**CAEP Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity**

**COMPONENTS**

**Plan for Recruitment of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs**

**3.1** The provider presents **plans** and **goals** to **recruit** and **support** completion of high-quality candidates from **a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations** to accomplish their mission. The **admitted pool of candidates reflects the diversity of America’s P-12 students.** The provider demonstrates efforts to **know and 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.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Possible Evidence** | **What Does the Educator Preparation Program Have Currently** |
| **Recruitment plan with:** |  |
| 1. Outreach strategies to reach diverse and academically able applicants
 |  |
| 1. Evidence that goals are based on completers’ existing and forecasted employment need/opportunities, including STEM, ELL, hard-to-staff schools
 |  |
| 1. Evidence of collaboration with other providers
 |  |
| **Report on:** |  |
| 1. Numerical goals and baseline data on admitted cohorts (application, acceptance, enrollment)
 |  |
| 1. Disaggregation of data by SES, gender, ethnicity, etc.
 |  |

**Admission Standards Indicate That Candidates Have High Academic Achievement and Ability**

* 1. The provider **sets admissions requirements,** including CAEP minimum criteria, the state’s minimum criteria, or graduate school minimum criteria, whichever is highest, and gathers **data to monitor applicants and the selected pool of candidates.** The provider ensures that the **average grade point average** of its **accepted cohort of candidates** meets or exceeds the CAEP **minimum of 3.0** and the **group average performance** on **nationally normed ability/achievement assessments** such as ACT, SAT, or GRE:
* **Is in the top 50 percent from 2016-2017 (frozen at this level);**
* is in the top 40 percent of the distribution from 2018-2019; and
* is in the top 30 percent of the distribution by 2020. (Temporarily suspended)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Possible Evidence** | **What Does the Educator Preparation Program Have Currently** |
| 1. EPP’s data on admission criteria and the cohort average are explicit so they can be compared with CAEP minima
 |  |
| 1. EPP’s Provide data from a reliable model with P-12 student learning outcomes
 |  |
| **Data-based evidence:** |  |
| 1. Includes the “N” for the data set broken out by year or semester
 |  |
| 1. Provides comparison point(s) for the data reported
 |  |
| 1. If reporting a mean score, the range/standard deviation as well as percentage of students below 3.0 should also be reported.
 |  |
|  |  |

**Additional Selectivity Factors**

* 1. 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.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Possible Evidence** | **What Does the Educator Preparation Program Have Currently** |
| **Non-Academic Factors: “grit”, empathy, cultural awareness, commitment, etc.** |  |
| 1. Establish attributes and dispositions at admissions and/or during the program that were grounded in research literature
 |  |
| 1. Assessments used for non-academic admission criteria have established minimum content validity
 |  |
| 1. Protocols and criteria are established for interviews or other alternative forms of evaluation
 |  |
| 1. Description of how these non-academic factors are applied at admission and monitored during preparation
 |  |
| 1. Evidence that supports the use of the identified criteria
 |  |
|  |  |

**Selectivity During Preparation**

* 1. 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.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Possible Evidence** | **What Does the Educator Preparation Program Have Currently** |
| **Monitoring candidate progression:** |  |
| 1. Two or more measures from key decision points, including decision points on candidate:
 |  |
| * retention
 |  |
| * assessments
 |  |
| * provider interventions
 |  |
| * provider explanations for actions taken
 |  |
| 1. Measures on developing proficiencies in critical areas, such as candidates’:
 |  |
| * Ability to teacher college- and career-ready standards
 |  |
| * Content knowledge
 |  |
| * Pedagogical content knowledge
 |  |
| * Pedagogical skills
 |  |
| * Integration of technology with instruction
 |  |

**Selection At Completion**

* 1. Before the provider recommends any completing candidate for licensure or certification, it documents that the candidate has reached **a high standard for content knowledg**e in the fields where certification is sought and **can teach effectively** with **positive impacts on P-12 student learning** and development.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Possible Evidence** | **What Does the Educator Preparation Program Have Currently** |
| **Exit Standards** |  |
| 1. Evidence used for part of the documentation for Standard 1 (1.1 on candidate competence and 1.3 on alignment with specialty area standards)
 |  |
| 1. Documentation of pre-service positive candidate impact on P-12 student learning and development, using:
 |  |
| * Methods courses
 |  |
| * Clinical experiences
 |  |
| * Exit experiences
 |  |
| * Capstone assessments (lesson plans, teaching artifacts, examples of student work, observations and/or videos by trained reviewers, etc.
 |  |

* 1. **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.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Possible Evidence** | **What Does the Educator Preparation Program Have Currently** |
| **Expectations of the Profession:** |  |
| 1. Provider measure of topic knowledge of codes of ethics, professional standards of practice and relevant laws and policies based on course material/assessments
 |  |
| 1. Results of national, state, or provider-created instruments to assess candidates’ understanding of special education laws (section 504 disability), code of ethics, professional standards, and similar content
 |  |
| 1. Evidence of specialized training (e.g., bullying, state law, etc.)
 |  |