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Overview

• Accreditation Process and Timeline
• Distinctive Characteristics & Assumptions of the IB Pathway
• Steps for Conducting the Self-Study and Preparing the Inquiry Brief
• CAEP Standards
• CAEP Evidence
• Elements of the Inquiry Brief
  ▪ Main Sections
  ▪ Appendices
• Additional Resources
• Site Visit and Beyond
Accreditation Process and Timeline

- The Accreditation Cycle involves EPPs in continuous improvement and demonstration that they meet high standards of quality resulting in enhanced P-12 student learning.

- Optional Early Instrument Review
  - Submit up to 3 years prior to site visit

- Program Review
  - Submission timeline varies across options

- Self Study Process
  - Submit 12-9 months prior to site visit

- Site Visit
  - Occurs the semester prior to term expiration

- Site Visit Report

- Formative Review

- Accreditation Council Review and Decision
  - Occurs the semester after the visit

- Annual Reporting
  - Each Spring
Distinctive Characteristics of the IB Pathway

• **Claims:** The provider documents that all the CAEP Standards have been met through an inquiry-driven process centrally focused on high-quality empirical evidence for claims about candidate and completer outcomes. (Standards 1, 4, and Component 5.2)

• **Internal Audit:** The provider documents operational effectiveness and continuous improvement through an inquiry-driven examination of its Quality Assurance System, particularly as it relates to candidate quality, clinical education, and evidence-based decisions about candidates and program features. (Standards 2 and 3, and Components 5.1 and 5.3-5.5)
Assumptions of the IB Pathway

Conducting the self-study and writing the Inquiry Brief:

- Is inquiry driven, starting with the faculty’s own questions and curiosity about the EPP’s accomplishments with respect to the CAEP standards
- Examines the trustworthiness and adequacy of the evidence the faculty relies on to support its claims about candidates and to gather stakeholder feedback
- Examines the effectiveness of the system the faculty has in place to monitor and control program quality
- Leads to program improvement – a continuous process of investigating and addressing problems and testing innovations that might enhance the program
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Inquiry Brief</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Has a research article or monograph format (30-50 pages plus appendices)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Makes a persuasive case that the EPP’s claims about the CAEP Standards are true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Present results from an internal audit that the program and QAS are functioning well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Documents program capacity and institutional commitment to sustain quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Presents a plan for further monitoring, inquiry, and program enhancement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Steps for Preparing the IB Self-Study Report

- Review CAEP Standards, IB Pathway Requirements, and CAEP Resources (e.g., handbook, assessment rubrics, evidence sufficiency criteria)
- Generate Potential Claims and Inventory Available Evidence
- Define the Quality Assurance System and Develop Plan for Internal Audit
- Gather, categorize, and prepare evidence for claims and internal audit
- Adjust Claims (if needed)
- Collect and analyze data on remaining standards and report elements
- Draft and submit the self-study report
CAEP STANDARDS & CROSS-CUTTING THEMES
CAEP Standards & Cross-Cutting Themes
Main Focus
(See Workbook, p. 6-10)

1. Content Knowledge and Pedagogical Knowledge
2. Clinical Partnerships and Practice
3. Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity
4. Program Impact
5. Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

CCT • Diversity

CCT • Technology
CAEP Standard 1
Content Knowledge and Pedagogical Knowledge
(IB Workbook, p. 6)

1.1 • Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

1.2-1.5 • Provider Responsibilities
CAEP Standard 2
Clinical Partnerships and Practice
(IB Workbook, p. 6-7)

2.1 • Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

2.2 • Clinical Educators

2.3 • Clinical Experiences
CAEP Standard 3

Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity
(IB Workbook, p. 7-8)

3.1 • Plan for Recruitment of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs

3.2 • Admission Standards Indicate That Candidates Have High Academic Achievement and Ability

3.3 • Additional Selectivity Factors (non-academic)

3.4 • Selectivity During Preparation (performance standards)

3.5 • Selection At Completion (ready, not just finished)
CAEP Standard 4
Program Impact
(IB Workbook, p. 8-9)

4.1 • Impact on P-12 Student Learning and Development

4.2 • Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness

4.3 • Satisfaction of Employers

4.4 • Satisfaction of Completers
CAEP Standard 5
Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement
(IB Workbook, p. 9)

- Quality and Strategic Evaluation
  5.1-5.2

- Continuous Improvement
  5.3-5.5
Cross-cutting Themes
(IB Workbook, p. 10)

Embedded in Every Aspect of Educator Preparation

Coursework
- Diversity
- Technology

Fieldwork
- Diversity
- Technology

Interpersonal Interactions
- Diversity
- Technology
Generating Claims: Three Steps

1. The process of generating the claims should begin with an examination of the statements of the goals, claims, objectives, promises, and standards published in the institution’s catalogs, brochures, state approval/registration reports, and websites describing the provider’s projected outcomes.

