validity cannot be credibly established for state sources, supplement with other valid evidence.

EPPs that do not have access to data from states about completer impact can:

- Select a sample of completers (tested and non-tested subject areas)
- Collect their students' assessment data or pre-post learning data
- Collect individual teacher evaluations that assess impact on student learning

Standard 4, Guidance from Component 4.1

REQUIRED COMPONENT:

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.

- *Consider: What evidence do you have that would demonstrate graduates' impact on P-12 student learning? What research methodologies could you feasibly employ to gain such information?*

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE: IMPACT ON LEARNING

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

- If state data are not available:
 - Teacher-linked student assessments from districts
 - Classroom-based research (e.g., action research, case studies)

Standard 4, Guidance from Component 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.

- *Consider: What evidence do you have (beyond measures of P-12 student learning) that would demonstrate that your completers are effective teachers?*

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE:

CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION

- Observations of Teaching
 - Aligned to the 4 InTASC categories
 - Aligned to state standards for teachers / local teacher evaluation framework
- P-12 Student Surveys
 - Aligned to the InTASC categories
 - Corroboration for observation/evaluation data
- Employer Surveys
 - Aligned to the InTASC Standards
 - Corroboration for observation/evaluation data

Standard 4, Guidance from Component 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.

- *Consider: What evidence do you have that would demonstrate that employers are satisfied with the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions of your program graduates who are working at their location?*

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE:

EMPLOYER SATISFACTION

- 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)
- Employer satisfaction case studies (include a description of methodology)
- Data on employment milestones such as
 - Retention in education position for which initially hired or another education role by the same or a different employer
 - Promotion
- Aligned to the InTASC Standards/Corroboration for observation/evaluation and data

Standard 4, Guidance from Component 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**.

- *Consider: What evidence do you have that would demonstrate your program graduates are satisfied with how well the program prepared them for their job?*

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE:

COMPLETER SATISFACTION

- 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)
- Completer satisfaction case studies (include a description of methodology)
- Aligned to the InTASC Standards
- Aligned to state standards for teachers/local teacher evaluation framework
- Can triangulate with observation/evaluation, survey, and impact data

STANDARD A.4

Program Impact



Kansas City, Missouri
March 2018

EVIDENCE SUFFICIENCY: RESOURCES

CONSULT:

- Evidence Sufficiency Criteria
 - Evaluation Criteria for Self-Study Evidence - Standard A.4
 - [CAEP Guidelines for Plans](#) for phase-in plan content
 - F18 –S19 SSRs, **no evidence** for advanced-level standards included in self-study reports
 - F19-S20 **can** present plans for components A.4.1 and/or A.4.2
 - **Plan with progress** can be submitted in SSRs until 2021-2023
 - Site visits in F23 and beyond are **not eligible** for phase-in
- Assessment Sufficiency Criteria
 - [CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments](#)

Standard A.4: Context and Purpose

The provider **documents** the **satisfaction** of its **completers** from advanced preparation programs [component 4.2] and their **employers** [component 4.1] with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.

Standard A.4, Guidance from Component A.4.1

The provider **demonstrates** that **employers are satisfied with completers' preparation** and that **completers reach employment milestones** such as promotion and retention.

- *Consider: What evidence do you have that would demonstrate that employers are satisfied with the preparation of programs completers, that they fulfill employments needs, and that they perform effectively enough to be retained or promoted?*

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE:

EMPLOYER SATISFACTION

- 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)
- Employer satisfaction case studies (include a description of methodology)
- Data on employment milestones such as
 - Retention in education position for which initially hired or another education role by the same or a different employer
 - Promotion
- Aligned to the NBPTS Standards
- Corroboration for observation/evaluation and data

Standard A.4, Guidance from Component A.4.2

The provider **demonstrates** that advanced program **completers perceive their preparation as relevant** to the responsibilities they confront on the job, and that the preparation was effective.

- *Consider: What evidence do you have that would demonstrate that employers are satisfied with the preparation of programs completers, that they fulfill employments needs and that they perform effectively enough to be retained or promoted?*

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE:

COMPLETER SATISFACTION

- 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)
- Completer satisfaction case studies (include a description of methodology)
- Aligned to the NBPTS Standards
- Aligned to state standards for teachers / local teacher evaluation framework
- Can triangulate with observation/evaluation, survey, and impact data

In Summary - The Case for Standard 4/A.4

- The EPP:

Provides information from several sources and provides evidence of shared decision-making, collaboration among clinical faculty, and continuous functioning.

- Analyzes data.
- Examines differences and similarities across licensure areas, comparisons over time, and demographical data are examined in relation to clinical experiences, as appropriate
- Interprets and reaches conclusions
- Identifies trends or patterns that suggest need for preparation modification
- Make decisions that are based on the analysis of data
- Takes actions in response to analysis of data described

Standard 4/A.4's Case

Providers establish the outcomes of preparation indicating that completers from licensure programs are impacting P-12 student learning and development.

...CAEP Standards for Initial/Advanced Programs, Evidence Sufficiency Criteria

Accreditation Decision Guidelines: Standard 4/A.4

AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT MAY BE CITED WHEN:

- Instrument Quality is Poor:
 - EPP-created assessments used to collect Standard 4 data have significant deficiencies with respect to CAEP's assessment evaluation framework
 - Phase-In Plans for one or more components do not meet CAEP's guidelines for plans
- Evidence Quantity is Limited:
 - Less than three cycles of data are provided
 - Less than one cycle of phase-in data collected by calendar 2018
- Case is Weak:
 - Gaps or inconsistencies in the coherence of the EPP's case that it meets the standard
 - Interpretations of evidence are not well grounded in the provided evidence
 - Inaccuracies found when comparing original data to reported results

Accreditation Decision Guidelines: Standard 4/A.4

STIPULATIONS MAY BE CITED WHEN:

- Evidence Quality is Low
 - Significant aspects of the standard are not addressed by relevant measures
 - A component is omitted or addressed very superficially
 - Data for a component are not a direct measure of key language
 - No efforts to ensure validity of evidence and/or no information on representativeness of the data
- Case is Weak
 - There is no significant analysis of evidence or interpretation of results
 - EPP cannot speak on CAEP's impact indicators for completers employed in positions for which they were prepared by the EPP

