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General Overview

• CAEP Accreditation includes **two steps:**
  
  **Step #1: Program Review** (up to three options)

  **Step#2: Accreditation Self-Study** (three pathway choices are Selective Improvement (SI), Inquiry Brief (IB), or Transformation Initiative (TI))*

* TI Pathway has been suspended by the CAEP Board of Directors. EPPs cannot at this moment switch into the TI or new applications cannot chose TI.
Relationship between Program Review and Accreditation

• Under CAEP, the program decisions factor into Standard 1, which says: “The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.”
Timeline

• The Accreditation Cycle involves the educator preparation providers in continuous improvement and demonstration that they meet the high standards of quality required to improve P-12 student learning.
Optional assessment review

• Improve assessments/surveys before the site visit — EPPs will have the option to submit assessments three years* before the site visit and will have opportunity to modify assessments/surveys based on the feedback prior to the site visit
• Improve assessments to provide more precise feedback to candidates
• Improve the EPP’s ability to drill down into data for evidence leading to continuous improvement
• Part of CAEP’s effort to increase capacity for EPPs

• Overview of the Optional Early Instrument Review
  ▪ Friday 9:45 – 10:45 Sapphire AB (Level 4)
Program review options

- CAEP Program Review with National Recognition ("SPA review")
- CAEP Program Review with Feedback ("Feedback Option")
- State Program Review

* Each state will negotiate a new agreement with CAEP to define the options for Program Review available to the EPP’s within each state.
# Program Review Options Cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review with National Recognition (“Specialty Professional Association” or SPA Option)</th>
<th>Review with Feedback Option</th>
<th>State Review Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial review submitted 3 years prior to on-site visit</td>
<td>Addendum to self study 8 months prior to on-site visit</td>
<td>Follows state guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA Standards</td>
<td>State defined standards, CAEP/InTASC Standards.</td>
<td>State defined standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA reviewers provide feedback to programs</td>
<td>Site visitor team reviews alignment of specialty area data with state &amp; CAEP standards</td>
<td>State review process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Recognition</td>
<td>CAEP provides feedback to states and providers on alignment of evidence with state standards.</td>
<td>State approval of program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Selected Program Review Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>State Review</th>
<th>Feedback Option</th>
<th>SPA Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Selected Program Review Options Cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>State Review</th>
<th>Feedback Option</th>
<th>SPA Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CAEP Program Review with National Recognition

- CAEP Program Review with National Recognition
  - “National Recognition” through review by Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs)
    - Only option that leads to “National Recognition”
    - Review is specific to SPA National Standards
    - Option A, B, C, D and IL/PB
- The program submits assessment data for program review to separate SPAs representing specific specialty/license area.
- **Timing of Submission:** Mid-cycle of the overall accreditation cycle (3 years in advance of the accreditation visit for most states)
Program Review with Feedback

- Providers submit disaggregated assessment data by specialty/license area in self-study under CAEP Standard 1.
- EPPs selecting this option will align the specialty licensure area data with CAEP Standard 1 and state standards
- Answer questions on how specialty/license area data were used for continuous improvement.

**Timing of Submission:** At the same time as the self-study (roughly 8 months in advance of the visit)
State Review

• Review is at the state level
• State determines the review process and standards to be used
• CAEP will require EPPs to answer questions specific to the ways that specialty licensure area data are used for continuous improvement.
The Accreditation Pathways

The EPP may choose one of three pathways for the accreditation process:

1. Structured around CAEP standards
2. Presents evidence-based case for each standard
3. Composes an operational plan to improve programs

Selective Improvement:

1. Structured around CAEP standards
2. Presents evidence-based case for each standard
3. Composes an operational plan to improve programs

Transformation Initiative:

1. First standard is structured around claims made by provider; Other standards addressed through audit
2. Presents evidence to support all claims
3. Data is verified during on-site visit

Inquiry Brief:

1. Structured around CAEP standards
2. Presents evidence-based case for each standard
3. Composes an operational plan to improve programs
Pathway Similarities

