



# 2019 ACCREDITATION HANDBOOK

[October 30, 2019]

Based on *CAEP Standards for Initial Licensure*  
Adopted by the CAEP Board of Directors August 2013; Amended June 2016 and December 2018  
And *CAEP Standards for Advanced-Level Programs*  
Adopted by the CAEP Board of Directors, June 2016

NOTICE: This handbook is effective for self-study reports submitted by educator preparation providers preparing for site visits scheduled Spring 2021 and beyond. The *CAEP Handbook: Guidance on Self-Study reports for Accreditation at the Advanced-Level 2017*, and the *CAEP Handbook: Initial-Level Programs 2018* remain in effect through site visits scheduled Fall 2020.

1140 19<sup>th</sup> Street, NW Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20036 [caepnet.org](http://caepnet.org)

# Contents

Page

<b><i>PREFACE</i></b> , CAEP President Christopher A. Koch	4
<b>CAEP 2019 ACCREDITATION HANDBOOK</b>	5
<b>PART A. INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE</b>	5
<b>Section A.i Introduction</b>	5
• Overview of the Handbook	5
• Accreditation Timeline at a Glance	6
<b>Section A.ii Scope of Accreditation, Initial Licensure</b>	10
<b>Section A.iii Scope of Accreditation, Advanced-Level</b>	11
<b>PART B: PREPARING FOR AND WRITING A SELF-STUDY REPORT</b>	12
<b>Section B.i Introduction</b>	12
<b>Section B.ii Conducting Self-Studies and Writing Self-Study Reports</b>	12
• Steps in preparing for accreditation review	12
• Writing the Self-study Report	14
<b>Section B.iii Use of Data as Evidence</b>	16
<b>Section B.iv Use of Program Review Information in Accreditation</b>	18
<b>Section B.v Addressing Cross-cutting Themes of Diversity and Applications of Technology</b>	120
<b>PART C: CAEP STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES FOR SELF-STUDIES</b>	21
<b>Section C.i: Quality Assurance and Cross-cutting Themes, EPP-wide</b>	21
• Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement, EPP-wide (CAEP Standards 5 and A.5)	22
• Diversity, EPP-wide (CAEP cross-cutting theme)	29
• Technology Applications, EPP-wide (CAEP cross-cutting theme)	31
<b>Section C.ii: Candidates and Preparation, Initial Licensure and Advanced-Level</b>	34
• Standards 1 and A.1	34
• Standards 2 and A.2	45
• Standards 3 and A.3	53
<b>Section C.iii: Results of Preparation, Initial Licensure and Advanced-Level</b>	65
• Standards 4 and A.4	65
<b>APPENDIX A: Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments</b>	76
<b>APPENDIX B: Phase-in Schedule and Guidelines for Plans; Advanced-Level Preparation</b>	81
<b>APPENDIX C: CAEP Evidence Review Guidelines</b>	85
<b>APPENDIX D: Data Quality: Validity and Other Principles of Good Evidence</b>	135

**APPENDIX E: Evidence from Case Studies and P-12 Impact Studies** 142

**APPENDIX F: Optional Evidence for Writing Proficiency** 151

**APPENDIX G: CAEP Glossary** 153

## PREFACE

This is an invitation for Educator Preparation Providers (EPPs) to participate in the concluding stage of writing the *CAEP 2019 Accreditation Handbook*. The handbook will be in effect Spring 2021 and beyond.

CAEP made a commitment in 2016 to develop a revised accreditation process. We received advice about ways to improve CAEP's procedures from educator preparation faculty and administration, participants in CAEPCon sessions, members of the Accreditation Council, and our board members. This volume is the third handbook compiled since 2016. Like its predecessors—the *CAEP Handbook: Guidance on Self-Study reports for Accreditation at the Advanced-Level 2017*, and the *CAEP Handbook: Initial-Level Programs 2018*—it describes a unified accreditation process.

This 2019 handbook brings the separate Initial Licensure and Advanced-Level handbooks together into a single set of guidelines for self-studies. It updates and refines the unified procedures further, while maintaining the basic approach and expectations for evidence that appeared in the 2017 and 2018 handbooks.

One goal of our unified process is to acknowledge the unique context that each EPP brings, so one set of procedures anticipates many forms of evidence, different assessments, differing approaches to candidate recruitment, multiple ways to monitor candidate progress and efforts to support them. Each EPP has its own diversity and faces its own challenges as it plays its part in making America's teachers better reflect the diversity found in America's P-12 classrooms. There is not "one way" to make a case for accreditation and accreditation is not simply providing what "CAEP wants." Accreditation is a means for EPPs to strive for equity and excellence in their P-12 educator preparation through evidence and discussion.

This handbook has been reviewed in detail by eight individuals who have extensive experience with EPPs, states, and accreditation. While these reviewers offered differing perspectives and advice to CAEP, we have made changes to address their feedback and guidance as best we could. We adopted suggestions for more consistent and clear writing; made references more accessible; restored the third person addressee—"the EPP"—that reviewers preferred; and shifted formatting of the CAEP Standards for Initial Licensure and the CAEP Standards for Advanced-Level Programs to a side-by-side presentation rather than serial. We were encouraged by reviewers' favorable comments on other features, such as CAEP's identification of the principal concepts that make up each standard and its accompanying components; the prominence given to quality assurance and continuous improvement; and the more explicit description of cross-cutting themes, particularly diversity.

In addition, CAEP sought the advice of members of the Accreditation Council and several lead site visitors on guidelines for review of evidence, contained in Appendix C. These guidelines create a common framework for accreditation visitors and Council members with the intent to build shared understanding and consistency in evaluation of evidence and accreditation decisions.

As with the 2017 and 2018 handbooks, CAEP is inviting public review of our draft. We have created an online survey to organize comments here: [2019 Handbook Public Comment Survey](#). Please complete the survey by November 30 so we can take your views into account in the final version of this document.

Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D.  
President  
October 31, 2019

# CAEP 2019 ACCREDITATION HANDBOOK

## PART A. INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE

### Section A.i Introduction

#### Overview of the Handbook

The CAEP Standards for Initial Licensure and Advanced-Level Programs (referred to collectively as the CAEP Standards) address important attributes of educator preparation conducted by an Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) and also the EPP's performance as an educational organization. They are intended to elevate the bar for the relevance and quality of evidence that the EPP submits for accreditation.

The purpose of this handbook is to assist EPPs in conducting their self-studies and writing their self-study reports. Its contents are adapted from the November 2017 (Advanced-Level) and May 2018 (Initial Licensure) handbooks, but with some changes for clarification and greater consistency. The CAEP standards are grouped to emphasize three large purposes:

- **Quality Assurance and Cross-Cutting Themes**—The first grouping addresses EPP-wide topics, as represented by Standards 5 (Initial Licensure) and A.5 (Advanced-Level) and by the CAEP cross-cutting themes of diversity and applications of technology. These topics allow EPPs to highlight, across all of their functions, the capabilities of their quality assurance system (QAS), consequences of continuous improvement, and EPP-wide accomplishments in cross-cutting themes for diversity and applications of technology.
- **Candidates and Preparation**—The second grouping clusters standards that focus especially on candidates—the courses, clinical opportunities, and recruitment/selection/monitoring of candidates through to successful completion. These are in Standards 1, 2, and 3 (Initial Licensure) and A.1, A.2, and A.3 (Advanced-Level).
- **Results of Preparation**—The third grouping emphasizes an EPP's results as described by multiple indicators of completers' performance on the job. This is Standard 4 (Initial Licensure) and A.4 (Advanced-Level).

Appendix C, Evidence Review Guidelines, describes the qualities found in sufficient evidence and criteria used to evaluate evidence. The criteria provide a common framework that guides site visitors and the Accreditation Council, helping to ensure consistent accreditation evaluations and decisions. Since they are aligned with the 2019 handbook's standard-by-standard concepts and suggestions for evidence, they also serve as useful information for EPPs. In addition, the 2019 handbook appendices retain material in other recent handbooks, such as Appendix A, Framework for Evaluation for EPP-Created Assessments, and Appendix B, Phase-in Schedule and Guidelines for Plans. It has been enlarged to include some resources that had appeared in the 2015 CAEP Evidence Guide (and that document has been retired).

An additional feature of this handbook is that CAEP program review, now referred to as CAEP Evidence Review of Standards 1/A.1, is integrated into evidence for Standards 1/A.1 as submitted in the self-study report, and is no longer a separate feature or conducted in advance of the self-study reporting. EPPs may choose to participate in the SPA program review process leading to national recognition of the program, if there is a CAEP-SPA partner in a specific professional area. Of course they will respond to

their state's requirements for program review. Or they may conduct their own program review, drawing on appropriate program specialty expertise and adopting existing standards in the area of licensure to collect trend data. They may use evidence from their SPA submission or other program reviews to help make their case for Standard 1. However, each EPP must still provide the evidence it uses to make a case that Standards 1/A.1 are met in their entirety. Additional details are provided in Part B, Section B.iv (see p. 18), Use of Program Review Information in Accreditation, and in Part C CAEP Standards and Guidelines for Self-Studies, Standards 1 and A.1 (see p. 34).

CAEP publishes a number of accreditation resources in addition to this CAEP 2019 Handbook, including, among others, CAEP Standards, presentations and power-point slides from CAEPCon sessions, web briefings, information on program review procedures including those conducted with Specialized Professional Associations and leading to national recognition, CAEP's agreements with states, essays and articles on accreditation, online guidance on submission of applications for assessments to meet 3.2 criteria, CAEP bylaws, and accreditation and governance policies.

This handbook includes references to accreditation policy as well as to the 2013 CAEP Standards for Initial Licensure and Advanced-Level Programs. Changes are made from time to time in CAEP Standards and policies and these changes often have a direct effect on procedures that guide accreditation reviews and decisions. EPPs and states should stay abreast of such changes, which can be found on [CAEP's website](#). In any section of this document that references or quotes CAEP bylaws, accreditation policy, or governance policy, the language of the ratified bylaws or policy shall supersede the language contained in the handbook if the effective date is more recent than this handbook. *Any conflict or difference of interpretation between information provided in this handbook and any CAEP policy is to be resolved in favor of the relevant policy.*

### **Accreditation At-A-Glance**

The timeline and chart that follow provide an overview of the CAEP accreditation process.

# Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

## ACCREDITATION PROCESS

### TERMS TO KNOW

#### APPLICATION

Educator preparation providers (EPPs) that are new to CAEP Accreditation will complete a two-step application process. NCATE/TEAC-accredited EPPs become CAEP eligible and do not complete an application.

#### SELF-STUDY REPORT

The self-study report is the collection of evidence and supporting narrative which forms the basis of the accreditation review and is the first source of information for the site team.

#### FORMATIVE MEETING

The site team will conduct a virtual formative meeting to discuss their preliminary review of the SSR and evidence. After the formative meeting, the site team will finalize a formative feedback report (FFR) which will inform the EPP of any clarification or deficiencies needed by the site team to conduct the site visit.

#### SITE VISIT

The site team arrives at the EPP to review evidence and material supporting the self-study report.

#### SITE VISIT REPORT

The site team will provide a finished report after the site visit, which serves as the foundation of the Accreditation Council's decision-making process. EPPs have an opportunity to respond to the site visit report prior to the Council's review - within 30 days in the form of a rejoinder. No 'new' evidence may be included within the rejoinder.

#### ACCREDITATION COUNCIL

The Accreditation Council reviews all materials related to an EPP and makes all final accreditation decisions.

#### ANNUAL REPORT

Each year, providers submit their Annual Report to CAEP. These reports inform CAEP about the degree to which providers continue to meet CAEP Standards between accreditation cycles.

### CHECKLIST:



For more information and resources, visit [www.caepnet.org](http://www.caepnet.org).

<u>Steps</u>	<u>Activity</u>	<u>Policies and Processes</u>
<b>ANNUAL REPORT</b>		
Annual Report	EPP submits a report each year to update its information for CAEP, including a link to its posted data on the CAEP annual measures of candidate outcomes and impact. Failure to complete all required sections of the Annual report may result in Revocation or lapse of eligibility. The EPP pays annual dues to CAEP in July.	Annual reports due in spring of each year.  Relevant Accreditation Policy: 6.01  Questions: <a href="mailto:EPPAnnualReport@caepnet.org">EPPAnnualReport@caepnet.org</a>
<b>PREPARING THE SELF-STUDY REPORT</b>		
SPA Review with National Recognition/State Review (as required by state)/CAEP Evidence Review of Standards 1/A.1	EPPs in states requiring SPA program review with National Recognition, or EPPs that choose to participate in SPA review, submit their SPA report. In addition, states may have their own program review procedures or requirements.  EPP in states requiring state review will follow the state-specified timeline.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If SPA review with national recognition—at least three years prior to scheduled site visit semester and in consultation with CAEP staff.</li> <li>• If State review—please contact state for process and requirements</li> </ul> Relevant Accreditation Policy: 5.02
Scheduling Your Site Visit*  <i>*Accreditation with Stipulations and Probationary Accreditation Results in a two-year accreditation term.</i>	Site visits are typically conducted Sunday-Tuesday. EPPs check with state (if applicable) to determine feasible dates. In consultation with CAEP staff, EPP sets site visit dates. CAEP staff open digital SSR report templates.	18 months prior to scheduled site visit semester.  Relevant Accreditation Policies: 5.04; 5.14(b)  Questions: <a href="mailto:SiteVisit@caepnet.org">SiteVisit@caepnet.org</a>
Self-Study Report (SSR) Prepared and Submitted	EPP submits self-study report and data/evidence in CAEP’s digital management system no less than nine months prior to scheduled site visit. Upon submission of the SSR and evidence the site team will be assigned.	Nine months prior to site visit.  Related Accreditation Policy: 5.03
Call for <a href="#">Third Party Comments is Issued</a>	The EPP and CAEP publicly announce the upcoming site visit and provide time for interested stakeholders to make comments. EPPs upload evidence of call such as a PDF of an email announcement or website posting within the accreditation management system. Please visit the CAEP website for more information and sample text.	Not less than 16 weeks prior to the scheduled date of a site visit  Related Accreditation Policy: 5.13
<b>FORMATIVE MEETING</b>		
Formative Feedback Report (FFR) is Written and Returned to EPP	The site team reviews the SSR and evidence and conduct a virtual formative meeting to discuss findings and formulate tasks for site visit.. The lead site visitor submits the FFR to EPP and state representatives. The FFR will inform the EPP on how and what to prepare and submit in their addendum.	The formative feedback report is provided to the EPP five (5) months before the site visit.  Related Accreditation Policy: 5.05
SSR Addendum	The EPP submits an addendum and uploads supplemental evidence (as requested and appropriate)	The EPP has 60 days after receipt of the formative feedback report



	in response to the FFR. Site visitors review addendum and supplementary evidence in advance of the site visit.	to submit its addendum response to CAEP  Related Accreditation Policy: 5.05
Pre-Visit Meeting	Prior to the site visit the lead site visitor, EPP, and state consultants (if applicable) will hold a brief virtual meeting to discuss schedule, interviews, and logistics for the site visit and any questions related to the FFR or Addendum.	
<b>SITE VISIT</b>		
EPP Hosts Site Visit*  *Stipulation site visits are conducted virtually	During the site visit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site visitors verify submitted evidence and conduct tasks as indicated in the FFR.</li> <li>• Lead site visitor conducts an exit interview with EPP. <i>Information shared at this exit interview is not final and is subject to change as the site team completes its report and as the Accreditation Council deliberates for a final decision.</i></li> <li>• Site visitors prepare draft of site visit report.</li> </ul>	Site visits are typically held Sunday-Tuesday.  Questions: Assigned CAEP Staff*  <i>*Each site visit is assigned a CAEP staff member to assist both the EPP and site team with policy and process related questions</i>
<b>SITE VISIT REPORT</b>		
Site Visit Report—2 <sup>nd</sup> Draft—Sent to EPP	The site team submits a draft of the SVR to EPP and the EPP has 7 days to submit any factual corrections (names, misspellings, etc.) . The provider responds to the accuracy (factual corrections) of the site visit report. This includes evidence findings, <b>recommendations</b> to the Accreditation Council for areas for improvement or stipulations. If the EPP is not submitting factual correction, the report must be “Quitclaimed” to indicate they do not have factual corrections to submit..	The draft site visit report is typically provided to the EPP within 30 days post site visit.  Relevant Accreditation Policy: 5.08  Questions: Assigned CAEP Staff
Rejoinder	EPPs are highly encouraged to submit a rejoinder within 30 days from receipt of the draft site visit report. The rejoinder contains the EPPs response to the findings in the site visit report but may not contain new evidence that was not presented at the time of the site visit. The lead site visitor can respond to the rejoinder.	Due 30 days from draft site visit report.  Relevant Accreditation Policy: 5.08  Questions: Assigned CAEP staff
<b>ACCREDITATION COUNCIL</b>		
Accreditation Council Meeting is Held	The Accreditation Council meets to determine accreditation decisions through a three step process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First, an initial Review Panel reviews all reports and evidence and affirms, removes, or revises areas of improvement and stipulations (if any), and makes recommendations regarding whether standards met or unmet. EPP representatives, lead site visitor, and/or state representatives are invited to participate in a 20 minute open session to respond to the panel’s questions. A Joint Review Panel is formed from two initial panels that then review the Initial Review Panel recommendations and may affirm or revise the recommendations to be presented before the full Accreditation Council</li> </ul>	The Accreditation Council meetings are held in the spring and fall of each year. The Accreditation Council reviews EPPs the semester after their site visit is conducted.  Relevant Accreditation Policies: 5.10; 5.14; 5.15

	✓ Full Council meets to determine the final Accreditation Decision of EPPs.	Questions: <a href="mailto:AccreditationCouncil@caepnet.org">AccreditationCouncil@caepnet.org</a>
Notification of Accreditation Decision	The Accreditation Council's decisions are processed by CAEP Staff and distributed to the EPP's leadership as listed in the accreditation management system.	30 days post Accreditation Council Meeting  Relevant Accreditation Policies: 5.14; 5.15; 5.16  Questions: <a href="mailto:AccreditationCouncil@caepnet.org">AccreditationCouncil@caepnet.org</a>
<b>ANNUAL REPORT</b>		
Annual Report	EPP submits a report each year to update its information for CAEP, including a link to its posted data on the CAEP annual measures of candidate outcomes and impact. Failure to complete all required sections of the Annual report may result in Revocation or lapse of eligibility.  EPP's that receive Probationary Accreditation, Accreditation with Stipulations and/or Areas for Improvement (AFIs) must report their progress toward resolving the noted deficiencies within the Annual Report.	Annual Reports are due in the spring of each year.  Relevant Accreditation Policy: 6.01  Questions: <a href="mailto:EPPAnnualReport@caepnet.org">EPPAnnualReport@caepnet.org</a>

\*Accreditation timelines are altered in accordance with other site visit types such as Probationary Accreditation or Accreditation with Stipulations. Timeline modifications due to unusual circumstances require consultation with CAEP staff and may require approval by the Accreditation Council.

## Section A.ii Scope of Accreditation, Initial Licensure

CAEP [Accreditation Policy Section III: Scope of Accreditation](http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/about/apolicy.pdf?la=en) establishes the scope of accreditation for Initial Licensure (<http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/about/apolicy.pdf?la=en>). CAEP's review of an EPP encompasses everything falling within the scope. The policy, with an excerpt from its introductory paragraph, reads as follows:

### Section III. Scope of Accreditation

Per the CAEP Governance Policy, the scope of CAEP's work is the accreditation of educator preparation providers (EPPs) that offer bachelor's, master's, and/or doctoral degrees, post-baccalaureate or other programs leading to certification, licensure, or endorsement in the United States and/or internationally. CAEP reviews the following:

1. All specialty licensure areas that prepare candidates to work in preschool through grade 12 settings and lead to professional licensure, certification, or endorsement.
2. Advanced-level programs at the post-baccalaureate or graduate levels leading to licensure, certification, or endorsement.
3. Programs that lead to endorsements, licensure add-ons, or their equivalent as required by the state or country.

### Policy 3.01 Initial Licensure Programs

Initial Licensure 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. 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. . . For specialty area programs recognized by another accreditor, reference Policy 5.11.

EPPs seeking accreditation submit self-study reports describing their accomplishments using the [CAEP Standards for Initial Licensure](#) (as amended June 2016 and December 2018).

### **Section A.iii Scope of Accreditation, Advanced-Level**

Accreditation Policy 3.02 (<http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/about/apolicy.pdf?la=en>) establishes the scope of accreditation at the advanced-level. It provides a definition for advanced-level preparation and information on the applicable standards, decisions, and petitions for the exemption.

Advanced-Level Preparation is provided through 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 initial licensure, currently licensed administrators, other certificated (or similar state language)<sup>1</sup> school professionals for employment in P-12 schools/districts. 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 Advanced-Level Programs. For specialty area programs recognized by another accreditor, reference Policy 5.11.

- (a) Advanced-level programs not reviewed by CAEP include the following:
1. Any advanced-level program not specific to the preparation of teachers or other school professionals for P-12 schools/districts.
  2. Any advanced-level non-licensure programs, including those specific to content areas (e.g., M.A., M.S., Ph.D.).
  3. Educational leadership programs not specific to the preparation of teachers or other school professionals for P-12 schools/districts.

EPPs seeking accreditation submit self-study reports describing their accomplishments using the CAEP Standards for Advanced-Level Programs.

The Accreditation Council reviews the accreditation documents for each EPP and makes accreditation decisions for the EPP. **Although one self-study report is submitted, the Accreditation Council makes two separate decisions.** There is one decision for initial licensure and one for the advanced-level, with areas for improvement and stipulations assigned (as appropriate) for each. See Section B.ii, p. 12, below, for additional information on preparing for and writing the self-study report.

In accreditation policy 5.11(b), CAEP recognizes that some EPPs may wish to secure accreditation of specialty area programs by specialized accrediting agencies (e.g., music, library science, school counseling). An EPP that has secured specialty area accreditation from a specialized accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education or CHEA can choose to have such program(s) exempted from review by CAEP. In this circumstance, the program will not be recognized as accredited by CAEP

---

<sup>1</sup> States use different terminology for licensure and certification.

and the EPP will not be required to report the number of completers in these program(s) in the annual report submitted to CAEP. However, if the EPP chooses to have these program(s) be part of the CAEP accreditation process and recognized by CAEP, evidence required to meet the CAEP standards must be submitted for review, and completer numbers must be reported in the CAEP annual report.

## PART B: PREPARING FOR AND WRITING A SELF-STUDY REPORT

### Section B.i Introduction

[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 the CAEP Standards 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.

If the SSR addresses programs at both levels, the Accreditation Council will make two separate accreditation decisions for the EPP—one at each level. These are submitted in a single self-study report as stated in Accreditation Policy 3.02 (quoted above).

The self-study process is the mechanism through which an EPP evaluates its programs and prepares its case for accreditation. The process allows for focused analysis and reflection, includes steps for improvement, and serves as a means of accountability to the EPP's stakeholders. A self-study report documents the results from that process and demonstrates how the EPP is meeting each of the five Initial Licensure and five Advanced-Level CAEP Standards, along with diversity and technology themes. CAEP offers descriptions in the remainder of Part B to suggest how an EPP *might* proceed to conduct its self-study in relation to the CAEP Standards. EPP leaders and faculty will engage intensely in collaboration prior to developing a self-study narrative, then outline the program they have designed and compile evidence in support of their case for accreditation.

### Section B.ii Conducting Self-studies and Writing Self-study Reports

#### Steps in preparing for accreditation review

These are some initial steps for EPPs to consider before they begin writing their self-study report.

1. **Review.** The EPP should study and understand the CAEP Standards for Initial Licensure (as amended in 2016 and 2018), and 2016 CAEP Standards for Advanced-Level Programs. The CAEP Initial Licensure Standards include a rationale, and both the initial and advanced-level standards are accompanied by components describing further details. There are explanations and guidelines in this handbook, including the descriptive interpretations of the concepts in each standard, examples of evidence the EPP might consider, and prompts for making the EPP's case for each standard. The Glossary provides definitions (see Appendix G and <http://caepnet.org/glossary>). Access [www.caepnet.org](http://www.caepnet.org) for the most up-to-date guidance on evidence for the self-study report. EPPs may also find it helpful to read contextual background documents about accreditation, such as an essay by Dan Fallon, *The Self-Study Report is a Chance to Take Stock of Your Program's Quality* (<http://caepnet.org/about/news->

[room/statements-press-releases/essay-the-self-study-report](#)).

2. **Inventory available evidence.** EPPs may consider developing an inventory of evidence currently used that documents candidate performance and other CAEP requirements. They note what evidence they rely on and use, what is not available or used, and what may still need to be collected. They determine whether each assessment has undergone a review under CAEP's Evaluation Framework for EPP Created Assessments (Appendix A, p. 76) and, if not, undertake such a review. Information from the assessment sufficiency review can help EPPs determine what programs or practices need to be improved.
3. **Review the digital SSR template, gather information, prepare evidence to be uploaded, and draft tables to be completed.** EPPs should invest time in examining the evidence thoroughly. CAEP suggests that they begin to categorize their evidence by the standards and components to which they apply. EPPs should also refer to the digital template that has been established for their EPP, reading through the labels that appear there with cells to be filled in to compile the self-study report. The sections of the report include the following:
  - (I) The EPP overview. This contains the EPP's guide to the self-study report, including (a) the context and unique characteristics; (b) description of its organizational structure; (c) its vision, mission, and goals; and (d) its shared values and beliefs for educator preparation. The EPP is then asked to provide data and descriptions on
    - The regional or institutional accreditation of an EPP's institution [NOTE: If the host institution is not eligible for regional accreditation, the EPP should refer to accreditation policy 401.a. If the EPP is located outside of the United States, it should refer to accreditation policy 401.a and also 401.d found at <http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/accreditation-resources/2019-accreditation-policy.pdf?la=en>]
    - Each Initial Licensure or Advanced-Level Preparation Program offered (name, enrollment, degree level, certification, delivery mode, location and program review option) (Table 2);
    - A table describing the EPP's characteristics (Table 3);
    - A table detailing qualifications of clinical faculty (by degrees, specialty, assignment, P-12 licenses and experience) (Table 4); (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 the EPP that makes a comparison to a comparative entity (e.g., another academic department) that the EPP determines (Table 5);
    - The EPP identifies sites outside of the main campus or administrative headquarters and the programs offered at each site that will be included during the 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;
    - And a list of all of the proprietary assessments that are used as evidence in the self-study report, arranged by standard (Table 7), including their reliability and validity information if available and applicable.
  - (II) The evidence and summary statement for each standard in which the EPP makes the case that the standard has been met.

- The template has sections to write narrative analysis for Standard 1, followed by Standard A.1 on the next page. This continues in the same pattern until Standard 5 and A.5, which are combined into one narrative analysis.
- The template then has a section for a description of the EPP’s approach to the CAEP diversity and technology cross-cutting themes.

The template indicates the number of characters that can be inserted for each EPP summary statement. All of Part C of this handbook is addressed to this section of the self-study report. Standards 1 and A.1 include disaggregated data for the Standard 1 and A.1 concepts by licensure area or advanced specialty field, and then disaggregations by race and ethnicity. Results from the specialized professional association (SPA) review with national recognition, or relevant information from state review may serve as sources of some of the evidence for Standards 1 and A.1.

(III) Responses to previously cited areas for improvement, if any. [NOTE: If the previous accreditation was from NCATE, the term was *areas for improvement*; if it was from TEAC, the term was *weaknesses*.] If the EPP is preparing for a probationary visit it will need to respond to all stipulations, and for any standard determined to be “not met,” the EPP will need to respond to the entire standard.

- 4. Analyze and interpret the evidence and take stock.** Systematically analyze and interpret the evidence in relation to the applicable [CAEP Standards at the Initial Licensure and/or Advanced-Levels](#). Meet with stakeholders, including P-12 districts and candidates/completers, 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 (Appendix A, p. 76). At this point EPP leaders and faculty may learn that a preparation program is somewhat different from what they had designed and expected. This is an opportunity to assert what the EPP intends the defining characteristics of its programs to be, and how leaders and faculty intend to use evidence that will strengthen them. The EPP can use the self-study stocktaking to point out what is special about its program.
- 5. Formulate summary statements.** The EPP drafts a set of statements that clarify what leaders and faculty believe they have accomplished and need to accomplish with regard to the CAEP Standards and its two crosscutting themes. These statements should be consistent with the EPP’s public statements of its quality and the performance of its candidates. The statements the EPP makes in the SSR should be linked to the evidence it has collected, including assessments and results.
- 6. Draft and submit the self-study report.** From evidence the EPP has collected, and conversations it has conducted, it compiles a complete draft of the self-study report, including evidence and summary statements. It reviews the draft with stakeholders, revises as needed, and uploads 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 data quality indicators. The paragraphs, below, expand on writing the report.

### Writing the Self-Study Report

The notes presented here represent an accumulation of conventions and suggestions that CAEP has assembled 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 the EPP uses to make a case that each standard is met, and to framing of compelling arguments for its case.

### Writing to standards

The guidelines in Part C of this handbook take the entire text of each standard together with its accompanying components, and, from that, identify key concepts in the standard. The concepts appear in the paragraphs immediately following the text of each CAEP standard quoted in the Part C guidelines. They are closely aligned with components, but sometimes—and particularly in Standard 1—provide additional details and interpretations of CAEP’s intent. The details and interpretations help ensure consistent understanding of the purposes of each standard, and can assist EPPs in the task of locating the most direct and responsive evidence.

The EPP makes the case for a standard in a written summary statement constructed around its most cogent evidence. That summary statement will express the EPP’s leadership and faculty judgment about how to make the most reasoned and powerful case for the standard by weaving in direct and relevant evidence for the concepts. 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 their significance interpreted.**

### Examples of evidence in the CAEP Handbook

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

For all EPP-created evidence measures, providers should demonstrate the quality of the data, including their validity and reliability in relationship with the CAEP Standards. The EPP should clearly tag evidence to a specific CAEP standard and/or component so that site visitors and reviewers can access and evaluate evidence in the context of specific standards or components.

### Building a case that a standard is met

The EPP’s self-study report constitutes an assembly of compelling evidence, making the case that standards are met and weaving supporting evidence about concepts within the standard into a statement. Here are suggestions for building the case:

- **Frame the argument** (i.e., what does the EPP claim it has achieved with respect to the standard and its concepts).
- **Present the results in a way that aligns with the standard.** Since data collected for an EPP’s purposes likely exceed what is relevant or needed for CAEP Accreditation, they should provide direct evidence only, omitting redundant information. Data are the basis for the presentation, but need the EPP’s analyses and interpretations—What is most important? What are confirming or conflicting data saying?
- **Describe the data sources** used to support the argument. (See [CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments](#), Appendix A, p. 76, for key features of measures.)

- **Discuss the findings and implications** for subsequent action the EPP intends to take.
- **Explain why the data are credible** indicators for the standard or how the data provide credible evidence related to concepts within a standard. This includes discussing qualities of good evidence (such as validity and reliability) and describing methods of data analysis or interpretation.
- **Discuss the EPP's** completed, ongoing, and/or planned **uses of data** for continuous improvement.

## Section B.iii Use of Data as Evidence

CAEP has compiled a few guidelines to assist in common understanding among EPP leaders and faculty of typical use of data in self-study reports. These address the key concepts of standards that are to be informed by evidence, and the ways that evidence is developed, tagged, evaluated, analyzed, and presented. They also help ensure fairness and consistency in accreditation reviews conducted by CAEP site visitors.

Faculty and administrators, state policymakers, and accrediting bodies must all make decisions about the merits of educator preparation. 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*, “. . . 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.”<sup>2</sup>

### Guidelines for development and relevance of evidence

- **Key concepts of standards**—The SSR should address each standard, with evidence, together with the key concepts as described in the interpretive paragraphs under each quoted CAEP standard in the Section C guidelines.
- **Phase-in rules for advanced-level evidence**—The phase-in schedule is time-limited and the period for initial licensure evidence expires for site visits in Fall 2020. Phase-in plans describe evidence that EPPs have planned and are developing; the plans alone—and then the plans and progress steps—are judged as if they were evidence. Appendix B, p. 79, contains the phase-in schedule and guidelines for plans prepared under that schedule for advanced-level evidence. See [Accreditation Policy 102\(b\)](#).

### Data quality and usefulness in making a case

- **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 initial licensure or advanced-level standard and any relevant component and also to component 5.2. This procedure assists site visitors by ensuring ready access to the assessments and other evidence the EPP intends to have a bearing on its case for a standard.

---

<sup>2</sup> 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. Retrieved May 2, 2019, from <https://www.apa.org/monitor/2014/12/teacher-assessing>.



- **Uniform names for tagged evidence**—Items that are used as evidence in the CAEP accreditation management system (i.e., SSR evidence) should be cited in the narrative using the same name as the uploaded item.
- **Quality of assessments**—The EPP’s own created assessments should meet or exceed the CAEP Sufficient Level as defined in the [CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments](#) (see Appendix A, p. 76).
- **Performance on assessments**—Performance averages should be at or above acceptable levels on whatever scoring guide the EPP has created for EPP-created assessments. The SSR should clearly describe distinctions the EPP makes to differentiate between performance levels.

### Analysis of data patterns

- **Evidence for trends**—As a general rule, CAEP expects that an SSR will support the case for a trend by data derived from at least three points, or “cycles,” during which the EPP has 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, such as number of completers in relation to the original cohort size. Other measures might closely monitor progress during preparation more frequently. In either case, three cycles will help to affirm trends or attest to the stability of measures for the phenomenon under investigation. If three cycles of data are not available at the time the self-study is submitted, additional cycles can be submitted in the self-study addendum or during the on-site visit (within the time limits provided for in Accreditation Policy V).

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. 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.

- **Disaggregation of Data**—Disaggregation of data by program, as well as by campus sites, mode of delivery, and diversity (race and ethnicity, and also other population groups that may be relevant to an EPP’s mission), is an important element of self-study reporting for Standards 1 and A.1 and also other standards. Disaggregated data provide essential information that enables continuous improvement procedures to function in the EPP (as detailed in Standards 5 and A.5). These data can uncover similarities and differences, identify potential conditions that call for a closer look or an EPP intervention, provide opportunities to compare performance with benchmarks and otherwise inform leadership and faculty about the status and progress of their candidates. The EPP can probe even more deeply, for example, examining program by program candidate performance (first level) and then by race and ethnicity (second level). Depending on the mission of an EPP, it may choose to monitor data from additional population groupings.

For CAEP’s purposes, review of disaggregated data informs an accreditation decision by identifying variations that might suggest targets for continuous improvement efforts or indicate consistent or differing patterns across specialty field areas within the EPP or across additional campuses, and for online and classroom programs. There may be variation over time or after changes to the EPP’s programs or context as well. Note that it is not the disaggregated data *alone* that are the focus of CAEP review—but also the EPP’s analysis of the resulting information, discussions with stakeholders, and subsequent use for improvement.

CAEP requires the disaggregation of data where the number of EPP completers (n) in a single year is greater than ten (10) or as set by the state, by licensure area. The EPP should use its 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. (See [CAEP Governance Policy 2.08](#).) Accreditation Policy establishes further evidentiary and review requirements for programs that span multiple sites including those delivered through distance learning. The handbook indicates where such data are expected and where EPPs may monitor them for their own purposes.

- **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 is met. Multiple sources allow triangulation of data—helping to document different aspects of an element of preparation and to enrich analyses through indications of convergence in cases where findings are mutually reinforcing.
- **Comparisons, Confirming and Conflicting Evidence**—Analysis of data/evidence includes identification of trends/patterns, comparisons, and/or differences. The EPP should highlight confirming and conflicting findings from data. When possible, it should make comparisons between actual EPP 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 earn “proficient” ratings on internship evaluations). These final steps generate a context for considering the implications of findings for program-related decisions and continuous improvement.
- **Interpretations from the Data**—The EPP’s analysis will include identification of trends and patterns in the data, as well as comparisons and/or differences found in multiple measures, but the ultimate purpose is to reach conclusions—what do the data say? Data and evidence will be the basis for support of the EPP’s interpretations and conclusions in the EPP’s context.

## Section B.iv Use of Program Review Information in Accreditation

CAEP encourages EPPs to conduct rigorous reviews of individual preparation programs. These can provide strong corroboration of claims for the strength of programs and the knowledge and professional skills attained by candidates in the area of licensure, certification, or endorsement. In addition, they can be a source of evidence for CAEP Standards 1/A.1, for which an EPP will need to demonstrate that its candidates have opportunities to learn, and abilities to develop, a deep understanding of the discipline they will be licensed to practice. First, of course, an EPP will follow the program review requirements as specified by the state in which it is located and as specified in CAEP-state agreements. EPPs in states without a CAEP partnership will make voluntary selection of methods to review its programs from

among the three options CAEP offers—namely, SPA Review with National Recognition, CAEP Evidence Review of Standards 1/A.1, and State Review options. The current list of state and CAEP agreements that detail these requirements is available . Also, an EPP can conduct its own review of individual preparation programs, drawing on appropriate content and pedagogical expertise for the particular program specialty and adopting existing standards in the area of licensure to collect trend data.

SPA reviews are conducted by SPAs using a CAEP-built information management system. Programs selecting the SPA option are scheduled to submit reports for Initial Review by SPAs three years in advance of the CAEP site visit for each accreditation cycle. When successfully completed, the program receives “national recognition” by the appropriate SPA.

CAEP Evidence Review of Standards 1/A.1 involves reporting of program level evidence as part of the self-study report. Features include:

- An EPP selecting this option may adopt existing specialty area standards in the field –such as standards developed by former SPAs like NSTA<sup>3</sup> and ILA<sup>4</sup>; standards from current SPAs like NCTM<sup>5</sup> and NELP<sup>6</sup>; specialty standards like the 2018 CAEP Elementary Standards; or the National Board standards.
- In keeping with CAEP Component 1.3, providers will ensure that candidates apply content and pedagogical knowledge as reflected in outcome assessments in response to standards of specialty professional associations, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, states, or other accrediting bodies.
- EPPs will develop assessments used for evaluating candidates’ competencies in the respective licensure area.
- The EPP will collect trend data from three most recent applications of these assessments. The data may be uploaded in the Evidence Room for Standard 1 of the CAEP self-study report (SSR) template.
- The evidence may be tagged while analyzing program-specific data trends in the Standard 1, Specialty Licensure Area Data section, of the SSR. There is no prescribed format, template, or early review process involved in this case.

The state review involves standards, timelines, and protocols outlined by the EPP’s state to conduct program level reviews. As with the SPA Review and CAEP Evidence Review of Standards 1/A.1, the evidence gathered from the state review process may be used by an EPP to demonstrate that its candidates have the opportunities and abilities to develop a deep understanding of the discipline they will be licensed to practice.

Any information that the EPP gathers during an external review of programs by a SPA or a state, or any trends noted by the EPP while conducting internal review of programs for CAEP Evidence Review, may be used to make a case that Standard 1 is met. Also, any subsequent actions the EPP takes in response to the program level findings can be addressed before the SSR is completed and the site visit occurs. EPP leaders and faculty may decide, as well, that it would be best to update some of the SPA or state evidence or supplement it to complete its case for Standard 1 in the SSR or in the evidence available for the site visitor review.