2. Determine how claims align with CAEP Standard 1 and 4. All components these standards should be addressed, but different providers may give different emphases to the components.

3. The provider should be able to identify at least two high-quality measures or categories of evidence associated with each claim.
Evidence & Sample Measures
(IB Workbook p. 20-21, 28-40)
(Handout: Evaluation Criteria for Self-Study Evidence)

• IB Pathway Standards: p. 20-21
• Standard 1: p. 28-30
• Standard 2: p. 30-31
• Standard 3: p. 31-34
• Standard 4: p. 34-35
• Standard 5: p. 35-37
• More Examples of Evidence: p. 37-39
• CAEP Evidence Phase-in Schedule: p. 40
FORMAT OF THE INQUIRY BRIEF
SELF-STUDY REPORT
Inquiry Brief: Main Body
(Sections 1-6)

1. Introduction (description and demographics)
2. Claims and Rationale for the Assessments
3. Methods of assessment
4. Results
5. Discussion of results and Plan for inquiry
6. References
Appendices in the Inquiry Brief (Section 7)

A: Internal audit of the quality assurance system

B: Evidence of EPP capacity and IHE commitment

C: Qualifications of EPP faculty

D: Requirements aligned to state/SPA standards

E: Inventory of evidence

F: Copies of locally-developed assessments
# Tips for Writing: Full Inquiry Brief

## Essential Content
- Table of Contents (TOC)
- All sections of the report are included
- All components of each standard are addressed
- All required tables are present
- Formatting guidelines are followed (including evidence tagging)
- Document is single-spaced with reasonable margins ($\geq .5$ in)

## Common Problems
- Submitted $< 9$ months prior to visit
- Incomplete draft submitted for Formative Review
- PDF rather than Word version submitted for Formative Review
- File size $> 5$MB (AIMS per file limit)
- Manual TOC inserted instead of Word-generated version
- Insufficient quantity of data ($<3$ cycles)
- Insufficient evidence establishing data quality
- Incomplete Plans for Phase-in eligible elements
Section 1: The Introduction
IB Workbook p. 19, 42)

Essential Content

- EPP Context
  - Location (state, city, etc.)
  - Age/founding date of institution and EPP
  - Structure/Organization of the Institution
  - Mission of Institution and EPP
- Required CAEP Table of Program Options
- Other demographics

Common Problems

- Excessive length (> 5 pgs)
- Missing Table 1.1
- Formatting Tables as 1, 2, 3 versus 1.1, 1.2, 1.3
  - The latter “section.#” format prevents the need to renumber all subsequent tables in the document if a table is added/removed in an earlier section
- Includes program description content that belongs elsewhere (e.g., in Methods Section or Appendix D)
## Section 2: The Claims & Rationale

See Handout: Evaluation Criteria for Self-Study Evidence  
IB Workbook p. 20-24, 43-44, Exercises 25, 29 & 33

### Essential Content

- Claims for Standards 1 and 4 (or phase-in plan in lieu of evidence)
- Claims for cross-cutting themes
- Required CAEP tables
- Criteria for success specified for each measure (i.e., instrument or item subset)
- Reasons for using and trusting each assessment used as evidence (i.e., relevance and appropriateness)
- Plan for phase-in of Standard 4 components

### Common Problems

- Claims omit components of Standard 1, 4, or Cross-cutting Themes
- Missing or incomplete alignment table or evidence/criteria table
- Misalignment of evidence to CAEP Standards/Components
- Alignment to whole instrument when subsets of items provide the relevant data
- Cross-cutting themes omitted or measured indirectly
- Missing or weak rationale
- Missing or incomplete phase-in Plan
## Section 3: The Methods


