

# STANDARD A.3

CANDIDATE QUALITY AND SELECTIVITY

Michelle D. Bicey, Ed.D.  
Senior Accreditation Associate  
[michelle.bicey@caepnet.org](mailto:michelle.bicey@caepnet.org)

Jennifer Carinci Ed.D.  
Accreditation Director, Director of Research and Engagement  
[jennifer.carinci@caepnet.org](mailto:jennifer.carinci@caepnet.org)



Kansas City, Missouri  
March 2018

## JOIN THE SESSION ON THE APP



- Follow along with the slides or handouts
- Send in questions through the "Ask a Question" feature on this session
  - Up-vote the questions of others if you would also like it answered

## Session Overview

- This session will focus on the key language and intent of CAEP Standard A.3, and its components.
- Content will reference the evidence sufficiency criteria.
- The CAEP Standards for Initial-Level Programs are not covered in this presentation.
  - Please attend the session dedicated to those standards or access the presentation materials for guidance.

## STANDARD A.3: CANDIDATE QUALITY, SELECTIVITY, AND PROGRESS

- The provider demonstrates that the **quality of advanced program candidates** is a continuing and purposeful part of its responsibility so that **completers are prepared to perform effectively** and can be **recommended for certification where applicable**.

# Standard A3 in Context

## Standards A1-A3

- NRC (2010) aspects of teacher preparation “likely to have the strongest effects” on outcomes

## Standard A4

- Linchpin - assessment of outcomes critical to
  - testing inputs and
  - grounding data-informed improvement

## Standard A5

- Quality assurance system & organizational improvement
  - research advanced by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching



# Quality Assurance System (QAS) Indicators

- Standard 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 A.3.1.
- There is a system in place that collects, stores, analyzes, and reviews data relevant to Standard A.3 on applicants, enrollees, and exiting candidates, including data that address CAEP's cross-cutting themes of diversity and applications of technology.

• Page 20 [CAEP Handbook: Guidance on Self-Study Reports for Accreditation at the Advanced Level](#)

# Evidence Sufficiency Rules for Standard A.3

## General Rules

- 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 (as applicable)
- Data/evidence analysis includes discussion of trends/patterns, comparisons, and/or differences.
- EPP-created assessments (if any) meet CAEP's assessment sufficiency criteria

## Special Rules

- Component A.3.2 must be met for Standard A.3 to be considered met

# EVIDENCE SUFFICIENCY: RESOURCES

## CONSULT:

---

- Evaluation Criteria for Self-Study Evidence
  - [CAEP Handbook: Guidance on Self-Study Reports for Accreditation at the Advanced Level](#)
  - CAEP Guidelines for Plans for phase-in plan content
    - Site Visits: SSR submitted through academic year 2018/2019 can include plans
    - Site Visits: Fall 2019- Spring 2021 eligible for phase-in- plans
    - Site Visits: Fall 2021 – Spring 2023 plans with progress
    - Site visits in Fall 2023 and beyond report on evidence
- Assessment Sufficiency Criteria
  - [CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments](#)



## COMPONENT A.3.1: KEY LANGUAGE

The provider **sets goals** and **monitors progress** for **admission and support of high-quality** advanced program **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 teacher pool** and, over time, should reflect **the diversity of P-12 students**. The provider demonstrates efforts to **know and address** community, state, national, regional, or local **needs for school and district staff** prepared in advanced fields.

*Consider: What evidence do you have that would demonstrate that there is an admission plan that is sensitive to candidate diversity, academic ability, and the employment landscape?*

# EVIDENCE SUFFICIENCY CRITERIA, A.3.1

## SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE

---

- Demonstrates knowledge of employment opportunities in schools, districts, and/or regions where completers are likely to seek employment and documents the influence of employment opportunities on enrollment patterns
- Written plan for the continuously improving the admitted candidate pool provides base points and annual monitoring of characteristics related to academic ability, diversity, and employment needs.
- Admission goals and enrollment data demonstrate annual progress from the base point and have moved the provider toward greater candidate diversity and academic achievement.

# DATA-INFORMED RECRUITMENT & RETENTION PLAN & PROGRESS

## *A Tool for EPPs*



### Data-informed Recruitment and Retention Plan & Progress

*A Tool for EPPs*

**Standard 3, CAEP Component 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 address community, state, national, regional, or local needs for hard-to-staff schools and shortage fields, currently, STEM, English-language learning, and students with disabilities.*

**Purpose:** to provide structure and reflective questions to intentionally focus and track progress of relevant to recruitment and retention efforts.

In many cases, the data needed to complete this template are already being collected; by targeting attention to data and strategies most likely to help you achieve meaningful results, this document is intended to relieve some of the burden EPPs may face when designing a realistic recruitment and retention plan from scratch.