---

<sup>3</sup> NSTA: National Science Teachers Association

<sup>4</sup> ILA: International Literacy Association

<sup>5</sup> NCTM: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics

<sup>6</sup> NELP: National Educational Leadership Preparation

- Additional information on program review options is available here: <http://caepnet.org/working-together/state-partners>
- Specific guidance on SPA Review with National Recognition is available here: <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/spa-program-review-process>
- Guidance on SPA-specific standards is available here: <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/spa-standards-and-report-forms>

The narrative under Standard 1 in Part C of this handbook (pp. 36-41) provides examples of evidence that might serve as points of reflection when the EPP identifies self-study report evidence. Here are some questions particularly relevant to use of SPA, state program review, or the EPP’s own program review as evidence for Standard 1:

- What evidence has the EPP provided for an external review by a SPA, state or the EPP that can respond to the concepts in Standard 1?
- What evidence has the EPP gathered during an internal evaluation of candidates’ ability using specialty area standards, if a program selected CAEP Evidence Review of Standard 1/A.1 option?
- How was that evidence evaluated, what feedback did the EPP receive, and what were the key findings from the data trends?
- What actions were taken in response to feedback and/or findings?
- Should the EPP consider whether its evidence might be complemented in the self-study report with some additional evidence that represents candidates’ proficiencies for Standards 1 or A.1 more recently, or Standard 1 concepts not fully addressed in the SPA or state evidence?

All EPPs should include *disaggregated evidence for each specialty area program* in their case for Standard 1. Here are some examples of questions to consider in building the case:

- Are there differences in the depth of evidence about candidate proficiencies for each of the Standard 1 concepts between specialty area programs?
- If so, is there additional evidence that might more fully describe candidate proficiencies?
- Are the performances of candidates similarly strong across specialty area programs, or are there indications of programs needing some adjustment in courses and experiences?

## **Section B.v Addressing Cross-Cutting Themes of Diversity and Applications of Technology**

The CAEP 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 themes are critical characteristics of quality preparation programs and both are to be addressed in self-study reports. The requirement is made explicit in [Accreditation Policy 5.03 available here](#) — self-study reports include “complete evidence for all elements of the SSR including 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.”

There are explicit diversity and/or technology references in the CAEP Standards for initial licensure and advanced-levels. In this handbook, the text guides EPPs to respond to those themes in the designated places in initial licensure and advanced-level standards. In addition, this handbook has placed a section on the diversity and technology themes in a group together with Standards 5 and A.5 that are to be addressed at the EPP-wide level and only once, not separately, for initial and advanced.

## **PART C. CAEP STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES FOR SELF-STUDIES**

This part of the handbook presents the text of the CAEP Standards for Initial Licensure and Advanced-Level Programs together with their associated components and also the cross-cutting diversity and technology application themes. Each section begins with the appropriate standard (or cross-cutting theme) quote, then continues with guidelines for preparation of SSRs, including key concepts that identify the main points of the standards and components language, examples of evidence, and self-study prompts and reflection questions.

### **Section C.i: Quality Assurance and Cross-cutting Themes, EPP-wide**

EPPs should only respond to Standard 5 once—not separately for initial licensure and for advanced-level preparation. The focus is on quality assurance at the provider-level, and the SSR should include examples from initial licensure and advanced-level preparation to document

- The capabilities of the EPP's quality assurance system (QAS);
- The quality of the EPP's data;
- The EPP's continuous improvement efforts; and
- The EPP's stakeholder involvement.

**Initial Licensure and Advanced-Level  
PROVIDER QUALITY ASSURANCE AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT  
CAEP STANDARDS 5 AND A.5  
EPP-wide**

**Standards 5 and A.5**—*The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates’ and completers’ positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers’ impact on P-12 student learning and development.*

**Quality and Strategic Evaluation**

*5.1 and A.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 and A.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 and A.5.3 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 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.*

*A.5.4 Measures of advanced program completer outcome, are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision-making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction. Outcomes include completion rate, licensure rate, employment rate in field of specialty preparation, and consumer information such as places of employment and salaries.*

*5.5 and A.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**

Key concepts identify the main points that comprise the CAEP Standards. They interpret the combined language of standards with their accompanying components and provide guidance to shape evidence gathering and the EPP’s writing of its case that a standard is met.

Standards 5 and A.5 occupy a pivotal position in the CAEP Standards. They describe the EPP’s

**Initial Licensure and Advanced-Level  
PROVIDER QUALITY ASSURANCE AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT  
CAEP STANDARDS 5 AND A.5  
EPP-wide**

capacity to reach its 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 maintain an evidence-based quality assurance system (QAS) and data in a process of continuous improvement. These systems and data-informed continuous improvement practices are essential foundational requirements for CAEP Accreditation. The SSR and evidence reviewed on-site provide an opportunity for EPPs to describe how well their QAS is working (e.g., How well does it respond to questions about the effectiveness of preparation for both initial licensure and advanced-level candidates? How does the EPP use the QAS capacity to investigate innovations and inform continuous improvement?).

The two key concepts for Standard 5 follow:

- **Maintain a QAS capable of providing data output** that enables quality control and continuous improvement (*components 5.1, 5.2 and A.5.1, A.5.2*) and
- **Support continuous improvement** through EPP engagement with appropriate stakeholders, and EPP procedures that gather, input, analyze, interpret and use information from the QAS effectively, including the CAEP annual reporting measures (*components 5.3, 5.4 and 5.5 and A.5.3, A.5.4 and A.5.5*).

Every provider has a set of procedures, processes, and structures, as well as reporting lines, committees, offices, positions, policies. These help to ensure quality in hiring, admissions, courses, program design, facilities, and the like. In an effective 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 also serve to provide evidence for accreditation purposes.

Appendix D, p.135, Data Quality, defines principles of data that should characterize the multiple measures in the EPP's QAS. These include characteristics explicitly listed in Standards 5 and A.5, components 5.2 and A.5.2—"valid and consistent," "relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable," as well as "fairness" and "robustness."

Standards 5 and A.5 focus on the extent to which providers effectively ensure, and continually increase, quality. The standards adapt principles stated in the Baldrige Education Criteria<sup>7</sup> that successful education organizations follow (emphasizing measurement of operations and results), and that the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching<sup>8</sup> has described as

<sup>7</sup> Baldrige Performance Excellence Program. (2011). *2011-2012 Education criteria for performance excellence*. Gaithersburg, MD. National Institute of Standards and Technology, Author. The updated version is available here: <https://www.nist.gov/baldrige/publications/baldrige-excellence-framework/education>.

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.carnegiefoundation.org/resources/publications/>

**Initial Licensure and Advanced-Level  
PROVIDER QUALITY ASSURANCE AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT  
CAEP STANDARDS 5 AND A.5  
EPP-wide**

“improvement research” in educational organizations. Those principles give particular weight to maintaining a QAS and using the output from that system for purposes of continuous improvement:

- The QAS has multiple capabilities and data. It stores information from multiple measures, makes calculations, has capacity to build relational data in response to faculty questions, and provides a means to monitor candidate progress, the achievements of completers, and the EPP’s operational effectiveness (*components 5.1 and A.5.1*). The “multiple measures” are relevant, actionable, comprehensive, purposeful, and coherent (*component 5.2 and A.5.2*).
- The EPP routinely investigates the quality and usefulness of existing measures, and uses information to make any needed adjustments that ensure its QAS is relying on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable data (*components 5.2 and A.5.2*). See Appendix D for additional information on data quality.
- Information from the QAS is the basis for a continuous improvement function. Leaders and faculty of the EPP use data regularly. They assess performance in relation to EPP goals and standards; follow results over time; conduct tests of changes made in courses, selection, or clinical experiences; study natural variation across their different preparation programs; and use the results to judge their progress and status, and improve program elements (*components 5.3 and A.5.3*).
- Finally, the EPP shares results with stakeholders, including results on the CAEP annual reporting measures (*components 5.4 and 5.5 and A.5.4 and A.5.5*) and involve them in evaluating the EPP’s effectiveness, generating improvements, and identifying models to emulate (*component 5.3 and A.5.3*).

**Evidence examples for Standards 5 and A.5**

The types of evidence described in this handbook are intended only as examples. Each EPP is welcome to employ different measurements from those described here and to select ones that its leadership and faculty believe will make the strongest case that each standard is met. Whatever evidence is chosen, the purpose is to show that the concepts in the CAEP Standards are addressed 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 the EPP’s 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 an EPP collects, monitors, reports, and uses data EPP-wide.

**The QAS**

Maintaining an effective QAS (Standards 5 and A.5, and components 5.1 and A.5.1)

- The evidence is intended to document the capabilities of an EPP’s QAS (i.e., what it can do) (*components 5.1 and A.5.1*). Documentation should show the quality assurance processes and measures on which the EPP relies, such as
  - A description of how the evidence submitted in Standards 1-4, and A.1-A.4, and other



**Initial Licensure and Advanced-Level  
PROVIDER QUALITY ASSURANCE AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT  
CAEP STANDARDS 5 AND A.5  
EPP-wide**

provider data are collected, analyzed, monitored, and reported.

- Evidence of system capabilities to support data-driven change (e.g., data can be disaggregated by specialty license area and/or candidate race and ethnicity, as appropriate), application across and within specialty license areas, and ability to disaggregate data by relevant aspects of the EPP's management and policy (e.g., usefulness).
- The schedule and process for continuous review, together with roles and responsibilities of system users.
- The EPP's analysis of how and how well its QAS documents Standards 1 through 4 as evidence of the capabilities of the QAS.

Demonstrating data quality (Standards 5 and A.5 and components 5.2 and A.5.2)

- The evidence documents how measures are relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable (*components 5.2 and A.5.2*). While site visitors will use information that the EPP provides about data quality tagged to the evidence for Standards 1 and A.1 through 4 and A.4., the SSR for Standards 5 and A.5 should not repeat that information. Instead it should make an EPP-wide case for data quality across the EPP. Documentation indicates the following:
  - 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.
  - Principles of good evidence are followed (See Appendix D, Data Quality).
  - Convergence analyses (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.
- The EPP provides a summary analysis EPP-wide about data quality in evidence cited for Standards 1 and A.1 through 4 and A.4. Those references would include such information as
  - 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. The EPP needs to ensure that the evidence collected is likely to be relevant to completer effectiveness questions that leaders and faculty want to answer. They will want to know what variance is associated with results from these assessments or from scoring the assessments, as well as how to interpret evidence based on this knowledge. As the EPP takes steps to improve means for gathering data, it should consider moving toward development of outcome measures that relate to or predict completer effectiveness.

**Initial Licensure and Advanced-Level  
PROVIDER QUALITY ASSURANCE AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT  
CAEP STANDARDS 5 AND A.5  
EPP-wide**

**Demonstrating continuous improvement** (*Standards 5 and A.5 and components 5.3, 5.4 and A.5.3, A.5.4*)

- The EPP documents regular and systematic data-driven changes (*components 5.3 and A.5.3*) grounded in (a) research and evidence from the field, (b) data analyses and interpretations from its quality assurance system, and (c) changes linked to its goals and relevant standards.
- While site visitors will use information the EPP provides about continuous improvement when they review evidence for Standards 1 and A.1 through 4 and A.4, the SSR for Standards 5 and A.5 should not repeat that information; instead it should make a case across all the standards and on behalf of the EPP as an organization.
  - The examples indicate that changes are clearly connected to evidence, tests of innovations are of appropriate design, and provider performance is systematically assessed against goals.
  - The tests may be formal studies or informal tests of innovations (e.g., Plan, Do, Study, Act [PDSA] cycle). (See Appendix E, p . 141, Evidence from Case Studies and P-12 Impact Studies)
  - 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 a cycle such as the following:
    - ✓ Describe the baseline condition or status,
    - ✓ Define the intervention applied,
    - ✓ Track changes over time,
    - ✓ Compare results with criteria or target goals,
    - ✓ State conclusions, and
    - ✓ Define next steps that were taken and/or are planned.
- EPP 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.
- Suggestions to prompt EPP leader and faculty thinking about continuous improvement have been written for CAEP by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. These are contained in Appendix E, Evidence from Case Studies and P-12 Impact Studies. See notes on case studies in the paragraph on improvement research, pp. 141-145.

**Documenting results from the CAEP Reporting Measures** (*components 5.4 and A.5.4*)

- EPPs present the evidence for components 5.4 and A.5.4. The CAEP Annual Reporting Measures work together as indicators of EPP performance in relation to candidates as they complete preparation, and to completers once they are on the job. They are basic indicators of an EPP's performance sought by many external audiences—policymakers, parents, stakeholders, and the media, for example. EPPs should give indicators particular priority, partly by taking steps to ensure these data are available (posted publicly and prominently on the EPP's website), and by documenting the EPP's analysis of outcomes and contextual factors relating to interpretation of the data. The measures include those described in Initial Licensure Standard 4 (impact measures):
  1. Evidence of completer impact on P-12 student learning and development

**Initial Licensure and Advanced-Level  
PROVIDER QUALITY ASSURANCE AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT  
CAEP STANDARDS 5 AND A.5  
EPP-wide**

2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness, observation instruments, and student surveys
3. Employer satisfaction and completer persistence
4. Completer satisfaction

The measures also include those described in Advanced Standard A.4 (satisfaction with preparation):

1. Employer satisfaction and completer persistence
2. Completer satisfaction

And the CAEP Reporting Measures include the following outcome and consumer measures for initial candidates and completers at both the Initial- and Advanced-Levels:

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

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

**PHASE-IN APPLIES for Advanced-Level Accreditation:**

See the CAEP Phase-in Schedule and Guidelines for Plans (Appendix B, p. 79) for details on timeline for submitting “plans only” and “plans with progress” steps including expectations for the first data collection, as well as guidelines on the content of phase-in plans that are permitted under accreditation policy. The phase-in procedure applies to components A.5.3 and A.5.4 for advanced-level preparation.

**Self-study prompts and reflection questions for Standards 5 and A.5**

The prompts and reflection questions below are intended as reminders of evidence available to an EPP, ideas for points to be made in the EPP’s case for the standard, or suggestions to help organize the EPP’s case for the standards. They help bring together the general steps in building a case that a standard is met (see p. 15) with the specific concepts that make up Standards 5 and A.5 (see Key Concepts heading, above). They do not describe topics to address in the SSR that have not already appeared in the key concepts or evidence examples, nor are they intended for response, one by one, in the SSR and on-site evidence.

The prompts that follow are intended to focus on the EPP as an organization—the EPP quality assurance system and the EPP’s experiences with continuous improvement. The emphasis is on the whole organization for Standards 5 and A.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 Standards 1-4 and A.1-A.4.

**The EPP’s Accomplishments and its Case that Standards 5 and A.5. are Met**

**Initial Licensure and Advanced-Level  
PROVIDER QUALITY ASSURANCE AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT  
CAEP STANDARDS 5 AND A.5  
EPP-wide**

- **The EPP identifies key points for an evidence-based narrative stating its case that it has a functioning QAS with capability to provide relevant evidence and analyses that support an ongoing continuous improvement function.** Describe how well the QAS is working and how leaders and faculty know this (*components 5.1 and A.5.1*). Is the QAS 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 (*components 5.2 and A.5.2*)? Examples might include the following: Are the data relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable? Can findings be triangulated with multiple data points 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 and impact measures**—What have leaders and faculty learned from reviewing the EPP’s annual outcome and impact measures over the past three years? (See section above for lists in components 5.4 and A.5.4 as well as the components of Standards 4 and A.4.)

- **The EPP identifies key points for a convincing evidence-based narrative making the case that it has continuous improvement mechanisms in place and functioning.**

**DIVERSITY  
CAEP CROSS-CUTTING THEME  
EPP-wide**

*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*

Definition of diversity adopted by the CAEP Board, December 2017

**Key Concepts**

Key concepts in this section of the handbook identify the main points that comprise CAEP’s diversity cross-cutting theme.

Diversity responsibilities appear explicitly in the CAEP Standards for Initial Licensure 1, 2, and 3 and the CAEP Standards for Advanced-Level Programs A.2 and A.3. The EPP’s diversity evidence for each of those standards will be an explicit part of the EPP’s case for each of those standards. At the

**DIVERSITY**  
**CAEP CROSS-CUTTING THEME**  
**EPP-wide**

EPP-wide level, the examples and prompts, below, ask the EPP to **draw from the documentation of their accomplishments under each of the individual standards to weigh their overall performance as an EPP.**

In addition, the EPP has its 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, the CAEP diversity theme calls on EPPs to

- Analyze their own situation, **determine how best to make use of the diversity they already have**, so candidates will be prepared for the diversity of P-12 schools and classrooms.
- Then **set challenging goals that move further toward the diversity found in America’s P-12 classrooms** and prepare their candidates for those classrooms.

**Evidence examples for EPP-wide diversity theme**

The types of evidence described in this handbook are intended only as examples. Each EPP is welcome to employ different measurements from those described here and to select ones that its leadership and faculty believe will make the strongest case for a standard or a CAEP cross-cutting theme.

The CAEP diversity theme incorporates multiple perspectives, respect for and responsiveness to cultural differences, and candidate understanding of diverse contexts that EPP completers will encounter in their employment situations. The 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 CCSSO’s 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 embed references to diversity as shown in the chart below:

Initial Licensure Standards	Advanced-Level Standards
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standard 1               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ “Candidates demonstrate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college- and career-ready standards.”</li> <li>➤ Candidates demonstrate understanding of the InTASC Standards on “the learner and learning.”</li> <li>➤ Candidates use “research and evidence...to measure their P-12 students’ progress.”</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standard A.2               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Data document work with partners to design diverse clinical experiences, and candidates have opportunities to experience settings in schools or districts that enroll diverse P-12 students with differing needs.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Standard A.3               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Evidence documents EPP’s progress on greater diversity in the pool of candidates.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

**DIVERSITY**  
**CAEP CROSS-CUTTING THEME**  
**EPP-wide**

- 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 EPP identifies candidates at risk of failure and provides effective supports for candidates who need them.

The report from the 2013 CAEP Standards Commission provided the following examples of proficiencies that candidates who complete an educator preparation program should develop. While these were originally written in the context of initial licensure preparation for teaching, most of them are equally relevant at the advanced-level:

- 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 (personal) 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

**DIVERSITY**  
**CAEP CROSS-CUTTING THEME**  
**EPP-wide**

learners and their families.

Additional resources on candidate proficiencies relative to diversity and equity are available in the InTASC standards and learning progressions are here: <https://ccsso.org/resource-library/intasc-model-core-teaching-standards-and-learning-progressions-teachers-10>.

**Self-study prompts and reflection questions for EPP-wide diversity theme**

The prompts and reflection questions below are intended as reminders of evidence available to an EPP, ideas for points to be made in the EPP's case or suggestions to help organize the EPP's case for its actions relative to the diversity cross-cutting theme. They do not describe topics to address in the SSR that have not already appeared in the key concepts or evidence examples, nor are they intended for response, one by one, in the SSR and on-site evidence.

**The EPP identifies key points for an evidence-based case that the EPP-wide purposes for diversity are documented:**

- What evidence can the EPP offer of candidate knowledge, dispositions, and skills related to diversity and equity across the standards?
- What overall, EPP-wide, conclusions can be drawn from evidence the EPP has provided about diversity in Initial Licensure Standards 1, 2 and 3 and Advanced-Level Standards A.2 and A.3?
- What aspects of diversity are represented in the EPP's preparation programs, experiences, faculty, and candidates? How does it make use of that diversity so that candidates will be prepared for America's classrooms or for advanced specialty field roles in schools and districts?
- What challenge goals has the EPP set for itself and what is its progress toward achieving them?
  - What are the specific knowledge, skills, and dispositions (KSDs) 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 does the EPP act to include those KSDs in courses and experiences?

**TECHNOLOGY APPLICATIONS**  
**CAEP CROSS-CUTTING THEME**  
**EPP-wide**

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.

**TECHNOLOGY APPLICATIONS  
CAEP CROSS-CUTTING THEME  
EPP-wide**

**Key Concepts**

Key concepts in this section of the handbook identify the main points that comprise CAEP’s technology applications cross-cutting theme.

The technology cross-cutting theme addresses incorporation of technology to engage P-12 students and enhance instruction, and also to manage student and assessment data.

**Evidence for EPP-wide technology applications theme**

The chart, below, shows the direct references to technology embedded in the CAEP Standards.

**Standards for Initial Licensure**

- 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.”

**Standards for Advanced-Level Programs**

- Standard A.1
  - Evidence showing that candidates for advanced preparation demonstrate their proficiency in “supporting . . . applications of appropriate technology for their field of specialization.”
- Standard A.2
  - Evidence that partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements, including technology-based collaborations, for clinical preparation.
- Standard A.3
  - Evidence documents that advanced-level candidates have reached a high standard for . . . applications of technology. . . appropriate for the field of specialization.

**Self-study prompts and reflection questions for EPP-wide technology applications theme**

The prompts and reflection questions below are intended as reminders of evidence available to an EPP, ideas for points to be made in the EPP’s case or suggestions to help organize the EPP’s case for its actions relative to the technology cross-cutting theme. They do not describe topics to address in the SSR that have not already appeared in the key concepts or evidence examples, nor are they intended for response, one by one, in the SSR and on-site evidence.

**The EPP identifies key points for an evidence-based case that the EPP-wide purposes for technology**



**TECHNOLOGY APPLICATIONS**  
**CAEP CROSS-CUTTING THEME**  
**EPP-wide**

**applications are documented:**

- What overall, EPP-wide, conclusions can be drawn from evidence the EPP has provided about technology threads in Initial Licensure Standards 1, 2, and 3 and Advanced-Level Standards A.1, A.2 and A.3?
- How do candidates infuse technology into lesson plan development in coursework, fieldwork, and clinical practice? How do advanced-level candidates use and adapt applications of technology in their field of specialization?
- How does the EPP collaborate with partners to provide expertise on new technology in professional development for teachers in partner schools? For advanced-level specialists?
- How do partners collaborate with the EPP to provide expertise on new technology to candidates in coursework, fieldwork, or clinical practice?
- What performance assessments does the EPP use to measure candidate proficiencies in technologies used at clinical partner sites?

**Section C.ii Candidates and Preparation  
Standards 1 and A.1**

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE, CAEP STANDARD 1</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE CAEP STANDARD A.1</b></p>
<p><b>Standard 1</b>—<i>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.</i></p> <p><b>Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions</b></p> <p>1.1 <i>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.</i></p> <p><b>Provider Responsibilities</b></p> <p>1.2 <i>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.</i></p> <p>1.3 <i>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]).</i></p> <p>1.4 <i>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).</i></p> <p>1.5 <i>Providers ensure that candidates model and apply technology standards</i></p>	<p><b>Standard A.1</b>—<i>The provider ensures that candidates for professional specialties develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their field of preparation and, by completion, are able to use professional specialty practices flexibly to advance the learning of P-12 students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.</i></p> <p><b>Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions</b></p> <p>A.1.1 <i>Candidates for advanced preparation demonstrate their proficiencies to understand and apply knowledge and skills appropriate to their professional field of specialization so that learning and development opportunities for all P-12 are enhanced through</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Applications of data literacy;</i></li> <li>• <i>Use of research and understanding of qualitative, quantitative, and/or mixed methods research methodologies;</i></li> <li>• <i>Employment of data analysis and evidence to develop supportive school environments;</i></li> <li>• <i>Leading and/or participating in collaborative activities with others such as peers, colleagues, teachers, administrators, community organizations, and parents;</i></li> <li>• <i>Supporting appropriate applications of appropriate technology for their field of specialization; and</i></li> <li>• <i>Application of professional dispositions, laws and policies, codes of ethics and professional standards appropriate to their field of specialization.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Evidence of candidate content knowledge appropriate for the professional specialty will be documented by state licensure test scores or other proficiency measures.</i></p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure</b> <b>CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD 1</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level</b> <b>CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD A.1</b></p>
<p><i>as they design, implement, and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning, and enrich professional practice.</i></p>	<p><b>Provider Responsibilities</b> A.1.2 Providers ensure that advanced program completers have opportunities to learn and apply specialized content and discipline knowledge contained in approved state and/or national discipline-specific standards. These specialized standards include, but are not limited to, specialized professional association (SPA) standards, individual state standards, standards of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), and standards of other accrediting bodies (e.g., Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs [CACREP]).</p>
<p><b>Key Concepts</b></p> <p>Key concepts identify the main points that comprise the CAEP Standards. They interpret the combined language of standards with their accompanying components and provide guidance to shape evidence gathering and the EPP’s writing of its case that a standard is met.</p>	
<p>Standard 1 is constructed around candidates’ proficiencies 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 an EPP to document the competence of its candidates in terms of knowing the subject content of their specialty field, and using their professional preparation effectively. Multiple measures should be used to demonstrate candidate attainments by completion as well as success at gateway points and/or growth through their preparation.</p> <p>The language of Standard 1 and its associated components highlight six areas in which EPPs need to demonstrate candidate proficiencies in their specialized licensure area. Four of these are categories into which teacher standards of the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) are grouped. InTASC Standards are available here: <a href="https://www.ccsso.org/resource-library/intasc-model-core-teaching-standards-and-learning-progressions-teachers-10">https://www.ccsso.org/resource-library/intasc-model-core-teaching-standards-and-learning-progressions-teachers-10</a>.</p> <p>Looking at all of the language of Standard 1 and its five components</p>	<p>Standard A.1 is constructed around specialized content knowledge and skills for candidates in preparation fields that provide leadership and supporting services in schools and school districts. The evidence should demonstrate that completers are competent and ready to undertake school responsibilities in the specialized areas for which they are being prepared.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure</b> <b>CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD 1</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level</b> <b>CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD A.1</b></p>
<p>together, the concepts that best serve to organize evidence for the standard are listed below.</p> <p><u>InTASC categories</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The learner and learning</b>—(including learning differences, the context of diverse cultures, and creating effective learning environments) <i>(part of component 1.1);</i></li>   <li>• <b>Content knowledge</b>—including deep content knowledge, critical thinking, and collaborative problem solving; and pedagogical knowledge in the content field <i>(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);</i></li>   <li>• <b>Instructional practice</b>—including applications of content and pedagogical knowledge, assessment, and data literacy and use of assessment to advance learning <i>(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);</i> and</li>   <li>• <b>Professional responsibilities</b>—including professional and ethical practice and collaboration with colleagues <i>(part of component 1.1, and also component 3.6 on professional responsibilities).</i></li> </ul>	<p>(There is no advanced-level concept that is directly comparable to the learner and learning concept for initial licensure.)</p> <p>(The two concepts for advanced-level programs described below for content knowledge and professional skills occupy the same central focus as initial licensure concepts for content knowledge, instructional practice and professional responsibilities. However, the description of generic professional skills includes professional standards and ethics, and it appears first in Standard A.1, prior to content knowledge.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Generic professional skills</b>—The standard specifies generic professional skills in which candidate performance outcomes should be documented in self-study reports—adapted, as appropriate, to each field of specialization. The areas include data and research literacy, data analysis, collaborative activities, application of technology, and professional standards and dispositions, laws and policies, and codes of ethics <i>(component A.1.1).</i></li>   <li>• <b>Specialized content knowledge</b>—Standard A.1 addresses candidate’s deep understanding of critical concepts and principles of their specialized field and ability to apply professional specialty practices to advance the learning of P-12 students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness. EPP preparation may draw from sources such as specialized professional association (SPA) standards, state standards, standards of the NBPTS, or those of other accrediting bodies (such as CACREP) <i>(component A.1.2).</i></li> </ul>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure</b> <b>CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD 1</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level</b> <b>CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD A.1</b></p>
<p>The remaining two highlighted areas of Standard 1 are woven through the InTASC Standards; however, these are attributes of preparation on which the CAEP Standards place specific emphasis for the EPP’s self-study documentation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>College and career readiness preparation</b>—<i>(in the language of Standard 1, and component 1.4 as well as in the InTASC categories of component 1.1); and</i></li> <li>• <b>Diversity and equity</b>—preparing for teaching in America’s diverse classrooms <i>(in the language of Standard 1, in the InTASC references of component 1.1 on the learner and learning and instructional practice, in component 1.2 on use of research for learning, and in component 1.4 on teaching at college- and career-readiness levels).</i></li> </ul>	<p>CAEP does not specify the state or national standards an EPP utilizes for specialized content knowledge (<i>component A.1.2</i>). EPPs make the case why the standards chosen are appropriate for the particular advanced-level program.</p> <p>(There is no advanced-level concept that is directly comparable to college and career readiness for initial licensure.)</p> <p>(There is no advanced-level concept that is directly comparable to diversity and equity for initial licensure.)</p>
<p><b>Evidence examples for Standards 1 and A.1</b></p> <p>The types of evidence described in this handbook are intended only as examples. Each EPP is welcome to employ different measurements from those described here and to select ones that its leadership and faculty believe will make the strongest case that each standard is met. Whatever evidence is chosen, the purpose is to show that the concepts in the CAEP Standards are addressed in an effective way.</p>	
<p>This is the primary standard in which the EPP can assemble evidence to demonstrate the competencies of candidates, both during the initial stages of preparation and at exit. Its evidence should be disaggregated by specialty licensure area, race and ethnicity, campus sites (if more than one), and mode of delivery (if there are options) to assist in interpretation of the data. Evidence submissions include copies of the instruments, the tools (e.g.,</p>	<p>This is the primary standard in which the EPP can bring together evidence that demonstrates competencies of candidates, both during their advanced preparation program and at exit. In its selection of evidence for the listed advanced preparation candidate outcomes, the EPP adapts the generic professional skills listed in component A.1.1 to each specialized field. For example, data literacy for a principal might be demonstrated by</p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure</b> <b>CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD 1</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level</b> <b>CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD A.1</b></p>
<p>rubrics, criterion scores) for scoring, and information on how the evidence is consistently used for continuous improvement. EPPs will usually find that it is most efficient to compile data/evidence from assessments conducted with all candidates, using the same tasks, and scoring rubrics or criteria. However, some may choose to document topics (e.g., content knowledge and content pedagogy as well as ability to apply them successfully) with unique assessments for a specialized field of preparation. Whatever choices each EPP makes, concepts for CAEP Standard 1 should be addressed using multiple indicators/measures.</p> <p>Disaggregation of evidence for Standard 1 is particularly important. The EPP will assemble an array of the best evidence it has from both their own created assessments and proprietary assessments (e.g., state licensure exams or edTPA or PPAT) that can make their case for candidate proficiencies in the six Standard 1 concepts defined above. EPPs will want to learn as much as they can from all of these sources, including the sub-test information (such as content category scores for Praxis, rubrics for edTPA, tasks for PPAT, or content domain for Pearson licensure tests).</p> <p>All EPPs should provide disaggregated evidence for each specialty area program and should examine consistency of candidate proficiencies across programs—for example, the depth of information about CAEP Standard 1 concepts for each program, and programs for which candidates’ proficiencies are especially strong or could be improved. EPPs should examine candidate performance by race and ethnicity, and they may investigate differences across campus sites (if there is more than one) and mode of delivery (if there is more than one). These disaggregations of data will allow EPPs to identify particular strengths or areas to examine more closely in their courses and preparation experiences. It is this examination and the EPP’s response to it that is the essence of continuous improvement.</p> <p>As EPPs compile evidence for a comprehensive case that Standard 1 is met, it</p>	<p>interpretation of statistical reports or assembling a budget plan, while a candidate for advanced preparation in special education would know which diagnostic instruments are appropriate to employ or how to interpret the scores from those instruments.</p> <p>The evidence that EPPs assemble for Standard A.1, disaggregated by specialty area, makes a case for candidate proficiency as defined in the list of generic professional skills for advanced specialized fields from measures such as those suggested below. Evidence submissions include copies of the instruments used and the tools (e.g., rubrics, criterion scores) that the EPP has used for scoring.</p> <p>All EPPs should provide evidence that has been disaggregated by each specialty area program. These data will inform the EPP’s continuous improvement investigations, and also inform analyses that build the EPP’s case for Standard A.1. The EPP’s self-study report would include trends and comparisons within and across specialty area data. They will show the degree and characteristics of consistency of candidate proficiencies across programs—for example, the depth of information about CAEP Standard A.1 concepts for each program, and programs for which candidates’ proficiencies are especially strong or could be improved. EPPs should examine candidate performance by race and ethnicity, and they may investigate differences across campus sites (if there is more than one) and mode of delivery (if there is more than one).</p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure</b> <b>CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD 1</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level</b> <b>CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD A.1</b></p>
<p>is likely they will include information from pre-service exit measures (as described in components 3.5 and 3.6). If they do, the tag to the evidence should note that it applies to both Standard 1 and Standard 3. The SSR can include a note where evidence addressing components 3.5 or 3.6 appears in the Standard 1 case as data, analyses, interpretations or uses for continuous improvement. Then, in making the EPP’s case for Standard 3, it can indicate that evidence for those exit criteria are part of the Standard 1 evidence, and no further evidence is expected.</p> <p>CAEP provides an opportunity to make use of any evidence relevant to Standard 1 that was submitted for—or received from—the program reviews conducted by SPAs or states (see Section B.iv, above). Any information that the EPP provides for review by a SPA or a state, or any feedback that it has received, may be used as part or all of the evidence for Standard 1. Also, evidence may be provided relevant to any subsequent actions the EPP takes in response to SPA or state comments.</p> <p>The EPP leaders and faculty will want to review the suggestions for evidence below, however, as a reminder when they consider the whole array of evidence for Standard 1. If they identify important evidence of candidates’ proficiencies, or if they believe that some evidence from the program review procedures was not fully representative of the candidates’ accomplishments or sufficiently up to date, then they may want to supplement program review evidence with additional information in their summary statement for Standard 1. In addition, they will want to provide appropriate information about the quality of these data with details on their validity, content, and scoring.</p> <p><b>Examples of evidence on the learner and learning (InTASC) (Standard 1 and component 1.1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trend data gathered from program level reviews conducted by external entities like SPAs and the state, or internally by the EPP using</li> </ul>	<p>The SSR can be used to provide evidence for alignment of EPP courses and measures of candidate proficiencies with state or national specialty area standards. The EPP’s evidence could also include the number of completers who have been board certified or have won awards from specialty area organizations (e.g., <a href="#">AERA</a>, <a href="#">APA</a>, <a href="#">NAESP</a>, <a href="#">NASSP</a>, <a href="#">ASCD</a>) for accomplishments mentioned in Standard A.1. If these data are used as evidence, there should be a description of qualities that are recognized in the award that are relevant to CAEP Standard A.1.</p> <p>(There is no advanced-level concept comparable to the learner and learning concept for initial licensure.)</p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure</b> <b>CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD 1</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level</b> <b>CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD A.1</b></p>
<p>outcomes assessments in response to standards of Specialized Professional Associations (SPA), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), states, or other accrediting bodies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results from 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. “Results” include sub-test results, as well as overall scores (for example, content categories for ETS Praxis tests, rubrics for edTPA).</li> <li>• Evidence that candidates provide effective instruction for diverse P-12 students as described 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”).</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples of evidence for content and content pedagogy knowledge (InTASC) (Standard 1, and components 1.1 and 1.3)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trend data gathered from program level reviews conducted by external entities like SPAs and the state, or internally by the EPP using outcomes assessments in response to standards of Specialized Professional Associations (SPA), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), states, or other accrediting bodies.</li> <li>• Results from 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). “Results” include sub-test results, as well as overall scores (for example, content categories for ETS Praxis tests, rubrics for edTPA).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Examples, sources for measures of generic professional skills (component A.1.1):</b> Self-study reports and EPP evidence on-site should demonstrate that the six generic professional skills are introduced to candidates across the EPP’s advanced-level programs. Only the three skills that the EPP determines are most relevant for a specialty preparation program must be demonstrated for that individual program. An EPP with multiple advanced-level programs need not demonstrate the same three competencies for all of its programs.</p> <p>Self-study reports and on-site evidence should include rubrics, scoring guides and evidence that the instrument meets the sufficiency level in the CAEP Evaluation Framework (Appendix A)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Action research or a summative project or thesis</li> <li>• Survey results from completers and employers</li> <li>• Excerpts from portfolios that capture evidence of proficiencies listed in A.1.1</li> <li>• Professional behavior and responsibility measures</li> <li>• Legal compliance assessments (e.g., for reporting requirements,</li> </ul>