### Essential Content

- For each source of evidence, the provider indicates:
  - Who evaluates candidate performance
  - How evaluators are trained/certified competent to evaluate accurately
  - When and in what context candidates are assessed (e.g., at admission, during a course, in the field, online exam)
  - Replication-supporting description of data analysis procedures for performance data (Standard 1) and for data quality (Component 5.2)
  - Required CAEP Methods table

### Common Problems

- Misalignment of Sections 2 and 3
- Poorly-rated instruments used to generate data
- Missing or incomplete information on sampling procedures and the characteristics of the resulting samples
- Missing, incomplete, or vague descriptions of procedures
  - Stating that rather than how, e.g.: that “performance will be compared to…” or “source content was analyzed qualitatively to assess…”
- Selecting a contraindicated analytical procedure
  - Pearson correlation run on data that violates most assumptions of the test
Section 4: The Results

Essential Content

- Results from every source and analysis in Section 2 (Alignment Table) and Section 3 (Methods Table)
- Results tables and narrative all tagged to CAEP components and to state or national Standards
- Disaggregated by licensure area for all Standard 1 results and also by the 4 InTASC categories for Component 1.1 results
- Samples aggregated across years if small Ns in individual years inhibit analysis
- Representativeness of samples

Common Problems

- Misalignment of Sections 3 and 4
- Missing results on data quality (5.2)
- Incomplete results, e.g.:
  - No Ns reported
  - Mean with no SD or range interval
  - Correlation coefficient with no p-value
  - No “Total” column/row in tables (where appropriate)
- Conclusions/interpretations of results presented in lieu of actual results
  - “Correlation was moderate and statistically significant” or “Sample was representative” rather than actual values/findings that led to the conclusion presented
### Section 5: The Discussion & Plan

See Handout: Evaluation Criteria for Self-Study Evidence
CAEP Guidelines for Plans (IB Workbook, 25, 46)

#### Essential Content

- Interpretations of/conclusions about the meaning of results for claims and CAEP Standards
- Required table on Evidence Use for program enhancement
  - Plus any additional discussion of how results have been/are being/will be used for program decisions/improvements
- Program review results provided
  - If SPA: performance is summarized
  - If State Review: State Report (uploaded to AIMS) is summarized
  - If Program Review with Feedback: The 4 reflection questions are answered.
- Presents Phase-in Plan for Standard 4 (if applicable)

#### Common Problems

- Does not synthesize evidence for Cross-Cutting Themes
- Misinterprets findings/results
  - Overestimates the magnitude of correlations (e.g., r = .3 described as moderate interrater reliability)
  - Conflates magnitude or correlation with significance (e.g., r = .3; p < .01 described as strong correlation)
- Introduces new material unrelated to current claims, methods, and results, or to phase-in plans.
Section 6: The References
(IB Workbook, 25)

**Essential Content**

- All sources cited in the brief (including electronic sources hyperlinked in the main body)
- All proprietary instruments (with hyperlinks if possible)
- APA format

**Common Problems**

- Inclusion of background documents and sources consulted but not cited
- Exclusion of documents relied upon but published non-commercially
Appendix A: The Internal Audit Report
Handout: Evaluation Criteria for Self-Study Evidence
(IB Workbook p. 25-27, 47-55, Exercises 13, 17, & 18)

Essential Content

• Required CAEP Table: Summary of Internal Audit Probes that addresses all components of all 5 standards
• Supplemental content that fully addresses Standards 2, 3, and 5 and makes the case that they are met
  ▪ Includes information about data quality for stakeholder surveys
  ▪ Information presented in the main body about Component 5.2 can be referenced.

Common Problems

• Missing table of audit probes or omission of Standards 1 and 4
• Embedding handbooks as evidence
• Omission of information about sampling and sample characteristics (e.g., representativeness)
• Insufficient sample size or representativeness
• Vague/non-replicable probes
  ▪ “Probe student records.”
• Conclusions presented in lieu of findings/results for each component.
• Missing overall conclusion on how well the QAS is functioning
Appendix B: Parity & Capacity
(IB Workbook p. 27, 56-57, Exercises 6, 8, & 10)

Essential Content

• Required CAEP Tables
  ▪ Parity
  ▪ Capacity

Common Problems

• Missing or incomplete capacity table
• Embedding handbooks and other large documents
Appendix C: Faculty Qualifications
(IB Workbook p. 27, 58)