- Program Review
- Optional Assessment Review
- Address the CAEP Standards
- Submit a Self Study
- Call for comment
- Hosts a Site Visit
- Accreditation Decision from Accreditation Council

*** TI Pathway has been suspended by the CAEP Board of Directors. EPPs cannot at this moment switch into the TI or new applications cannot chose TI.
Distinctive characteristics

- **Inquiry Brief Pathway** emphasizes study of candidate and completer outcomes. It is inquiry-driven starting from the provider’s own questions about the program’s mission and results. Through the IB process, the provider documents that all the CAEP Standards have been met.

- A provider would submit:
  - Self-study report investigating the provider’s claims. The report addresses Standards 1, 4, data quality expectations for Standard 5
  - An Internal Audit Report that provides evidence that the EPP meets Standards 2 and 3 and continuous improvement expectations for Standard 5
Distinctive Characteristics

- **Selected Improvement Pathway** requires providers to demonstrate how they meet all of the standards. In addition, they must present a data-driven plan for improvement in a selected focus area of one or more standard(s), or components across standards, and show progress over the accreditation term.

- A provider would submit:
  - A report addressing the five standards through prompts about the evidence for each standard
  - A Selected Improvement Plan that provides additional evidence for Standard 5
Distinctive Characteristics

- **Transformation Initiative Pathway** requires providers to demonstrate how they meet all of the CAEP Standards. In addition, the provider (and sometimes a consortia of providers) submits a formal research study that advances knowledge of effective practices in educator preparation and informs the field.

- **A provider would submit:**
  - A report addressing the five standards through prompts about the evidence for each standard
  - A Transformation Initiative Plan (submitted three to five years before the self-study report) and progress report (contained in the self-study report) that provides additional evidence for Standard 5

*** TI Pathway has been suspended by the CAEP Board of Directors. EPPs cannot at this moment switch into the TI or new applications cannot chose TI.***
Additional Information on the Pathways

• How to Write a Self-Study Report for the Inquiry Brief Pathway (IB) Pathway
  ▪ 1:30 – 2:30 Indigo A (Level 2)

• How to Write a Self-Study Report for the Selected Improvement (SI) Pathway –
  ▪ (Now, sorry! Sapphire AB) (Level 4)

• How to Write a Self-Study Report for the Transformation Initiative (TI) Pathway
  ▪ 3:00 – 4:00 pm Sapphire AB (Level 4)
Site visit

- **Activities**: site visitors will pursue evidence trails and conduct interviews to validate the evidence provided.

- **Purpose**: site visitors will evaluate the quality of the evidence and identify strengths and weaknesses relative to the standards.

- **Result**: Visit report and EPP response
  - **IB**: examination and verification of internal audit
  - **SI**: examination of progress on the development and implementation of the SI Plan
  - **TI**: examination of progress on implementation of the TI Plan
Decision process/Accreditation Council

What is reviewed:

• Self-study, (if applicable, as amended in response to the formative report),

• Visitor Team report, including possible provider corrections and response and

• Visitor Teams comments on the provider’s response; and (for the Council only) the record of the panels (initial and joint) deliberations and recommendations
Accreditation and Program Review Team

- Tatiana Rivadeneyra, Director of Accreditation, SI/TI Pathways, tatiana.rivadeneyra@caepnet.org
- Francisco Jaimes, Accreditation Associate, SI/TI Pathways, francisco.jaimes@caepnet.org
- Glenda Breaux, Director of Accreditation, IB Pathway, glenda.breaux@caepnet.org
- Brad Duncan, Accreditation Associate, IB Pathway, bradley.duncan@caepnet.org
- Banhi Bhattacharya, Senior Director of Program Review, banhi.bhattacharya@caepnet.org
- Sabata Morris, Senior Accreditation Associate, sabata.morris@caepnet.org
- Monica Crouch, Accreditation Associate, monica.crouch@caepnet.org