<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure</b> <b>CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD 1</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level</b> <b>CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD A.1</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EPP’s own end-of-course or end of major content exams, compared with performances of non-education candidates in its host institution</li> <li>• GRE field tests (in limited fields, such as biochemistry, cell and molecular biology, biology, chemistry, computer science, literature in English, mathematics, physics, psychology)</li> <li>• EPP’s or the host institution’s major field tests</li> <li>• Results from licensure pedagogy assessments</li> <li>• Number of completers who have been board certified or have won awards from specialty area organizations (e.g., <a href="#">AERA</a>, <a href="#">APA</a>, <a href="#">NAESP</a>, <a href="#">NASSP</a>, <a href="#">ASCD</a>) for accomplishments mentioned in Standard 1. [NOTE: If these data are used as evidence, there should be a description of qualities that are recognized in the award that are relevant to CAEP Standard 1.]</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples of evidence for instructional practice (InTASC) (Standard 1 and components 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trend data gathered from program level reviews conducted by external entities like SPAs and the state, or internally by the EPP using outcomes assessments in response to standards of Specialized Professional Associations (SPA), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), states, or other accrediting bodies.</li> <li>• Rubrics (edTPA) or tasks (PPAT) or “high leverage practices” (e.g., ETS NOTE is an observational test on use of “high leverages” teaching practices) or an EPP’s 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</li> <li>• Other examples: Massachusetts Tests for Educator Licensure, Elementary General Curriculum; Pearson Foundations of Reading; Connecticut/Pearson Foundations of Reading licensure test. “Results”</li> </ul>	<p>ADA/IDEA)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Problem-based project in conjunction with coursework</li> <li>• Problem-based group projects</li> <li>• Synthesis and interpretation of research relevant to a specialty specific problem that a completer might find on the job</li> <li>• Problem-based project in conjunction with a school or district partner</li> <li>• Reflections on the interpretation and use of data</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples, sources for measures of specialized content knowledge (component A.1.2)</b></p> <p>Self-study reports and on-site evidence should include rubrics, scoring guides and evidence that the instrument meets the sufficiency level in the CAEP Evaluation framework (Appendix A, p. 76)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trend data gathered from program level reviews conducted by external entities like SPAs and the state, or internally by the EPP using outcomes assessments in response to standards of Specialized Professional Associations (SPA), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), states, or other accrediting bodies.</li> <li>• Relevant assessments of completers, including excerpts from relevant sub-test information</li> <li>• Licensure examinations, including sub-test information (e.g., Praxis content categories)</li> <li>• End of key-course tests <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Excerpts from submissions to or results from SPA program reviews at the advanced-level</li> <li>○ Specialty area accreditor reports</li> <li>○ Specialty area-specific state standards achieved OR evidence of alignment of assessments to other state/national/CAEP Standards</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Projects requiring investigation of a problem or issue in the specialized content field</li> </ul>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure</b> <b>CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD 1</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level</b> <b>CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD A.1</b></p>
<p>include sub-test results, as well as overall score (for example, content categories for ETS Praxis tests, rubrics for edTPA)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre-service measures of candidate impact on diverse 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</li> <li>• Demonstrations of candidate facility with effective use of technology in classroom practice</li> <li>• Number of completers who have been board certified or have won awards from specialty area organizations (e.g., <a href="#">AERA</a>, <a href="#">APA</a>, <a href="#">NAESP</a>, <a href="#">NASSP</a>, <a href="#">ASCD</a>) for accomplishments mentioned in Standard 1. [NOTE: If these data are used as evidence, there should be a description of qualities that are recognized in the award that are relevant to CAEP Standard 1.]</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples of evidence on professional responsibility (InTASC) (Standard 1, and components 1.1, 1.3 and 3.6)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trend data gathered from program level reviews conducted by external entities like SPAs and the state, or internally by the EPP using outcomes assessments in response to standards of Specialized Professional Associations (SPA), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), states, or other accrediting bodies.</li> <li>• Dispositional and professional development measures</li> <li>• Professional behavior and responsibility measures</li> <li>• State-required measures (e.g., on standards of ethics)</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples of evidence for college and career readiness to teach (Standard 1 and component 1.4)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<p><b>PHASE-IN APPLIES for Advanced-Level Accreditation</b></p> <p>See Appedix B: Phase-in Schedule and Guidelines for Plans for details on timeline for submitting “plans only,” “plans with progress” steps including expectations for the first data collection, as well as guidelines on the content of phase-in plans that are permitted under accreditation policy. The phase-in procedure applies to component A.1.1.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure</b> <b>CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD 1</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level</b> <b>CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD A.1</b></p>
<p>problem solving, and critical thinking with diverse P-12 students</p> <p><b>Examples of evidence on diversity and equity</b> (<i>Standard 1 and cross-cutting themes</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extract from data on learners and learning demonstrating candidate understanding of learning differences and ways to differentiate instruction effectively</li> <li>• Extract from college-and career-readiness evidence documenting instruction in deep content knowledge, critical thinking, and problem solving with diverse P-12 students</li> <li>• Extract from instructional practice evidence relative to candidate capacities in data literacy and use of assessments with diverse students</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Self-study prompts and reflection questions for Standards 1 and A.1</b></p> <p>The prompts and reflection questions below are intended as reminders of evidence available to an EPP, ideas for points to be made in the EPP’s case for the standard, or suggestions to help organize the EPP’s case for the standards. They help bring together the general steps in building a case that a standard is met (see p. 16) with the specific concepts that make up Standards 1 and A.2 (see Key Concepts heading, above). They do not describe topics to address in the self-study report that have not already appeared in the key concepts or evidence examples, nor are they intended for response, one by one, in the self-study report and on-site evidence.</p>	
<p><b>The EPP’s accomplishments and its case that Standard 1 is met follow:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The EPP identifies key points for a convincing evidence-based case that candidates are competent in the concepts that make up Standard 1.</b> The EPP describes what it has done that is unique and especially effective to prepare candidates. How does it know that its candidates are successful in the Standard 1 concepts? For example <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Are they proficient in the content knowledge of their field and how to teach it?</li> <li>○ How does the EPP know that its candidates are able to apply what they are learning so that their diverse P-12 students learn in pre-</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>The EPP’s accomplishments and its case that Standard A.1 is met follow:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The EPP identifies key points for a convincing evidence-based case that candidates are competent in the generic professional skills and specialized content knowledge that comprise Standard A.1.</b> The EPP describes what it has done that is unique and especially effective to prepare candidates. It uses evidence to address questions such as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How does it know candidates are successful? Are they proficient in the specialized advanced-level content of their field and how do they practice it in schools and districts?</li> <li>○ How does it know candidates are able to apply what they are learning</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure</b> <b>CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD 1</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level</b> <b>CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD A.1</b></p>
<p>service clinical settings?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How does it know that its 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?</li> <li>○ How does it know that its candidates are ready to teach diverse learners under the different situations they may encounter on the job?</li> <li>○ How does it know that its candidates are proficient in applications of technology to enhance P-12 student learning?</li> <li>○ How does it know that its candidates can apply appropriate professional and ethical standards in their work?</li> <li>○ Has it set external benchmarks for success that apply to its programs and faculty?</li> <li>○ Has it extracted relevant information built into sub-tests, such as the content categories of ETS Praxis, edTPA rubrics, or PPAT tasks?</li> </ul> <p>When the EPP disaggregates data by specialty area program</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Are there differences in the depth of evidence about candidate proficiencies for each of the Standard 1 concepts between specialty area programs?</li> <li>○ If so, is there additional evidence that might more fully describe candidate proficiencies?</li> <li>○ Are the performances of candidates similarly strong across specialty area programs, or are there indications of programs needing some adjustment in courses and experiences?</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>The EPP describes the evidence that most compellingly demonstrates its case, what it has learned from the evidence, and what conclusions and interpretations it has made.</b> To frame the case for Standard 1, what evidence does the EPP have about candidate proficiencies in the key</li> </ul>	<p>so they can create and maintain supportive school environments for P-12 learning?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How does it know candidates are proficient in applications of technology appropriate to their field of specialization? How does it know candidates can apply appropriate professional and ethical standards in their work?</li> <li>○ How has the EPP made use of external benchmarks for discussion with its program faculty?</li> <li>○ What do data show about the performance of the EPP’s candidates, by exit, in relation to peers or over time?</li> </ul> <p>When the EPP disaggregates data by specialty area program</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Are there differences in the depth of evidence about candidate proficiencies for each of the Standard A.1 concepts between specialty area programs?</li> <li>○ If so, is there additional evidence that might more fully describe candidate proficiencies?</li> <li>○ Are the performances of candidates similarly strong across specialty area programs, or are there indications of programs needing some adjustment in courses and experiences?</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>The EPP describes the evidence that most compellingly demonstrates its case, what it has learned from the evidence, and what conclusions and interpretations it has made.</b> What evidence does the EPP have to frame its case about candidate proficiencies in the key concepts (generic</li> </ul>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure</b> <b>CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD 1</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level</b> <b>CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD A.1</b></p>
<p>concepts addressed in the standard? What has it learned about the consistency of candidate proficiencies in the Standard 1 concepts when the data are disaggregated by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Preparation program</li> <li>○ Race and ethnicity</li> </ul> <p>Is the EPP monitoring performance across campus sites (if there is more than one) and mode of delivery (if there is more than one)? Has the EPP probed more deeply, for example, to examine candidate proficiencies in the Standard 1 concepts by preparation program? Or has it looked at performance by race and ethnicity for each program? What has the EPP learned from the data? What evidence supports its case? What contrary evidence has it found and how is that explained? What are the EPP's interpretations of the meaning of the data regarding abilities of its candidates to perform with competence and in a professional manner? What questions have emerged that need more investigation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>The EPP explains how leaders and faculty know that the evidence they are assembling to justify its case for Standard 1 is valid and credible.</b> What can the EPP say about data validity and reliability? About data relevance for the topic that it is to be informed? About its representativeness?</li> <li>● <b>The EPP describes the uses it is making of the evidence for Standard 1 by sharing it with stakeholders and undertaking or planning modifications in its preparation courses and experiences.</b></li> </ul>	<p>professional skills and specialized advanced-level content knowledge) addressed in the standard? What has the EPP learned about the consistency of candidate proficiencies in the Standard A.1 concepts when it disaggregates the data by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Specialty area program</li> <li>○ Race and ethnicity</li> </ul> <p>Is the EPP monitoring performance across campus sites (if there is more than one) and mode of delivery (if there is more than one)? What contrary evidence has it found and how does it explain it? What are the EPP's interpretations of the meaning of the data regarding abilities of candidates to perform with competence and in a professional manner? What questions have emerged that need more investigation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>The EPP explains how it knows that the evidence to justify its case for Standard A.1 is valid and credible.</b> What can the EPP say about data validity and reliability? About data relevance for the topic that is to be informed? About its representativeness?</li> <li>● <b>The EPP describes the uses it is making of the evidence for Standard A.1 by sharing it with stakeholders and undertaking or planning modifications in preparation courses and experiences.</b></li> </ul>

## Standards 2 and A.2

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure</b> <b>CLINICAL PARTNERSHIPS AND PRACTICE,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD 2</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level</b> <b>ADVANCED PREPARATION CLINICAL PARTNERSHIPS AND</b> <b>PRACTICE, CAEP STANDARD A.2</b></p>
<p><b>Standard 2</b>—<i>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.</i></p> <p><b>Partnerships for Clinical Preparation</b></p> <p>2.1 <i>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.</i></p> <p><b>Clinical Educators</b></p> <p>2.2 <i>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.</i></p> <p><b>Clinical Experiences</b></p> <p>2.3 <i>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</i></p>	<p><b>Standard A.2</b>—<i>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 appropriate for their professional specialty field.</i></p> <p><b>Partnerships for Clinical Preparation</b></p> <p>A.2.1 <i>Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements, including technology-based collaborations, for clinical preparation and share responsibility for continuous improvement of advanced program candidate preparation. Partnerships for clinical preparation can follow a range of forms, participants, and functions. They establish mutually agreeable expectations for advanced program 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 advanced program candidate outcomes.</i></p> <p><b>Clinical Experiences</b></p> <p>A.2.2 <i>The provider works with partners to design varied and developmental clinical settings that allow opportunities for candidates to practice applications of content knowledge and skills that the courses and other experiences of the advanced preparation emphasize. The opportunities lead to appropriate culminating experiences in which candidates demonstrate their proficiencies through problem-based tasks or research (e.g., qualitative, quantitative, mixed methods, action) that are characteristic of their professional specialization as detailed in component A.1.1.</i></p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure</b> <b>CLINICAL PARTNERSHIPS AND PRACTICE,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD 2</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level</b> <b>ADVANCED PREPARATION CLINICAL PARTNERSHIPS AND</b> <b>PRACTICE, CAEP STANDARD A.2</b></p>
<p><i>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.</i></p>	
<p><b>Key Concepts</b></p> <p>Key concepts identify the main points that comprise the CAEP Standards. They interpret the combined language of standards with their accompanying components and provide guidance to shape evidence gathering and the EPP's writing of its case that a standard is met.</p>	
<p>High-quality clinical practice is a unique and critical feature for educator preparation. Standard 2 encourages EPPs to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Establish partnerships with close collaborators</b> from schools and school districts, as well as other appropriate organizations (<i>components 2.1 and 2.2</i>).</li> <li>• <b>Examine the sufficiency</b> (e.g., in depth, breadth, coherence, and duration) <b>of opportunities that the EPP provides for candidates to practice the application of course knowledge under diverse clinical conditions</b> with P-12 students who have differing needs (<i>component 2.3</i>).</li> </ul> <p>The language of Standard 2 and component 2.1 uses new terms: co-construct and co-select, and—by implication—co-prepare, co-evaluate, co-support and co-retain. These terms are meant to describe the close working relationship between EPPs and their colleagues in schools and school districts. They review evidence together, they determine practices and procedures</p>	<p>High-quality clinical practice is a unique and critical feature for educator preparation. Standard A.2 encourages EPPs to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Develop and maintain partnerships with close collaborators</b> from schools and school districts, as well as other appropriate organizations (<i>component A.2.1</i>).</li> </ul> <p>(The Standard for Advanced-Level preparation is written in terms of the clinical experiences provided and opportunities for candidates to practice, in contrast with the Standard for Initial Licensure which asks, particularly, that EPPs examine the sufficiency of their clinical experiences.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Through the partnership, provide <b>diverse and developmental clinical experiences in settings with diverse P-12 students, and also opportunities for Advanced-Level candidates to practice applications of specialized content knowledge and professional skills</b> (<i>component A.2.2</i>).</li> </ul> <p>Standard A.2 provides an opportunity for EPPs to demonstrate that their partnerships with P-12 schools and districts are beneficial to both parties for advanced-level preparation. The SSR will explain, and provide examples, that demonstrate how collaborative partnerships are conducted, monitored, and evaluated, as well as how these evaluations lead to changes in preparation courses and experiences for the EPP's</p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure</b> <b>CLINICAL PARTNERSHIPS AND PRACTICE,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD 2</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level</b> <b>ADVANCED PREPARATION CLINICAL PARTNERSHIPS AND</b> <b>PRACTICE, CAEP STANDARD A.2</b></p>
<p>together, and they reach decisions together. Both partners are active participants, engaged in the conduct of successful candidate clinical experiences. These partnerships and clinical experiences keep a clear focus on candidate opportunities, and on interactions with P-12 students that have positive effects on 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. (See CAEP’s glossary definitions for school-based educator and university-based educator. These educators include all individuals who assess, support, and develop candidates’ knowledge, skills, and/or professional dispositions at some stage in the clinical experiences. They may be EPP-based, P-12 school-based, central office personnel, community-based, or in any other setting where candidates practice practical application.)</p>	<p>candidates. The EPP should document the opportunities for candidates in advanced-level preparation to practice their developing knowledge and skills, and address what faculty have learned from the relationship of culminating experiences with candidate success in problem-based tasks characteristic of their professional specialization.</p> <p>The partnerships should be continuous and feature shared decision making about crucial aspects of the preparation experiences and collaboration among all school-based and university-based educators. Standard A.2 prompts EPPs to (1) be purposeful in and reflective on all aspects of clinical experiences; (2) provide opportunities for candidates to practice the application of course knowledge in a variety of developmental settings; and (3) keep a clear focus on experiences that will foster proficiencies that are characteristic of their professional specialization and promote authentic applications of the advanced knowledge and skills described in component A.1.1.</p> <p>School-based and university-based educators include all individuals who assess, support, and develop candidates’ knowledge, skills, and/or professional dispositions at some stage in the clinical experiences. See Appendix G Glossary.</p>
<p><b>Evidence examples for Standards 2 and A.2</b></p> <p>The types of evidence described in this handbook are intended only as examples. Each EPP is welcome to employ different measurements from those described here and to select ones that its leadership and faculty believe will make the strongest case that each standard is met. Whatever evidence is chosen, the purpose is to show that the concepts in the CAEP Standards are addressed in an effective way.</p>	
<p>Standard 2 provides an opportunity for the EPP to demonstrate that its partnerships with P-12 schools are beneficial to both parties for initial licensure programs. That demonstration would explain how the EPP conducts, monitors, and evaluates collaborative partnerships, and how evaluations lead to changes in preparation experiences. The EPP provides examples of beneficial collaboration and how it works together with</p>	<p>The EPP’s SSR can document its case that the clinical experiences are effective in preparing candidates for beginning roles in their field of advanced-level preparation. This demonstration does not involve reiterating performance outcomes submitted under Standard A.1. Instead, it establishes that (or how) the features of the clinical experiences contribute to those outcomes. The evidence might answer questions such</p>



<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure</b> <b>CLINICAL PARTNERSHIPS AND PRACTICE,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD 2</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level</b> <b>ADVANCED PREPARATION CLINICAL PARTNERSHIPS AND</b> <b>PRACTICE, CAEP STANDARD A.2</b></p>
<p>schools. The SSR 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.</p> <p>Note that the standard and its components do not define specific qualitative characteristics of clinical experiences. Instead they ask that the EPP and its partners conduct clinical experiences with “sufficient depth, breadth, coherence and duration” so that candidates are well prepared to have a positive impact on all P-12 students. The EPP should collect and examine data on the clinical experiences it offers, study them, and reflect on the messages in the data as a means of making clinical experiences still more effective.</p> <p><b>Evidence of partnerships and shared responsibility</b> (<i>components 2.1 and 2.2</i>)</p> <p>The partnerships could create opportunities for mutual consideration of areas for modification in light of collected evidence from candidates and partners. They could set common expectations for candidates, review the coherence of candidate’s experience across clinical and academic components, and accept accountability for results in terms of P-12 learning. More specifically, they could include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Descriptions of partnerships along with documentation that partnerships are being implemented as described, such as agendas, minutes, and videos, and also documentation of stakeholder involvement. (The site-visit team may conduct interviews of stakeholders to confirm the evidence);</li> <li>• Results from stakeholder surveys or other tools for receiving input or feedback from P-12 teachers and/or administrators;</li> <li>• Documentation of shared responsibilities;</li> <li>• Documentation of technology-based collaborations;</li> <li>• Evidence that placements, observational instruments, and evaluations are</li> </ul>	<p>as, “How does the EPP know that the practical activities have appropriate scope and sequence to best promote progressively independent functioning in the specialty area role?” or “What was the effect of changing the duration or order of activities in the sequence?”</p> <p><b>Examples of partnerships and shared responsibility</b> (component A.2.1):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Descriptions of partnerships (e.g., MOUs) along with documentation that the partnership is being implemented as described;</li> <li>• Documentation of stakeholder involvement such as agendas, minutes, and videos;</li> <li>• Results from stakeholder surveys or other tools for receiving input or feedback from P-12 teachers and/or administrators;</li> <li>• Documents showing that the EPP and its partners have jointly probed particular aspects of preparation such as depth or coherence, or explored attributes that create unique clinical experiences adapted to a particular specialized field;</li> <li>• Evidence that expectations for candidates during clinical experiences are co-constructed and identified and explicit (e.g., hours, frequency, activities, behaviors);</li> <li>• Evidence that candidates’ performance evaluations during clinical experiences address content and set performance standards that are mutually acceptable to providers and partners;</li> <li>• Evidence that collaborative projects or action research projects inform</li> </ul>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure</b> <b>CLINICAL PARTNERSHIPS AND PRACTICE,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD 2</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level</b> <b>ADVANCED PREPARATION CLINICAL PARTNERSHIPS AND</b> <b>PRACTICE, CAEP STANDARD A.2</b></p>
<p>co-constructed with partners;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that expectations for candidates during clinical experiences are co-constructed and identified (e.g., hours, frequency, activities, behaviors);</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• Records of remediation and/or counseling out; and</li> <li>• Documentation of jointly structured curriculum development/design/redesign.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples of clinical experience evidence:</b> <i>(component 2.3)</i> The EPP makes a case that its 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 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 been 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.</p> <p>Evidence documents the relationship between the attributes and outcomes of clinical experiences. For example, the EPP could</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• examine clinical experiences to ensure that these experiences are deliberate, purposeful, and sequential, and are assessed using performance-based protocols;</li> <li>• document clinical experience goals and operational design along with evidence that clinical experiences are being implemented as described;</li> <li>• include a scope and sequence matrix that charts depth, breadth, and diversity of clinical experiences; a chart of candidate experiences in</li> </ul>	<p>problems of practice that providers and partners agree are sufficiently authentic to assess readiness for advanced-level professional practice; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of appropriate uses of technology for the candidate’s future role.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples of clinical experience evidence:</b> CAEP acknowledges that states are a special stakeholder group, particularly for clinical experiences. Any candidate’s experiences will reflect opportunities provided through the EPPs preparatory activities and state requirements. <b>Evidence might include</b> <i>(component A.2.2)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of opportunities for candidates to develop and practice applying a range of content knowledge and skills to practical challenges in their specialty area.</li> <li>• Documentation that diversity in clinical situations, schools, or districts with diverse P-12 students, is an explicit factor in partnership arrangements.</li> <li>• Evidence of candidate proficiencies by completion of their program from artifacts or completed assignments that would be reflective of an on-the-job task in the specialty field. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ e.g., preparation of a budget for a school principal, a briefing for a superintendent on the adequacy of special education services available in the community, or an analysis of opportunities for different configurations of technology applications in a school.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Evidence mapping the developmental path through which candidates attain specific practical knowledge and skills as candidates progress through courses and clinical experiences. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ e.g., an investigation into whether/how often research activities in</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure</b> <b>CLINICAL PARTNERSHIPS AND PRACTICE,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD 2</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level</b> <b>ADVANCED PREPARATION CLINICAL PARTNERSHIPS AND</b> <b>PRACTICE, CAEP STANDARD A.2</b></p>
<p>diverse settings and with diverse P-12 students; evidence of how candidate progression is monitored, including counseling actions; and application of technology to enhance instruction and P-12 learning for diverse students;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• describe attributes of the clinical experiences (i.e., depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and/or duration) that the EPP has learned are associated with observed outcomes; and</li> <li>• describe studies conducted on any changes to clinical experiences and the results observed by the EPP’s leaders and faculty.</li> </ul>	<p>courses and/or work as a research assistant leads to competence in designing an original project that is implemented during an internship and/or accepted for conference presentation or publication in the specialty area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that candidates evaluate their preparatory activities for clinical practice (e.g., coursework, acculturation) as relevant and appropriately calibrated to the demands of their clinical experiences. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Relevance could be investigated in relation to candidates’ preparation to meet specific challenges in a setting or general problems of practice endorsed by clinical partners or other stakeholders.</li> <li>○ Calibration could be investigated in relation to selected levels of contact or prior experience with practical skills leading up to clinical experiences (e.g., exposure, familiarity, knowledge, scaffolded practice, integrated understanding, competent autonomy, mastery, or candidate cultural competence).</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>PHASE-IN APPLIES for Advanced-Level Accreditation:</b> See Appendix B: Phase-in Schedule and Guidelines for Plans for details on timeline for submitting “plans only,” “plans with progress” steps including expectations for the first data collection, as well as guidelines on the content of phase-in plans that are permitted under accreditation policy. The phase-in procedure applies to components A.2.1 and A.2.2.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Self-study prompts and reflection questions for Standards 2 and A.2</b></p> <p>The prompts and reflection questions below are intended as reminders of evidence available to an EPP, ideas for points to be made in the EPP’s case for the standard, or suggestions to help organize the EPP’s case for the CAEP Standards. They help bring together the general steps in building a case that a standard is met (see p. 16) with the specific concepts that make up Standards 2 and A.2 (see Key Concepts heading, above). They do not describe topics to address in the self-study report that have not already appeared in the key concepts or evidence examples, nor are they intended for response, one by one, in the self-study report and on-site evidence.</p>	
<p><b>The EPP’s accomplishments and its case that Standard 2 is met</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The EPP identifies key points for an evidence-based case that EPP and school/district partnerships and clinical experiences are effective in</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>The EPP’s accomplishments and its case that Standard A.2 is met</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The EPP identifies key points for an evidence-based case that its partnerships and clinical experiences are effective in accomplishing</b></li> </ul>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure</b> <b>CLINICAL PARTNERSHIPS AND PRACTICE,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD 2</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level</b> <b>ADVANCED PREPARATION CLINICAL PARTNERSHIPS AND</b> <b>PRACTICE, CAEP STANDARD A.2</b></p>
<p><b>accomplishing the purposes of Standard 2.</b> The EPP describes what it has done that is unique and that it believes 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) has the EPP 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?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The EPP describes the evidence that most compellingly demonstrates its case, what it has learned from the evidence, and what conclusions and interpretations it has made.</b> To frame the EPP case for Standard 2, what evidence does it have about the effectiveness of partnerships and clinical experiences? What has it learned from the data? What supports its case? What contrary evidence has it found and how can the EPP explain those findings? What are the EPP’s interpretations of the data regarding the effectiveness of its partnerships and clinical experiences—are modifications needed? What questions have emerged that need more investigation?</li> </ul>	<p><b>the purposes of Standard A.2.</b> The EPP describes what it has done that is unique and that it believes is especially effective in partnerships and advanced-level experiences. What are the mutually agreeable expectations for candidate entry, preparation, and exit to ensure that theory and practice are linked, to maintain coherence across clinical and academic components of advanced-level preparation, and to share accountability for candidate outcomes? What opportunities have candidates had to prepare in diverse settings where students having different needs are enrolled? What are the particular features of the EPP’s clinical experiences for candidates in advanced-level programs that lead to successful outcomes? For example,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What are the EPP’s successes in creating authentic problem-based clinical experiences suited to candidates in the specialized professional programs it offers?</li> <li>○ What are the multiple indicators used to establish, maintain, and refine criteria for selection, professional development, performance evaluation, continuous improvement, and retention of clinical educators in all clinical placement settings?</li> <li>○ What clinical experiences have enhanced completers’ 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?</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The EPP describes the evidence that most compellingly demonstrates its case, what it has learned from the evidence, and what conclusions and interpretations it has made.</b> To frame the EPP’s case for Standard A.2, what evidence does it have about the effectiveness of partnerships and clinical experiences? What has it learned from the data? What supports its case? What contrary evidence has it found and how can it be explained? What are the EPP’s interpretations of the data regarding the effectiveness of its partnerships and clinical experiences—are modifications needed? What questions have</li> </ul>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure</b> <b>CLINICAL PARTNERSHIPS AND PRACTICE,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD 2</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level</b> <b>ADVANCED PREPARATION CLINICAL PARTNERSHIPS AND</b> <b>PRACTICE, CAEP STANDARD A.2</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The EPP explains how it knows that the evidence it is assembling to justify its case for Standard 2 is valid and credible.</b> What can the EPP say about data validity and reliability? About data relevance for partnerships and clinical experiences? About its representativeness?</li> <li>• <b>The EPP describes the uses it is making of the evidence for Standard 2, such as sharing it with stakeholders and undertaking modifications in preparation courses and experiences.</b></li> </ul>	<p>emerged that need more investigation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The EPP explains how it knows that the evidence it is assembling for Standard A.2 is credible.</b> What can it say about data validity and reliability? About data relevance for partnerships and clinical experiences? About its representativeness?</li> <li>• <b>The EPP describes the uses it is making of the evidence for Standard A.2 by sharing it with stakeholders and undertaking or planning modifications in its preparation courses and experiences.</b></li> </ul>

### Standards 3 and A.3

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure</b> <b>CANDIDATE QUALITY, RECRUITMENT, AND SELECTIVITY,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD 3</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level</b> <b>CANDIDATE QUALITY AND SELECTIVITY,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD A.3</b></p>
<p><b>Standard 3</b>—<i>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.</i></p> <p><b>Plan for Recruitment of Diverse Candidates Who Meet Employment Needs</b></p> <p>3.1 <i>The provider presents plans and goals to recruit and support completion of high-quality candidates from a broad range of</i></p>	<p><b>Standard A.3</b>—<i>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.</i></p> <p><b>Admission of Diverse Candidates Who Meet Employment Needs</b></p> <p>A.3.1 <i>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 addresses community, state, national,</i></p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure</b> <b>CANDIDATE QUALITY, RECRUITMENT, AND SELECTIVITY,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD 3</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level</b> <b>CANDIDATE QUALITY AND SELECTIVITY,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD A.3</b></p>
<p><i>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.</i></p> <p><b>Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement</b></p> <p>3.2 <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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 50<sup>th</sup> percentile standard for writing will be implemented in 2021. As an alternative to cohort average performance on a nationally- or state-normed writing assessment, the EPP may present evidence of candidates’ performance levels on writing tasks similar to those required of practicing educators.<sup>9</sup></i></p> <p><i>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</i></p>	<p><i>regional, or local needs for school and district staff prepared in advanced fields.</i></p> <p><b>Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully</b></p> <p>A.3.2 <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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 develop and use a valid and reliable substantially equivalent alternative assessment of academic achievement. The 50<sup>th</sup> percentile standard for writing will be implemented in 2021. As an alternative to cohort average performance on a nationally- or state-normed writing assessment, the EPP may present evidence of candidates’ performance levels on writing tasks similar to those required of practicing educators.<sup>10</sup> The CAEP minimum criteria apply to the group average of enrolled candidates whose preparation begins during an academic year.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>

<sup>9</sup> The final sentence of this paragraph is the effect of CAEP Board action, December 2018, on an additional form of evidence for writing proficiency.

<sup>10</sup> This sentence is the effect of CAEP Board action, December 2018, on an additional form of evidence for writing proficiency.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure</b> <b>CANDIDATE QUALITY, RECRUITMENT, AND SELECTIVITY,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD 3</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level</b> <b>CANDIDATE QUALITY AND SELECTIVITY,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD A.3</b></p>
<p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><b>Additional Selectivity Factors</b></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><b>Selectivity During Preparation</b></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>	<p><b>Selectivity During Preparation</b></p> <p><i>A.3.3 The provider creates criteria for program progression and uses disaggregated data to monitor candidates’ advancement from admissions through completion.</i></p> <p><b>Selection at Completion</b></p> <p><i>A.3.4 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.</i></p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure</b> <b>CANDIDATE QUALITY, RECRUITMENT, AND SELECTIVITY,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD 3</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level</b> <b>CANDIDATE QUALITY AND SELECTIVITY,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD A.3</b></p>
<p><b>Selection at Completion</b></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>	
<p><b>Key Concepts</b></p> <p>Key concepts identify the main points that comprise the CAEP Standards. They interpret the combined language of standards with their accompanying components and provide guidance to shape evidence gathering and the EPP's writing of its case that a standard is met.</p>	
<p>Standard 3 addresses the need for the EPP to recruit and intentionally develop strong applicants, pools of enrolled candidates, and completers who meet academic achievement (<i>component 3.2</i>) and non-academic (<i>component 3.3</i>) criteria and understand expectations of the profession (<i>component 3.6</i>). 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.<sup>11</sup> The standard and its recruitment/support provision (<i>component 3.1</i>) also signal shared responsibility that an educator workforce should more broadly represent the wide and growing diversity</p>	<p>Standard A.3 focuses on the need for providers to recruit and develop a diverse and strong pool of applicants who successfully complete the specialized program. EPPs will monitor candidate progress, and provide support when needed, to those at risk of falling behind. The pool of applicants is, in most instances, the existing teacher workforce. Over time, and considering wider national goals to recruit a more diverse teacher workforce that reflects the diversity of our P-12 student population, there should be growing diversity in the pool of admitted candidates.</p>

<sup>11</sup> 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 at <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 <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 at <https://www.nap.edu/catalog/12882/preparing-teachers-building-evidence-for-sound-policy>.



<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure</b> <b>CANDIDATE QUALITY, RECRUITMENT, AND SELECTIVITY,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD 3</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level</b> <b>CANDIDATE QUALITY AND SELECTIVITY,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD A.3</b></p>
<p>found in America’s student population. While EPPs should build strength in their candidates to ensure that each is prepared to positively impact P-12 learning prior to recommendation for licensure or certification (<i>component 3.5</i>), they should also monitor the progress of all candidates and take steps that ensure appropriate support for candidates who are not meeting progression gateways (<i>components 3.1 and 3.4</i>).</p> <p>The key concepts of the standard are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Recruitment of an increasingly diverse and strong pool of candidates and responding to and serving employer needs</b> (<i>component 3.1</i>)</li> <li>• <b>Academic achievement</b> (<i>component 3.2</i>) as described in component 3.2 and here: <a href="http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/standards/standard-3-component-32-measures-of-acad.pdf?la=en">http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/standards/standard-3-component-32-measures-of-acad.pdf?la=en</a>.</li> <li>• <b>Monitoring candidate progress, including performance on non-academic factors, and providing support for candidates at risk of falling behind</b> (<i>component 3.3 on non-academic measures; components 3.1 on support and 3.4 on monitoring progress that identifies candidates in need</i>).</li> <li>• <b>High EPP exit requirements including (1) content and practice expectations</b> (<i>component 3.5</i>), and <b>(2) understanding expectations of the profession</b> (<i>component 3.6</i>). (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. If there is additional evidence, relevant to Standard 3 and not Standard 1, then it would appear in the Self-study Report in the EPP’s case for Standard 3.)</li> </ul>	<p>The key concepts are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EPP <b>admits diverse candidates</b> and emphasizes meeting <b>employment needs</b> at the advanced-level (<i>component A.3.1</i>).</li> <li>• <b>Candidates demonstrate academic achievement at admissions</b> with minimum criteria for GPA <i>or</i> a group average performance on nationally- or substantially equivalent state-normed assessments (<i>component A.3.2</i>) and <b>also meet additional EPP criteria to ensure they are likely to complete the program successfully</b> (<i>component 3.2</i>).</li> <li>• EPPs <b>monitor the progress of all candidates</b> (<i>components A.3.1 and A.3.3</i>) and provide <b>support and counseling for candidates whose progress falls behind</b> (<i>components A.3.1 and A.3.2</i>).</li> <li>• EPPs document that <b>completing candidates have knowledge and skills appropriate for their field</b> of specialization (<i>components A.3.4 and also Standard A.1</i>).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Evidence examples for Standards 3 and A.3</b></p>	

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure</b> <b>CANDIDATE QUALITY, RECRUITMENT, AND SELECTIVITY,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD 3</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level</b> <b>CANDIDATE QUALITY AND SELECTIVITY,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD A.3</b></p>
<p>The types of evidence described in this handbook are intended only as examples. Each EPP is welcome to employ different measurements from those described here and to select ones that its leadership and faculty believe will make the strongest case that each standard is met. Whatever evidence is chosen, the purpose is to show that the concepts in the CAEP Standards are addressed in an effective way.</p>	
<p><b>Examples of recruitment and meeting employer needs (<i>Standard 3 and component 3.1</i>) follow:</b></p> <p>CAEP has created a planning tool to assist in organizing and monitoring EPP recruitment and retention efforts, titled Data-informed Recruitment and Retention Plan and Profess, available here: <a href="http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/standards/component-31-plan.pdf?la=en">http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/standards/component-31-plan.pdf?la=en</a>. A companion paper, per Lisa Zagumny, <i>Compiled Resources Relating to CAEP Standard 3.1 Recruitment and Retention</i>, contains examples from EPP experience: <a href="http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/standards/compiled-resources.pdf?la=en">http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/standards/compiled-resources.pdf?la=en</a>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A recruitment/retention plan—Documentation that the EPP periodically examines the employment landscape to identify shortage areas, openings, forecasts, and related information in the community, state, regional, or national market for which it is preparing completers. An appropriate plan should document base points on current measures of (1) academic achievement, (2) diversity, and (3) provider knowledge of</li> </ul>	<p>Standard A.3, component A.3.1, does not call for a “recruitment plan” as does Standard 3 for Initial Licensure preparation. The EPP is expected, however, to have an “admissions plan” for Advanced-Level programs that builds a pool of candidates who can be successful in completing the preparation program and reflects increasing diversity over time. The EPP should monitor employment trends and have a working knowledge, from its school and district partners and others, about employment needs so that candidates are admitted to preparation in fields where there are employment opportunities. The suggested measures provide a basis for the EPP to monitor results of its admission practices and criteria and then evaluate the association of those measures with the progress of candidates through their program and after completion.</p> <p><b>Examples of admitting diverse candidates and focusing on employment opportunities (<i>component A.3.1</i>) follow:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation that the EPP periodically examines the employment landscape in order to identify shortage areas, openings, forecasts, and related information in the community, state, regional, or national market for completers</li> <li>• An appropriate plan that documents base points on current measures of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ academic achievement</li> <li>○ diversity</li> <li>○ EPP knowledge of employment need</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Target outcomes for five years</li> <li>• Documentation that the EPP monitors annual progress toward admission goals and fields where there are employment opportunities. Data are disaggregated to describe gender, ethnicity, academic ability, and/or candidate fit for high-need specialty areas or communities and trends are analyzed.</li> </ul>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure</b> <b>CANDIDATE QUALITY, RECRUITMENT, AND SELECTIVITY,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD 3</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level</b> <b>CANDIDATE QUALITY AND SELECTIVITY,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD A.3</b></p>
<p>employment needs, and include target outcomes for three or more years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>Monitoring progress—The EPP shows results of its annual monitoring of progress toward achieving recruitment goals. It disaggregates data to describe gender, ethnicity, academic ability, and/or candidate fit for high-need specialty areas or communities and analyzes trends. It disaggregates admissions, enrollment, and completion data by (1) relevant demographics such as race/ethnicity, SES, and sex; (2) branch campuses (if any); (3) mode of delivery, and (4) individual programs.</li> <li>Continuous improvement—The EPP conducts analyses and evaluates the adequacy of its 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.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for candidate academic proficiency</b> (<i>Standard 3 and component 3.2</i>)</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-top: 10px;"> <p>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 found at <a href="http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/standards/guidelines-for-equivalence-studies-for-c.pdf?la=en">http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/standards/guidelines-for-equivalence-studies-for-c.pdf?la=en</a>. Assessments used to demonstrate component 3.2 must be approved by CAEP prior to an EPP’s use in its self-study report.</p> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Admissions data that are disaggregated for enrolled candidates by (1) relevant demographics such as race/ethnicity, SES, and sex, and (2) branch campuses (if any), (3) mode of delivery, and (4) individual programs.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for academic achievement and criteria to ensure candidate success</b> (<i>component A.3.2</i>) <b>follow:</b></p> <p>At the advanced-level, the GPA and normed test results are two alternative criteria from which the EPP selects, not two additive criteria as they are for initial licensure.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-top: 10px;"> <p>For component A.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 available at <a href="http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/standards/guidelines-for-equivalence-studies-for-c.pdf?la=en">http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/standards/guidelines-for-equivalence-studies-for-c.pdf?la=en</a>. Assessments used to demonstrate component A.3.2 must be approved by CAEP prior to an EPP’s use in its self-study report.</p> </div>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure</b> <b>CANDIDATE QUALITY, RECRUITMENT, AND SELECTIVITY,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD 3</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level</b> <b>CANDIDATE QUALITY AND SELECTIVITY,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD A.3</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidate academic proficiency is documented 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; also see additional writing option below). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ EPPS may combine academic proficiency results from several vendors (e.g., ACT, SAT, Praxis) so that not all candidates have to take the same test;</li> <li>○ Criteria for normed tests and results (See summary information paper, including list of assessments approved for demonstrating component 3.2 is located at <a href="http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/standards/caep-standard-3-component-32-measures-of.pdf?la=en">http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/standards/caep-standard-3-component-32-measures-of.pdf?la=en</a>); and</li> <li>○ The CAEP list will be updated from time to time as additional assessments are approved. The online summary information paper also contains additional explanatory information about the component 3.2 criteria and a link to guidelines for states, EPPs, or testing organizations that propose other tests not currently on the approved list to be documented and reviewed by CAEP.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• There are specific CAEP minimum criteria described in component 3.2, but EPPs also may include their own, <i>additional</i> academic or non-academic criteria. Examples include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Criteria for GPA and results</li> <li>○ Measures from dispositions surveys</li> <li>○ Measures of communications proficiency</li> <li>○ EPP criteria created for interviews or other admission or progress monitoring procedures, together with results.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of academic admissions criteria that result in yearly averages for GPA or achievement test scores that meet CAEP’s minimum criteria described in component A.3.2, for example <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Admission criteria for GPA and results</li> <li>○ Admission criteria for normed tests and results</li> <li>○ Performance on qualifying exams</li> <li>○ Assessments of writing ability</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Description of the EPP’s criteria to ensure that candidates are likely to be able to complete the program successfully, together with data from the application of those criteria and trends over time, but also including EPP criteria (as component A.3.2 reads) “intended to ensure that candidates have, or develop, abilities to complete the program successfully.” EPPs present evidence for their case that the component is met distinctly from other information presented on meeting Standard A.3 overall, for example <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ EPP criteria created for interviews or other admission procedures together with results</li> <li>○ Assessments of any of the advanced-level professional skills described in component A.1.1, adapted to the field of specialization: data and research literacy, data analysis, collaborative activities, application of technology, and professional dispositions, laws, and policies; and</li> <li>○ Data that monitor the percentage of a class cohort that completes preparation each year.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Writing Criterion goes into effect 2021 with alternative means of providing evidence:</b></p> <p>The CAEP Board has approved an option for evidence of writing proficiency that EPPs can use instead of the 2021 criterion. This is an</p>	<p><b>Writing Criterion goes into effect 2021 with alternative means of providing evidence:</b></p> <p>The CAEP Board has approved an option for evidence of writing proficiency that EPPs can use instead of the 2021 criterion. It would be an <i>additional option</i> to the cohort average performance on a nationally or state-normed writing assessment for EPPs that elect to use those normed tests instead of</p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure</b> <b>CANDIDATE QUALITY, RECRUITMENT, AND SELECTIVITY,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD 3</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level</b> <b>CANDIDATE QUALITY AND SELECTIVITY,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD A.3</b></p>
<p><i>additional option</i> to the cohort average performance on a nationally or state-normed writing assessment for Standard 3.2.</p> <p>Additional details are available in Appendix F.</p>	<p>GPA as the advanced-level academic criterion for Standard 3.2.</p> <p>Additional details are available in Appendix F.</p>
<p><b>Examples of monitoring candidate progression, including proficiency on non-academic measures, and providing support for candidates who need it (components 3.1 support, 3.3 non-academic, and 3.4 monitoring) follow:</b></p> <p>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. Academic and non-academic proficiencies selected by the EPP and the EPP’s monitoring should be systematic and intentional, and targeted toward guiding decision making (e.g., EPP interventions/remediation, referrals to student support services, counseling out of program, evaluating program effectiveness). Measures could be the same ones used for evidence in Standard 1, such as candidate content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, pedagogical skills, professional dispositions, abilities to integrate technology with instruction, meet needs of diverse P-12 students, and to teach to college- and career-readiness standards. The EPP’s self-study report would summarize information on actions taken to enhance candidates’ development of competencies captured in these evaluations, and steps taken to help ensure that candidates who need support actually receive it. More specifically, examples could include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Examples of monitoring candidate progression and providing support when needed (components A.3.3, A.3.2, A.3.1) follow:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessments used at key points during the program (e.g., phases/stages, checkpoints);</li> <li>• Content knowledge and dispositions assessments that could be administered serially (in any order) or in parallel;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• Case studies demonstrating candidate development of abilities in any of the Advanced-Level professional skills listed in A.1.1: data and research literacy, data analysis, collaborative activities, application of technology, and professional dispositions, laws, and policies; and</li> <li>• Evidence for components A.3.1 and A.3.2 might also include documentation from performance reviews, remediation efforts, and/or provisions illustrating that the EPP sets goals for candidate support and monitors progress toward goals of providing sufficient support to candidates to facilitate successful program completion.</li> </ul>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure</b> <b>CANDIDATE QUALITY, RECRUITMENT, AND SELECTIVITY,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD 3</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level</b> <b>CANDIDATE QUALITY AND SELECTIVITY,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD A.3</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-academic factors used during candidate admission and/or monitored during preparation that demonstrate knowledge and use of relevant literature supporting the factors the EPP has selected or investigated. The rationale for Standard 3 (<a href="http://caepnet.org/standards/standard-3/rationale">http://caepnet.org/standards/standard-3/rationale</a>) 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. The EPP could supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ evidence that its base non-academic selection criteria on relevant research literature and/or investigations that it has conducted, whether quantitative or qualitative;</li> <li>○ a description of how it assesses non-academic factors and applies them in admission or preparation decisions; and</li> <li>○ measures that may be related to specific specialty licensure areas or applied to all candidates.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Evidence that candidates who need it are given necessary support might include documentation from performance reviews, remediation efforts, and/or provisions illustrating the EPP’s goals for candidate support (<i>component 3.1</i>) and monitoring of progress toward goals of providing sufficient support to candidates to facilitate successful program completion (<i>component 3.4</i>).</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples of exit performance and understanding professional responsibilities</b> (<i>Standard 3 and components 3.5 and 3.6</i>) follow:</p> <p>The EPP 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. If the 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.</p>	<p><b>Example of exit performance:</b> EPP self-study reports need not repeat any evidence that is included in their documentation for Standard A.1; they can</p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure</b> <b>CANDIDATE QUALITY, RECRUITMENT, AND SELECTIVITY,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD 3</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level</b> <b>CANDIDATE QUALITY AND SELECTIVITY,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD A.3</b></p>
<p>The EPP’s 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. EPPs should include evidence of candidates’ positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre-service measures of candidate impact on P-12 student learning gathered during methods courses, clinical experiences, and/or at exit; and</li> <li>• Capstone assessments (e.g., 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.</li> </ul> <p>The EPP’s evidence documents candidate understanding of the profession. Evidence may include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Course materials/assessments measuring topic knowledge on codes of ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant laws and policies;</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• Documentation of specialized training (e.g., bullying, state law).</li> </ul>	<p>simply cross-reference it for their summary statement on Standard A.3.</p> <p>The EPP 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Authentic problem-based experience and</li> <li>• Dispositional/ethics assessments.</li> </ul> <p><b>PHASE-IN APPLIES for Advanced-Level Accreditation:</b> See Appendix B: Phase-in Schedule and Guidelines for Plans for details on timeline for submitting “plans only,” “plans with progress” steps including expectations for the first data collection, as well as guidelines on the content of phase-in plans that are permitted under accreditation policy. The phase-in procedure applies to A.3.1, A.3.2, A.3.3 and A.3.4.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Self-study prompts and reflection questions for Standards 3 and A.3</b></p> <p>The prompts and reflection questions below are intended as reminders of evidence available to an EPP, ideas for points to be made in the EPP’s case for the standard, or suggestions to help organize the EPP’s case for the CAEP Standards. They help bring together the general steps in building a case that a standard is met (see p. 16) with the specific concepts that make up Standards 3 and A.3 (see Key Concepts heading, above). They do not describe topics to</p>	