**Essential Content**

- Required table(s) of faculty qualifications
  - Include field-based cooperating professionals (or a sample) if feasible

**Common Problems**

- Omission of degree field
- Omission of courses taught
- Excessive amount of scholarly activity recorded
- Set of CVs embedded in Brief
Appendix D: Program Alignment
(IB Workbook p. 28, 59)

Essential Content

- Required CAEP Table
- Summary of state licensure requirements
- Index of course numbers and names (e.g., EDU 101: Introduction to Education
  - full course description not required, but a link to the course catalog should be included in here or in Appendix B (or both)

Common Problems

- Duplicate reporting of state requirements that are common across programs (e.g., background check, anti-bullying training, etc.)
## Appendix E: Inventory of Evidence
(IB Workbook p. 28, 64-65, Exercises 2a, 3a, & 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential Content</th>
<th>Common Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Required CAEP Table: Inventory of Evidence</td>
<td>• Inclusion of additional data that should be instead uploaded to the Data Sheet slot in AIMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Numerous files can be uploaded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• File size limit applies to individual files, not the combined set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Inclusion of additional data that should not be provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix F: Local Assessments
(IB Workbook p. 28, 62)

### Essential Content
- Table of Contents with page numbers (Word-generated)
  - Add a blank sheet between instruments if necessary to create bookmark points for imaged documents.
- All EPP developed instruments used to gather evidence for any CAEP standard or to be used for Phase-in data collection
- Tag instruments, sections, or items (as relevant) to the CAEP Components to which they are used as evidence
  - Annotation is acceptable

### Common Problems
- Untagged instrument content
- Illegibility/Poor image quality
- Scrambled content / Format drift
- Files embedded as “objects” without maximum compression (email size)
Additional Resources

http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/caep-accreditation-resources

- CAEP Assessment Rubrics
- Guidelines for Plans (phase-in)
- Handout: Evaluation Criteria for Self-Study Evidence
Evaluating the Self-Study Report

The site visit audit
The accreditation review
Maintaining accreditation
Site Visit: Is the Inquiry Brief trustworthy?
(see Workbook, p. 129)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understand</th>
<th>Verify</th>
<th>Corroborate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Summary of the Case</td>
<td>• Statements</td>
<td>• The evidence as presented in the <em>Brief</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clarification questions</td>
<td>• Tables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Figures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Audit of the *Inquiry Brief: Task Example*

**Target:** “Ninety-six percent of our students pass the Elementary Education MTTC exam and 80% pass the Subject Area MTTC exams on their first attempt” (page 12).

**Probe:** Get the MTTC results for Elementary Education and Subject Area for 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12 to verify.

**Finding:** Present 2 tables: list scores of all elementary ed students in the 3 years and list scores of all secondary ed students in the 3 years. Note the percentage passing on first attempt.

**Score** (Verified, Verified with Error, Not Verified)

St Augustine College Training IB
Materials the Accreditation Council reviews

- Inquiry Brief
  - EPP’s case

- Audit Report
  - Site visit

- Case Analysis
  - Evidence Summary linked to Standards
Case Analysis:
How well does the EPP make its case that it meets the Standards?

- What evidence is consistent?
- What evidence is inconsistent?
- What are rival explanations for the evidence (if any)?
Accreditation Review
(see Workbook, p. 130)

• Have the CAEP Standards been met?

• Does any problem rise to the level of a Areas for Improvement (AFIs) or a stipulation?

• Is any problem so serious that a reduced term length or interim site visit is warranted.
Maintaining Accreditation
(see Workbook, p. 130)

Submit petition for removal of stipulations in AIMS by 18 months after decision

- AFI and stipulations
- Substantive change
- Data
- Annual Report
- Enrollment
- Upload all into AIMS
- Appendix E
Stipulation Removal

• If a stipulation is attached to the accreditation decision, it has to be removed by 2 years after the decision date.

• The petition requesting removal and the supporting documentation that the stipulation was addressed should be uploaded in AIMS by 6 months prior to the deadline to allow for review of the materials and a decision prior to the deadline.
  - It is not sufficient to refer to the annual report. The evidence must be provided.
  - In certain cases, a targeted site visit will be required.
EXERCISES
Thank You

• Glenda Breaux | Director, IB Pathway
  ▪ glenda.breaux@caepnet.org
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