#### *Context within CAEP's Diversity Theme*

Candidate quality insists that providers must undertake positive outreach efforts to recruit a more able and more diverse candidate pool. The pairing of recruitment with raising candidate quality level in Standard 3 is of particular importance. This point has been powerfully underscored by the February 2013 report from the Equity and Excellence Commission to the Secretary of Education, in response to a Congressional mandate:

*"We won't have a serious equity policy until we steer our best talent to the classrooms where it's most needed; and we won't raise the bar for all children until far more of our entering teachers in all schools are well prepared themselves."*

The quality of new teachers entering the field depends not only on the quality of the preparation they receive, but also on the capacity of preparation programs to attract, select, and retain academically able people who have the potential to be effective teachers in the classrooms they will serve. Likewise, addressing the well-documented gap between the demographics of the current American teacher workforce and the increasingly diverse students they serve requires intentionality.

More information regarding the importance of the motivation for CAEP's diversity theme and how it should be manifested in EPPs' practice can be found [here](#).

#### *CAEP's Definition of Diversity*

CAEP Standards use the term "all" students as a reference to P-12 student diversity in America. 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]

1

- Check out the following session presentation and tool:

**LEVERAGING CAEP'S CROSS-CUTTING THEME OF DIVERSITY TO ACCOMPLISH MEANINGFUL GOALS FOR YOUR EPP AND THE PROFESSION**

Leverage partnerships!

## COMPONENT A.3.2: KEY LANGUAGE

The **provider sets admissions** requirements for academic achievement, including CAEP minimum criteria, the state's minimum criteria, or graduate school minimum criteria, whichever is highest, and **gathers data to monitor candidates from admission to completion**. The provider determines additional criteria intended to ensure that candidates have, or develop, abilities to complete the program successfully and arranges appropriate support and counseling for candidates whose progress falls behind.

*Consider: What evidence do you have that would demonstrate that States can submit requests for determinations of substantial equivalence to CAEP for evaluation. CAEP will advise them on the process and materials to submit. Individual EPPs cannot submit requesting this evaluation.*

# EVIDENCE SUFFICIENCY CRITERIA, A.3.2

## SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE

---

- The CAEP minimum criteria are a **college grade point average of 3.0** **Or** a **group average performance** on nationally normed assessments, or substantially equivalent state-normed or EPP administered assessments, of **mathematical, verbal, and written** achievement **in the top 50 percent** of those assessed.
- An EPP may submit substantially equivalent alternative assessment of academic achievement for review for approval. The 50th percentile standard for writing will be implemented in 2021. **The CAEP minimum criteria apply to the group average of enrolled candidates whose preparation begins during an academic year.**
- EPPs 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.

# STANDARD 3, COMPONENT 3.2

## CAEP WEBSITE - STANDARD 3 RESOURCES TAB

---

- <http://caepnet.org/standards/standard-3/resources>
  - [Standard 3, Component 3.2 Measures of Academic Proficiency](#)
    - provides contextual information about CAEP's academic achievement criterion
    - operationalizes CAEP's reference population for this component
    - includes a chart of assessments approved for demonstrating Standard 3, component 3.2
  - [Guidelines for Equivalence Studies for CAEP Standard 3](#)
    - written for sponsors of studies seeking to make the case that alternative assessments are substantially equivalent

# REQUIREMENTS FOR AVERAGE SCORES ON ASSESSMENTS

Assessment	Test or Section	3.2 Domain—NOTE: proficiency must be met for each domain	Group average performance requirements of candidates whose preparation began during the 2016-2017 academic year or earlier
ACT	"Reading"	Reading	21.25
ACT	"Math"	Math	21.25
ACT	"Writing"	Writing	6.60
SAT	"Evidence-Based Reading and Writing"	Reading	543.33
SAT	"Math"	Math	532.50
SAT	"Essay – Writing dimension"	Writing	5.30
<i>Praxis Core</i>	"Reading"	Reading	168.06
<i>Praxis Core</i>	"Mathematics"	Math	162.14
<i>Praxis Core</i>	"Writing"	Writing	165
GACE PAA	"Reading"	Reading	263.70
GACE PAA	"Mathematics"	Math	272.16
GACE PAA	"Writing"	Writing	262.01
OGET	"Oklahoma General Education Test (OGET)"	Reading, Math, and Writing	258**
GRE	"Verbal Reasoning"	Reading	150.75**
GRE	"Quantitative Reasoning"	Math	152.75**
GRE	"Analytical Writing"	Writing	3.74**
MAT	"Miller Analogies Test"	Reading	396***

APPROVED BY  
CAEP FOR  
DEMONSTRATING  
STANDARD 3,  
COMPONENT 3.2

[CAEP Standard 3,  
Component 3.2  
Measures of Academic  
Proficiency](#)

## COMPONENT A.3.3: KEY LANGUAGE

The **provider creates criteria for program progression** and **uses disaggregated data to monitor candidates'** advancement from admissions through completion.