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure</b> <b>CANDIDATE QUALITY, RECRUITMENT, AND SELECTIVITY,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD 3</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level</b> <b>CANDIDATE QUALITY AND SELECTIVITY,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD A.3</b></p>
<p>address in the self-study report that have not already appeared in the key concepts or evidence examples, nor are they intended for response, one by one, in the self-study report and on-site evidence.</p>	
<p><b>The EPP’s accomplishments and its case that Standard 3 is met</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The EPP identifies key points for an evidence-based narrative stating its case that candidate recruitment, support, achievement, and progress to completion are effective.</b> The EPP describes what it has 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 the EPP’s recruitment efforts? Is the EPP meeting its goals for diversity and academic ability? How does the EPP know? How were these goals informed by data and how did the EPP determine they are meaningful? Do the EPP’s 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? For the writing criterion, has the EPP chosen to use the option for its own assessments of candidate writing through tasks similar to those they would experience on-the-job? What were the findings from the alternative evidence? What do the EPP’s data show? What has the EPP learned about candidate progression and needed points for remediation as candidates move through preparation toward successful completion? How has the EPP set external benchmarks for success for its recruitment, progression, and exit goals? What is the EPP’s evidence about the degree to which these have been achieved? How do the EPP’s 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?</li> <li>• <b>The EPP describes the evidence that most compellingly demonstrates its case, what it has learned from the evidence, and what conclusions</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>The EPP’s accomplishments and its case that Standard A.3 is met</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The EPP identifies key points for an evidence-based narrative stating the case that it is meeting Standard A.3 by effectively building more diversity into its candidate pool, aligning advanced-level preparation with employment needs, administering criteria for academic achievement and criteria to ensure successful completion, monitoring progress and supporting candidates who need it, and setting high criteria for exit.</b> The EPP describes what it has done that is unique and especially effective in attracting and supporting advanced-level candidates who are diverse, have achieved academically, and who successfully complete their preparation. What is the current status of the EPP’s efforts to align preparation with employment opportunities? How were these goals informed by data and how did the EPP determine they are meaningful? Is the EPP meeting its goals for diversity and academic ability? How does it know? Do candidates meet the CAEP academic achievement criterion (GPA minimum of 3.0 OR group average performance on nationally normed or “substantially equivalent” in the top 50 percent) at admissions? What do the EPP’s data show? What has the EPP learned about candidate progression and needed points for remediation as advanced-level candidates move through preparation toward successful completion? Has the EPP set external benchmarks for success for its advanced-level candidate progression, and exit goals? What is the evidence about the degree to which these have been achieved? Does the EPP have confirming evidence about completers’ progress on-the-job and, if so, what does it say about the effectiveness of the EPP’s advanced-level preparation?</li> <li>• <b>The EPP describes the evidence that most compellingly demonstrates its case, what it has learned from the evidence, and what conclusions</b></li> </ul>



<b>Initial Licensure</b> <b>CANDIDATE QUALITY, RECRUITMENT, AND SELECTIVITY,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD 3</b>	<b>Advanced-Level</b> <b>CANDIDATE QUALITY AND SELECTIVITY,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD A.3</b>
<p><b>and interpretations it has made.</b> The EPP frames its case for Standard 3, describing its evidence about recruitment, candidate diversity and academic achievement, and progression to completion. What has it learned from the data? What supports the EPP’s case? What contrary evidence has it found and how can it be explained? What are the EPP’s interpretations of the meaning of the data, particularly regarding implications for modification in 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?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The EPP explains how it knows that the evidence it is assembling for Standard 3 is valid and credible.</b> What can the EPP say about data validity and reliability? About data relevance for the topic that it is to be informed? About data representativeness?</li> <li>• <b>The EPP describes the uses it is making of the evidence for Standard 3 by involving stakeholders and undertaking or planning modifications in its preparation courses and experiences.</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>and interpretations it has made.</b> To frame the EPP’s case for Standard A.3, what evidence does it have about admitted candidates, candidate diversity and academic achievement, and progression to completion? What has it learned from the data? What supports the EPP’s case? What contrary evidence has it found and how can it be explained? What are the EPP’s interpretations of the meaning of the data, particularly regarding implications for modification in admissions practices or of the EPP’s criteria intended to ensure that candidates are likely to complete successfully? What questions have emerged that need more investigation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The EPP explains how it knows that the evidence it is assembling for Standard A.3 is valid and credible.</b> What can be said about data validity and reliability? About data relevance for the topic that it is to inform? About its representativeness?</li> <li>• <b>The EPP describes the uses it is making of the evidence for Standard A.3 by involving stakeholders and undertaking or planning modifications in its preparation courses and experiences.</b></li> </ul>

**Section C.iii: Results of Preparation**  
**Standards 4 and A.4**

<b>Initial Licensure</b> <b>PROGRAM IMPACT,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD 4</b>	<b>Advanced-Level</b> <b>SATISFACTION WITH PREPARATION,</b> <b>CAEP STANDARD A.4</b>
<p><b>Standard 4—</b><i>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.</i></p>	<p><b>Standard A.4—</b><i>The provider documents the satisfaction of its completers from advanced preparation programs and their employers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.</i></p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure PROGRAM IMPACT, CAEP STANDARD 4</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level SATISFACTION WITH PREPARATION, CAEP STANDARD A.4</b></p>
<p><b>Impact on P-12 Student Learning and Development</b></p> <p>4.1 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.</p> <p><b>Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness</b></p> <p>4.2 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.</p> <p><b>Satisfaction of Employers</b></p> <p>4.3 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.</p> <p><b>Satisfaction of Completers</b></p> <p>4.4 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.</p>	<p><b>Satisfaction of Employers</b></p> <p>A.4.1. The provider demonstrates that employers are satisfied with completers' preparation and that completers reach employment milestones such as promotion and retention.</p> <p><b>Satisfaction of Completers</b></p> <p>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.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Key Concepts</b></p> <p>Key concepts identify the main points that comprise the CAEP Standards. They interpret the combined language of standards with their accompanying components and provide guidance to shape evidence gathering and the EPP's writing of its case that a standard is met.</p>	

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure PROGRAM IMPACT, CAEP STANDARD 4</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level SATISFACTION WITH PREPARATION, CAEP STANDARD A.4</b></p>
<p>Standard 4 addresses the <i>results</i> of preparation when completers are employed in positions for which they are prepared.<sup>12</sup> The standard especially emphasizes the impact on P-12 student learning as measured in multiple ways, and the components collectively create a complementary 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.)</p> <p>The key concepts for Standard 4 are the same as the four components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Teacher impact on P-12 student learning and development</b> through multiple measures (<i>component 4.1</i>)</li> <li>• <b>Teaching effectiveness in the classroom</b> through validated observations instruments and/or <b>student perception surveys</b> (<i>component 4.2</i>)</li> <li>• <b>Satisfaction with preparation as viewed by employers</b>, including employment milestones such as promotion and retention (<i>component 4.3</i>)</li> <li>• <b>Satisfaction with preparation as viewed by completers</b> (<i>component 4.4</i>)</li> </ul> <p>The measurement challenges for Standard 4, while substantial, continue to evolve. CAEP points to three documents in particular that may help guide providers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CAEP’s web resources contain a report from the American Psychological Association (<a href="#">Assessing and Evaluating Teacher Preparation Programs</a>) on</li> </ul>	<p>Standard A.4 addresses the <i>results</i> of preparation in terms of the satisfaction of completers and employers. There are no Advanced-Level components similar to those for initial licensure preparation on P-12 student learning and observations/evaluations of teacher effectiveness. At the advanced-level, there is not a rich conceptual approach for that kind of performance evaluation nor are there commonly employed measures that might serve as models. However, components A.4.1 and A.4.2 are similar to those components for initial licensure that examine satisfaction of both completers and employers with preparation. Data from surveys or interviews or other sources can provide important, highly relevant information for providers to use in analyzing the consequences of their preparation courses and experiences. In addition, information from component A.4.1 on completer persistence and employment milestones can indicate career orientation and paths of progress that providers can use in their future planning and actions.</p> <p>The key concepts for Standard A.4 are the same as the two components: (There is no advanced-level provision for on-the-job impact measures based on P-12 student learning as is included for initial licensure.) (There is no advanced-level provision for on-the-job evaluations as is included for initial licensure.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Satisfaction with preparation as viewed by employers</b>, including <b>employment milestones</b> such as promotion and retention (<i>component A.4.1</i>)</li> <li>• <b>Satisfaction with preparation as viewed by completers</b> (<i>component A.4.2</i>)</li> </ul>

<sup>12</sup> Note that “completers” in Standard 4 refers to those who have completed preparation in an EPP **and are employed** in positions for which they were prepared. The term does not refer to completers who have continued their education at advanced levels, or those employed in other education positions or in non-education positions.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure PROGRAM IMPACT, CAEP STANDARD 4</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level SATISFACTION WITH PREPARATION, CAEP STANDARD A.4</b></p>
<p>the use of assessments, observations, and surveys in educator preparation, including the use of P-12 student learning information as part of teacher evaluations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix E: Evidence from Case Studies and P-12 Student Impact Studies 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.</li> <li>• CAEP has posted a “resource” based on three different examples that EPPs have included as part of their self-study report evidence, titled <a href="#">CAEP Standard 4 Evidence: A Resource for EPPs</a>.</li> </ul> <p>Among the Standard 4 measures are ones for which the Gates-supported Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) study<sup>13</sup> 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.</p> <p><b>The components of Standard 4 represent four of the CAEP Annual Reporting Measures.</b></p> <p>CAEP’s requests for provider annual reports include a section that asks EPP’s to provide prominent and public links to the Annual Reporting Measures, including the components of Standard 4. In addition to providing a link, the EPP is asked to summarize the posted data, analyze trends, and summarize</p>	<p><b>The components of Standard A.4 represent two of the CAEP Annual Reporting Measures.</b></p> <p>CAEP’s requests for provider annual reports include a section that asks EPPs to provide prominent and public links to the Annual Reporting Measures, including the components of Standard A.4. In addition to providing a link, EPPs are asked to summarize the posted data, analyze trends, and summarize</p>

<sup>13</sup> <http://k12education.gatesfoundation.org/InitiativeSlug/measures-of-effective-teaching/>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure PROGRAM IMPACT, CAEP STANDARD 4</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level SATISFACTION WITH PREPARATION, CAEP STANDARD A.4</b></p>
<p>how data were used for continuous improvement and programmatic changes. The submission of an EPP’s Annual Report to CAEP should provide documentation that it can summarize to address component 5.4 at the time the SSR is compiled. In addition, trends in the EPP’s cumulative reports since the last accreditation cycle will be included and interpreted as part of the SSR.</p>	<p>how data were used for continuous improvement and programmatic changes. The submission of an EPP’s Annual Report to CAEP should provide documentation that it can summarize relative to component A.5.4 at the time the SSR is compiled. In addition, trends in the EPP’s cumulative reports since the last accreditation cycle will be included and interpreted as part of the EPP’s SSR.</p>
<p><b>Evidence examples for Standards 4 and A.4</b></p> <p>The types of evidence described in this handbook are intended only as examples. Each EPP is welcome to employ different measurements from those described here and to select ones that its leadership and faculty believe will make the strongest case that each standard is met. Whatever evidence is chosen, the purpose is to show that the concepts in the CAEP Standards are addressed in an effective way.</p>	
<p>The purpose of Standard 4 is to provide a source of feedback to EPPs about the successes of their candidates, as one source they draw from for continuous improvement. These data are particularly useful as tools to evaluate the adequacy of preparation, and of greater value to providers when results indicate performance in relation to specified benchmarks, norms, and cut scores.</p> <p><b>Examples of evidence for P-12 student impact</b> (<i>component 4.1</i>) If the EPP is in a state that provides access to P-12 student learning data, or if its completers are employed in multiple states where these data are available, the SSR should include data on completers' contribution to student learning growth through such evidence as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Value-added modeling (VAM)</li> <li>• Student growth percentiles tied to teacher (completers or provider)</li> <li>• Student learning and development objectives</li> <li>• State-supported measures addressing P-12 student learning and development that can be linked with teacher data</li> <li>• Providers’ documentation of analysis and evaluation of the evidence presented on completers’ impact on P-12 student learning</li> </ul> <p>If these data are available and applicable, the EPP should demonstrate its familiarity with evidence such as the following:</p>	<p>The purpose of Standard A.4 is to provide a source of feedback to EPPs about the successes of their candidates, as one source they draw from for continuous improvement. These data are particularly useful as tools to evaluate the adequacy of preparation, and of greater value to providers when results indicate performance in relation to specified benchmarks, norms, and cut scores.</p> <p>(There are no advanced-level equivalents for P-12 student impart and teacher observation evaluations for initial licensure completers.)</p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure PROGRAM IMPACT, CAEP STANDARD 4</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level SATISFACTION WITH PREPARATION, CAEP STANDARD A.4</b></p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sources of any P-12 learning data from states on               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Psychometric soundness of the assessments taken by students</li> <li>b. Complementary sources of evidence</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. P-12 student data, such as the following:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Proportion of the EPP’s completers for whom P-12 student growth measures are available and the extent to which the reported completers are representative of all of the completers</li> <li>b. Degree of attrition in the P-12 student data (from one measuring period to the next), that provides context and influences interpretations of data</li> <li>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.</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. The practice of reporting data for the state in which the EPP is located, including the following information               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Level of the state disaggregation of data so that relevant information is available for specific preparation fields</li> <li>b. State criteria used to establish the minimum number of completers for whom data are shared with the provider</li> <li>c. State’s decisions as to the number of years that completers’ performance is associated with their preparation</li> <li>d. Disaggregated data provided by the state that permit comparisons for prior P-12 performances</li> <li>e. Disaggregation of data provided by the state that permit comparisons for completers teaching in similar situations, such as students with disabilities, English language learners, or gifted</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p>If the EPP does not have access to state P-12 student learning data or is supplementing state or district data with data on subjects or grades not covered, the following guidance applies:</p>	

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure PROGRAM IMPACT, CAEP STANDARD 4</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level SATISFACTION WITH PREPARATION, CAEP STANDARD A.4</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EPP may be eligible to meet the standard using the phase-in provisions of accreditation policy. For example, initially the EPP may create an appropriate design; then conduct a pilot data collection and analysis; and then make refinements and further data collection.</li> <li>• The EPP can maintain a continuing cycle of such studies, examining completer performance in different grades and/or subjects over time.</li> <li>• The EPP 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The EPP’s own case studies of completers</li> <li>○ Completer-conducted action research</li> <li>○ Descriptions of partnerships with individual schools or districts</li> <li>○ Description of methods and development of any assessment used</li> <li>○ Use of focus groups, blogs, electronic journals, interviews, and other evidence</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Examples of teaching effectiveness–instructional proficiencies</b> <i>(Component 4.2)</i></p> <p>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, the EPP should submit data on completers' classroom application of professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions promoted in the preparation program. These might be from</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p>If state-created student surveys and/or observation tools have been administered, the EPP could rely on those measures, taking care to describe the content and how it relates to the knowledge, skills, and dispositions in the</p>	

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure PROGRAM IMPACT, CAEP STANDARD 4</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level SATISFACTION WITH PREPARATION, CAEP STANDARD A.4</b></p>
<p>InTASC Standards and the EPP’s framework for the preparation program.</p> <p>The SSR 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 the EPP, between completers’ results and external benchmarks (e.g., district, state, national, or other relevant benchmarks), or over time.</p> <p><b>Examples or employer satisfaction and employment milestones</b> <i>(component 4.3)</i></p> <p>Data on indicators of employer satisfaction with completers' preparation from evidence sources such as the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Employer satisfaction surveys (include instrument sampling, response rates, timing);</li> <li>● Employer satisfaction interviews (include population represented, response rates, instrument content, timing);</li> <li>● Employer satisfaction focus groups (include population represented, response rates, instrument content, timing); and</li> <li>● Employer satisfaction case studies (include a description of methodology).</li> </ul> <p>Information on employment milestones such as the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Promotion;</li> <li>● Employment trajectory;</li> <li>● Employment in high-needs schools;</li> <li>● Retention in education position for which initially hired or another education role with the same or a different employer; and</li> <li>● Rates of achieving the next step in states with stepped certification (e.g., moving from induction-level certificate to professional-level/permanent certificate).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Examples of employer satisfaction and employment milestones</b> <i>(Component A.4.1)</i></p> <p>Providers submit data on indicators of employer satisfaction with completers' preparation from evidence sources such as the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Employer satisfaction surveys (include instrument sampling, response rates, timing);</li> <li>● Employer satisfaction interviews (include population represented, response rates, instrument content, timing);</li> <li>● Employer satisfaction focus groups (include population represented, response rates, instrument content, timing); and</li> <li>● Employer satisfaction case studies (include a description of methodology).</li> </ul> <p>Providers submit data on employment milestones such as the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Promotion;</li> <li>● Employment trajectory;</li> <li>● Employment in high-needs schools; and</li> <li>● Retention in <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ education position for which initially hired or</li> <li>○ another education role by the same or a different employer.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure PROGRAM IMPACT, CAEP STANDARD 4</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level SATISFACTION WITH PREPARATION, CAEP STANDARD A.4</b></p>
<p><b>Examples of completer satisfaction</b> (<i>Component 4.4</i>) Data on completers’ perception of their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completer satisfaction surveys (include instrument, sampling, response rates, timing);</li> <li>• Completer satisfaction interviews (include population represented, response rates, instrument content, timing);</li> <li>• Provider focus groups of completers (include population represented, response rates, instrument content, timing); and</li> <li>• Completer satisfaction case studies (include a description of methodology).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Examples of completer satisfaction</b> (<i>Component a.4.2</i>) Completer survey information has frequently been difficult to obtain, but current initiatives by states may change the consistency and responses to such surveys. The results are particularly useful as tools to evaluate the adequacy of preparation when the questions are specific to particular aspects of preparation; they are of greater value to providers when results indicate performance in relation to specified benchmarks, norms, and cut scores. EPPs should present an explicit case for meeting this component. Providers submit trend data on completers' perception of their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completer satisfaction surveys (include instrument, sampling, response rates, timing);</li> <li>• Completer satisfaction interviews (include population represented, response rates, instrument content, timing);</li> <li>• Provider focus groups of completers (include population represented, response rates, instrument content, timing); and</li> <li>• Completer satisfaction case studies (include a description of methodology).</li> </ul> <p><b>PHASE-IN APPLIES for Advanced-Level Accreditation:</b> See Appendix B: Phase-in Schedule and Guidelines for Plans for details on timeline for submitting “plans only,” “plans with progress” steps including expectations for the first data collection, as well as guidelines on the content of phase-in plans that are permitted under accreditation policy. The phase-in procedure applies to components A.4.1 and A.4.2.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Self-study prompts and reflection questions for Standards 4 and A.4</b></p> <p>The prompts and reflection questions below are intended as reminders of evidence available to an EPP, ideas for points to be made in the EPP’s case for the standard, or suggestions to help organize the EPP’s case for the CAEP Standards. They help bring together the general steps in building a case that a standard is met (see p 16) with the specific concepts that make up Standards 4 and A.4 (see Key Concepts heading, above). They do not describe topics to address in</p>	

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure PROGRAM IMPACT, CAEP STANDARD 4</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level SATISFACTION WITH PREPARATION, CAEP STANDARD A.4</b></p>
<p>the self-study report that have not already appeared in the key concepts or evidence examples, nor are they intended for response, one by one, in the self-study report and on-site evidence.</p>	
<p><b>The EPP’s accomplishments and its case that Standard 4 is met</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>The EPP identifies key points to build a convincing evidence-based case for completers’ on-the-job impact in terms of P-12 student learning, classroom evaluations, employer satisfaction, and completer satisfaction.</b> The EPP describes what it has done that is unique and especially effective to understand the post-preparation employment experiences of former candidates. What can be said confidently about the performances of completers on the job with their P-12 students? In their teaching roles? What corroboration has the EPP found from student perception surveys? What is the current status of its information from employers about their satisfaction with completers’ preparation? What does information returned from the EPP’s completers reveal about their satisfaction with preparation? Do the data identify elements of preparation experiences that might warrant a closer look? What external benchmark performances do the EPP’s completers meet?</li>   <li>● <b>The EPP describes the evidence that most compellingly demonstrates the EPP’s case, what has it learned from the evidence, and what conclusions and interpretations has it made.</b> To frame the case for Standard 4, what evidence does the EPP have about its completers’ performance in the classroom (e.g., on P-12 student learning)? On instructional practices? On engagement with P-12 students and families? What evidence does the EPP have from employers (including information on employment milestones such as job changes or tenure decisions)? What information does it have from completers? What has been learned from the data? What supports the EPP’s case? What contrary evidence has it found and how can it be explained?</li> </ul>	<p><b>The EPP’s accomplishments and its case that Standard A.4 is met</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>The EPP identifies key points for a convincing evidence-based case that measures of employer satisfaction and completer satisfaction meet the expectations for Standard A.4.</b> EPP’s describe what they have done that is unique and especially effective to <b>understand the post-preparation employment experiences of former candidates.</b> What can EPPs confidently say about the performances of completers on the job in the advanced-level positions for which they were prepared? What is the current status of their information from employers about satisfaction with completers’ preparation? What does information returned from completers tell the EPP about satisfaction with preparation? Do completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job, and that the preparation was effective? What has the EPP learned from its investigations of these data when they are disaggregated by program and by demographics? Do the data identify elements of preparation experiences that might warrant a closer look? What external benchmark performances do the EPP’s candidates meet?</li>   <li>● <b>The EPP describes the evidence that most compellingly demonstrates their case, what they have learned from the evidence, and what conclusions and interpretations they have made.</b> To frame the EPP’s case for Standard A.4, what evidence does the EPP have about its completer’s performance in the school or district where they are employed? What evidence does the EPP have from employers (including information on employment milestones such as job changes or tenure decisions)? What information do they have from completers? What has the EPP learned from the data? What supports its case? What contrary evidence has it found and how can it be explained?</li> </ul>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Initial Licensure PROGRAM IMPACT, CAEP STANDARD 4</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced-Level SATISFACTION WITH PREPARATION, CAEP STANDARD A.4</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The EPP explains how the EPP leadership and faculty know that the evidence they are assembling to justify their case for Standard 4 is valid and credible.</b> What can the EPP say about data validity and reliability? About data relevance for the topic that it is to inform? About its representativeness?</li>   <li>• <b>The EPP describes the uses the EPP is making of the evidence for Standard 4 by sharing it with stakeholders and by undertaking or planning modifications in its preparation courses and experiences.</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The EPP explains how it knows that the evidence it is assembling for Standard 4 is valid and credible.</b> What can the EPP say about data validity and reliability? About data relevance for the topic that it is to inform? About its representativeness?</li>   <li>• <b>The EPP describes the uses it is making of the evidence for Standard A.4 by sharing it with stakeholders and undertaking or planning modifications in its preparation courses and experiences.</b></li> </ul>

# APPENDIX A

## Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments

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 are 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 framework. It can also be used by EPPs when they design, pilot, and judge the adequacy of the assessments they create.

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES <b>BELOW</b> SUFFICIENT LEVEL	<b>CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL</b>	EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES <b>ABOVE</b> SUFFICIENT LEVEL
<b>Note: WHEN THE INSTRUMENT IS AN ASSESSMENT: Use sections 1 through 5, below.</b> <b>WHEN THE INSTRUMENT IS A SURVEY: Use Sections 1 and 2 and then sections 6 and 7 below.</b>		
<p style="font-size: 2em; margin: 0;">-</p> <p>a. Use or purpose is ambiguous or vague.</p> <p>b. There is limited or no basis for reviewers to know what information is given to candidates.</p> <p>c. Instructions given to candidates are incomplete or misleading.</p> <p>d. The criterion for success is not provided or is not clear.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>1. ADMINISTRATION AND PURPOSE</b> (informs relevancy)</p> <p>a. The point or points when the assessment is administered during the preparation program are explicit.</p> <p>b. The purpose of the assessment and its use in candidate monitoring or decisions on progression are specified and appropriate.</p> <p>c. Instructions provided to candidates (or respondents to surveys) about what they are expected to do are informative and unambiguous.</p> <p>d. The basis for judgment (criterion for success, or what is “good enough”) is made explicit for candidates (or respondents to surveys).</p> <p>e. Evaluation categories or assessment tasks are aligned with CAEP, InTASC, national/professional, and state standards.</p>	<p style="font-size: 2em; margin: 0;">+</p> <p>a. The purpose of the assessment and its use in candidate monitoring or decisions are consequential.</p> <p>b. Candidate progression is monitored and information is used for mentoring.</p> <p>c. Candidates are informed how the instrument results are used in reaching conclusions about their status and/or progression.</p>

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES <b>BELOW</b> SUFFICIENT LEVEL	<b>CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL</b>	EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES <b>ABOVE</b> SUFFICIENT LEVEL
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>-</b></p> <p>a. Indicator alignment with CAEP and InTASC standards, in addition to national, professional, or state standards is incomplete, absent, or only vaguely related to the content of standards being evaluated.</p> <p>b. Indicators fail to reflect the degree of difficulty described in the standard.</p> <p>c. Indicators not described, are ambiguous, or include only headings.</p> <p>d. Higher level functioning, as represented in the standards, is not apparent in the indicators.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2. CONTENT OF ASSESSMENT</b> (informs relevancy)</p> <p>a. Indicators<sup>14</sup> assess explicitly identified aspects of CAEP and InTASC Standards, in addition to national, professional, or state standards.</p> <p>b. Indicators reflect the degree of difficulty or level of effort described in the standards.</p> <p>c. Indicators unambiguously describe the proficiencies to be evaluated.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>e. Most indicators (at least those comprising 80% of the total score) require observers to judge consequential attributes of candidate proficiencies in the standards.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>+</b></p> <p>a. Almost all indicators (95% or more of the total score) require observers to judge consequential attributes of candidate proficiencies in the standards.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>-</b></p> <p>a. Rating scales are used instead of rubrics; e.g., "level 1= significantly</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>3. SCORING</b> (informs reliability and actionability)</p> <p>a. The basis for judging candidate performance is well defined.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>+</b></p> <p>a. Higher level actions from Bloom's or other taxonomies are used in</p>

<sup>14</sup> 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.

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES <b>BELOW</b> SUFFICIENT LEVEL	<b>CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL</b>	EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES <b>ABOVE</b> SUFFICIENT LEVEL
<p>below expectation” “level 4 = significantly above expectation.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. Proficiency level descriptors (PLDs) do not align with indicators.</li> <li>c. PLDs do not represent developmental progressions.</li> <li>d. PLDs provide limited or no feedback to candidates specific to their performance.</li> <li>e. PDLs are vague or not defined and may just repeat the language from the standards.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. Each proficiency level descriptor (PLD) is qualitatively defined by specific criteria aligned with indicators.</li> <li>c. PLDs represent a developmental sequence from level to level (providing raters with explicit guidelines to evaluate candidate performance and giving candidates explicit feedback on their performance).</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.]</li> </ul>	<p>PLDs such as “analyzes” or “evaluates.”</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>-</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Description of or plan to establish reliability does not inform reviewers about how it was established or is being investigated.</li> <li>b. Described steps do not meet accepted research standards for reliability.</li> <li>c. No evidence, or limited evidence, is provided that scorers are trained, and their inter-rater agreement is documented.</li> <li>d. Described steps do not meet accepted research standards for reliability.</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4. DATA RELIABILITY</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>b. Training of scorers and checking on inter-rater agreement and reliability are documented.</li> <li>c. The described steps meet accepted research standards for establishing reliability.</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>+</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Raters are initially formally calibrated to master criteria and are periodically formally checked to maintain calibration at levels meeting accepted research standards.</li> <li>b. A reliability coefficient is reported.</li> </ul>

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES <b>BELOW</b> SUFFICIENT LEVEL	<b>CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL</b>	EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES <b>ABOVE</b> SUFFICIENT LEVEL
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>-</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Description of or plan to establish validity does not inform reviewers about how it was established or is being investigated.</li> <li>b. The type of validity established or investigated is mis-identified or not described.</li> <li>c. The instrument was not piloted before administration.</li> <li>d. Process or plans for data analysis and interpretation are not presented or are superficial.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>5. DATA VALIDITY</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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. (See Appendix G glossary definition of validity, which includes an extended reference note excerpted from a National Academy of Education report, <i>Evaluation of Teacher Preparation Programs</i>).</li> <li>c. If the assessment is new or revised, a pilot was conducted.</li> <li>d. The EPP details its current process or plans for analyzing and interpreting results from the assessment.</li> <li>e. The described steps meet accepted research standards for establishing the validity of data from an assessment.</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>+</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Types of validity investigated go beyond content validity and move toward predictive validity.</li> <li>b. A validity coefficient is reported.</li> </ul>

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

**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 validity and reliability).



# APPENDIX B

## PHASE-IN SCHEDULE AND GUIDELINES FOR PLANS Advanced-Level Preparation

### Overview of the Phase-in Policy for Advanced-Level Preparation

Accreditation Policy 1.02 addresses CAEP’s procedure to phase-in expectations for new types of evidence called for under the CAEP Standards for Advanced-Level Programs. CAEP has created a developmental stage for providers submitting self-study reports (SSRs) during a transition period. This appendix contains a schedule that indicates the stage for the phase-in, followed by guidelines that provide more details on the contents of plans, the review by site visitors, and guides for Accreditation Council decisions when the phase-in procedure is applied.

The phase-in provisions apply only to the components listed in the chart below. For each, additional information on the collection and reporting of evidence and data is included in the handbook pages describing evidence for the appropriate advanced-level standard. The chart, below, shows dates for the scheduled site visit. Submission of SSRs will usually occur nine months earlier than the chart dates.

For any site visit that is rescheduled as a result of the EPP’s request for an extension, or other EPP-related delay or postponement, any use of the phase-in procedures as part of the SSR evidence should be aligned with 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 scheduled.

This phase-in schedule supersedes all previous versions. Any conflicts between the information provided below and the phase-in provisions contained in Accreditation Policy will be resolved in favor of Accreditation Policy. The academic years indicated below are effective December 15, 2017, following action by the CAEP Executive Board.

<b>The Phase-in Schedule</b>				
<i>Standards for Advanced-Level Programs</i>	<i>CAEP Standards for Advanced-Level Programs required for all accreditation SSRs, reviews, and decisions beginning in Fall 2018</i>			
<p><b>The Phase-in schedule for accreditation at the Advanced-Level (accreditation policy 1.02) is indicated by the time of the site visit in the columns of this chart →</b></p> <p><b>The policy applies to the specific components of the CAEP Advanced-Level Standards listed below ↓</b></p>	Fall 2020 or Spring 2021	Fall 2021 or Spring 2022	Fall 2022 or Spring 2023	Fall 2023 or Spring 2024
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A.1.1, advanced preparation candidate knowledge and skills in their professional specialization field</li> <li>• A.2.1, clinical partnerships</li> <li>• A.2.2, clinical experiences</li> <li>• A.3.1, admission of diverse candidates who meet employment needs</li> <li>• A.3.2, demonstrate academic achievement and ability to complete parathion successfully</li> </ul>	SSR can include plans for new evidence items if evidence is not complete or available	SSR includes plans and progress steps (including data, if any)	SSR includes plans and progress steps (including data, if any)	SSR plus on-site data provide EPP evidence to document each standard

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A.3.3, candidate progress during preparation</li> <li>• A.3.4, high exit standards, also professional and ethical preparation, in the field of specialization</li> <li>• A.4.1, employer satisfaction with preparation and employment persistence of completers</li> <li>• A.4.2, completer satisfaction with preparation</li> <li>• A.5.2, data quality</li> <li>• A.5.3, testing innovations as part of Standard 5, continuous improvement</li> <li>• A.5.4, CAEP outcome measures: licensure, completion placement, consumer information</li> </ul>				
---	--	--	--	--

## Overview

CAEP Accreditation Policy 1.02 includes a phase-in provision that allows educator preparation providers (EPPs) submitting SSRs some additional time to collect the appropriate evidence/data related to designated components of the CAEP Standards for Advanced-Level Programs. For advanced-level preparation, years during which plans alone may be submitted are for site visits scheduled through Spring 2021.) (The corresponding SSRs would usually be submitted nine months earlier than the site visit dates.) For the following two academic years (site visits scheduled in Fall 2021 or Spring 2022 and Fall 2022 or Spring 2023), new plans may not be submitted, but the progress steps, including any available data, are reported along with the plan. EPPs should sequence plans so there will be full data for SSRs and from on-site sources during site visits occurring in Fall 2023 and beyond.

While this policy is in effect, CAEP’s site teams and Accreditation Council 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.

## Guidelines for Educator Preparation Providers (EPPs)

These *Guidelines for Plans* describe: (1) EPP responsibilities when they prepare plans and use them as evidence in SSRs; (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 can be submitted as accreditation evidence for site visits as indicated in the chart, above, and 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;
- A description of the content and objective of the data/evidence collection is included.

### Timeline and Resources

The 2019 Handbook is published for Site Visits spring 2021 and beyond, Effective [MONTH], 2019

- 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; 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 the scoring rubrics, Appendix A, CAEP Framework for Evaluation of EPP-created Assessments;
- Description of procedures to ensure that surveys and assessments reach the sufficient level on the scoring rubrics, Appendix A, CAEP Framework;
- 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.

#### **Guidelines for Review by Site Visitors**

Site visitors review plans as if they were data. Their responsibility is to document the following:

#### Relationship to Standard or Component

- There is a specific connection with provisions of a CAEP Standard or a component;
- 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

- 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;
  - Available data have been interpreted and used for continuous improvement by the EPP in ways appropriate to the stage of implementation of the plan;
  - Implementation steps and any available data suggest that the evidence compiled under the plan will be valid and sufficient for the intended purpose; and
  - The plan can realistically be accomplished within the resources available to the EPP (regarding personnel, technology, access, or other resources).

#### Data Quality

- Survey and assessment instruments included in plans are reviewed under the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-created Assessments, Appendix A, and Site visitors judge whether those instruments are consistent with the “CAEP sufficient level” indicators. Here is an abbreviated list of examples of sufficient level performance:
  - “Instruments” may refer to any of several forms of assessment—content texts, prompts, tasks, observations, projects or assignments—and also refer to surveys.
  - The instruments address explicitly identified aspects of standards, reflect the degree of difficulty or effort described in the standards, and unambiguously describe the proficiencies

- to be evaluated;
- When standards address high level functioning, higher levels of intellectual behavior are assessed (e.g., create, evaluate, analyze, apply);
- Most indicators require observers to judge consequential attributes of candidate proficiencies in the standards;
- Survey topics are aligned with the EPP’s mission and with CAEP and other standards;
- Surveys use questions that are clear and unambiguous, and avoid leading questions;
- Survey items are stated in terms of behaviors or practices instead of opinions, whenever possible;
- Assessments and surveys are administered at specified points during the preparation experiences that are appropriate for the standard or component being informed and candidates are provided instructions about what they are expected to do that are informative and unambiguous; and
- The instruments are scored by evaluators trained in using the instrument.
- Any survey or assessment can reasonably be expected to achieve a representative response and have an appropriately high response rate;
- The plan specifies appropriate measures to ensure quality of the planned data; and
- Appropriate analyses will be conducted with the data/evidence and appropriate interpretations are likely to be made.

### **Guidelines for Accreditation Action**

The CAEP Accreditation Council review panels conduct an initial cumulative review and determine the degree to which each standard has been met 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 visit report, and recommendations from the panels, 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; and
- If deficiencies are found in the plans, instruments or implementation, there can be an area for improvement or a stipulation—depending on severity:
  - If the particular measure 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 a deficiency is severe, it may result in a standard not met.

# APPENDIX C

## CAEP Evidence Review Guidelines

### PURPOSE AND USE OF THESE GUIDELINES

Purpose--The standard-by-standard evidence review descriptions contained in this Appendix are *examples* intended to guide evaluation of accreditation evidence. The guidelines create a common framework or template for CAEP site visitors and the Accreditation Council with the intent to build shared understanding and consistency, through examples, about the *characteristics or sources* of sufficient accreditation evidence. The guidelines are for use in CAEP site visitor review of self-study reports, in panel reviews to frame recommendations for the Accreditation Council, and in Accreditation Council deliberations to decide on appropriate and consistent accreditation actions.

Use--Much of the evidence provided by EPPs will be from sources such as those described in these guidelines, but also, much of it will be different in ways that are unique to the EPP. Reviewers are asked to evaluate the evidence they have been presented through their *professional judgment* about whether:

- the cumulative evidence for a standard is most similar to the example descriptions for “sufficient” under each Standard, or whether, on balance,
- the cumulative evidence for that Standard is more similar to the “below sufficient” example descriptions.

- Or the evidence may primarily be judged as “sufficient” but some pieces might be flagged by site teams and Accreditation Council panels as falling short and appropriate to designate as an Area for Improvement or, when more severe, a stipulation.

There is no intention to imply that an EPP should provide a specific piece of evidence that matches each of the guidelines. It is the accumulation of evidence for the standard and the array of evidence around key concepts that form the basis for CAEP review.

Note that the evidence provided for CAEP accreditation is often itself numeric (e.g., assessment scores) but what is “good” or “sufficient” or “enough” needs to be interpreted. Interpretations and appropriate conclusions are matters of judgment. For that reason, the text of Appendix C guidelines is written to emphasize the need for professional judgments, so words such as “most” evidence are frequently used instead of percentiles or cut scores. For the same reason, the Handbook guidelines for EPPs call for multiple pieces of evidence and also for EPPs to offer comparisons, analyze evidence and interpret the meaning of their evidence. That will demonstrate the EPP’s thinking about and use of evidence and also assist site visitors’ understanding of the EPP’s case for each standard.

Index to the Evidence Review Guidelines	Page
<b>Section I: Quality Assurance and Cross-cutting Themes</b>	86
• Quality assurance and continuous improvement (CAEP Standards 5 and A.5)	86
<b>Section II: Candidates and Preparation</b>	91
• Initial Licensure Preparation	91

○ Standard 1, Content and Pedagogical Knowledge	91
○ Standard 2, Clinical Partnerships and Practice	99
○ Standard 3, Quality, Recruitment and Selectivity	105
● Advanced-Level Preparation	111
○ Standard A.1, Content and Pedagogical Knowledge	111
○ Standard A.2, Clinical Partnerships and Practice	115
○ Standard A.3, Candidate Quality and Selectivity	119
<b>Section III: Results of preparation</b>	127
● Initial Licensure Preparation	127
○ Standard 4, Program Impact	127
● Advanced-Level Preparation	131
○ Standard A.4, Satisfaction with Preparation	131

## SECTION I: QUALITY ASSURANCE

### QUALITY ASSURANCE AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT (CAEP STANDARDS 5 and A.5)

NOTE: This section on QAS and Continuous Improvement focuses on EPP-wide perspectives. Standards 5 and A.5 need to be addressed only once in the EPP's evidence, not separately for Initial and for Advanced.

**Standards 5 and A.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.*

NOTE for site visitors: Through your review of evidence that the EPP provides for Standards 1-4 and A.1-A.4, you will have your own direct experience in using the EPP's quality assurance system. You will learn about:

- the capabilities of the EPP's quality assurance system to access, assemble, and analyze data;
- characteristics of the EPP's assessments; and
- the quality of the EPP's data measures/indicators.

This standard-by-standard experience will complement that of your colleagues so that, together, you will have a strong basis to begin your evaluation of the EPP-wide and system focus of Standards 5 and A.5. Examples of questions to consider are: how well is the quality assurance system functioning? What can be concluded about the validity of evidence used by the EPP?

## Key Concepts (excerpt from Handbook guidelines)

Key concepts identify the main points that comprise the CAEP Standards. They interpret the combined language of standards with their accompanying components and provide guidance to shape evidence gathering and the EPP's writing of its case that a standard is met.

Standards 5 and A.5 occupy a pivotal position in the CAEP Standards. They describe the EPP's capacity to reach its 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 maintain an evidence-based quality assurance system (QAS) and data in a process of continuous improvement. These systems and data-informed continuous improvement practices are essential foundational requirements for CAEP Accreditation. The SSR and evidence reviewed on-site provide an opportunity for EPPs to describe how well their QAS is working (e.g., How well does it respond to questions about the effectiveness of preparation for both initial licensure and advanced-level candidates? How does the EPP use the QAS capacity to investigate innovations and inform continuous improvement?).

The two key concepts for Standard 5 follow:

- **Maintain a QAS capable of providing data output** that enables quality control and continuous improvement (*components 5.1, 5.2 and A.5.1, A.5.2*) and
- **Support continuous improvement** through EPP engagement with appropriate stakeholders, and EPP procedures that gather, input, analyze, interpret and use information from the QAS

effectively, including the CAEP annual reporting measures (*components 5.3, 5.4 and 5.5 and A.5.3, A.5.4 and A.5.5*).

Every provider has a set of procedures, processes, and structures, as well as reporting lines, committees, offices, positions, policies. These help to ensure quality in hiring, admissions, courses, program design, facilities, and the like. In an effective 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 also serve to provide evidence for accreditation purposes.

Appendix D, p. 135, Data Quality, defines principles of data that should characterize the multiple measures in the EPP's QAS. These include characteristics explicitly listed in Standards 5 and A.5, components 5.2 and A.5.2—"valid and consistent," "relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable," as well as "fairness" and "robustness."

Standards 5 and A.5 focus on the extent to which providers effectively ensure, and continually increase, quality. The standards adapt principles stated in the Baldrige Education Criteria<sup>15</sup> that successful education organizations follow (emphasizing measurement of operations and results), and that the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching<sup>16</sup> has described as "improvement research" in educational organizations. Those principles give particular weight to maintaining a QAS and using the output from that system for purposes of continuous improvement:

<sup>15</sup> Baldrige Performance Excellence Program. (2011). *2011-2012 Education criteria for performance excellence*. Gaithersburg, MD. National Institute of Standards and Technology, Author. The updated version is available here:

<https://www.nist.gov/baldrige/publications/baldrige-excellence-framework/education>.

<sup>16</sup> <https://www.carnegiefoundation.org/resources/publications/>

- The QAS has multiple capabilities and data. It stores information from multiple measures, makes calculations, has capacity to build relational data in response to faculty questions, and provides a means to monitor candidate progress, the achievements of completers, and the EPP’s operational effectiveness (*components 5.1 and A.5.1*). The “multiple measures” are relevant, actionable, comprehensive, purposeful, and coherent (*component 5.2 and A.5.2*).
- The EPP routinely investigates the quality and usefulness of existing measures, and uses information to make any needed adjustments that ensure its QAS is relying on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable data (*components 5.2 and A.5.2*). See Appendix D for additional information on data quality.
- Information from the QAS is the basis for a continuous improvement function. Leaders and faculty of the EPP use data regularly. They assess performance in relation to EPP goals and standards; follow results over time; conduct tests of changes made in courses, selection, or clinical experiences; study natural variation across their different preparation programs; and use the results to judge their progress and status, and improve program elements (*components 5.3 and A.5.3*).
- Finally, the EPP shares results with stakeholders, including results on the CAEP annual reporting measures (*components 5.4 and 5.5 and A.5.4 and A.5.5*) and involve them in evaluating the EPP’s effectiveness, generating improvements, and identifying models to emulate (*component 5.3 and A.5.3*).

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
<p>Components 5.1 and A.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.  <i>[Relates to key concept on maintaining a quality assurance system]</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No evidence of a useable QAS that compiles, maintains, provides access and analyses of data</li> <li>• Evidence shows a serious deficiency (e.g., in comprehensiveness or capacity for analyses) that the QAS purposes can’t be served</li> <li>• There is no evidence that the QAS provides capacity to disaggregate data by important categories, such as race and ethnicity or program, to monitor candidate progress</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The provider demonstrates that the Quality Assurance System provides data from a coherent set of multiple measures to inform, modify, evaluate and monitor the EPP’s operational effectiveness (e.g., setting program priorities and candidate progress tracking).</li> <li>• The provider submits evidence that it regularly reviews system operations and data.</li> <li>• The provider demonstrates the Quality Assurance System has the capacity to collect, analyze, monitor, and report data/evidence on all CAEP Standards.</li> <li>• The provider’s Quality Assurance System supports the disaggregation of data by licensure area and other dimensions (e.g., over time, by race/ethnicity, gender, etc.).</li> </ul>



Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site teams are able to verify, through interviews with stakeholder groups or other means such as replications (where feasible), claims about the QAS capacity as represented in the EPP’s evidence</li> </ul>

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
<p>Components 5.2 and A.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. <i>[Relates to key concept on maintaining a quality assurance system]</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EPP provides such limited evidence of data quality that reviewers cannot conclude data are valid or reliable, and are not useable to make accreditation decisions for one or more standards</li> <li>• Most EPP-created assessments are not judged by reviewers to meet the sufficient level criteria in the CAEP Framework</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Measures used for each standard yield evidence that meets CAEP’s expectations for evidence quality (i.e., relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable). For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The EPP details steps it has taken to ensure validity of the data and specifies types of validity (e.g., construct, content, predictive) that are under investigation or have been established</li> <li>○ The EPP provides a description of the type of reliability it has investigated or established (e.g., test-retest, parallel forms, inter-rater, internal consistency) and the steps it took to ensure the reliability of the data;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• EPP created assessments meet CAEP sufficiency levels (Evaluation Framework for EPP Created Assessments in Appendix A).</li> <li>• Data follow CAEP principles of good evidence (Appendix D)</li> </ul>
<p>Components 5.3 and A.5.3--The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EPP does not show connection of evidence with changes in courses or experiences</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most changes and program modifications are based on evidence/data with specific examples provided .</li> </ul>

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
<p>time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes.</p> <p><i>[Relates to key concept on supporting continuous improvement]</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EPP shows no documentation that it uses continuous improvement procedures purposefully to consider whether changes in courses or experiences are needed</li> <li>• Evidence available to the EPP is not appropriate to monitor effectiveness or relevant for course and experience decisions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Written documentation confirms that the EPP regularly and systematically: reviews, analyzes and interprets QAS data, identifies patterns across programs, uses data for continuous improvement, and tests innovations</li> <li>• Program decisions are directly supported by data and/or contradictory data are explained</li> </ul>
<p>Component 5.4--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.</p> <p>Component A.5.4--Measures of advanced program completer outcomes are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision-making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction. Outcomes include completion rate, licensure rate, employment rate in field of specialty preparation, and consumer information such as places of employment and salaries.</p> <p><i>[Relates to key concept on supporting continuous improvement]</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no evidence that the EPP's annual report information is used as part of its continuous improvement procedures</li> <li>• There is no evidence that the EPP conducts analysis of outcomes and impact data or of trends</li> <li>• There is no evidence that the outcome and impact data are examined in relation to other aspects of the EPPs examination of continuous improvement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EPP analyzes and interprets its effectiveness and trends drawing from information on the outcome and impact measures for Initial and Advanced preparation that is updated each year for the EPP annual report, together with any additional candidate and completer data on outcome and impact measures that the EPP determines are relevant.</li> <li>• The Self-study Report provides direct access to the published materials and evidence of accurate trend analysis and comparisons with benchmarks</li> <li>• Program changes and modifications are directly linked to evidence/data with specific examples</li> </ul>
<p>Component 5.5. The provider assures that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider, are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no documentation of stakeholder engagement beyond "showing"</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EPP identifies examples of input from stakeholders and uses that input</li> <li>• Specific evidence of diverse stakeholder involvement is documented through multiple sources.</li> </ul>

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
[Relates to key concept on supporting continuous improvement]		

## SECTION II: CANDIDATES AND PREPARATION

### INITIAL LICENSURE PREPARATION: CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE, 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.*

#### Key Concepts (excerpt from Handbook guidelines)

Key concepts identify the main points that comprise the CAEP Standards. They interpret the combined language of standards with their accompanying components and provide guidance to shape evidence gathering and the EPP's writing of its case that a standard is met.

Standard 1 is constructed around candidates' proficiencies 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 an EPP to document the competence of its candidates in terms of knowing the subject content of their specialty field, and using their professional preparation effectively. Multiple measures should be used to demonstrate candidate attainments by completion as well as success at gateway points and/or growth through their preparation.

The language of Standard 1 and its associated components highlight six areas in which EPPs need to demonstrate candidate proficiencies in their

specialized licensure area. Four of these are 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 best serve to organize evidence for the standard are listed below.

#### InTASC categories

- **The learner and learning**—(including learning differences, the context of diverse cultures, and creating effective learning environments) (*part of component 1.1*);
- **Content knowledge**—including deep content knowledge, critical thinking, and collaborative problem solving; and pedagogical 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 applications of content and pedagogical knowledge, 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 on

which the CAEP Standards place specific emphasis for the EPP’s 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, in the InTASC references of component 1.1 for the learner and learning, and for instructional practice categories; in component 1.2 on use of research for learning, and in component 1.4, teaching at college- and career-readiness levels*).

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
<p>Component 1.1--Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the 10 InTASC Standards at the appropriate progression level(s) in the following categories: <b>the learner and learning</b>; content; instructional practice; and professional responsibility.</p> <p><i>[Relates to key concept on LEARNERS AND LEARNING, the first of four InTASC categories listed in component 1.1]</i></p>	<p>LEARNER AND LEARNING—There are significant insufficiencies in evidence that candidates understand P-12 student growth and development and individual differences across cognitive, linguistic, social, emotion, and physical areas as well as individual differences and diverse cultures and communities.</p> <p>For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no specific evidence on candidate proficiency on the learner and learning</li> <li>• There is no evidence that the EPP has disaggregated information to describe candidate understanding by race and ethnicity or by program</li> </ul>	<p>LEARNER AND LEARNING--Evidence documents 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.</p> <p>Note: This is the first of three component references to the diversity theme. Disaggregated evidence indicates that candidates understand student growth and development across racial/ethnic demographic populations.</p> <p>Sources of evidence could include course assignments or tasks, or end-of- course assessments.</p> <p>Disaggregated data by preparation program and race/ethnicity show no or few disparities OR disparities are identified and explained, including steps to remedy them.</p>

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
<p>Component 1.1--Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the 10 InTASC Standards at the appropriate progression level(s) in the following categories: the learner and learning; <b>content</b>; instructional practice; and professional responsibility.</p> <p><i>[Relates to key concept on CONTENT KNOWLEDGE, the second of four InTASC categories listed in component 1.1]</i></p>	<p>CONTENT KNOWLEDGE—There are significant insufficiencies in evidence that demonstrate candidates develop deep understanding of critical concepts and principles in their discipline and pedagogical knowledge in their content field.</p> <p>For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no EPP information on candidate mastery of content knowledge beyond what is in licensure tests</li> <li>• There is no evidence that the EPP has disaggregated information to describe candidate understanding by race and ethnicity or by program</li> <li>• There are no meaningful comparisons to help interpret the depth of candidates proficiency in content knowledge</li> </ul>	<p>CONTENT KNOWLEDGE-- Evidence demonstrates that candidates have developed deep understanding of critical concepts and principles in their discipline and pedagogical knowledge in their content field.</p> <p>Sources of evidence could include the EPP’s own measures, proprietary measures if available, and state licensure measures.</p> <p>Disaggregated data by preparation program show no or few disparities.</p> <p>On the EPP’s own measures, candidate performances meet or exceed the sufficient level in the CAEP Framework for Evaluation of EPP-created Assessments.</p> <p>The EPP develops meaningful comparisons to help interpret the depth of candidate proficiency in content knowledge. Examples might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Content knowledge comparisons between candidates and their institutional peers in the same courses.</li> <li>• Candidate content knowledge on proprietary and state measures compared with national norms, where possible, or with state norms, or with state established passing scores.</li> <li>• Class averages at or above acceptable levels on the EPP scoring scale for instruments that measure outcomes for content knowledge.</li> </ul>
<p>Component 1.1--Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the 10 InTASC Standards at the</p>	<p>INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICE—There are significant insufficiencies in evidence demonstrating</p>	<p>INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICE-- Evidence demonstrates that candidates have developed</p>

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
<p>appropriate progression level(s) in the following categories: the learner and learning; content; <b>instructional practice</b>; and professional responsibility.</p> <p><i>[Relates to key concept on INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICE, the third of four InTASC categories listed in component 1.1]</i></p>	<p>candidate proficiencies to apply their content and pedagogical knowledge effectively in instruction.</p> <p>For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no specific clinical practice evidence or no evidence on candidate engagement or outcomes with diverse P-12 students</li> <li>• There is no evidence that the EPP has disaggregated information to describe candidate understanding by race and ethnicity or by program</li> </ul>	<p>proficiencies to apply their content and pedagogical knowledge effectively in instruction and other interactions with diverse P-12 students. Sources of evidence could include summaries from such sources as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assignments or tasks from courses</li> <li>• Assignments or tasks from initial clinical experiences</li> <li>• Practice teaching (e.g., edTPA, PPAT, teacher work sample tasks)</li> <li>• Content licensure exams</li> <li>• Pedagogical knowledge tests</li> <li>• Observational measures</li> </ul> <p>Note: This is the second of three Standard 1 references to the diversity theme. Disaggregated evidence indicates that candidates apply content and pedagogical knowledge effectively across racial/ethnic demographic populations.</p> <p>The EPP regularly examines patterns in performance with disaggregated data by program or field, and by race and ethnicity, to identify differences that need possible consideration for preparation modifications.</p>
<p>Component 1.1--Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the 10 InTASC Standards at the appropriate progression level(s) in the following categories: the learner and learning; content; instructional practice; and <b>professional responsibility</b>.</p>	<p>PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY—There is an insufficient demonstration 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.</p> <p>For example:</p>	<p>PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY-- The EPP 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.</p>

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
<p><i>[Relates to key concept of PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY, the fourth of four InTASC categories listed in component 1.1]</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EPP fails to provide evidence that candidates understand state-requirements relevant to ethics and pertinent laws</li> <li>• The EPP provides no disaggregation of data by race and ethnicity or by preparation program, or the data show significant, but unexplained, disparities</li> </ul>	<p>Sources of evidence might include course assignments or tasks, or relevant sections of state licensure requirements, or required state ethics training. Candidate performance meets state requirements.</p> <p>Disaggregated data by preparation program show no or few disparities, OR disparities are identified and explained, including steps to remedy them.</p>
<p>Component 1.2--Providers ensure that candidates use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession and use both to measure their P-12 students' progress and their professional practice. <i>[Relates to key concept on Instructional practice]</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of candidate knowledge is provided, but there is no evidence that candidates use research or data to enhance teaching effectiveness with individual P-12 students</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence indicates that candidates use research and evidence for planning, implementing, and evaluating P-12 students' progress.</li> <li>• Evidence indicates that candidates use data to reflect on teaching effectiveness and their own professional practice.</li> <li>• Evidence indicates that candidates use data to assess diverse P-12 student progress and to modify instruction based on student data (data literacy).</li> <li>• Evidence shows candidate performance at or above acceptable level on rubric indicators.</li> <li>• Evidence indicates valid interpretations of data that are supported by results.</li> </ul> <p>Note: This is part of the second of three Standard 1 references to the diversity theme. Disaggregated evidence indicates that candidates use research and data effectively across racial/ethnic demographic populations as part of instructional practice</p>
<p>Component 1.3--Providers ensure that candidates apply content and pedagogical</p>	<p>The EPP evidence, as gathered from selected program level review, does not show that—</p>	<p>The EPP evidence, gathered from a selected program level review, indicates that a majority of</p>

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
<p>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]).</p> <p><i>[Relates to the four InTASC concepts with specific alignment to specialty area standards]</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A majority of candidates enrolled in P-12 licensure/certification programs demonstrate their abilities to apply content and pedagogical knowledge at specialty licensure areas levels.</li> <li>• The EPP demonstrates use of program review data to make programmatic decisions for improving instruction and candidate outcomes The EPP evidence does not show that candidates apply content and pedagogical knowledge at specialty licensure areas levels.</li> </ul>	<p>candidates enrolled in P-12 licensure/certification programs are able to demonstrate their abilities to apply content and pedagogical knowledge at specialty licensure area levels in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EPP provides evidence documenting that P-12 licensure/ certification programs enrolling a majority of candidates demonstrate high level of proficiency, as might be represented by completion of SPA National Recognition or state approval of meeting state standards.</li> <li>• For programs with a status other than full SPA National Recognition from a three year out review (e.g., National Recognition with Conditions, National Recognition with Probation, or Further Development Required, Not Nationally Recognized) or complete state program approval, the EPP has evidence of using SPA or state feedback to address remaining conditions or gaps to meet the standards.</li> <li>• For programs opting the CAEP Evidence Review of Standard 1 using outcome assessments aligned to specialty area standards, the EPP demonstrates use of the trend data to make programmatic decisions for improving instruction and candidate outcomes.</li> </ul>
<p>Component 1.4--Providers ensure that candidates demonstrate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college- and career-ready standards (e.g., Next Generation Science Standards, National Career Readiness Certificate, Common Core State Standards).</p>	<p>The EPP shows no evidence that proficiencies associated with design and implementation of college and career ready teaching.</p> <p>For example:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence indicates that candidates develop proficiencies associated with design and implementation of college and career ready teaching, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ providing effective instruction for diverse P-12 students (differentiation of</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
<p><i>[Same as concept on college and career readiness]</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no specific evidence related to college and career teaching proficiencies</li> <li>• There are not measures for concepts that make up college and career teaching proficiencies, such a deep content knowledge, use of data literacy to advance P-12 student learning at college and career levels, or use of problem solving and critical thinking skills for P-12 student learning</li> <li>• Disaggregated data have not been made available to show proficiencies of candidates' with diverse P-12 students on college-and career-level teaching, OR disaggregated data by race/ethnicity show unexplained disparities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ instruction)</li> <li>○ using data and assessment literacy effectively to identify diverse PK-12 students needs and to monitor their progress</li> <li>○ fostering deep content knowledge</li> <li>○ engaging students in activities that apply knowledge to solve problems and think critically</li> <li>○ using cross-discipline learning experiences and teaching for transfer of skills.</li> <li>○ designing and implementing learning experiences that require collaboration and communication skills.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence indicates that multiple measures specific to evaluating proficiencies for college-and career- readiness are scored at or above the EPP scoring guide indicators at the minimal level of sufficiency (acceptable level)</li> <li>• Disaggregated data by preparation program and race/ethnicity show no or few disparities.</li> </ul> <p>Note: This is the third of three Standard 1 references to the diversity theme. Disaggregated evidence indicates that candidates apply college-and career-ready level teaching effectively across racial/ethnic demographic populations.</p>
<p>Component 1.5--Providers ensure that candidates model and apply technology standards as they design, implement, and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning, and enrich professional practice.</p>	<p>The EPP has not provided specific evidence about candidate applications of technology</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence indicates that candidates are proficient in applications of technology for enhancement of P-12 learning. Examples might include:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ candidates model and apply technology</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
<i>[Relates to InTASC concept on instructional practice]</i>		<p>standards in coursework and clinical experiences</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ candidates demonstrate knowledge and skill proficiencies including accessing databases, digital media, and/or electronic sources.</li> <li>○ candidates demonstrate ability to track and share student performance data digitally.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● candidate performance is at or above acceptable level on rubric indicators.</li> </ul>
Data quality for Standard 1 <i>[Relates to Standard 1 and to component 5.2]</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Many EPP-created instruments fail to meet CAEP’s sufficient level on the Framework for Evaluation of EPP-created assessments.</li> <li>● The number of measures of candidate proficiencies is so limited that the case that candidates are proficient in the four InTASC categories under Standard 1 is not effectively made.</li> <li>● Measures are limited to opinions (e.g., grades or observations lacking descriptive rubrics) rather than direct measures of candidate proficiencies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Most EPP-created instruments meet CAEP’s sufficient level on the Framework for Evaluation of EPP-created assessments.</li> <li>● Multiple indicators/measures are used to document candidate proficiencies across the knowledge and skills described in Standard 1.</li> <li>● The EPP provides data from direct measures of the concepts that underlie Standard 1 (e.g., from such sources as edTPA, PPAT, or teacher work samples; performance on subject knowledge assessments).</li> </ul>
Continuous improvement for Standard 1 <i>[Relates to Standard 1 and to component 5.3]</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The EPP disaggregates results by specialty area, but shows little or no additional effort to identify differences or patterns for further analysis.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The EPP disaggregates results by specialty licensure area and race/ethnicity so that differences and patterns in the results can be identified. Disparities are identified and explained, including steps to remedy them.</li> </ul>

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is limited or no additional analysis. There are limited or no attempts to place candidate performance into context through comparisons, trends, or benchmarks.</li> <li>• The EPP’s interpretation of results is limited, and there is limited or no evidence of the EPP using the results as part of its internal evaluation of effectiveness.</li> <li>• Claims for trends may not be supported by at least three cycles of data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EPP’s analyses are informed by data, address issues relevant to the progress and achievement of candidates in Standard 1 concepts, and make effective use of disaggregated data by examining underlying patterns, program by program, of candidate progress and attainment.</li> <li>• Sound data analysis practices are followed. The EPP provides contextual meaning for the analyses through comparisons, trends, or benchmarks with similar EPPs or state or national data. Results are considered by the EPP in evaluation of its own preparation program effectiveness.</li> <li>• The EPP’s interpretation of 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 program areas are not described as reasonable).</li> <li>• Claims for trends are supported by at least three cycles of data.</li> </ul>

## INITIAL LICENSURE PREPARATION: 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.*

### Key Concepts (excerpt from Handbook guidelines)

Key concepts identify the main points that comprise the CAEP Standards. They interpret the combined language of standards with their accompanying components and provide guidance to shape evidence gathering and the EPP’s writing of its case that a standard is met.

High-quality clinical practice is a unique and critical feature for educator preparation. Standard 2 encourages EPPs to

- **Establish partnerships with close collaborators** from schools and school districts, as well as other appropriate organizations (*components 2.1 and 2.2*).
  
- **Examine the sufficiency** (e.g., in depth, breadth, coherence, and duration) **of opportunities that the EPP provides for candidates to practice the application of course knowledge under diverse clinical conditions** with P-12 students who have differing needs (*component 2.3*).

The language of Standard 2 and component 2.1 uses new terms: co-construct and co-select, and—by implication—co-prepare, co-evaluate, co-support and co-retain. These terms are meant to describe the close working relationship between EPPs and their colleagues in schools and school districts. They review evidence together, they determine practices and procedures together, and they reach decisions together. Both partners are active participants, engaged in the conduct of successful candidate clinical experiences. These partnerships and clinical experiences keep a clear focus on candidate opportunities, and on interactions with P-12 students that have positive effects on 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. (See CAEP’s glossary definitions for school-based educator and university-based educator. These educators include all individuals who assess, support, and develop candidates’ knowledge, skills, and/or professional dispositions at some stage in the clinical experiences. They may be EPP-based, P-12 school-based, central office personnel, community-based, or in any other setting where candidates practice practical application.)

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
Component 2.1--Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements, including technology-based collaboration, for clinical preparation and share responsibility for continuous improvement of candidate preparation. Partnerships for clinical preparation can follow a range of forms, participants, and functions. They establish mutually agreeable expectations for candidate entry, preparation, and exit; ensure that theory	The EPP presents insufficient evidence of its collaboration with P-12 partners.  For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a lack of evidence of collaboration in decisions about candidate experiences, candidate evaluation, or structure of operations of partnerships</li> <li>• There is no explicit demonstration that diversity is addressed in Standard 2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The provider presents evidence that a collaborative process is in place with P-12 partners that is reviewed periodically and involves activities such as:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Collaborative development, review, or revision of instruments and evaluations</li> <li>○ Collaborative development, review, or revision of the structure and content of the clinical activities</li> <li>○ Mutual involvement in ongoing decision-</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
<p>and practice are linked; maintain coherence across clinical and academic components of preparation; and share accountability for candidate outcomes. <i>[Part of concept on establishing partnerships]</i></p>		<p>making about partnership structure and operations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Agreed upon provisions to ensure diversity of clinical settings (e.g., two or more).</li> <li>○ Creation of opportunities for candidates to work with diverse P-12 students who have differing needs.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EPP provides evidence that the P-12 schools and EPPs have both benefited from the partnership.</li> </ul>
<p>Component 2.2--Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators, both provider- and school-based, who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates' development and P-12 student learning and development. In collaboration with their partners, providers use multiple indicators and appropriate technology-based applications to establish, maintain, and refine criteria for selection, professional development, performance evaluation, continuous improvement, and retention of clinical educators in all clinical placement settings. <i>[Part of concept on establishing partnerships]</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no explicit evidence of clinical educator evaluation in the partnership</li> <li>• There is no evidence that clinical educators are trained so that EPP and school/district goals for the partnership are aligned</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence demonstrates that the EPP and P-12 partners co-construct criteria for selection, training, retention, evaluation, and responsibilities of clinical educators.</li> <li>• Evidence documents that the EPP and its P-12 partners participate in the design and delivery of training for clinical educators and that relevant training materials are available online. Examples of training might include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Understanding the roles and responsibilities of clinical educators and of the clinical curriculum</li> <li>○ Use of evaluation instruments, evaluating professional disposition of candidates,</li> <li>○ Setting specific goals/objectives of the clinical experience, and</li> <li>○ Providing feedback</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 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</li> </ul>

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
<p>Component 2.3--The provider works with partners to design clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration to ensure that candidates demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students' learning and development. Clinical experiences, including technology-enhanced learning opportunities, are structured to have multiple performance-based assessments at key points within the program to demonstrate candidates' development of the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, as delineated in Standard 1, that are associated with a positive impact on the learning and development of all P-12 students.</p> <p><i>[Relates to concept on sufficiency of clinical experiences]</i></p>	<p>There is insufficient evidence that candidates have active clinical experiences in diverse settings and experiences with diverse P-12 students.</p> <p>For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no evidence that the EPP has specifically examined the association of attributes of clinical experiences (i.e., depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration) with candidate outcomes</li> <li>• There is no specific evidence of candidate opportunities to work with diverse P-12 students</li> </ul>	<p>field).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence documents that all candidates have active clinical experiences in diverse settings and experiences with diverse P-12 students. Note: The Standard 2 reference to the diversity theme anticipates evidence for placements in diverse clinical settings and also placements involving candidate experiences with diverse P-12 students. For site visits in the Spring and Fall of 2021, one or two cycles of data will be sufficient, rather than the three cycles usually needed to indicate a trend.</li> <li>• Evidence is provided that clinical experiences are assessed using performance-based criteria.</li> <li>• Evidence documents a sequence of clinical experiences with specific goals that are focused, purposeful, and varied.</li> <li>• Attributes (depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration) are linked to student outcomes and candidate performance.</li> <li>• Evidence shows that candidates have purposefully assessed impact on student learning using both formative and summative assessments in more than one clinical setting (which may be in the same or different schools) and have: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ used comparison points or other means to interpret findings</li> <li>○ used the impact data to guide instructional decision-making</li> <li>○ modified instruction based on impact data, and have differentiated instruction</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
<p>Data quality in Standard 2 <i>[Relates to Standard 2 and to component 5.2]</i></p>	<p>Evidence on partnerships primarily documents formal agreements, rather than actions. Few, if any, specific joint actions are described.</p> <p>The EPP provides limited or no evidence that clinical faculty are evaluated, or that candidates' progress and accomplishments are monitored.</p> <p>There are no formal EPP-created instruments for Standard 2, or the ones that have been created (including evaluations of clinical faculty, as well as faculty, stakeholder or candidate surveys) fail to meet CAEP's sufficient level on the Framework for evaluation of EPP-created assessments.</p> <p>The EPP provides limited or no evidence indicating examination of attributes of clinical experience listed in Standard 2 (i.e., depth, breadth, coherence, and duration).</p>	<p>Evidence on partnerships documents not just "agreements" but "actions"—e.g., decisions made jointly about candidate experiences, co-sponsorship of training and evaluation of clinical faculty, nature of feedback given to candidates, the progression of experiences, and candidate evaluation at exit. Several examples are provided (e.g., 3 or 4)</p> <p>Most EPP-created instruments for Standard 2 (including evaluations of clinical faculty, as well as faculty, stakeholder or candidate surveys), meet CAEP's sufficient level on the Framework for Evaluation of EPP-created Assessments.</p> <p>The EPP provides data from direct measures of attributes of clinical experience listed in Standard 2 (i.e., depth, breadth, coherence, and duration).</p>
<p>Continuous improvement in Standard 2 <i>[Relates to Standard 2 and to component 5.3]</i></p>	<p>The EPP provides limited or no documentation that the EPP and its partners periodically examine the status and progress of their collaboration to determine whether some aspects of the agreement, and the clinical experiences it addresses, need modifications.</p> <p>The EPP provides no evidence of specific actions taken based on EPP and partner review of the status and progress of their agreement.</p> <p>There is little or no evidence of any systematic examination of one or more aspects of clinical</p>	<p>The EPP provides documentation that the EPP and its partners periodically examine the status and progress of their collaboration to determine whether some aspects of the agreement, and the clinical experiences it addresses, need modifications.</p> <p>Evidence is provided of specific actions taken based on EPP and partner review of the status and progress of their agreement.</p> <p>Data gathered on one or more aspects of clinical experiences (depth, breadth, diversity, coherence</p>

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
	experiences (depth, breadth, diversity, coherence and/or duration) in relation to candidate performance at completion.	and/or duration) are correlated with candidate performance at completion. Analyses are conducted with disaggregated data to determine whether there are patterns in the data across individual preparation programs, across diverse groups of candidates, or across different sites, that need closer review and perhaps may require program modifications.

### INITIAL LICENSURE PREPARATION: CANDIDATE QUALITY, RECRUITMENT, AND SELECTIVITY, 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 processes ultimately determined by a program’s meeting of Standard 4.*

#### Key Concepts (excerpt from Handbook guidelines)

Key concepts identify the main points that comprise the CAEP Standards. They interpret the combined language of standards with their accompanying components and provide guidance to shape evidence gathering and the EPP’s writing of its case that a standard is met.

Standard 3 addresses the need for the EPP to recruit and intentionally develop strong applicants, pools of 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.<sup>17</sup> The standard and its recruitment/support provision (*component 3.1*) also signal shared

<sup>17</sup> 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 at <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

<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 at <https://www.nap.edu/catalog/12882/preparing-teachers-building-evidence-for-sound-policy>.



responsibility that an educator workforce should more broadly represent the wide and growing diversity found in America’s student population. While EPPs should build strength in their candidates to ensure that each is prepared to positively impact P-12 learning prior to recommendation for licensure or certification (*component 3.5*), they 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 as follows:

- **Recruitment of an increasingly diverse and strong pool of candidates and responding to and serving employer needs** (*component 3.1*)

**Academic achievement** (*component 3.2*) as described in component 3.2 and here: <http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/standards/standard-3-component-32-measures-of-acad.pdf?la=en>.

- **Monitoring candidate progress, including performance on non-academic factors, and providing support for candidates at risk of falling behind** (*component 3.3 on non-academic measures; components 3.1 on support and 3.4 on monitoring progress that identifies candidates in need*).
- **High EPP exit requirements including (1) content and practice expectations** (*component 3.5*), and **(2) understanding expectations of the profession** (*component 3.6*). (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. If there is additional evidence, relevant to Standard 3 and not Standard 1, then it would appear in the Self-study Report in the EPP’s case for Standard 3.)

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
<p>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. <i>[Relates to concept on recruitment]</i></p>	<p>Examples could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no recruitment plan or one so limited in scope or strategies that it is of little practical use</li> <li>• The EPP provides no baseline data and/or no periodic monitoring data</li> <li>• There is no or only superficial information about places of employment that are open to candidates and use of information about positions available at those locations</li> <li>• There is no specific evidence that the recruitment and monitoring data are used in planning future recruitment</li> <li>• The EPP does not include explicit documentation of its support for candidates who need it</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a written plan for the EPP to continuously improve the admitted candidate pool, based on mission, with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Baseline points and goals</li> <li>○ Annual monitoring of characteristics related to academic ability, diversity, and employment needs</li> <li>○ Moves the EPP’s candidate pool toward the collective diversity found across America’s diverse P-12 classrooms</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Evidence demonstrates that the EPP records results under its recruitment plan, monitors progress, and uses data in planning and modification of recruitment strategies. The plan includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Has clearly identified goals that are evidence-informed, meaningful, and feasible given the context of the EPP</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Identifies specific strategies to meet the goals set forth in the plan</li> <li>○ Includes knowledge of and addresses employment opportunities and needs in schools, districts, and/or regions the institutions serve.</li> </ul> <p>Demonstrates appropriate progress from the base point toward the goals</p> <p>For candidate support: The EPP provides a descriptive summary indicating advising or remediation actions conducted, types of services or support provided, or interventions made by the EPP on behalf of initial candidates—particularly those who were struggling at progress checkpoints. Examples might include supplementary services for individual candidates or through modifications in preparation experiences for all candidates.</p>
<p>Component 3.2--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.</p> <p>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 50<sup>th</sup> percentile standard for writing will be implemented in 2021. As an</p>	<p>Examples could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence that is not relevant to the CAEP criteria (does not follow group performance level specified here: <a href="http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/standards/caep-standard-3-componen20180410t154547.pdf?la=en">http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/standards/caep-standard-3-componen20180410t154547.pdf?la=en</a>)</li> <li>● Evidence indicates progress toward the CAEP criteria, but most recent results still fall short of the criteria</li> <li>● EPP’s use of the CAEP writing option does not follow CAEP guidelines or samples of actual candidate writing fall far short of acceptable levels on standard writing evaluation rubrics</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The EPP states its decision about when it measures the CAEP minimum criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Average score of each admitted cohort meets CAEP minimum GPA of 3.0</li> <li>○ Performance on a nationally normed test of academic achievement in the top 50% in mathematics, reading, and writing</li> <li>○ OR Similar average cohort performance using a state normed test, corresponding with a national normed test of academic achievement in the top 50%.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● The EPP presents results separately for mathematics, reading, and (beginning in 2021) writing (also see rubric for EPPs that</li> </ul>

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
<p>alternative to cohort average performance on a nationally- or state-normed writing assessment, the EPP may present evidence of candidates' performance levels on writing tasks similar to those required of practicing educators.<sup>18</sup></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>		<p>elect to provide evidence under the writing option, below).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All evidence provided is disaggregated by admission year and by licensure area.</li> <li>• The EPP can use a variety of normed tests to demonstrate that candidates' average at or above the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile. See CAEP list of score values for approved tests: <a href="http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/standards/caep-standard-3-component-32-measures-of.pdf?la=en">http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/standards/caep-standard-3-component-32-measures-of.pdf?la=en</a>.</li> <li>• Disaggregated data on academic achievement metrics meet the CAEP minimum for GPA (<math>\geq 3.0</math> average) and test performance on an approved test at the group performance level specified (<a href="http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/standards/caep-standard-3-component20180410t154547.pdf?la=en">http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/standards/caep-standard-3-component20180410t154547.pdf?la=en</a>)</li> <li>• If EPPs elect to use the optional measure to meet the writing criterion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The EPP describes its writing proficiency tasks and its scoring procedures to demonstrate that proficiency is consistent with average national writing performance for the SAT (2.65 on a scale of 1-4) or ACT (3.3 on a scale of 1-6).</li> <li>○ The EPP provides its average scores by</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<sup>18</sup> The final sentence of this paragraph is the effect of CAEP Board action, December 2018, on an additional form of evidence for writing proficiency.