*Consider: What evidence do you have that would demonstrate that candidate progress is checked against performance criteria at multiple points prior to program completion?*



# EVIDENCE SUFFICIENCY CRITERIA, A.3.3

## SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE

---

- Documents how often and when the EPP monitors candidate performance
  - At two or more points after admission
  - For each specialty area and for individual candidates
- Documents outline the criteria for satisfactory progress at each monitoring point and results showing attainment rates
  - Disaggregated by specialty area
- Outlines the supporting services available to assist advanced program candidates to complete their program, including information provided to candidates on how to access services.
- Documents the types of services/support that advanced candidates – particularly those that were struggling at progress checkpoints – have accessed and/or the types of interventions the EPP initiated

## COMPONENT A.3.4: KEY LANGUAGE

Before the provider recommends any advanced program candidate for completion, it **documents that the candidate has reached a high standard for content knowledge in the field of specialization, data literacy and research-driven decision making, effective use of collaborative skills, applications of technology, and applications of dispositions, laws, codes of ethics and professional standards** appropriate for the field of specialization.

*Consider: What evidence do you have that would demonstrate that each candidate who is awarded the specialty degree has achieved the set of proficiencies expected at exit?*


# EVIDENCE SUFFICIENCY CRITERIA, A.3.4

## SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE

- Documents that each candidate that the program recommended for the specialty area credential passed all of the progress monitoring checkpoints or remediated all deficiencies by the final checkpoint
- Documents that the knowledge, skills, and dispositions listed in A.1 are key to program completion, particularly
  - Content knowledge in the field of specialization
  - Data literacy and research-driven decision making
  - Effective use of collaborative skills
  - Applications of technology
  - Applications of dispositions, laws, codes of ethics and professional standards appropriate for the field of specialization

# CROSS-CUTTING THEMES OF DIVERSITY AND TECHNOLOGY

- Places in which the cross-cutting themes of diversity and technology must be explicitly addressed through evidence are **identified by the following icons** in the CAEP Evidence Table.

-  = diversity

and

-  = technology

# CROSS-CUTTING THEMES OF DIVERSITY AND TECHNOLOGY

## Diversity

### Standard A.3

- Providers engage in the outreach efforts to recruit a more able and diverse pool of advanced-level program candidates.
- Since applicants and candidates for advanced-level programs come principally from the current pool of America's teachers, they will reflect the diversity of that pool. Over time, and considering wider national goals to recruit a more diverse teacher workforce that reflects the diversity of our P-12 population, there should be growing diversity in admitted candidates for advanced preparation. The goal is that completers of advanced-level programs should better reflect the diversity of the school-age population they are being prepared to serve.
- EPPs monitor disaggregated evidence of academic quality and candidate progress for each campus and mode of delivery, providing support for candidates who need it.

## Technology

### Standard A.3

- Candidates can apply technology in appropriate ways to their field of specialization.

# MAKE YOUR EVIDENCE-BASED CASE

- Self-study reflection questions for Standard A.3 - pages 35 to 36
  - –What **strengths and areas of challenge** have you discovered as you analyzed and compared the results of your disaggregated data on candidate quality, recruitment/admissions, and quality monitoring by program and by demographics? What questions have emerged that need more investigation? **How are you using this information** for continuous improvement?
  - What **trends** in candidate quality, recruitment and admissions practices, and monitoring of candidate progress have emerged as you compared program and demographic data across evidence sources and programs?
  - What **implications** can you draw, or what conclusions can you reach, across evidence sources about candidate quality, recruitment/ admissions, and quality monitoring? What questions have emerged that need more investigation? Improvement? How have **data-driven decisions** on changes been incorporated into preparation?

# RESOURCES FOR ADVANCED-LEVEL PROGRAMS

- <http://caepnet.org/standards/standards-advanced-programs>
  - [CAEP Handbook: Guidance on Self-Study Reports for Accreditation at the Advanced Level](#)
  - [CAEP 2016 Standards for Advanced-Level Programs](#)
  - [CAEP 2016 Standards for Advanced-Level Programs: One-Pager](#)
  - [Board Action: Summary of Changes in Standards for Advanced-Level Programs \(June 10, 2016\)](#)
  - [Policy Changes: Accreditation for Advanced-Level Programs](#)
  - [Scope of Accreditation for Advanced-Level Programs \(September 2017\)](#)
  - [CAEP Standards for Advanced-Level Programs Evidence Sufficiency Criteria](#)





TELL US HOW TO IMPROVE FOR  
YOUR NEXT CAEP CON

# COMPLETE YOUR SESSION FEEDBACK