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
<p>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.</p> <p><i>[Same as concept on academic achievement]</i></p>		<p>race and ethnicity, campus site (if more than one) and mode of delivery (if more than one)</p> <p>See details in Appendix F of this Handbook, Optional Evidence for Writing Proficiency</p>
<p>Component 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.</p> <p><i>[Relates to concept on monitoring candidate progress, non-academic factors and providing support for candidates at risk of falling behind]</i></p>	<p>Evidence that EPP establishes, monitors, and reviews non-academic criteria is insufficient.</p> <p>Examples could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of evidence for creation and/or use of non-academic measures</li> <li>• No evidence that non-academic measures are studied to determine their consequences and whether changes are needed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence is provided that the EPP has established non-academic criteria and monitors candidate progress on established non-academic criteria at the identified monitoring points and takes appropriate action based on the results.</li> <li>• The EPP has established at least two points after admission to monitor candidate performance and the criteria used to determine satisfactory progress at each monitoring point.</li> <li>• Evidence is provided that the monitoring points and criteria for progression are shared with candidates.</li> </ul>
<p>Component 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.</p>	<p>Evidence that the EPP monitors candidate performance is insufficient.</p> <p>For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a lack of evidence of systematic monitoring of candidate progress</li> <li>• There are no described links between monitoring and identification of candidates who need support because their performance is falling short</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence is provided that the EPP monitors candidate performance (e.g., at two or more points after admission).</li> <li>• Evidence is provided that the EPP has explicit criteria for determining satisfactory progress at each monitoring point and that criteria is shared with candidates.</li> <li>• Evidence is provided that the results and stated candidate progressions criteria align with evidence of actions taken.</li> </ul>

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
<p><i>[Relates to concept on monitoring candidate progress, non-academic factors and providing support for candidates at risk of falling behind.]</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no evidence that the EPP is taking needed actions when there are problems with the progress of individual candidates</li> </ul>	
<p>Component 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.</p> <p><i>[Relates to concept on high EPP exit requirements]</i></p>	<p><i>[NOTE: Any or all EPP evidence relevant to component 3.5 that is used by the EPP as part of the documentation for Standard 1, component 1.1, can simply be cross-referenced in the EPP's case for Standard 3. The EPP need not repeat the documentation for Standard 3.]</i></p>	<p>Evidence documents effective teaching, including positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development for all candidates as noted in Standard 1.</p> <p><i>[NOTE: Any or all EPP evidence relevant to component 3.5 that is used by the EPP as part of the documentation for Standard 1, component 1.1, can simply be cross-referenced in the EPP's case for Standard 3. The EPP need not repeat the documentation for Standard 3.]</i></p>
<p>Component 3.6--Before the provider recommends any completing candidate for licensure or certification, it documents that the candidate understands the expectations of the profession, including codes of ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant laws and policies. CAEP monitors the development of measures that assess candidates' success and revises standards in light of new results.</p> <p><i>[Relates to concept on high EPP exit requirements]</i></p>	<p><i>[NOTE: Any or all EPP evidence relevant to component 3.6 that is used by the EPP as part of the documentation for Standard 1, component 1.1, can simply be cross-referenced in the EPP's case for Standard 3. The EPP need not repeat the documentation for Standard 3.]</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence documents candidates' understanding of codes of ethics and professional standards of practice.</li> <li>Evidence documents candidates' knowledge of relevant laws and policies (e.g., 504 disability provisions, education regulations, bullying)</li> <li>Evidence documents that each candidate the program recommended for a teaching credential passed all of the progress checkpoints, or remediated all deficiencies by the final checkpoint, and met the EPP's standards for exit.</li> </ul> <p><i>[NOTE: Any or all EPP evidence relevant to component 3.6 that is used by the EPP as part of the documentation for Standard 1, component 1.1, can simply be tagged and cross-referenced in the EPP's case for Standard 3. The EPP need not repeat</i></p>

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
		<i>its documentation for Standard 3.]</i>
<p>Data quality in Standard 3 <i>[Relates to Standard 2 and to component 5.2]</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Few or no EPP-created assessments for Standard 3 are evaluated at the CAEP sufficient level on the Assessment Evaluation Framework.</li> <li>• Evidence for the academic achievement criteria do not meet the requirements specified in the CAEP list of approved academic measures for reading, mathematics, and (in 2021) writing.</li> <li>• The EPP states that it is using the writing option, but provides a limited description of the tasks and results, or shows no systematic evaluation of candidate writing through descriptive rubrics (such as those used for SAT or ACT writing) so site teams are unable to find that the evidence is sufficient.</li> <li>• The recruitment “plan” shows no evidence of being informed with data about specific (subject field or hard-to-place school) opportunities for employment that are likely to be available for EPP completers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most EPP-created assessments for Standard 3 are evaluated at the CAEP sufficient level on the Assessment Evaluation Framework.</li> <li>• Evidence for the academic achievement criteria meet the requirements specified in the CAEP list of approved academic measures for reading, mathematics and (in 2021) in writing.</li> <li>• Evidence for the writing achievement option is consistent with the CAEP guidelines (see Appendix F of the Handbook).</li> <li>• The recruitment “plan” includes data describing specific employment opportunities (in hard-to-fill subject fields or hard-to-staff schools) where positions are likely to be available for EPP completers.</li> </ul>
<p>Continuous improvement in Standard 3 <i>[Relates to Standard 2 and to component 5.3]</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site team finds no evidence that the EPP uses the results of Standard 3 performance/ progress monitoring to guide advising and support activities (e.g., referral to student support services, remediation planning and interventions). <i>(component 3.1)</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site team confirms that the EPP uses the results of Standard 3 performance/ progress monitoring to guide advising and support activities (e.g., referral to student support services, remediation planning and interventions). <i>(component 3.1)</i></li> <li>• Analyses of data and trends in the recruitment</li> </ul>

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analyses of data and trends are performed haphazardly, without indicating steps that could be replicated, and/or interpretations made of the data are not valid.</li> <li>The EPP provides little or no evidence that any non-academic criteria used in candidate admissions or preparation are monitored or periodically reviewed, their relationship with candidate success and/or need for additional support is investigated, or that follow-up actions are taken with candidates, as appropriate, and for modifications in preparation.</li> </ul>	<p>plans, academic achievement, diversity of candidate cohorts, and candidate progress are performed competently and interpretations made of the data are valid.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EPP provides evidence that any non-academic criteria used in candidate admissions or preparation are monitored and periodically reviewed, their relationship with candidate success and/or need for additional support is investigated, follow-up actions are taken with candidates, as appropriate, and modifications needed in preparation are undertaken.</li> </ul>

## ADVANCED LICENSURE PREPARATION: CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE, CAEP STANDARD A.1

**Standard A.1. Content and Pedagogical Knowledge**—*The provider ensures that candidates for professional specialties develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their field of preparation and, by completion, are able to use professional specialty practices flexibly to advance the learning of P-12 students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.*

### Key Concepts (excerpt from Handbook guidelines)

Key concepts identify the main points that comprise the CAEP Standards. They interpret the combined language of standards with their accompanying components and provide guidance to shape evidence gathering and the EPP's writing of its case that a standard is met.

Standard A.1 is constructed around specialized content knowledge and skills for candidates in preparation fields that provide leadership and supporting services in schools and school districts. The evidence should demonstrate

that completers are competent and ready to undertake school responsibilities in the specialized areas for which they are being prepared.

- Generic professional skills**—The standard specifies generic professional skills in which candidate performance outcomes should be documented in self-study reports—adapted, as appropriate, to each field of specialization. The areas include data and research

literacy, data analysis, collaborative activities, application of technology, and professional standards and dispositions, laws and policies, and codes of ethics (*component A.1.1*).

- **Specialized content knowledge**—Standard A.1 addresses candidate’s deep understanding of critical concepts and principles

of their specialized field and ability to apply professional specialty practices to advance the learning of P-12 students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness. EPP preparation may draw from sources such as specialized professional association (SPA) standards, state standards, standards of the NBPTS, or those of other accrediting bodies (such as CACREP) (*component A.1.2*).

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
<p>Component A.1.1-- Candidates for advanced preparation demonstrate their proficiencies to understand and apply knowledge and skills appropriate to their professional field of specialization so that learning and development opportunities for all P-12 are enhanced through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applications of data literacy;</li> <li>• Use of research and understanding of qualitative, quantitative, and/or mixed methods research methodologies;</li> <li>• Employment of data analysis and evidence to develop supportive school environments;</li> <li>• Leading and/or participating in collaborative activities with others such as peers, colleagues, teachers, administrators, community organizations, and parents;</li> <li>• Supporting appropriate applications of appropriate technology for their field of specialization; and</li> <li>• Application of professional dispositions, laws and policies, codes of ethics and professional standards appropriate to their field of specialization.</li> </ul>	<p>The EPP evidence of candidate proficiencies in the generic advanced-level skills is limited. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There may be data for only one or two of the six knowledge and skill areas for each particular specialty field.</li> <li>• The provider fails to present evidence that most advanced candidates perform adequately on the three generic measures of ability selected for the professional specialty field.</li> <li>• There may be evidence of coverage in course materials, but no evidence of candidate performance in generic advanced-level skill areas.</li> <li>• There may be sufficient evidence but for only a minority of the candidates.</li> <li>• There may be generalized information that is not disaggregated by the specific field of preparation.</li> </ul> <p>The documented skill areas fail to build a compelling case that candidates can create and maintain supportive environments that advance the learning of P-12 students.</p>	<p>The provider presents evidence that most advanced program candidates perform adequately or better on at least three of the six generic knowledge and skill abilities that are most relevant for the professional specialty field.</p> <p>The collective evidence makes a compelling case that candidates can create and maintain supportive environments that advance the learning of P-12 students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness.</p>



Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
<p>Evidence of candidate content knowledge appropriate for the professional specialty will be documented by state licensure test scores or other proficiency measures.</p> <p><i>[Same as the concept on generic professional skills]</i></p>		
<p>Component A.1.2--Providers ensure that advanced program completers have opportunities to learn and apply specialized content and discipline knowledge contained in approved state and/or national discipline-specific standards. These specialized standards include, but are not limited to, specialized professional association (SPA) standards, individual state standards, standards of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), and standards of other accrediting bodies (e.g., Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs [CACREP]).</p> <p><i>[Same as the concept on specialized content knowledge]</i></p>	<p>The EPP evidence, gathered from selected program level review, provides limited evidence that candidates understand critical concepts and principles for their specialized field of study. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There may be a limited amount of evidence so that important aspects of the specialized field concepts and principles are not informed by data gathered from instruments aligned to discipline specific standards.</li> <li>• There may be no information of some individual preparation programs that enroll significant proportions of the EPP total number of advanced-level candidates in a cohort.</li> <li>• The EPP fails to undertake steps that remedy shortcomings noted in evidence collected during program level review.</li> </ul> <p>The provider submitted limited or no evidence demonstrating that advanced candidates can apply their understanding of critical concepts and principles for their specialized field of study in school environments.</p>	<p>The EPP evidence gathered from selected program level review indicates that a majority of candidates enrolled in P-12 licensure, certificate, or endorsement programs are able to demonstrate their understanding of critical concepts and principles for their specialized field of study in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EPP provides evidence documenting that P-12 licensure, certification, or endorsement programs enrolling a majority of candidates demonstrate high level of proficiency, as might be represented by completion of SPA National Recognition or state approval of meeting state standards.</li> <li>• For programs with a status other than full SPA National Recognition from a three year out review (e.g., National Recognition with Conditions, National Recognition with Probation, or Further Development Required, Not Nationally Recognized) or complete state program approval, the EPP has evidence of using SPA or state feedback to address remaining conditions or gaps to meet the standards.</li> <li>• For programs choosing the CAEP Evidence Review of Standard A.1 using discipline-specific standards, the EPP demonstrates use of the trend data to make</li> </ul>

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
		programmatic improvement and candidate outcomes.
<p><b>Data quality</b>--Characteristics of data used to document Standard A.1 (<i>Standards 5 and A.5, components 5.2 and A.5.2</i>) Instruments evaluated with the CAEP Framework</p>	<p>Many EPP-created instruments fail to meet CAEP’s sufficient level on the Evaluation Framework for EPP-created assessments.</p> <p>Measures are limited to opinions (e.g., grades or observations lacking descriptive rubrics) rather than direct measures of candidate proficiencies in the Standard A.1 concepts under components A.1.1 or A.1.2.</p> <p>There is limited or no evidence that the EPP undertakes systematic efforts to ensure that data are relevant, fair, reliable and valid.</p>	<p>Most EPP-created instruments meet CAEP’s sufficient level on the Evaluation Framework for EPP-created assessments.</p> <p>The EPP provides data from direct measures of the phenomenon that underlies each Standard A.1 concept (e.g., from such sources as projects, work samples, assignments, tasks, or performance on specialized content knowledge assessments).</p> <p>The EPP documents its efforts to design and implement assessments and other measures so they are relevant, fair, reliable and representative measures of the phenomenon described in the concepts being measured, and yield valid and reliable interpretations.</p>
<p><b>Continuous improvement</b>--Use of data describing concepts in Standard A.1 (generic advanced-level skills and specialized content knowledge as well as ability to apply it in the field of preparation) for continuous improvement (<i>component A.5.3</i>)</p>	<p>The EPP disaggregates results by specialty area, but shows little or no additional effort to identify differences or patterns.</p> <p>There is no evidence that data used for Standard A.1 purposes is purposively used for continuous improvement.</p> <p>There is limited or no data analysis. There are limited or no attempts to place candidate performance into context through comparisons, trends, or benchmarks.</p> <p>The EPP’s interpretation of results is limited, and there is limited or no evidence of the EPP using the</p>	<p>The EPP disaggregates results by specialty licensure area and race/ethnicity to identify differences and patterns in the results.</p> <p>Evidence is presented that substantive changes in the preparation program are made as a result of EPP decisions from use, analyses and interpretations of data that make the case for Standard A.1.</p> <p>The EPP’s data analyses are informed by data, address issues relevant to the progress and achievement of candidates in Standard A.1 concepts, and make effective use of disaggregated data by examining underlying patterns, program</p>

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
	<p>results as part of its internal evaluation of effectiveness.</p> <p>There may be inappropriate interpretations of results, such as low scores being interpreted as high scores, or large and persistent performance gaps between program areas described as reasonable).</p> <p>Claims for trends may not be supported by at least three cycles of data.</p>	<p>by program, of candidate progress and attainment. Results are considered by the EPP in evaluation of its own preparation program effectiveness.</p> <p>Sound data analysis practices are followed. The EPP provides contextual meaning for the analyses through comparisons, trends, or benchmarks with similar EPPs or state or national data.</p> <p>The EPP’s interpretation of 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 program areas are not described as reasonable).</p> <p>Claims for trends are supported by at least three cycles of data.</p>

## ADVANCED LICENSURE PREPARATION: CLINICAL PARTNERSHIPS AND PRACTICE, CAEP STANDARD A.2

**Standard A.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 appropriate for their professional specialty field.*

### Key Concepts (excerpt from Handbook guidelines)

Key concepts identify the main points that comprise the CAEP Standards. They interpret the combined language of standards with their accompanying components and provide guidance to shape evidence gathering and the EPP’s writing of its case that a standard is met.

High-quality clinical practice is a unique and critical feature for educator preparation. Standard A.2 encourages EPPs to

- **Develop and maintain partnerships with close collaborators** from schools and school districts, as well as other appropriate organizations (*component A.2.1*).

(The Standard for Advanced-Level preparation is written in terms of the clinical experiences provided and opportunities for candidates to practice, in contrast with the Standard for Initial Licensure which asks, particularly, that EPPs examine the sufficiency of their clinical experiences.)

- Through the partnership, provide **diverse and developmental clinical experiences in settings with diverse P-12 students, and also opportunities for Advanced-Level candidates to practice applications of specialized content knowledge and professional skills** (*component A.2.2*).

Standard A.2 provides an opportunity for EPPs to demonstrate that their partnerships with P-12 schools and districts are beneficial to both parties for advanced-level preparation. The SSR will explain, and provide examples, that demonstrate how collaborative partnerships are conducted,

monitored, and evaluated, as well as how these evaluations lead to changes in preparation courses and experiences for the EPP’s candidates. The EPP should document the opportunities for candidates in advanced-level preparation to practice their developing knowledge and skills, and address what faculty have learned from the relationship of culminating experiences with candidate success in problem-based tasks characteristic of their professional specialization.

The partnerships should be continuous and feature shared decision making about crucial aspects of the preparation experiences and collaboration among all school-based and university-based educators. Standard A.2 prompts EPPs to (1) be purposeful in and reflective on all aspects of clinical experiences; (2) provide opportunities for candidates to practice the application of course knowledge in a variety of developmental settings; and (3) keep a clear focus on experiences that will foster proficiencies that are characteristic of their professional specialization and promote authentic applications of the advanced knowledge and skills described in component

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
<p>Component A.2.1--Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements, including technology-based collaborations, for clinical preparation and share responsibility for continuous improvement of advanced program candidate preparation. Partnerships for clinical preparation can follow a range of forms, participants, and functions. They establish mutually agreeable expectations for advanced program 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 advanced program candidate outcomes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EPP documents minimal or no agreements for collaborative clinical experiences</li> <li>• The EPP provides limited or no evidence of ongoing collaborative decisions about the actual operations of the partnerships around such topics as:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The nature of clinical experiences and how the partners make decisions about those experiences</li> <li>○ Selection, training, retention, evaluation and responsibilities of clinical educators</li> <li>○ Ensuring the clinical experiences provide opportunities for candidates to work with diverse clinical faculty in school and district</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence is provided to document ongoing formal and informal collaborations with schools and school districts and other partners where candidates participate in clinical experiences for Advanced-level preparation. Evidence describes activities such as:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Collaborative development, review, or revision of instruments and evaluations</li> <li>○ Collaborative development, review, or revision of the structure and content of the clinical activities</li> <li>○ Provisions for selection, training, retention, evaluation and responsibilities of clinical educators</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
<p><i>[Same as concept on developing and maintaining partnerships with close collaborators]</i></p>	<p>settings where diverse P-12 students are enrolled who have differing needs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Opportunities for candidates to apply technology in ways appropriate for the advanced-level field of specialization</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Agreed upon provisions to ensure that candidates have opportunities to work with diverse clinical faculty in school and district settings where diverse P-12 students are enrolled who have differing needs</li> <li>○ Creation of opportunities for candidates to work with diverse P-12 students who have differing needs</li> <li>○ Opportunities for candidates to apply technology in ways appropriate for the advanced-level field of specialization</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The EPP provides evidence that the P-12 schools and EPPs have both benefited from the partnership.</li> </ul>
<p>Component A.2.2--The provider works with partners to design varied and developmental clinical settings that allow opportunities for candidates to practice applications of content knowledge and skills that the courses and other experiences of the advanced preparation emphasize. The opportunities lead to appropriate culminating experiences in which candidates demonstrate their proficiencies through problem-based tasks or research (e.g., qualitative, quantitative, mixed methods, action) that are characteristic of their professional specialization as detailed in component A.1.1.</p> <p><i>[Same as the concept on partnerships providing diverse and developmental clinical experiences in settings with diverse P-12 students, and also</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The EPP provides little or no evidence that advanced-level clinical experiences are planned, purposeful, or sequential, or that they are designed to help candidates grow and develop in the practice of the knowledge and skills appropriate for the advanced-level specialty field.</li> <li>● The EPP provides some description of the role of clinical practice in the advanced-level program, but fails to show the connections between campus-based and field-based activities that are intended to provide opportunities for candidates to make practical applications of knowledge and skills in their advanced-level field of specialization.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The provider describes the role of clinical practice in the advanced-level program, including campus-based and field-based activities that involve practical applications of knowledge and skills appropriate for the advanced-level specialty field.</li> <li>● The EPP shows that the EPP and its partners ensure advanced-level clinical experiences are planned, purposeful and sequential; are designed to help candidates grow and develop in the practice of the knowledge and skills that make up the advanced-level preparation program; and are assessed with performance-based protocols.</li> <li>● Culminating experiences provide opportunities</li> </ul>

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
<p><i>opportunities for Advanced-level candidates to practice applications of specialized content knowledge and professional skills]</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EPP provides little or no evidence that culminating experiences ensure opportunities for candidates to demonstrate their proficiencies in the specialized field for which they are preparing; there are no significant artifacts, completed assignments, or tasks that would be reflective of responsibilities that are characteristic of the professional specialization.</li> </ul>	<p>for candidates to demonstrate their proficiencies through problem-based tasks or research that are characteristic of their professional specialization, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Artifacts or completed assignments reflective of on-the-job tasks for the specialized field</li> <li>Candidate evaluation of their preparatory activities for clinical practice</li> <li>Preparation of a school budget</li> <li>A proposal for a district’s response to criticism of some aspect of school functions (e.g., complaints of discriminatory responses given by principals to parent complaints)</li> <li>Paper to demonstrate understanding of a student’s IEP and to suggest appropriate child activities responsive to the IEP</li> </ul>
<p><u>Diversity and equity</u>, working with partners on clinical experiences in school or district settings where diverse P-12 students who have differing needs are enrolled (<i>component A.2.2</i>).</p> <p><i>[NOTE: This information on diversity theme will be used as part of the cross-cutting diversity theme.]</i></p>	<p>The EPP provides little or no compelling evidence demonstrating that the EPP and its partners design clinical experiences that are varied and that offer candidates opportunities to experience school or district settings where diverse P-12 students with differing needs are enrolled.</p>	<p>The EPP provides evidence that the EPP and its partners design varied clinical opportunities so candidates can experience school or district settings where diverse P-12 students with differing needs are enrolled.</p>
<p><b>Data quality</b>--Characteristics of data used to document Standard A.2 (<i>Standard 5, component 5.2</i>)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence on partnerships primarily documents formal agreements, rather than actions. Few, if any, specific joint actions are described.</li> <li>The EPP provides limited or no evidence that clinical faculty are evaluated, or that candidates’ progress and accomplishments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence on partnerships documents not just “agreements” but “actions”—e.g., decisions made jointly about candidate experiences; co-sponsorship of training and evaluation of clinical faculty; the design or projects, tasks, or research measures similar to those completers will face on-the-job in their specialty field; nature of feedback</li> </ul>

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• are monitored.</li> <li>• There are no formal EPP-created assessments, or those that are used fail to meet the CAEP sufficient level on the CAEP Assessment Framework.</li> </ul>	<p>given to candidates; the progression of experiences; and candidate evaluation at exit. Several examples are provided (e.g., 3 or 4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most EPP-created instruments for Standard A.2 (including evaluations of clinical faculty, as well as faculty, stakeholder or candidate surveys), meet CAEP's sufficient level on the Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Continuous improvement</b>--Use of data describing concepts in Standard A.2 (effectiveness of clinical partnerships and experiences) for continuous improvement (<i>Standard 5, component 5.3</i>)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EPP provides limited or no documentation that the EPP and its partners periodically examine the status and progress of their collaboration regarding Advanced-level clinical experiences to determine whether some aspects of the agreement need modifications.</li> <li>• The EPP provided no evidence of specific actions taken, based on EPP and partner review of the status and progress of their agreement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EPP provides documentation that the EPP and its partners periodically examine the status and progress of their collaboration to determine whether some aspects of the agreement for Advanced-level clinical experiences need modifications, or whether some of the candidate experiences could be strengthened.</li> <li>• Evidence is provided of specific actions taken, based on EPP and partner review of the status and progress of their agreement.</li> </ul>

### ADVANCED LICENSURE PREPARATION: CANDIDATE QUALITY, RECRUITMENT, AND SELECTIVITY, CAEP STANDARD A.3

**Standard A.3. Candidate Quality, Recruitment and Selectivity**—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.

#### Key Concepts (excerpt from Handbook guidelines)

Key concepts identify the main points that comprise the CAEP Standards. They interpret the combined language of standards with their accompanying components and provide guidance to shape evidence gathering and the EPP’s writing of its case that a standard is met.

Standard A.3 focuses on the need for providers to recruit and develop a diverse and strong pool of applicants who successfully complete the specialized program. EPPs will monitor candidate progress, and provide support when needed, to those at risk of falling behind. The pool of applicants is, in most instances, the existing teacher workforce. Over time, and considering wider national goals to recruit a more diverse teacher workforce that reflects the diversity of our P-12 student population, there should be growing diversity in the pool of admitted candidates.

- The EPP **admits diverse candidates** and emphasizes meeting **employment needs** at the advanced-level (*component A.3.1*).
- **Candidates demonstrate academic achievement at admissions** with minimum criteria for GPA or a group average performance on nationally- or substantially equivalent state-normed assessments (*component A.3.2*) and **also meet additional EPP criteria to ensure they are likely to complete the program successfully** (*component 3.2*).
- EPPs **monitor the progress of all candidates** (*components A.3.1 and A.3.3*) and provide **support and counseling for candidates whose progress falls behind** (*components A.3.1 and A.3.2*).
- EPPs document that **completing candidates have knowledge and skills appropriate for their field** of specialization (*components A.3.4 and also Standard A.1*).

The key concepts are as follows:

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
<p>Component A.3.1--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 addresses community, state, national, regional, or local needs for school and district staff prepared in advanced fields.  <i>[Same as concept on admitting diverse candidates and meeting employment needs]</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EPP provides no description of advanced-level admissions practices, and/or no evidence that demonstrates understanding of available employment opportunities for completers or its record of aligning preparation with available employment opportunities.</li> <li>• The EPP provides no evidence of adjustments to EPP admissions practices based on monitoring its own progress (<i>also relevant to 5.3</i>).</li> <li>• The EPP provides little evidence that diversity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EPP describes its ongoing advanced-level admissions practices, demonstrating its understanding of available employment opportunities for completers and its record of aligning preparation with available employment opportunities. For example, the EPP could:                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ identify information from state or other sources describing recent employment trends and likely available openings for each advanced-level specialized field</li> <li>○ show actual employment rates of completers for specific preparation programs each year over the past five years</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
	<p>of admitted and completing candidates is given explicit attention. There may be no evidence of the diversity characteristics of the candidate pool, and/or no evidence that changes are monitored over time.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ identify fields of specialization where there is a mismatch between projected numbers of completers and potential employment opportunities</li> <li>○ review its admissions practices for advanced-level preparation in relation to the changing employment market and purposefully use the findings to adjust counseling practices and/or preparation offerings <i>(also relevant to component 5.3)</i></li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The EPP provides evidence that diversity is reflected in admissions and that, over time, diversity of candidates for advanced preparation moves closer to the diversity of America’s P-12 classrooms.</li> <li>● The site team examines progress results for trends over time, including the patterns and degree of diversity and the academic proficiencies of candidates, as well as the alignment of completer specialties with available employment opportunities.</li> </ul>
<p>Component A.3.2--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</p>	<p><u>Candidates likely to complete successfully:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The EPP has not established, or has failed to describe, its criteria used to ensure that candidates are able to complete preparation successfully, OR the EPP provided no data from its criteria or no analysis of their efficacy. For example, the EPP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Describes criteria but provides no evidence those criteria are actually used,</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><u>Candidates likely to complete successfully:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The EPP describes its criteria used to ensure that candidates are likely to complete preparation successfully, together with its analysis of the efficacy of the criteria it uses. Sources of evidence might be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Descriptions of criteria, such as non-academic measures, dispositions, previous employment experiences, or</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
<p>appropriate support and counseling for candidates whose progress falls behind.</p> <p>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 develop and use a valid and reliable substantially equivalent alternative assessment of academic achievement. The 50th percentile standard for writing will be implemented in 2021. As an alternative to cohort average performance on a nationally- or state-normed writing assessment, the EPP may present evidence of candidates' performance levels on writing tasks similar to those required of practicing educators.<sup>19</sup> The CAEP minimum criteria apply to the group average of enrolled candidates whose preparation begins during an academic year.</p> <p>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. <i>[Same as concept on academic achievement criteria and other criteria to ensure that candidates are likely to be able to complete preparation successfully; also includes support for candidates</i></p>	<p>such as results from one or more cohorts of admitted candidates.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provides no indication as to how and when such criteria are evaluated for each candidate, or developed through the preparation experiences, or monitored at progression gateways during preparation.</li> <li>○ Provides no results from any specific investigations it has conducted relating the criteria to successful completion of the program, together with the EPP's interpretation of the meaning and significance of the findings.</li> </ul> <p><u>Academic achievement criteria:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The EPP disaggregates results on the CAEP minima (GPA OR test performance) by admission year. However, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The EPP may not present results separately for mathematics, reading, and (beginning in 2021) writing.</li> <li>○ The EPP does not use one of the CAEP approved normed tests to demonstrate that candidates' average at or above the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile. See CAEP list of score values for approved tests: <a href="http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/standards/caep-standard-3-component-32-measures-of.pdf?la=en">http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/standards/caep-standard-3-component-32-measures-of.pdf?la=en</a>.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>evidence demonstrating candidate abilities for any of the generic advanced-level professional skills (<i>in component A.1.1</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Indicators of how and when such criteria are evaluated for each candidate, or developed through the preparation experiences, or monitored at progression gateways during preparation.</li> <li>○ Results from any specific investigations the EPP has conducted relating the criteria to successful completion of the program, together with its interpretation of the meaning and significance of the findings. (<i>component A.3.2 and also A.5.3</i>)</li> </ul> <p><u>Academic achievement criteria:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The EPP disaggregates results on the CAEP minima (GPA OR test performance) by admission year. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The EPP presents results separately for mathematics, reading, and (beginning in 2021) writing.</li> <li>○ The EPP can select from a variety of normed tests to demonstrate that candidates' average at or above the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile. See CAEP list of score values for approved tests: <a href="http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/standards/caep-standard-3-component-32-measures-of.pdf?la=en">http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/standards/caep-standard-3-component-32-measures-of.pdf?la=en</a>.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<sup>19</sup> This sentence is the effect of CAEP Board action, December 2018, on an additional form of evidence for writing proficiency.

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
<p><i>falling behind that, in the key concepts, is paired with monitoring candidate progress]</i></p>	<p><u>CAEP performance criteria:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EPP may include cohort averages, but omit evidence that it monitors disaggregated results on the CAEP minima (GPA or test performance) by branch campuses, by mode of delivery (e.g., online programs) if applicable, and by licensure program.</li> <li>The actual proficiency levels of disaggregated data on academic achievement metrics fail to meet the CAEP minimum for GPA (<math>\geq 3.0</math> average) OR test performance on an approved test at the group performance level specified (<a href="http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/standards/caep-standard-3-componen20180410t154547.pdf?la=en">http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/standards/caep-standard-3-componen20180410t154547.pdf?la=en</a>)</li> </ul> <p><u>CAEP writing performance option:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EPP chooses to use the writing evidence option, but provides little or no description of the tasks assigned or scoring procedures.</li> <li>The EPP provides no comparison of candidate performance with standard national benchmark performances such as those from SAT or ACT writing.</li> </ul> <p><u>Supporting candidates:</u> The EPP provides no description of its support for candidates who are at risk, and no information about the outcomes (completion) for such candidates OR the EPP provides very generalized</p>	<p><u>CAEP performance criteria:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EPP includes evidence that it monitors disaggregated results on the CAEP minima (GPA OR test performance) by branch campuses, by mode of delivery (e.g., online programs) if applicable, and by licensure program.</li> <li>Disaggregated data on academic achievement metrics meet the CAEP minimum for GPA (<math>\geq 3.0</math> average) OR test performance on an approved test at the group performance level specified (<a href="http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/standards/caep-standard-3-componen20180410t154547.pdf?la=en">http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/standards/caep-standard-3-componen20180410t154547.pdf?la=en</a>)</li> </ul> <p><u>CAEP writing performance option:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EPP describes its writing proficiency tasks and its scoring procedures to demonstrate that proficiency is consistent with average national writing performance for the SAT (2.65 on a scale of 1-4) or ACT (3.3 on a scale of 1-6).</li> <li>The EPP provides its average scores by race and ethnicity, campus site (if more than one) and mode of delivery (if more than one).</li> </ul> <p><u>Supporting candidates:</u> The EPP provides support for candidates who are at risk with the intent to help ensure their successful completion. A descriptive summary indicates advising or remediation actions</p>

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
	information without numerical backup or other specific descriptions.	conducted, types of services or support provided, or interventions made by the EPP on behalf of advanced-level candidates. The description is documented with numerical backup.
<p>Component A.3.3--The provider creates criteria for program progression and uses disaggregated data to monitor candidates' advancement from admissions through completion.</p> <p><i>[Same as concept on monitoring candidate progress but omits providing support for candidates who need it that is addressed in component A.3.2]</i></p>	<p>The EPP provides limited or no description of its monitoring of candidate progress through program milestones or the markers of progress it follows. It does not use regular candidate progress monitoring to identify those at risk of falling behind and offers no other actions to identify such candidates.</p>	<p>The EPP describes its monitoring of advanced-level candidate progress through program milestones and the markers of progress it follows. It identifies candidates who are at risk of falling behind.</p>
<p>Component A.3.4-- 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.</p> <p><i>[Same as concept on candidates proficiencies in knowledge and skills appropriate for their specialty area]</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EPP provides no specific evidence that it has reviewed the performance record of each candidate who completed the program or documented that candidate's attainment of high standards for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ content knowledge in the specialized advanced-level field <i>components A.3.4 and A.1.2</i>,</li> <li>○ understanding and applying advanced-level generic skills in data and research literacy, data analysis, collaborative activities, applications of technology, and professional dispositions, laws and policies (<i>components A.3.4 and A.1.1</i>)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• EPP evidence fails to focus on the generic advanced-level professional skills that are most relevant to the specific field of preparation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EPP provides evidence that it has reviewed the performance record of each candidate who successfully completes an advanced-level program and documents that candidate's attainment of high standards for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ content knowledge in the specialized advanced-level field (<i>components A.3.4 and A.1.2</i>),</li> <li>○ understanding and applying advanced-level generic skills in data and research literacy, data analysis, collaborative activities, applications of technology, and professional dispositions, laws and policies (<i>components A.3.4 and A.1.1</i>).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• EPP evidence focuses on the three of those six generic advanced-level professional skills that are most relevant to the specific field of preparation.</li> </ul>
Diversity cross-cutting theme:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EPP provided little or no compelling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The rows above address the diversity theme</li> </ul>

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
<p>Evidence documents that EPPs make progress on greater diversity in the pool of candidates, and the EPP identifies candidates at risk of failure and provides effective supports for candidates who need them</p> <p><i>[NOTE: This information on diversity in Standard A.3 will be used as part of the cross-cutting diversity theme.]</i></p>	<p>evidence demonstrating a response to the three aspects of diversity addressed in Standard A.3: with differing needs are enrolled.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the diversity of the candidate pool from year to year</li> <li>○ identification of candidates at risk of failure, and</li> <li>○ providing effective supports for candidates who need them.</li> </ul>	<p>explicitly on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ progress on diversity of the candidate pool from year to year (components A.3.1 and A.3.2)</li> <li>○ identification of candidates at risk of failure, and (component A.3.3)</li> <li>○ providing effective supports for candidates at risk of failure (component A.3.2)</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The EPP should flag responses on these three aspects of diversity in their evidence.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Data quality</b>--Characteristics of data used to document that Standard A.3 is met (<i>Standard A.5, component A.5.2</i>)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● There is limited or no evidence from the EPP about alignment of its assessments with the CAEP Framework for Evaluation of EPP-created Assessments, OR the evidence indicates that those assessments fail to meet the CAEP sufficient level.</li> <li>● Evidence for the academic achievement criteria fail to meet the scores specified in the CAEP list of approved academic measures or GPA.</li> <li>● The admissions practices and criteria show no evidence of being informed with data about specific advanced-level specialty field employment opportunities that are likely to be available for EPP completers.</li> <li>● Site teams find evidence that source material and reports are not always in agreement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Most EPP-created assessments for Standard A.3 are evaluated at the CAEP sufficient level on the Framework for Evaluation of EPP-created Assessments (see Appendix A in this Handbook).</li> <li>● Evidence for the academic achievement criteria meets the scores specified in the CAEP list of approved academic measures for reading, mathematics and (in 2021) in writing.</li> <li>● Admissions practices and criteria are informed with data about advanced-level employment opportunities for the specific field of preparation that are likely to be available for EPP completers (e.g., from state or national sources).</li> <li>● Site teams find that distributions around diversity categories are consistent with source material and are competently</li> </ul>

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
		transcribed and reported.
<p><b>Continuous improvement</b>—Use of data describing concepts in Standard A.3 for continuous improvement (<i>Standard A.5, component A.5.3</i>) EPP uses progress results to evaluate and improve support services</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site team finds no evidence that the EPP uses the results of Standard A.3 performance/ progress monitoring to guide advising and support activities (e.g., referral to student support services, remediation planning and interventions). (<i>component 3.2</i>)</li> <li>• The EPP provides no information that it encourages candidates to enter fields with likely employment opportunities.</li> <li>• EPP evidence raises questions about the quality of analyses of data and trends, appear haphazard, do not indicate steps that could be replicated for such Standard A.3 provisions as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ data and trends in the recruitment plan (<i>component 3.1</i>),</li> <li>○ the academic achievement and diversity of candidate cohorts (<i>component 3.1</i>),</li> <li>○ candidate progress monitoring (<i>component 3.4</i>), and</li> <li>○ any non-academic indicators employed by the EPP in preparation (<i>component 3.3</i>)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Interpretations made of the data are not valid.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site team confirms that the EPP uses the results of Standard A.3 performance/ progress monitoring to guide advising and support activities (e.g., referral to student support services, remediation planning and interventions). (<i>components A.3.2 on support, and A.3.3 on monitoring progress</i>)</li> <li>• The EPP provides information about employment opportunities that are likely to be available for completers and monitors those opportunities over time.</li> <li>• Analyses of data and trends are performed competently for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ employment opportunities and admissions practices (<i>component A.3.1</i>),</li> <li>○ the academic achievement and diversity of candidate cohorts</li> <li>○ the EPP’s criteria to ensure candidate completion (<i>component A.3.2</i>)</li> <li>○ candidate progress monitoring, including non-academic factors (<i>component A.3.3</i>).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Interpretations made of the data are valid.</li> <li>• When academic measures are close to the CAEP criteria (a little above or a little below), the EPP monitors candidate performance closely and provides remedial</li> </ul>

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
		assistance for individual candidates when needed to maintain academic achievement at the criterion levels.

## SECTION III: RESULTS OF PREPARATION

### INITIAL LICENSURE PREPARATION: PROGRAM IMPACT, 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.*

#### Key Concepts (excerpt from Handbook guidelines)

Key concepts identify the main points that comprise the CAEP Standards. They interpret the combined language of standards with their accompanying components and provide guidance to shape evidence gathering and the EPP’s writing of its case that a standard is met.

Standard 4 addresses the *results* of preparation when completers are employed in positions for which they are prepared.<sup>20</sup> The standard especially emphasizes the impact on P-12 student learning as measured in multiple ways, and the components collectively create a complementary 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*)

<sup>20</sup> Note that “completers” in Standard 4 refers to those who have completed preparation in an EPP **and are employed** in positions for which they were prepared. The term does not refer to completers who have continued their education at advanced levels, or those employed in other education positions or in non-education positions.

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.
- Appendix E: Evidence from Case Studies and P-12 Student Impact Studies 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<sup>21</sup> 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,

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
Component 4.1--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	Examples could include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No attempt to provide evidence on impact of employed completers on their P-12 students from any potential source</li> <li>• There are no case studies in place as potential sources of evidence of completer impact</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of at least one measure of state-provided impact data at the in-service level when available, OR evidence of at least one measure of impact data, utilizing research-based methodology, from a representative or purposeful sample of candidates at the in-</li> </ul>

<sup>21</sup> <http://k12education.gatesfoundation.org/InitiativeSlug/measures-of-effective-teaching/>

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.

#### **The components of Standard 4 represent four of the CAEP Annual Reporting Measures.**

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



Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
<p>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.</p> <p><i>[Same as key concept on teacher impact on P-12 student learning and development]</i></p>		<p>service level (case studies, action research, etc.).</p>
<p>Component 4.2--The provider demonstrates, through structured 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.</p> <p><i>[Same as concept on Teaching effectiveness in the classroom and student perception surveys]</i></p>	<p>Examples could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EPP provides no data on evaluation of employed completers OR from student surveys in classrooms of employed completers</li> <li>• Data are general or not associated with the EPP's completers, so they fail to inform reviewers about completer's capabilities to apply their professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions</li> <li>• There are no case studies in place as potential sources of evidence to evaluate completer classroom proficiencies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence documents the application of professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions corresponding with teaching effectiveness and/or P-12 student learning through observation and/or student survey assessments.</li> <li>• Sources may include classroom teaching observation evaluations, or P-12 student perception surveys about classroom experiences.</li> <li>• EPPs that have no access to state data present results from district data, or case studies using research-based methodologies with a representative or purposive sample. (See Appendix E section on case studies)</li> </ul>
<p>Component 4.3--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.</p> <p><i>[Same as concept on satisfaction with preparation as viewed by employers]</i></p>	<p>Examples could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No evidence that the EPP has employer survey results, or plans to attain it</li> <li>• Survey information contains no questions that would describe particular teacher knowledge or skills</li> <li>• There is no information on employment milestones</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence is provided that employers perceive completers' preparation was sufficient for their job responsibilities.</li> <li>• Evidence provided that documents employment milestones, including promotion, employment trajectory, and retention for at least some completers and conducts appropriate analysis.</li> <li>• The survey questions are specific enough to identify employer's satisfaction with particular aspects of completer's preparation such as:</li> </ul>

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ addressing diverse needs of individual students,</li> <li>○ use of assessments to enhance learning,</li> <li>○ use of data about students and their progress, and</li> <li>○ working with colleagues.</li> </ul>
<p>Component 4.4--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.</p> <p><i>[Same as concept on satisfaction with preparation as viewed by completers]</i></p>	<p>Examples could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● No evidence that the EPP has completer survey results or plans to attain it</li> <li>● Survey information contains no questions that would describe particular teacher knowledge or skills</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence provided that completers perceive their preparation was sufficient for their job responsibilities.</li> <li>● The survey questions are specific enough to identify completer's satisfaction with particular aspects of preparation such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ addressing diverse needs of individual students,</li> <li>○ use of assessments to enhance learning,</li> <li>○ use of data about students and their progress, and</li> <li>○ working with colleagues.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Data quality</b> in Standard 4 <i>[Relates to Standard 4 and to component 5.2]</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The EPP provided no or limited descriptions of the sample for state or district data, or surveys, assessments, or case studies.</li> <li>● There is no evidence that the EPP is moving toward more representative data in planned steps. The EPP provided no information on characteristics of respondents compared with the whole population being studied.</li> <li>● Few EPP-created assessments meet the sufficient level on CAEP's Assessment Framework for EPP-Created Assessments.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The EPP described the sample for all state or district data, or surveys, assessments, or case studies.</li> <li>● While the goal is data that accurately represent the EPP's completers, across programs and years of completion, purposive or convenience samples may be used. In all cases, however, the characteristics of respondents compared with the whole population being studied is explained in the EPP's evidence.</li> <li>● Most EPP-created assessments meet the sufficient level on CAEP's Assessment Framework for EPP-Created Assessments.</li> </ul>

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
<b>Continuous improvement</b> in Standard 4 <i>[Relates to Standard 4 and to component 5.3]</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data are not disaggregated and compared by the number of years the completer has taught—one, two or three years.</li> <li>• The analysis of trends, patterns, comparisons and differences is limited or missing and/or is not appropriate for the data. It is not possible for reviewers to establish validity for EPP interpretations for the components of Standard 4.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data are disaggregated and compared, where possible, by the number of years the completer has taught—one, two or three years.</li> <li>• Evidence of data analysis by disaggregated and/or overall performance groups and the conclusion that the EPP’s completers (across licensure areas) have a positive impact on student learning is supported by data.</li> <li>• Evidence provides valid interpretations of data that are supported by results.</li> </ul>

## ADVANCED LICENSURE PREPARATION: SATISFACTION WITH PREPARATION, CAEP STANDARD A.4

**Standard A.4.Satisfaction with Preparation** — *The provider documents the satisfaction of its completers from advanced preparation programs and their employers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.*

### Key Concepts (excerpt from Handbook guidelines)

Key concepts identify the main points that comprise the CAEP Standards. They interpret the combined language of standards with their accompanying components and provide guidance to shape evidence gathering and the EPP’s writing of its case that a standard is met.

Standard A.4 addresses the *results* of preparation in terms of the satisfaction of completers and employers. There are no Advanced-Level components similar to those for initial licensure preparation on P-12 student learning and observations/evaluations of teacher effectiveness. At the advanced-level, there is not a rich conceptual approach for that kind of

performance evaluation nor are there commonly employed measures that might serve as models. However, components A.4.1 and A.4.2 are similar to those components for initial licensure that examine satisfaction of both completers and employers with preparation. Data from surveys or interviews or other sources can provide important, highly relevant information for providers to use in analyzing the consequences of their preparation courses and experiences. In addition, information from component A.4.1 on completer persistence and employment milestones can indicate career orientation and paths of progress that providers can use in their future planning and actions.

The key concepts for Standard A.4 are the same as the two components:

- **Satisfaction with preparation as viewed by employers**, including **employment milestones** such as promotion and retention *(component A.4.1)*
- **Satisfaction with preparation as viewed by completers** *(component A.4.2)*

including the components of Standard A.4. In addition to providing a link, EPPs are asked to summarize the posted data, analyze trends, and summarize how data were used for continuous improvement and programmatic changes. The submission of an EPP’s Annual Report to CAEP should provide documentation that it can summarize relative to component A.5.4 at the time the SSR is compiled. In addition, trends in the EPP’s cumulative reports since the last accreditation cycle will be included and interpreted as part of the EPP’s SSR.

**The components of Standard A.4 represent two of the CAEP Annual Reporting Measures.**

CAEP’s requests for provider annual reports include a section that asks EPPs to provide prominent and public links to the Annual Reporting Measures,

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
<p>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. <i>[Same as the key concept on employer satisfaction]</i></p>	<p>The EPP fails to describe evidence of employers’ satisfaction with advanced-level program completers who are 1 to 3 years post-exit; OR survey questions are general opinion questions rather than specific descriptive information that identify employer’s satisfaction with particular aspects of completer’s preparation, in such skills as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ability to use generic professional skills at the advanced-level, including                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ interpreting research studies,</li> <li>○ gathering data,</li> <li>○ analyzing data,</li> <li>○ collaboration with colleagues,</li> <li>○ applying technology appropriately for the specific advanced-level field, and</li> <li>○ applying laws, professional dispositions and ethics.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• practical working knowledge of specialized content and principles in the advanced-level field for which the completer was prepared.</li> </ul>	<p>The EPP describes results from measures that report the employers’ satisfaction with advanced-level program completers who are 1 to 3 years post-exit. The survey questions are specific enough to identify employer’s satisfaction with particular aspects of completer’s preparation such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ability to use generic professional skills at the advanced-level, including                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ interpreting research studies,</li> <li>○ gathering data,</li> <li>○ analyzing data,</li> <li>○ collaboration with colleagues,</li> <li>○ applying technology appropriately for the specific advanced-level field, and</li> <li>○ applying laws, professional dispositions and ethics.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• practical working knowledge of specialized content and principles in the advanced-level field for which the completer was prepared.</li> <li>• The EPP describes the methodology and/or source of the employer satisfaction evidence.</li> </ul>

Component	Below sufficient level of evidence	Sufficient level of evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EPP did not describe the methodology and/or source of the employer satisfaction study.</li> <li>• The EPP evidence omits documentation of employment milestones for EPP completers, including promotion, employment trajectory, and retention, with descriptions of which part of the completer cohort is represented.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EPP includes documentation of employment milestones for EPP advanced-level completers, including promotion, employment trajectory, and retention, with descriptions of which part of the completer cohort is represented.</li> </ul>
<p>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.</p> <p><i>[Same as the key concept on completer satisfaction]</i></p>	<p>The EPP describes limited or no results from measures that report advanced-level completer's satisfaction with their preparation program who are 1 to 3 years post-exit; OR, survey questions are too general to identify completer's satisfaction with particular aspects of preparation, in such skills as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ability to use generic professional skills at the advanced-level, including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ interpreting research studies,</li> <li>○ gathering data,</li> <li>○ analyzing data,</li> <li>○ collaboration with colleagues,</li> <li>○ applying technology appropriately for the specific advanced-level field, and</li> <li>○ applying laws, professional dispositions and ethics.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• practical working knowledge of specialized content and principles in the advanced-level field for which the completer was prepared.</li> </ul> <p>The EPP fails to describe the methodology and/or source of the completer satisfaction study.</p>	<p>The EPP describes results from measures that report advanced-level completer's satisfaction with their preparation program who are 1 to 3 years post-exit. The survey questions are specific enough to identify completer's satisfaction with particular aspects of preparation such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ability to use generic professional skills at the advanced-level, including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ interpreting research studies,</li> <li>○ gathering data,</li> <li>○ analyzing data,</li> <li>○ collaboration with colleagues,</li> <li>○ applying technology appropriately for the specific advanced-level field, and</li> <li>○ applying laws, professional dispositions and ethics.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• practical working knowledge of specialized content and principles in the advanced-level field for which the completer was prepared.</li> </ul> <p>The EPP describes the methodology and/or source of the completer satisfaction study.</p>

<p><b>Data quality</b>--Characteristics of data used to document Standard A.4 (<i>Standards 5 and A.5, components 5.2 and A.5.2</i>)</p>	<p>The EPP presents no or limited descriptions of the sample of advanced-level completers for state or district data, or surveys, assessments, or case studies. There is no evidence that the EPP is moving toward more representative data in planned steps. The EPP provides no information on characteristics of respondents compared with the whole population being studied.</p> <p>Few EPP-created assessments meet the sufficient level on CAEP's Assessment Framework for EPP-Created Assessments.</p>	<p>The EPP describes the sample for all state or district data, surveys, assessments, or case studies. While the goal is data that accurately represent the EPP's advanced-level completers across programs and years of completion, purposive or convenience samples may be used. In all cases, however, the characteristics of respondents compared with the whole population being studied is explained in the EPP's evidence.</p> <p>Most EPP-created assessments meet the sufficient level on CAEP's Assessment Framework for EPP-Created Assessments.</p>
<p><b>Continuous improvement</b>--Use of data describing concepts in Standard A.4 (employer satisfaction and completer satisfaction with preparation) for continuous improvement (<i>Standards 5 and A.5, components 5.3 and A.5.3</i>)</p>	<p>Data are not disaggregated and compared by the number of years the completer has been employed—one, two or three years.</p> <p>The analysis of trends, patterns, comparisons and differences is limited or missing and/or is not appropriate for the data. It is not possible for reviewers to establish validity for EPP interpretations for the components of Standard A.4.</p>	<p>Data are disaggregated and compared, where possible, by the number of years the completer has been employed in the specialized advanced-level field for which he or she prepared—one, two or three years.</p> <p>The analysis of trends, patterns, comparisons and differences is illuminating and appropriate for the data. EPP interpretations for the components of Standard A.4 evidence are valid.</p>

# APPENDIX D

## DATA QUALITY

### Validity and Other Principles of Good Evidence

Key characteristics of evidence and useful data for improvement begin with validity and reliability. They also include data relevance, representativeness, cumulativeness, fairness, robustness, and actionability. The principles or attributes of good evidence addressed in this Appendix expand on, and extend, terms that appear in CAEP Standards 5 and A.5, components 5.2 and A.5.2. Standards 5 and A.5 state

*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.*

This Appendix to the handbook is a guide to attributes of evidence that EPPs use to monitor their status and progress, and evidence that will be compelling for accreditation purposes. The Appendix draws from three sources: a paper prepared by Peter Ewell for the CAEP Commission on Standards and Performance Reporting;<sup>22</sup> a National Academy of Education report on Evaluation of Teacher Preparation Programs, released in the fall of 2013;<sup>23</sup> and additional review and consideration by CAEP’s Data Task Force in 2014.

Of the seven attributes described in these pages, five are the same as ones included in Standard 5:

- valid and consistent (or reliable) are item a;
- relevant is item b;
- representative is item c;
- cumulative (which includes “multiple measures”) is item d; and
- actionable is item g.

Verifiable as listed in components 5.2 and A.5.2 refers to review by external parties of the data as well as the means by which they were generated and analyzed, a concept partly addressed by reliability. The other items below are

- fairness (item e) which means free from bias, and
- robustness (item f) referring to evidence that is a direct and compelling measure of the condition intended to be informed.

**a) Validity and Reliability.** All measures are in some way flawed and contain an error term that may be known or unknown. In general, the greater the error, the less precise—and therefore useful—the measure. But the level of precision needed depends on the circumstances in which the measure is applied. To be used in accreditation decisions, measures need to be founded upon reliable measurement procedures, but they also need to be designed to operate under less-than-ideal

---

<sup>22</sup> Ewell, Peter (2013). *Principles for Measures Used in the CAEP Accreditation Process*, prepared for the CAEP Commission on Standards and Performance Reporting, Retrieved May 12 from <http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/accreditation-resources/caep-measure-principle.pdf?la=en>.

<sup>23</sup> Feuer, J. J., Floden, R. E., Chudowsky, N., and Ahn, J. (2013). *Evaluation of teacher preparation programs: Purposes, methods, and policy options*. Washington, DC: National Academy of Education. Retrieved May 12 from [http://www.naeducation.org/xpedio/groups/naedsite/documents/webpage/naed\\_085581.pdf](http://www.naeducation.org/xpedio/groups/naedsite/documents/webpage/naed_085581.pdf).

measurement conditions. Even the most rigorous measures, moreover, may not embrace the entire range of validities—construct, concurrent, and predictive.

The meaning of *validity* has evolved and has come to embrace the appropriateness of the use to which the measure is put (“consequential validity” as in Messick, 1995). This means, for example, that studies of value-added measures (VAM) that explicitly consider their use as program evaluation indicators, rather than as a component of teacher or school evaluation, are more applicable for preparation program review situations.

In its data analyses to support continuous improvement and accreditation self-studies, accredited EPPs meet accepted research standards for validity and reliability of comparable measures and, among other things, rule out alternative explanations or rival interpretations of reported results. Validity can be supported through evidence of

Expert validation of the items in an assessment or rating form (for convergent validity)

- A measure’s ability to predict performance on another measure (for predictive validity)
- Expert validation of performance or of artifacts (expert judgment)
- Agreement among coders or reviewers of narrative evidence<sup>24</sup>.

**Excerpt from National Academy of Education report,  
Evaluation of Teacher Preparation Programs<sup>25</sup>**

NOTE: “TPP” = Teacher  
Preparation Program

**Validity**

*Validity* is defined in the literature of measurement and testing as “the extent to which evidence and theory support the interpretations of test scores” (Messick, 1989; American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, and National Council on Measurement in Education, 1999). There is a vast literature about the concept of test validity that goes back many decades (in addition to Messick, 1989, see, for example, Cronbach and Meehl, 1955; Shepard, 1993).

Evaluations typically make use of multiple measures rather than a single test, but key questions about validity, including the following, apply to TPP evaluation:

- To what extent does the evaluation measure what it claims to measure? (This is sometimes referred to as *construct validity*.)
- Are the right attributes being measured in the right balance? (This is sometimes referred to as *content validity*.)
- Is there evidence that teachers graduating from highly rated TPPs prove more effective in the classroom? (This is sometimes referred to as *predictive validity*.)
- Is a measure subjectively viewed as being important and relevant to assessing TPPs? (This is sometimes referred to as *face validity*.)

<sup>24</sup> Report of the CAEP Commission on Standards, pp. 33, 34, Retrieved here on May 27:  
<http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/standards/commrpt.pdf?la=en>

<sup>25</sup> Feuer et al., NAE, 2013. p. 14



The committee takes the view that *consequences* are central to judging the soundness of a TPP evaluation system. Questions about consequential validity—an aspect of validity that addresses the intended and unintended consequences of test interpretation and use (Messick, 1989)—include the following:

- To what extent does the evaluation affect the behavior of teacher educators in the ways intended?
- To what extent does the evaluation create perverse incentives such as “gaming” of the system on the part of teacher educators, lead to policy decisions with unknown or unwanted long-term effects, or create other unintended consequences?

Although debate continues among education and measurement researchers about whether consequences should be included in the formal definition of validity (Messick, 1989; Linn, 1997; Popham, 1997; Shepard, 1997; Feuer, 2013a), there is widespread agreement that monitoring consequences of an assessment system is crucial in determining the system’s soundness and value. For discussion of a particularly important aspect of consequential validity, see Principle 5.<sup>26</sup>

At the heart of *reliability* is the question, “Can the evidence be corroborated?” Because all evidence is of variable or unknown quality and coverage, it should always be backed up or “triangulated” by evidence from other sources that provide results that are consistent with those already shown. These sources, which can include qualitative data as well as quantitative, should be as different from one another as possible, and the more of them that are presented, the better. A second basic question related to reliability is, “Can the finding be replicated?” Additional confirmation of what any evidence shows can be provided by clear documentation that would allow the finding to be replicated.

Reliability in its various forms can be supported through evidence of

- Agreement among multiple raters of the same event or artifact (or the same candidate at different points in time);
- Stability or consistency of ratings over time; and
- Evidence of internal consistency of measures.

**b) Relevance.** The measures advanced ought to be demonstrably related to a question of importance that is being investigated. This principle implies validity, but it 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.

The principle implies two things with respect to CAEP accreditation. First, any evidence that is advanced by an EPP for accreditation should be appropriately related to a particular CAEP Standard or Standards that the program is claiming it meets. Furthermore, multiple items or measures of evidence will ideally be brought together so that there will be information about several elements of a standard, or portions of several standards. Evidence that only attempts to document atomized bits of learning is discouraged. The best evidence involves forms of assessment in which candidates are

---

<sup>26</sup> The reference is to “Principle 5” in the NAE report, which the report summarizes (p. 6): Evaluation systems may have differential and potentially unfair effects on diverse populations of prospective teachers and communities.

asked to perform tasks similar to those they will face in their initial employment as education professionals.

Second, evidence that is advanced by an EPP should be demonstrably related to desired candidate proficiencies. Candidates need opportunities to develop proficiencies that are assessed on a test and to be informed prior to its administration what is expected from them.

- The EPP curriculum and experiences should prepare candidates for what is to be tested.
- Unit and program leaders should be clear and explicit about their expectations for candidate proficiencies in relation to standards, and candidates should know and understand what those expectations are so they can effectively strive to achieve them.
- Faculty expectations may be conveyed in narrative descriptive material, perhaps including examples, *in advance* of any assessment.
- Faculty have a responsibility to provide clear directions covering what candidates are supposed to do, and how their responses to any assessments of these expectations are to be prepared.

**c) Representativeness.** Any measure put forward should be typical of an underlying situation or condition, not an isolated case. If statistics are presented based on a sample, therefore, 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 in the form of case studies or narratives, multiple instances should be documented or additional data shown to indicate how typical the examples chosen really are. 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.

There are occasions when a purposeful designed to meet a particular and intentionally limited objective is preferable or necessary. This approach might be appropriate when access to data is limited or when issues of practicality intrude. An example might be a case study that gathers P-12 student learning data or teacher observation evaluations only from a particular school district that happens to employ a significant group of the EPP's completers. In a case of this type, the EPP needs to be explicit about what part of the whole population is being represented. For example, the proportion of completers from a particular academic year who were employed by District X, spelling out how those completers were similar to, or different from, the cohort of that year's completers. In addition, such a study might be a part of a larger plan comprised of a cluster of studies that, over time, would accumulate to results that are more generally representative of completers or of hired completers.

The guiding question for this principle should always be, "Is the evidence drawn from situations that are typical and potentially generalizable?" All evidence should be drawn from situations that are typical. A given case study advanced as evidence should therefore be closely examined to determine if a similar case study in another situation or setting might show something else.

**d) Cumulativeness.** 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. Both imply that the entire set of measures used under a given standard should be mutually

reinforcing. The EPP should provide an explanation as to the way these measures are reinforcing and, if they are not, an explanation for that lack of congruence.

Providers using qualitative methods to analyze qualitative data (e.g., candidate reflections and journals, mentor teacher qualitative feedback) should describe the method used to analyze those data. Usually this involves triangulation of the data using one or more methods. The three most frequently employed types of triangulation are described below:

- *Data Triangulation* involves using different sources of information in order to increase the validity of the study. This includes such processes as in-depth interviews with a variety of stakeholders being interviewed to determine areas of agreement or divergence. And it includes time (collecting data at various points in time), space (collecting data at more than one site), and person (collecting data at more than one level of person) triangulation.
- *Investigator Triangulation* involves using different (more than two investigators) in the analysis process. Each investigator examines the data using the same qualitative method to reach an independent determination. The findings are compared and areas of agreement and divergences are sought.
- *Methodological Triangulation* involves the use of multiple qualitative and/or quantitative methods. For example, the results from surveys are compared to focus groups and in-depth interviews to determine if similar results are found.

The purpose of using triangulation is to ensure completeness and to confirm findings. In qualitative research, validity and reliability are aligned with the concept of “trustworthiness.” By using triangulation, the “trustworthiness” of the findings can be confirmed or replicated.

All aspects of a preparation program from recruitment and admissions, through completion and into on-the-job performance should be informed by multiple measures. These measures will:

- Document and monitor effects of EPP admissions selection criteria.
- Monitor candidate progress.
- Monitor completer achievements.
- Monitor provider operational effectiveness.
- Demonstrate that the provider satisfies all CAEP Standards.
- Trace status and progress of the EPP on measures of program impact:
  - P-12 student learning and development,
  - Indicators of teaching effectiveness,
  - Results of employer surveys, including retention and employment milestones, and
  - Results of completer surveys.
- Trace status and progress of the EPP measures of program outcomes:
  - Completer or graduation rates,
  - Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state accreditation requirements,
  - Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they are prepared, and
  - Other consumer information, including student loan default rates for completers.

A first guiding question for this principle is, “Is the evidence theoretically grounded?” Every body of evidence is situated within a larger theoretical or conceptual framework that guides the entire investigation. Every new piece of evidence generated or applied builds upon this framework to

create new understanding. For example, case descriptions of candidate teaching in a clinical setting are located within and made sense of through frameworks that describe sound teaching practice.

A second guiding question is, “Is the evidence part of a coherent and explicit chain of reasoning?” Sound evidence requires the development of a logical chain of reasoning from questions to empirical observations that is coherent, transparent, and persuasive to a skeptical outsider.

- e) Fairness.** Measures should be free from bias and suitable for application by any potential user or observer. Potential sources of bias might be introduced by the values or beliefs of those applying the measure, such as the conviction that a particular result should be observed. Other sources of bias are situational, such as the limited perspective of an untrained observer undertaking a classroom observation or applying a rubric. In this sense, fairness is a special case of reliability: a fair measure will return the same result even if applied by different observers under different circumstances or at different points in time. With this principle in place, it follows that all evidence should be systematically reviewed to ensure fairness.

Another aspect of fairness is that a sound set of measures should respect a range of client perspectives including the program, the student, the employer, and the state or jurisdiction. Taken as a whole, a set of measures should potentially support the establishment of an informed dialogue among the appropriate parties. A statistic on the employment rates of program completers, for example, can be summarized from the candidate point of view as the probability of being placed, from the program’s point of view as a placement rate, and from an employer’s point of view as the proportion of job openings filled each year. To reflect stakeholder interests, moreover, proposed measures should be neither arcane nor overly academic.

- f) Robustness.** A robust body of evidence will lead to the same set of conclusions in the face of a good deal of “noise” or measurement error. Triangulation and replication will bolster the credibility of any set of measures in this respect. A guiding question here should be, “Is the evidence direct and compelling?” Evidence should be directly related to the underlying condition or phenomenon under investigation. For example, if the effectiveness of candidate preparation is the object, student testimony through surveys indicating that they feel that they have received effective preparation should not be the only form of evidence submitted.

All measures are also to some extent vulnerable to manipulation. This is one reason to insist upon triangulation and mutual reinforcement across the measures used under each standard. For example, program graduation and licensure passage rates depend a great deal on which students are included in the denominator. Because the incentives to perform well on such measures are considerable, programs may identify ways to construct these denominators that yield maximum values on these measures regardless of what they are actually doing.

- g) Actionability.** Good measures, finally, should provide programs with specific guidance for action and improvement. Many promising measures fail simply because they are too expensive, too complex, too time consuming, or too politically costly to implement. Often, the simplest are best, even if they seem less technically attractive. A guiding question here is, “Why is the evidence important?” The intent of the evidence presented should be clear and the evidence should directly suggest program improvements. For example, the potential results of a given case study should be important or significant enough to trigger actions to modify the program.

Actionability also depends on the evidence having clear standards of comparison. Without clear standards of comparison, the interpretation of any measure is subject to considerable doubt. Measures can be compared across programs, against peers, against established “best practices,” against established goals, against national or state norms, or over time. For every measure under each standard, CAEP should be able to indicate an appropriate benchmark against which a given program’s performance can be judged. This principle also suggests that any measure should be able to be disaggregated to reveal underlying patterns of strength and weakness or to uncover populations who could be served more effectively. Finally, the measures provided should be reflectively analyzed and interpreted to reveal specific implications for the program.

# APPENDIX E

## EVIDENCE FROM CASE STUDIES AND P-12 IMPACT STUDIES

### Introduction

The report from CAEP's 2013 Commission on Standards described explicit steps to ensure that accreditation would set high standards, then back them up with diverse and rigorous evidence. CAEP's accreditation evidence would document what candidates know and are able to do in their chosen specialty and their academic achievements, while retaining important descriptive information about an EPP's context and mission. CAEP would call on EPPs to create multiple measures of candidate performances, including information on non-academic characteristics the EPP has chosen to monitor.

Other CAEP accreditation evidence asks EPPs to document their quality assurance systems and purposeful use of data for continuous improvement, to test innovations, and also to track the impact of completers after they are on the job in schools and districts. These aspects of the CAEP Standards may best be addressed with evidence derived from case studies or from results of completers' experiences when they are employed. This Appendix addresses these two sources of evidence:

1. the conduct of "case studies" by EPPs through which the leadership and faculty examine the effects of specific actions they take to improve the preparation of their completers, and
2. the gathering and analysis of information about completer performance in terms of P-12 student learning and development.

### Case Studies

Case studies are investigations of data gathered about particular program features, or demonstrations of the consequences of a practice. Here are some examples:

- Assess the effects of an EPP's attempts to develop candidate persistence and leadership abilities (or "grit") through explicit instruction and during clinical practice opportunities. *This could be relevant accreditation evidence for Standard 3 (component 3.3 on non-academic measures) and Standard 5 (component 5.3 on testing innovations);*
- Pilot a new clinical experience task in which candidates demonstrate their developing abilities to diagnose individual student needs, analyze the information available to them to determine appropriate next steps, engage P-12 students with those steps, then evaluate their results. *Such a task is one example of what an EPP might do under Standard 2 (component 2.3) to illustrate that its clinical experiences are of "sufficient depth, breadth, coherence and duration" to ensure that candidates develop effective strategies to have positive effects on diverse students' learning and development;*
- Conduct a study of completers that develops ways to define "impact on P-12 student learning and development," gathers data from completers consistent with that definition, and analyzes results in terms of how well prepared the EPP's completers are for their on-the-job instructional roles. *A task such as this would be an example of testing innovations under Standard 5 (component 5.3) and would also explicitly address an EPP's search for appropriate information on Standard 4 measures of results (specifically, for component 4.1 on P-12 student learning and*

*development and component 4.2 on teacher observation evaluations and/or student perception surveys).*

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching has advocated a form of improvement research, an evidence-based strategy to identify specific problems of practice such as the examples above, to purposively change preparation practices with the intent of obtaining better results to document and analyze the results, and then repeat the cycle. Leaders of the foundation have written the following set of notes on continuous improvement 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 at the Initial- and Advanced-Levels), and identify gaps between current results and established standards, why is it 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? <sup>27</sup>

In assembling accreditation evidence from this type of study, the standards that apply to research for peer review and publication cannot be implemented rigidly or in all situations. Here are some guidelines to keep in mind:

- **Focus on results**—Data used for improvement efforts and accreditation should ultimately aim to enhance preparation performance outputs related to P-12 student learning;
- **Always improve**—Data for accreditation should be some portion of the data that an EPP uses for its own continuous improvement efforts. A successful EPP builds capacity for improvement—not for “compliance;”
- **Rely on data**—Collecting valid and reliable data from multiple sources to inform decision making is an essential component of a continuous improvement system; and

---

<sup>27</sup> Email dated February 24, 2017, Ash Vasudeva, Vice President for Strategic Initiatives, to Christopher Koch

- **Engage stakeholders**—EPPs engage stakeholders as an integral part of their ongoing effort to improve programs.

In developing and implementing their case studies, EPPs may prefer a more structured approach than that suggested by the questions that Carnegie framed for CAEP’s Standard 5, above. The insert, below, is compiled from several Carnegie Foundation sources. It describes these steps: identify the topic; generate ideas for change; define the measurements; test promising solutions; sustain and scale solutions; and share knowledge.<sup>28</sup>

**i. Identify the topic to study.** Questions, and the case study designs developed to investigate them, should reflect a solid understanding of relevant prior theoretical, methodological, and empirical work. Tony Bryk of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching asks, “What specifically is the problem we are trying to solve?” And he observes that engaging key participants early and often at this and later stages is enlivening and important. Questions that EPPs can pose include the following:

- Is your improvement work focused on identifying and solving specific problems of practice that are measurable and whose solutions are reasonably attainable?
- What evidence have you used to identify the problem?
- Does your problem statement (question of inquiry) reflect a solid understanding of relevant prior theoretical, methodological, and empirical work on this topic?

**ii. Generate ideas for change.** Developing ideas to address the identified problem is not just a matter of brainstorming. Bryk cautions that it is hard to improve what you do not fully understand. He advises, “Go and see how local conditions shape work processes. Make your hypotheses for change public and clear.” Generating ideas should be a deliberative process that considers such questions as the following:

- Do you have a disciplined process in place for generating promising ideas for solving the problem?
- Does the process involve key stakeholders and end users?
- Are the ideas based upon a strong theoretical framework?
- Are the ideas clearly and directly aligned with the problem to be addressed?

**iii. Define the measurements.** What measures can be used to determine whether the change is an improvement? Bryk notes that measures should be embedded to gauge key outcomes and processes, tracking changes, and supporting judgments that the changes are actually improvements. He also reminds EPPs to anticipate unintended consequences and to measure those as well.

<sup>28</sup> See resources available through the Carnegie Foundation and AERA including the following:

- *Improvement Research*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Retrieved May 15, 2019, from <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/improvement-research/approach>.
- *The Six Core Principles of Improvement*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Retrieved May 15, 2019, from <https://www.carnegiefoundation.org/our-ideas/six-core-principles-improvement/>.
- 2014 AERA Distinguished Lecture, *Accelerating How We Learn to Improve*, Anthony S. Bryk, First Published December 1, 2015. Retrieved May 15, 2019, from <http://journals.sagepub.com/stoken/rbtf/nivlR./JY.5Y6/full>.



**iv. Test promising solutions.** Bryk reminds us that the critical issue at this stage is not only what works, but rather what works, for whom, and under what set of conditions? He further urges EPPs to adopt a *Plan-Do-Study-Act cycle*,<sup>29</sup> and observes “that failures may occur is not the problem; that we fail to learn from them is.” Key questions embodied in this process include the following:

- Does the EPP have a system in place to test ideas in authentic settings, rapidly collect and analyze results, make adjustments, and test interventions in additional contexts?
- Is the EPP using the measures set up in section iii to test promising solutions?
- Is the EPP able to determine if the change is an “improvement” based upon the evidence?
- Is the EPP able to determine through evidence what works, for whom, and under what set of conditions?

**v. Sustain and scale solutions.** A key goal of improvement work is the effort to transform promising ideas into sustainable solutions that achieve effectiveness reliably at scale. The term “scaling up” is popularly used to indicate moving from a limited effort to one that is much more widely implemented. Within an EPP, the concept might pertain to moving from piloting a “promising solution” with, say, half of the elementary teacher candidates, to the entire elementary preparation program. Or it might mean adapting a successful “promising solution” developed for the elementary preparation program to secondary preparation or preparation of special education teachers.

Issues of sustainability and scaling should be built into the solution’s design from the outset and not be done as an afterthought of the improvement process. Bryk writes, “Accelerate improvements through networked communities. Embrace the wisdom of crowds. We can accomplish more together than even the best of us can accomplish alone.”

Here are questions to consider at the early stages and into the later steps:

- Does the EPP intend to implement the solution in other programs or contexts over time?
- What level of evidence does the EPP need to begin to scale the solution?
- At what point will the EPP need to conduct an impact study?
- Will scaling require changes in the design of the solution? How will these changes affect performance?

**vi. Share knowledge.** Bryk emphasizes that building the field’s capacity to “learn in and through practice to improve” is a critical need.<sup>30</sup> Thus, sharing new knowledge about both the solution and the improvement process for developing it is a critical element of this improvement work. Here are several questions to consider:

- What conclusions and inferences can be drawn from the solutions generated through the process?
- How will the EPP share the findings?

<sup>29</sup> Langley, G. J., Moen, R., Nolan, K. M., Nolan, T. W., Norman, C. L., & Provost, L. P. (2009). *The improvement guide: A practical approach to enhancing organizational performance (2nd ed.)*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. Retrieved May 16, 2019, from <http://www.ihl.org/resources/Pages/HowtoImprove/default.aspx>.

<sup>30</sup> Bryk, A. S., et al. (2013, June). *Improvement research carried out through networked communities: Accelerating learning about practices that support more productive student mindsets* (p. 3). Retrieved May 16, 2019, from [http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/sites/default/files/improvement\\_research\\_NICs\\_bryk-yeager.pdf](http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/sites/default/files/improvement_research_NICs_bryk-yeager.pdf).

- What lessons has the EPP learned about the continuous improvement process itself?
- What kinds of adjustments are needed in the EPP's continuous improvement process?
- What more does the EPP need to know about the solution and continuous improvement?

## Impact on P-12 Student Learning and Development

### a. Context

CAEP Standard 4, on preparation program impact, begins with a call that providers demonstrate “the impact of (their) 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.” The concept that teacher impact on P-12 student learning is a basis for judging preparation occurs throughout the CAEP Standards, and anticipates measures at both pre-service and in-service levels. The commissioners viewed candidate and completer impact on student learning as the “ultimate” measure by which preparation would be judged. P-12 student learning might be perceived as the only *direct* measure of the results of teacher classroom performances.

The public has heard many claims from researchers and from advocates favoring or opposing P-12 student learning as a factor in evaluating teachers. However, the research knowledge base has accumulated so that the debate is now *less* about should we or should we not, and *more* about what are the appropriate ways to apply these data in different situations.

For additional perspectives, readers are referred to papers prepared with CAEP collaboration by the American Psychological Association<sup>31</sup> and, through a CAEP commission by the Value-Added Research Center at the University of Wisconsin.<sup>32</sup> Both of these are applications of P-12 student learning data in teacher evaluations for the purposes of program evaluation and accreditation rather than for evaluation of individual teacher performance. Research into appropriate ways to judge the effects of teachers in the classroom is a topic for continued investigation, and CAEP's use of such research for accreditation purposes, rather than for employment evaluations adds some complexity. Among other topics, investigations should document whether particular measures employed are appropriately aligned with the curriculum implemented by the teachers for whom results are reported.

A 2013 report from the National Academy of Education<sup>33</sup> is addressed entirely to evaluation of teacher preparation programs and contains the boxed summary, below, on P-12 learning measures in teacher evaluations. Note that the statement distinguishes use of P-12 student learning data to evaluate preparation from using them “for high-stakes decisions about individual teachers” (see last paragraph).

<sup>31</sup> Brabeck, M., Dwyer, C., Geisinger, K., Marx, R., Noell, G., Pianta, R., & Worrell, F. (2013). *Assessing and Evaluating Teacher Preparation Programs*, draft paper. American Psychological Association. Washington, DC. Retrieved May 16, 2019, from <http://www.apa.org/ed/schools/teaching-learning/teacher-preparation-programs.pdf>.

<sup>32</sup> Meyer, R., Pyatigorsky, M., & Rice, A. (2014). *Evaluation of educators and educator preparation programs: Models and systems in theory and practice* (WCER Working Paper No. 2014-6). Retrieved May 27, 2019, from [https://wcer.wisc.edu/docs/working-papers/Working\\_Paper\\_No\\_2014\\_06.pdf](https://wcer.wisc.edu/docs/working-papers/Working_Paper_No_2014_06.pdf)

<sup>33</sup> Feuer, M. J., et al. (2013). *Evaluation of teacher preparation programs: Purposes, methods, and policy options* (pp. 36-37). Washington, DC: National Academy of Education. Retrieved May 2, 2019, from <https://naeducation.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/028489-Evaluation-of-Teacher-prep.pdf>.

**Exhibit 3 • Excerpt from National Academy of Education report,  
*Evaluation of Teacher Preparation Programs – The Potential Value and Risks of  
Using***

***VAMs for TPP Evaluation***

NOTE: “TPP” = Teacher Preparation Program

Value-added models (VAMs) hold promise for moving TPP evaluation forward. They are an important development because they represent the only approach to TPP evaluation that actually judges TPP quality based on the effectiveness of their graduates in producing growth in student achievement, while controlling for out-of-school factors that are not subject to teachers’ influence. The results can help determine which TPPs produce the most effective teachers and can spur weaker providers to emulate those programs’ practices. VAMs allow for repeated measurement of a relevant, meaningful outcome of interest, and if results are stable or show clear trends over time, they offer the potential to improve programs by providing feedback in a domain in which data have not been available in the past (Reusser, Butler, Symonds, Vetter, and Wall, 2007; Gansle, Noell, and Burns, 2013).

Critics argue that the value-added approach is fraught with methodological difficulties, which render the results untrustworthy. Many of the difficulties relate to the general use of VAMs for measuring teacher effectiveness. A joint report of the National Research Council and National Academy of Education (2010) details some of the problems, including concerns about the standardized tests that provide the raw data for value-added analyses and technical problems related to bias, imprecision, and instability. There are also issues of transparency and public understanding of the results.

Most of the research on the use of VAMs specifically for TPP evaluation has focused on how well these models differentiate between different TPPs. Findings have been mixed. Several studies have found significant variation across TPPs in the average effectiveness of the teachers they produce (Boyd, Grossman, Landford, Loeb, and Wyckoff, 2008; Noell and Gleason, 2011; Goldhaber and Liddle, 2012; Henry, Bastian, and Smith, 2012; Plecki, Elfers, and Nakamura, 2012), but a few other studies have found only very small differences between programs (Mason, 2010; Koedel, Parsons, Podgursky, and Ehlert 2012). Other problems include incomplete data and the fact that methodological variations in statistical models can produce different judgments about TPP effectiveness (Mihaly, McCaffrey, Sass, and Lockwood, 2012). It is difficult to separate TPP effects from school-level factors (e.g., the culture at a school, the effectiveness of principals). The fact that some schools tend to hire teachers from particular TPPs makes this especially challenging (Mihaly, McCaffrey, Sass, and Lockwood, 2012). Another complexity is whether the VAM accounts for the possibility that training program effects decay or potentially grow over time; while it makes sense to evaluate TPPs based only on the most recent three cohorts of program graduates, limiting analyses to a few cohorts creates significant sample size problems if the programs are small (Goldhaber and Liddle, 2012).

As Harris (2011) explains, many of the most serious criticisms about VAMs assume they will be used as the basis for high-stakes decisions about individual teachers, such as decisions on hiring, firing, and pay. TPP evaluations avoid this problem by aggregating results from many teachers to make judgments about programs rather than individuals (Bryk, 2012). The odds of making valid decisions using VAMs can be further increased if the results are based on two or more years of data and if the VAM is just one of the multiple measures in an evaluation system (Harris, 2011; Meyer, Pyatigorsky, Rice, and Winter, 2013). Evaluation systems could use a VAM as an initial filter or trigger to identify the very lowest-performing TPPs that need further examination using additional methods.

## b. Guidelines

All EPPs that seek CAEP accreditation are expected to provide evidence of completer impact on P-12 student learning. These may come from such sources as the following:

- **Pre-service progress**—standardized measures where they are available, or periodic measures, designed and conducted by EPPs to supplement other measures;
- **Pre-service exit**—for example, edTPA that includes pre-and post-instruction P-12 student data, the ETS PPAT portfolio with similar student data, or state constructed teaching performance measures;
- **State teacher evaluations**—student learning, growth measures, or VAMs linked with teachers (NOTE: See items a-k, appropriate qualitative characteristics for state P-12 student learning data, in point ii, below.);
- **“Teachers of record” for alternative preparation**—state student growth and VAMs apply; and
- **Provider studies**—case studies conducted by the EPP.<sup>34</sup>

Accreditation information on candidate and completer P-12 student impact will frequently be provided through case study evidence. But the issues attending the gathering and use of these data are sufficiently unique that these supplemental guidelines have been written for EPPs. Note that point ii, below, describes situations where EPPs are recipients of data from states that include P-12 student learning information linked with completers.

### b.i. All EPPs provide the following information in their self-studies about impact on P-12 student learning:

- **Their case for the validity and reliability of P-12 student learning impact information as they use it for preparation and accreditation purposes.** Each EPP interprets the meaning and significance of the pre-service and in-service data, and describes how the data have been used for program- or continuous-improvement purposes.
- Information taken from **pre-service assessments** of candidate impact on P-12 student learning.

<sup>34</sup> Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). (2013). *CAEP Accreditation Standards* (p. 33). Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved May 16, 2019, from <http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/standards/commrpt.pdf?la=en>

- **All providers administer assessments that monitor candidate proficiencies, including impact on P-12 student learning,** at various points during their developmental preparation experiences.
- **All providers administer capstone assessments that sample multiple aspects of teaching.** These routinely include measures of 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 external reviewers.

**b.ii. EPPs that have access to data from states about completer impact on P-12 student learning:**

- **Demonstrate that they are familiar with the sources of the P-12 student learning impact data and the state’s model for preparing the data that are attributed to the EPP’s preparation program.** EPPs learn how the data are produced, and make their own interpretations of the data. Responsible state data systems make information transparent to describe

**The state teacher evaluations that are sent to EPPs, including**

- a) The psychometric soundness of the assessments taken by P-12 students and the alignment of those assessments with the State’s curriculum, and
- b) Other sources of information in the teacher evaluation that complement that on P-12 student learning, such as employer satisfaction, teacher classroom observations, candidate satisfaction with preparation, and other relevant measures.

**The P-12 students’ data**

- c) The proportion of the EPP’s completers for whom P-12 student growth measures are available and the extent to which the reported completers are representative of all completers from the EPP programs,
- d) The degree of attrition from prior to current performance measures of P-12 students that would influence interpretations of the data, and
- e) The manner by which pupil 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 actually taught by the EPP’s completers).

**The state's practices in reporting the data**

- f) The level of state disaggregation of data so that relevant information is available for specific preparation fields,
- g) The state criteria used to establish the minimum number of completers for whom data are provided to the EPP,
- h) The state’s decisions as to the number of years after preparation program completion that a completer’s performance is associated with their preparation,
- i) The state’s practice in flagging possible biases or misrepresentation in the results,
- j) The disaggregations provided by the state that permit comparisons for prior P-12 student performance, and

- k) The disaggregations provided by the state that permit comparisons for completers teaching in similar situations, such as special education, disability, English language learners, attendance, and giftedness.
- **Document the EPP’s analysis and evaluation of information provided on P-12 student learning, addressing**
  - **Characteristics and patterns in the data, such as**
    - a) The stability of the data over time,
    - b) Identification of trends or associations with program or policy features that are observed,
    - c) Separating, to the extent possible, the EPP’s recruitment efforts from program actions, and
    - d) Adjusting, to the extent possible, for the years of experience of teachers for whom data are reported.
  - **Interpretations of the data, such as**
    - e) Comparisons of P-12 student learning results for the EPP with other EPPs in the state, or with the range in performance across all providers in the state;
    - f) EPP explanation of why P-12 learning results may be high or low based on EPP placements and other factors related to their mission, noting relevant factors such as the location of typical employment sites; and
    - g) Explanation of the relationships that confirm or question P-12 student learning results, based on other evidence (especially other evidence on program impact such as employer surveys; completer retention and career trajectory; structured teacher observations; and P-12 student data).
- **Judge the implications of the data and analyses for the preparation program, consider appropriate modifications, and describe EPP actions to revise the curriculum or experiences in preparation.**

**b.iii. EPPs that do not have access to state P-12 student learning data and EPPs that are supplementing state or district data with data on subjects or grades not covered**

- The EPP creates data similar to those described in point ii, above, in conjunction with student assessment and teacher evaluations conducted *in school districts* where some portion of its completers are employed.
  - This type of EPP case study could be phased in. For example, initially the EPP would create an appropriate design, then conduct a pilot data collection and analysis, then make refinements and further data collection.
  - The EPP could maintain a continuing cycle of such studies, examining completer performance in different grades and/or subjects over time.
  - All EPPs should at least have a design in place and pilot data collection under way.
- The case study guide at the beginning of this Appendix provides additional information that can be adapted to construct P-12 learning documentation from district sources.

# APPENDIX F:

## OPTIONAL EVIDENCE FOR WRITING PROFICIENCY

### WHAT THE OPTION IS

- The alternative evidence would be from writing task assignments that are built into courses, experiences, or EPP-wide assignments selected by the EPP. EPPs may draw from writing experiences already in the preparation courses and experiences (e.g., tasks included in teacher work sample portfolios), but must evaluate them explicitly for writing.
- EPPs that elect to employ this optional source of candidate writing communications proficiency would identify the specific places during preparation where the writing tasks are to be completed as well as the specific prompts that candidates would be assigned.
  - Three candidate samples of significant original prose writing would be embedded in the EPP's writing achievement monitoring. These would focus on three of the types of writing that are commonly performed by educators, such as those listed here or others identified by the EPP:
    - information (e.g., a letter to a parent),
    - descriptions (e.g., a report to a principal on a class field trip),
    - instructions (e.g., how an assigned task is to be carried out by a P-12 student),
    - analysis (e.g., why a particular text book should be purchased rather than another), or
    - advocacy (e.g., a grant application).
  - Each prompt would call for a significant demonstration of candidate writing (e.g., 500-1000 words each). They could be extemporaneous (i.e., "on demand") or assigned, as the EPP prefers.
  - The three writing samples could be administered at different points during preparation, or could be part of a series of gateway or culminating candidate experiences.
- EPPs evaluate candidate writing using rubrics appropriate for the assigned tasks. The following are well suited to most general writing types: **the ACT writing domains**, <https://www.act.org/content/dam/act/unsecured/documents/Writing-Test-Scoring-Rubric.pdf>, **the SAT writing rubric**, <http://www.act.org/content/act/en/products-and-services/the-act/scores/writing-test-scores.html>, or **GRE analytic writing** [https://www.ets.org/gre/revised\\_general/scores/how/analytical\\_descriptions](https://www.ets.org/gre/revised_general/scores/how/analytical_descriptions). These rubrics address such topics as
  - use of language, a clear claim, a progression of ideas, clear reasoning, effective beginnings and conclusions, variety of sentence structure, word choice, and conventions of standard use of English.
  - If an EPP chooses to create its own rubrics, it might consider building on one of these and supplementing the criteria at each level with ones unique to the particular writing tasks assigned.

### WHAT EPPS WOULD PROVIDE IN THEIR SELF-STUDY REPORTS

- A description of the assigned tasks together with one sample of the "best" level writing and one at the candidates' "average."

- An evaluation of EPP writing evidence tasks using the CAEP Framework for Evaluation of EPP-created assessments—especially the rubrics on informing candidates about the purpose, alignment with writing goals (i.e., not subject content), steps to demonstrate data quality, and guides for evaluating candidate work (such as double scoring).
- The overall candidate average score and the EPP’s analysis of data on score distributions across diverse populations as well as for different campus sites or mode of delivery, if any.
- An interpretation of overall candidate writing proficiency in terms of EPP goals and their perspective on the level of proficiency needed for beginning educators on the job.
- When EPPs use SAT or ACT rubrics to judge their candidate’s writing, they can make their own comparison of their candidate’s writing with the average national writing performance for the SAT (average score is 2.65 on a scale of 1-4), ACT (average score is 3.30 on a scale of 1-6), or GRE (average score of 3.74 on a scale of 1-6).
- A case for the specific evaluation rubrics the EPP has chosen if they are different from or modified from those available from ACT, SAT, or GRE.
- A description of how the EPP is using the data as part of their continuous improvement efforts.

#### **WHAT CAEP SITE TEAMS WOULD DO**

- Examine whether the writing tasks align with the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-created Assessments and compare their perspective with that of the EPP.
- Consider the overall evidence to assess whether candidate proficiencies in writing, by completion, are sufficient for beginning educators on the job (i.e., is the candidate writing proficiently when judged with appropriate rubrics?).
- Determine that the EPP is effectively learning from its data on candidate writing proficiency and using them to inform candidate experiences to ensure entering professional level writing skills.
- Evaluate the evidence provided by the EPP that candidates needing support in their written communication skills are identified and effectively followed up.



# APPENDIX G

## 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 inconsistencies between this Glossary and policy, policy prevails.

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 for educational quality. (2) The decision rendered by CAEP when an EPP meets the CAEP Standards and requirements, subject to Appeals Council review in limited instances.
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 all-volunteer governance body that grants or withholds accreditation of an educator preparation provider (EPP), based on the review of findings from an initial review panel and a joint review panel. Subject to operational oversight by the CAEP Board of Directors, the Accreditation Council promulgates its own policies regarding the accreditation of EPPs based on the CAEP Standards.
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 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 reviewed by team members in-person or via technology.
Accreditation Status	The public recognition that the Accreditation Council or the Appeals Council grants to an educator preparation provider (EPP) to indicate the outcome of (1) an EPP’s application to CAEP, or (2) the accreditation

	<p>review. The outcome of an application to CAEP can be either Applicant Status or CAEP Eligible (sometimes referred to as CAEP Eligibility).</p> <p>The outcome of an accreditation review can be Accreditation, Accreditation with Stipulations, Probationary Accreditation, Revocation, or Denial. An EPP that is accredited by CAEP (or either of its predecessors NCATE or TEAC) and remains in good standing is considered Continuously Accredited (or in Continuing Accreditation status).</p>
Accreditation with Stipulation(s)	An accreditation decision indicating one or more systemic concerns or serious deficiencies in meeting the CAEP Standards and/or components that must be remedied by an educator preparation provider (EPP) within two years in order to retain status as a CAEP-accredited EPP.
Accredited	The accreditation status of an educator preparation provider (EPP) that meets all of CAEP’s standards and other requirements.
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.
Addendum	A formal report written by the EPP in response to the site team’s Formative Feedback Report, prior to the site visit. The Addendum may contain additional evidence and narrative to address preliminary findings of insufficient evidence based on the site team’s findings in the FFR.
Advanced-Level Licensure	Licensure, certification, or endorsement that signifies successful completion of preparation at the post-baccalaureate or graduate levels as specialized school professionals for employment in P-12 schools and districts. Advanced-level programs are designed to develop additional specialized professional skills for P-12 teachers who have already completed an initial licensure program, are currently licensed administrators, or are other certified (or similar state language) school professionals.
Adverse Action	A decision of the Accreditation Council for Revocation or Denial of accreditation, which may be affirmed, amended, reversed, or remanded by an Appeal Panel.
Aggregation	A process of grouping distinct or varied data together and considering them as a whole. See disaggregation (adapted from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges glossary).
All P-12 Students	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 the accreditation platform for annual report submission, and to support CAEP activities as outlined in its mission and strategic plan.
Annual Report	See EPP Annual Report.
Appeal	The process of reconsideration of Denial or Revocation of accreditation upon request by an educator preparation provider (EPP) in accordance with Appeals Policy.
Appeals Council	A decision making body from which a panel of qualified volunteers is drawn to review an appeal.
Appeals Panel	A group of five Appeals Councilors appointed from the Appeals Council by the CAEP President to review an EPP's appeal of an adverse action by the Accreditation Council. The Panel decides whether the Council's action is Affirmed, Amended, Reversed, or Remanded.
Applicant	The status of an educator preparation provider (EPP) that has successfully completed its Part 1 Application while its Part 2 Application is being completed or is under review.
Area for Improvement (AFI)	A determination by the Accreditation Council that describes a weakness in evidence for a CAEP standard and/or component that should be remediated by the end of the accreditation term. AFIs contrast with stipulations, which identify more serious deficiencies in evidence. Site visitors analyze the EPP's evidence to determine its sufficiency and make preliminary recommendations for AFIs. The Initial and Joint panels may confirm or modify the site visitor recommendations, and the final decision is made by the Accreditation Council. Progress toward improvement on AFIs is to be reported annually in the EPP 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).
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). Benchmark sometimes is used to refer to the “best in class” performance on a particular measure (e.g., applications of technology in small private liberal arts colleges).
Board of Directors	The CAEP governance body whose responsibilities include the adoption and revision of standards; governance policy development; the financial affairs of CAEP; and the election of CAEP’s Board members, committee members, and chair 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 entity 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 a primary recipient for CAEP related communications.
CAEP Eligible	The status conferred to an educator preparation provider (EPP) that has successfully completed CAEP’s 2-part application process and maintains eligibility through the payment of annual fees and the submission of an Annual Report.
Candidate	An individual engaged in the preparation process for professional educator licensure/certification/endorsement with an educator preparation provider (EPP). A candidate may be at either the initial licensure or advanced-level.
Capstone	A culminating project or experience that generally takes place in a candidate’s final year of study and requires review, synthesis, and application of what has been learned over the course of the candidate’s preparation program. The result may be a product (e.g., original research) or a performance (e.g., a teaching sequence). The capstone can provide evidence for assessment of a range of outcomes, (e.g., proficiencies) (adapted from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges glossary).
Case Study	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. Selection of participants from whom data will be gathered should be considered carefully so that, at the conclusion of the study, data will inform what works, for whom, and under what set of conditions. See Appendix E of this handbook, Case Studies section.

Certificate/License/ Credential	An official document or designation issued by a governmental agency or nongovernmental organization, in accordance with state law and policy, indicating 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); or (2) serve in a specific education role in a school (e.g., principal, reading specialist).
Certification/Licensure	The process by which a governmental agency or nongovernmental organization grants professional recognition to an individual who meets specified qualifications/requirements. States may use other terms.
Clinical Educators	See glossary entries for “School-based teacher educator” and “University-based teacher educator” (or EPP-based teacher educator).
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 Internship	The culminating clinical practice experience in some settings; can be of varying duration but no less than one university semester. During the clinical internship teacher candidates assume full responsibility for a pedagogical assignment under the coaching of school- and university-based teacher educators (AACTE “Lexicon of Practice,” 2017). [NOTE: In CAEP practice, which includes providers that are not located in either colleges or universities, there may be wider variation in the clinical internship duration and when it occurs. Some EPPs have multiple clinical experiences or are entirely clinically based, while others may have less than a “semester” duration.]
Clinical Practice	Teacher candidates’ work in authentic educational settings and engagement in the pedagogical work of the profession of teaching, closely integrated with educator preparation course work and supported by a formal school-university partnership. Clinical practice is a specific form of what is traditionally known as field work (AACTE “Lexicon of Practice,” 2017).
Clinical Practice Setting	A school or other authentic educational setting that works in partnership with an educator preparation program to provide clinical practice for teacher candidates (AACTE “Lexicon of Practice,” 2017).
Co-construct	A descriptor used in Standard 2 referring to a collaborative process through which features of clinical experiences are designed or arranged by EPPs together with their school or school district partners. Examples might include P-12 school outreach to community programs,

	applications of technology in the clinical experiences, and determining how candidates will receive timely descriptive feedback on their work.
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) or during an interval of time (e.g., all entrants or all completers during an academic year).
Cohort Average	Under CAEP Standard 3, component 3.2, the GPA and standardized test scores are averaged for all members of a cohort or class of admitted candidates. There may be a range of candidates' grades and scores on standardized tests. Averaging does not require that every candidate meet the specified score (definition adapted from 2013 report of the CAEP Commission on Standards and Performance Reporting). The term "cohort average" could apply to other accreditation evidence, such as assessment scores used to document Standard 1, component 1.1.
Complaint Review Committee	A committee of the Accreditation Council with responsibility for assessing the validity of, reviewing, and acting on complaints against an educator preparation provider (EPP).
Complaint	The formal submission of documents and other materials to seek investigation of an allegation (1) that an educator preparation provider (EPP) no longer meets one or more of the CAEP standard(s) or is not in compliance with CAEP's requirements for accreditation, pursuant to Accreditation Policy; or (2) that CAEP, including through the actions of accreditation volunteers, did not follow its established policies, pursuant to Governance Policy.
Completer	Any candidate who exited a preparation program by successfully satisfying the requirements of the educator preparation provider (EPP). For evidence in Standard 4, completers refer to those who have been employed in positions for which they were prepared by the EPP. This may be a lesser number than all completers in a given year.
Compliance	Presenting sufficient evidence of meeting the standards or requirements of a regulatory or accrediting body.
Component	A subdivision of a standard that elaborates upon and further defines the intent and scope of the standard. CAEP uses components as tagging references for EPP evidence and site visitor evaluations.
Confidentiality	A policy statement to which site visitors, councilors, EPP and state representatives, Accreditation Council meeting guests, and CAEP staff and consultants are required to adhere. The policy includes expectations that individuals will not disclose or inappropriately discuss information obtained throughout the entire accreditation process including from an educator preparation provider's (EPP) self-study,

	related evidence, interviews, panel discussions and deliberations of the Accreditation Council and Appeals Council.
Conflict of Interest	Any relationship that exists between a site visitor, Accreditation Council councilor or alternate, or Appeal Council member and an EPP that is engaged in the CAEP accreditation process, and any conduct of any such volunteer which may be or could be perceived to impinge on his/her ability to make an unbiased decision, as defined in Accreditation Policy. So as to withstand the sharpest scrutiny by those who would seek to find conflicts in any aspects of CAEP’s work, all such volunteers are required to disclose any conflict of interest and to recuse him/herself from discussions, deliberations, and decisions on any matters to which he/she is deemed to have a conflict of interest.
Consumer Information	Information about the status and trends of outcomes for completers (e.g., licensure rates, graduation rates, employment rates, places of employment, average salary) 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 central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of a discipline.
Continuing Accreditation	An accreditation status indicating that an educator preparation provider (EPP) has been accredited by CAEP or either of its predecessors NCATE and TEAC, and has remained in good standing. EPPs in good standing do not have to complete the CAEP application process prior to their next review.
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 or need adjusting, and then repeating the cycle.
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.
Credential	See definition for Certificate/License/Credential.
Criterion	A characteristic mark or trait on the basis of which a judgment may be made (adapted from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges glossary).
Criterion-referenced	Testing or assessment in which candidate performance is judged in relation to pre-established standards and not in relation to the

	performance of other students. Contrasts will norm-referenced (see glossary definition below) (adapted from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges glossary).
Cross-cutting Themes	Overarching emphases on diversity and applications of technology that are threaded throughout the standards and that are expected to be integrated throughout preparation experiences.
Culture of Evidence	A habit of using evidence in assessment, decision making, planning, resource allocation, and other processes that is embedded in and characteristic of an educator preparation provider’s (EPP’s) actions and practices (adapted from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges glossary).
Cumulative	Measures of candidate or EPP performance from which results increase or grow across successive administrations. Measures gain credibility as additional sources or methods for generating data about a condition or phenomenon (such as a concept in a CAEP Standard) 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 “cumulative” and mutually reinforcing.
Cut Score	A score or rating that is designated as the minimally acceptable level of performance on an assessment. This could be determined in EPP-created assessments by the EPP’s own faculty; on proprietary tests (e.g., state licensure tests) cut scores are usually determined through a professional standards-setting process involving peer groups.
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, behaviors, perceptions, status, achievement, or trends.
Denial	The accreditation decision indicating that an educator preparation provider (EPP) has failed to make a successful case for initial accreditation as defined in Accreditation Policy.
Disaggregation	A process of breaking out aggregated data according to specific criteria in order to reveal patterns, trends, and other information. Data such as retention and graduation rates are commonly disaggregated according to demographic characteristics such as race/ethnicity and gender. Data from assessment of candidate learning can be disaggregated to derive information about the needs of different subgroups and ways to



	improve their performance (adapted from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges glossary).
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 education process in which instruction occurs when the learner and the instructor are not in the same place at the same time using digital media in various forms. CAEP Governance Policy defines distance education as instances when 50% or more of the coursework of a program is offered through a distance education mode of delivery.
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). See handbook section on “Diversity and Technology Themes” for language added by the CAEP Board, December 2017, to explain diversity and equity in the context of CAEP standards.
Educator	Anyone who directly provides instruction or support services in P-12 or higher education settings.
Educator Preparation Provider (EPP)	An entity responsible for the preparation of educators including a nonprofit or for-profit institutions of higher education, organizations, corporations, governmental agency or school district.
EPP Annual Report	A yearly update submitted through the accreditation platform by an educator preparation provider (EPP) in which the EPP provides CAEP with a summary of information such as (1) provider; (2) program completer counts; (3) substantive changes; (4) analyses and display of annual reporting measures on its website; (5) progress remediating any areas for improvement, weaknesses, or stipulations; (6) data-informed improvement efforts; (7) transition to CAEP standards from legacy standards, if applicable, and (8) authorization acknowledging CAEP policy.
EPP-created assessments	A descriptor for assessments used as a source of evidence for CAEP standards that are created and administered by EPPs directly, or with contractors. They may be in the form of subject or pedagogical content tests, observations, projects, assignments, or surveys. EPPs take responsibility for design, administration, and validation of these assessments. Self-study reports make information available on the assessment results and also on the purpose and content of each

	assessment, the scoring, and on data reliability and validity. CAEP reviews are guided by the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments. CAEP distinguishes EPP-created assessments from proprietary assessments in which commercial test companies, states, or education research and development organizations design, administer, and validate the assessments.
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.
Endorsement	A notation on a license or certificate that officially designates an educator’s fulfillment of preparation requirements to teach a subject in addition to that specified on the original license/certificate. The addition may be to work with another group or age level of students, or to provide professional services in schools. For advanced-level specialties, the designation may be added at a later time than the original license/certificate.
Evaluation	A process for measuring and judging the quality of performance of a program, process, or individual (e.g., candidates, clinical faculty). While assessment of student learning (that measures what students know and can do) and evaluation processes (that assemble results and determine whether they are relevant and sufficient for the purpose) are related, they do differ and it is best not to use the terms interchangeably (adapted from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges glossary).
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’s) claims related to the CAEP Standards.
Extension	A change in the term of accreditation that results from the approval of a Good Cause Extension, or from a decision to postpone a site visit or the accreditation process in accordance with Accreditation Policy.
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 EPP-based 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 an educator preparation provider (EPP) to maintain its accreditation status. See glossary definition for annual fees.

Field Experiences	See definitions for clinical practice and clinical internship.
Formative Assessment	Assessment intended to provide feedback and support for improved performance as part of an ongoing learning process, whether at the candidate, program or EPP level. See summative assessment (adapted from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges glossary).
Good Cause Extension	A request made by an educator preparation provider (EPP) pursuant to Accreditation Policy, occurring no earlier than 24 months and no later than 12 months prior to the EPP’s site visit semester, that seeks an extension to its accreditation term for a ‘good cause.’ Good Cause Extension of longer than a period of one (1) year must be approved by the Annual Report Monitoring (ARM) Committee and the Accreditation Council.
Indicator	A numerical relationship constructed to show trends in characteristics or conditions or to monitor progress of a phenomenon. For example, the proportion of candidates in a cohort who complete preparation within a specified time, shown year by year, might be an indicator of EPP outcomes.
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.
Initial Licensure	Licensure, certification, or endorsement that signifies successful completion of preparation for P-12 teachers through programs at the baccalaureate or post-baccalaureate levels. Initial licensure programs are designed to prepare candidates who have not yet earned a license to become P-12 teachers.
Initial Review Panel	A 3-4-person group selected from the Accreditation Council that examines the self-study, site visit report, and other accreditation documents related to an educator preparation provider’s (EPP) case for accreditation. These documents include recommendations from the site team about the sufficiency of evidence for each standard, including their recommendations on areas for improvement (AFIs) or stipulations, if any. The Initial Review Panel determines the need for AFIs or stipulations, as well as whether standards are met, and forwards its conclusions to the Joint Review Team, and then to the Accreditation Council. The Joint Review Panel and Council confirm or amend areas for improvement, stipulations, and standards met or not met. The Accreditation Council makes all final accreditation decisions.

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	See definition for clinical internship.
Inter-rater reliability	Inter-rater reliability is a measure of consistency used to assess the degree to which different judges (or raters) agree in their evaluation (or scoring) decisions of the same phenomenon. Inter-rater reliability is useful because human observers will not necessarily interpret concepts, performances or scoring categories the same way. If various raters do not agree, the effects can be detrimental and suggest either that the scale is defective or that the raters need to be re-trained. Inter-rater reliability is high when reviewers demonstrate that they consistently reach the same or very similar decisions. A formal training and calibration procedure is usually needed to achieve this result, and the calibration involves calculating reliability coefficients.
Job Placement Rates	The percentage of a cohort of graduating candidates or program completers who are placed in jobs as teachers or other school professionals in the field for which they were prepared by the EPP.
Joint Review Panel	A working group of the Accreditation Council comprised of representatives from the Initial Panel and additional panelists that reviews the Initial Panel’s recommendations, confirms or modifies them, and presents the final recommendations to the Accreditation Council for decisions.
Lapse	Loss of accreditation status which may be Lapse of Accreditation or Lapse of Eligibility. Lapse of Accreditation occurs when an educator preparation provider (EPP) fails to host its site visit on schedule and no extension or postponement has been granted and no notice of withdrawal has been received by CAEP. Lapse of eligibility occurs when an EPP’s accreditation status is changed to inactive due to a failure to submit the Part 2 application or schedule a site visit within the timelines established in Accreditation Policy. Lapse of eligibility may also follow from an EPP’s failure to pay the annual fee or submit an annual report.
Lead Site Visitor	The head of the site 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. Lead visitors are selected following two or three years of experience as site visitors.
License	See definition for Certificate/License/Credential.

Licensure	See definition for Certification/Licensure.
Measures	The variety of observation and assessment tools and methods by which data are collected as part of a research or quality assurance system effort.
Misleading or Incorrect Statements	Misrepresentation by an educator preparation provider (EPP) of any action taken by CAEP, any of the EPP's accreditation-related information, or of the EPP's accreditation status, which may include the use of accreditation reports or materials in a false or misleading manner.
Mission	An important goal or purpose expressed by an EPP and accompanied by strong conviction that underlies the work of an educator preparation provider (EPP).
National Recognition	The status granted by a Specialized Professional Association (SPA) to specific educator preparation licensure areas that meet the SPA's standards.
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. Norm-referenced contrasts with criterion-referenced (adapted from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges glossary). (See criterion-referenced above in this glossary.)
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 CAEP purposes, parsimony is 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.
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. The term is also used in relation to EPP performance as an organization.
Petition	The document prepared by an educator preparation provider (EPP) to explain the grounds for an appeal following any decision for Adverse Action or for reconsideration of a decision under the Accreditation Policy provisions regarding petitions for the application of subsequent policy.
Preponderance of Evidence	Preponderance of evidence refers to Accreditation Councilors’ concluding evaluation of evidence as compelling or not, based on its probable truth or accuracy, taking into account the quality, completeness, relevance and strength of the data that informs the concept being measured. It is not numeric and not simply the amount of evidence. Instead, it is a result of professional judgment that balances what can be verified and what cannot.
Probationary Accreditation	The decision rendered by the Accreditation Council when an educator preparation provider (EPP) does not meet one (1) of the CAEP Standards. It is granted for two (2) years. A targeted self-study report to the unmet standard must be submitted by the EPP and is reviewed by site visitors as part of a targeted site visit. Failure to correct the condition leading to the unmet standard results in revocation or denial.
Probationary Visit	The targeted site visit of an educator professional provider (EPP) that is focused on an unmet standard. It follows a decision for Probationary Accreditation.

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.
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.
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 (e.g., elementary education, special education, secondary education in specific subject areas).
Program Approval	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 by the state, and is a separate status from National Recognition provided by SPAs. Information about state program approval actions is included in the self-study report, if available when that is prepared, or onsite.
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 National Recognition	The process by which specialized professional associations (SPAs) in collaboration with CAEP assess the quality of programs offered by educator preparation providers (EPPs). EPPs that select this program review option are either required by the state to, or voluntarily, seek national recognition for their programs. This is not a CAEP requirement for accreditation, although SPA review reports may contain information used by EPPs as evidence for CAEP Standard 1.
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 Levels	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).
Proprietary	A descriptor for assessments used as a source of evidence for CAEP standards that are created and/or administered by states, research organizations, or commercial test organizations. Typically information about the design of the assessments, and their validation, scoring, and other attributes, is available from sponsors online or in response to requests from EPPs or states. CAEP distinguishes proprietary assessments from EPP-created assessments in which the EPP takes responsibility for design, administration, and validation.
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. Continuous improvement and accountability are dependent on the capabilities of the Quality Assurance System.
Quantitative Measures	Assessments or data that can be reported numerically and sometimes generalized to a larger population. Common quantitative measures could include online, phone, or paper surveys (if they are structured as quantitative measures); observation and other evaluative forms; and tests. They also include EPP status measures such as completion rates and incidents of support for candidates at risk.
Rationale	A statement or argument that provides a justification for a selection, decision, or recommendation.
Rejoinder	An optional written response to the site visit report submitted by the EPP, post site visit. This response allows an EPP to state whether or not they agree with the site team’s findings; however, an EPP cannot include new and/or additional evidence with the rejoinder.



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 the result of a measurement, assessment calculation, or specification can be depended on over repeated applications. A metric is said to have a high reliability when it produces consistent results under consistent conditions. (See Appendix A of this handbook, Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments. Item 4 suggests several types of investigations that might be conducted to establish reliability of assessments, as well as evidence of inter-rater reliability for scoring of assessments. Also, see definition for inter-rater reliability in this glossary.)
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 can sometimes be 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. In all cases, EPPs should describe in what ways the actual data represent the full population under investigation and in what ways they do not—that is, how do respondents supplying the data correspond with the total population.
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.
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 requirements for CAEP Accreditation. The decision may be Affirmed, Amended, Remanded, or Reversed by an Appeal Panel.
Rigor	In education, refers both to a challenging curriculum and to the consistency or stringency with which high standards for learning and

	performance are upheld (adapted from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges glossary).
Rubric	A tool for scoring performances (e.g., samples of a candidate’s work, or evaluation of evidence submitted to meet a CAEP standard), 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). CAEP provides rubrics for evaluation of EPP-created assessments (Appendix A of this handbook) and rubrics to guide site visitors and the Accreditation Council in evaluation of accreditation evidence (Appendix C of this handbook).
Satisfaction	For CAEP purposes in Standard 4, satisfaction is the perception of employers or of completers about the relevance and sufficiency of an EPP program to prepare candidates for specific educator responsibilities in schools and with P-12 students.
School-based teacher educator	An individual involved in teacher preparation whose primary institutional home is a school. School-based teacher educators assume mentoring and partnership responsibilities in addition to their P-12 school responsibilities. These educators may also be known as university liaisons, site facilitators, cooperating teachers, mentor teachers, collaborating teachers, or school liaisons.
Self-Study	The process that an educator preparation provider (EPP) undergoes to evaluate its practices and results in relation to CAEP Standards.
Self-Study Report	The document that an educator preparation provider (EPP) creates, following its internal self-study, that assembles evidence demonstrating its case for CAEP Standards.
Shared Accountability	A policy or practice of a governmental agency or nongovernmental organization for holding educator preparation providers (EPPs), P-12 schools, and teachers mutually responsible for students’ and candidates’ learning and academic progress.
Site Visit	The step in CAEP’s accreditation process, generally two-to-three days in length, in which site visitors conduct a summative review of an educator preparation provider’s (EPP) self-study report and evidence on location at the EPP’s campus or organizational headquarters, and conclude with site team deliberations.

Site Visitors	Volunteer evaluators, subject to qualifications, training, and selection criteria provided for in Accreditation Policy, who review educator preparation providers (EPPs) as part of the accreditation process. Site visitors examine the EPP against the evidence presented to make the case for meeting the CAEP Standards.
Site Visit 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 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), and who are affiliated with CAEP as partners in review of educator preparation in their field of expertise.
Stakeholder	Partners, organizations, businesses, community groups, agencies, schools, districts, and/or educator preparation providers (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 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.
Stipulation	A determination by the Accreditation Council that describes one or more systemic concerns or serious deficiencies in evidence for a CAEP standard and/or component that must be remedied in order to continue accreditation. Stipulations contrast with areas for improvement (AFIs), which identify less serious deficiencies in evidence.

	Site visitors analyze the EPP’s evidence to determine its sufficiency and make preliminary recommendations for stipulations. The Initial and Joint panels may confirm or modify the site visitor recommendations, and the decision is made by the Accreditation Council. Failure to correct the condition leading to stipulation results in Probation, Revocation, or Denial of accreditation, as determined by the Accreditation Council.
Student	A learner in a school setting or other structured learning environment. CAEP uses “student” to identify learners in P-12 schools.
Student Development	The physical, psychological and emotional changes that occur in P-12 students as they progress from dependency to increasing autonomy facilitated by the educational process.
Student Growth	The change for an individual in educational outcome(s) between two or more points in time as measured against state or national standards, in academic learning, or in “whole child” development.
Student Learning	The educational outcome(s) mastered by P-12 students as set forth in the academic curriculum during a given time period by the school or school system and as provided by the classroom teacher.
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.
Substantive Change	Any of a number of significant changes enumerated in Accreditation Policy that include a 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; or 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.
Summative Assessment	Assessment that occurs at the conclusion or end point of a course or program to determine whether candidate learning outcomes have been achieved. See formative assessment (adapted from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges glossary).
Summative Report	The document prepared by site visitors during and/or following the site visit as a final evaluation and verification of the evidence presented in the self-study report by the educator preparation provider (EPP).
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.
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 apply 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.
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.
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, permitting complementary and/or contrasting perspectives that can deepen interpretation of the data.
University-based teacher educator	An individual involved in teacher preparation whose primary institutional home is a college or university. University-based teacher educators are a specific type of boundary-spanning teacher educators who engage in evaluation, coaching, instruction, and partnership and assume expanded and multiple responsibilities within, and often across,

	<p>each of these four domains. A university-based teacher educator may be otherwise known as a university supervisor, university liaison, clinical supervisor, or clinical faculty (AACTE “Lexicon of Practice,” 2017). In CAEP practice, not all EPPs are located in colleges or universities. “EPP-based teacher educator” would be more inclusive.</p>
<p>Validity</p>	<p>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. Validity is referenced in Appendix A, the Framework for Evaluation of EPP-created Assessments, and in numerous other locations in the handbook. It is described in Appendix D in the context of data quality.</p> <p>Validity is defined in the literature of measurement and testing as the extent to which evidence and theory support the interpretations of test scores. The following notes are excerpted from a 2013 National Academy of Education report, <i>Evaluation of Teacher Preparation Programs</i>:</p> <p>Evaluations typically make use of multiple measures rather than a single test, but key questions about validity, including the following, apply to TPP (teacher preparation program) evaluation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent does the evaluation measure what it claims to measure? (This is sometimes referred to as <b>construct validity</b>.)</li> <li>• Are the right attributes being measured in the right balance? (This is sometimes referred to as <b>content validity</b>.)</li> <li>• Is there evidence that teachers graduating from highly rated TPPs prove more effective in the classroom? (This is sometimes referred to as <b>predictive validity</b>.)</li> <li>• Is a measure subjectively viewed as being important and relevant to assessing TPPs? (This is sometimes referred to as <b>face validity</b>.)<sup>35</sup></li> </ul>
<p>Value-added Measures (VAM)</p>	<p>When available to EPPs, VAM measures are P-12 student assessment results linked with teachers who completed preparation in an EPP program. They provide evidence of P-12 students’ educational outcomes as measured by standardized tests and other assessments. For CAEP purposes, VAM should demonstrate the change over time of educational outcomes, as intended by the administering state or local school district, which may provide valuable information about effective teacher preparation.</p>

<sup>35</sup> Feuer, J. J., Floden, R. E., Chudowsky, N., and Ahn, J. (2013). *Evaluation of teacher preparation programs: Purposes, methods, and policy options*. Washington, DC: National Academy of Education. Retrieved May 17, 2019, from <https://naeducation.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/028489-Evaluation-of-Teacher-prep.pdf>.

Verifiable	The degree to which a measure or result can 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.
------------	--