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Overview of Session

• Working Group on Advanced Standards
  ▪ Members of the Working Group
  ▪ Role of Working Group
• Clinical Experiences
  ▪ Definition of Clinical Experiences for Advanced Programs
  ▪ Definition of a Supportive Environment
• Scope of Advanced Level Accreditation
  ▪ Possible common assessments
  ▪ Programs to be reviewed
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Process

• Working Group Made Suggestions
  ▪ No binding decisions
  ▪ Every aspect (policies and procedures) reviewed by the Accreditation Council and CAEP Board
  ▪ Policy issues at the Accreditation Council and CAEP Board level
  ▪ Procedures at the staff level
  ▪ Field provided feedback over the fall
Timeline for Review

- Feedback on proposed policies
  - Fall of 2015 – Report from Working Group
  - Feedback on Advanced Standards closed in March
  - Spring of 2016 – Revision of Draft Guidelines based on feedback from the field
  - CAEP Board action in June 2016
  - Summer of 2016 – Draft of Advanced Standards Guidelines
- Fall of 2016
  - Advanced Standards process in the CAEP Accreditation Handbook
  - Phase-in plan similar to the initial phase-in plan will be in place
Timeline for Submission of Advanced Level Programs

• If the EPP’s self study is due before September 1, 2017, the EPP does not submit the EPP’s advanced level programs for review. The EPP’s accreditation decision is based on initial level licensure areas only.

• These initial licensure areas include -
  ▪ Any MAT or Post-baccalaureate licensure areas that lead to initial teaching licensure

• What is not submitted before the September 1, 2017 –
  ▪ Add-on certifications for individuals who already have a licensure area certification
  ▪ Any advanced level programs for already licensed teachers or administrators
Timeline for Submission of Advanced Level Programs

- If the EPP’s self-study is due after September 1, 2017, the EPP must submit their advanced level programs as well as their initial licensure programs.
  - If the EPP’s site visit is in the spring of 2018, it will still depend on the self study due date. The self-study is submitted 8 months before the date of the site visit.
  - If the EPP’s site visit is in the fall of 2017, the EPP’s advanced level programs will not be submitted for review. Only the EPP’s initial licensure areas will be submitted for review.
Self Study and Standards for Advanced Programs

- One self study submitted for all pathways
- EPPs address standards for both initial and advanced levels
  - Uploading of evidence/data/tables specific to standard and level in Evidence Room (Initial Evidence Room & Advanced Evidence Room)
  - EPP would make the case for meeting the standard at both the initial and advanced levels
- Reviewers
  - Provide an analysis of the strength of the evidence for both levels
  - Assign AFIs and stipulations
  - Do not make any recommendations specific to met or unmet standards
Clinical Experiences – Advanced Level

• Committee recommended the following:
  ▪ In the progression from generalist to specialist, clinical experiences should allow candidates to demonstrate their mastery of knowledge and problem-posing and problem-solving skills to apply their professional practice, demonstrating the capacity to perform a range of professional roles such as collaborator, mentor, facilitator, leader, and scholar-practitioner.

▪ Clinical practice to be redefined for advanced level programs to allow for the diversity and uniqueness of advanced level programs.
Clinical Experience - Redefined

For the purposes of advanced preparation, clinical experiences should provide opportunities for candidates in advanced level programs to practice and demonstrate their proficiencies on problems of practice appropriate for their field of specialization.
Clinical Experiences - Redefined

• These experiences should allow for authentic demonstration (professional practice) of mastery of their specialization (i.e., knowledge, skills, and dispositions) addressing problems of practice. For example:
  ▪ Identify issue(s)
  ▪ Consider multiple perspectives and collaborative approaches
  ▪ Apply theory and research
  ▪ Identify and leverage resources
  ▪ Address potential impact
  ▪ Make recommendations and consider implications for practice and policy.
Sample of Types of Clinical Experiences at the Advanced level

• Advanced candidates could –
  ▪ Use their own classrooms or schools for clinical or field experiences
  ▪ Conduct action research projects using their own classrooms or schools
  ▪ Conduct collaborative problem-based projects with a school partner
  ▪ Internships
Definition of a Supportive Learning Environment

• Advanced candidates serve as leaders, advocates, and systems change agents for P-12 schools. Educators use their understanding of stakeholder characteristics, needs, and multiple influences on P-12 student learning to create environments that are just, fair, caring, respectful, safe, and challenging for all students.

• They know about, understand, and value the complex characteristics of students, families, and communities. They leverage their knowledge, skills, and dispositions to establish a culture conducive to continuous improvement.
Assessing a Supportive Learning Environment

• Types of assessments that might be appropriate for the evaluation of a supportive learning environment
  ▪ Surveys on climate (students/faculty/other school professionals)
  ▪ Individualized learning plans
  ▪ Evidence of data-driven decision making
  ▪ Dispositional assessments
  ▪ Authentic problem-based project
Possible Common Assessments at Advanced Level

• Content Specific
  - National/State/Professional Standards (when available)
  - Specialized exam (if available)
  - Grades (disaggregated by advanced level program)

• Authentic Demonstration of Problems of Practice
  - Field, clinical, practicum, or internship
  - Outcome-based Portfolio
  - Capstone Project
  - Action Research Project
Possible Common Assessments at Advanced Level (cont.)

• Regular and systematic data collection from graduates and employers
  ▪ Survey
  ▪ Structured focus groups
  ▪ Interviews
  ▪ Document analysis
Scope of Advanced Level Submissions

• Programs that would need to be reviewed at the advanced level should have the following –
  ▪ Clear entry point for all candidates
  ▪ Organized program of study with a progressive and coherent curriculum
  ▪ Significant authentic clinical component
  ▪ Clear exit criteria or culminating experience(s)
  ▪ Design to have a direct or indirect impact on P-12 learning

• If the advanced level program meets all the above criteria, the program must be submitted for review
Scope of Advanced Level Submissions (cont.)

• Programs that should be submitted
  ▪ Degrees, tracks, content specializations, concentration, or advanced level programs beyond initial certification with emphasis on P-12 learning (direct and/or indirect)

• Programs that should always be reviewed
  ▪ Educational Leadership specific to P-12 schools
  ▪ Curriculum and Instruction degree programs
  ▪ MEd or MS programs specific to P-12 learning/schools
  ▪ EdD or PhD specific to P-12 learning/schools
Scope of Advanced Level Submissions (cont.)

- Programs that should not be submitted:
  - Degree programs/tracks that are not specific to P-12 learning/schools (i.e., sport management, health administration, etc.)
  - Educational Leadership programs/tracks that are not related to P-12 learning/schools (e.g., religious leadership, health care leadership, etc.)
  - Technology programs/tracks not related to P-12 learning/schools (e.g., corporate instructional design, computer programming, etc.)
  - Adult learning
  - Advanced programs approved by another accreditor recognized by CHEA or USDoE (e.g., CACREP)
Scope of Advanced Level Submissions (cont.)

- Programs that might need to be submitted –
  - Certificate programs
  - Endorsement areas
  - Add-on licensure
- Committee reached no consensus on these programs
- Need common definitions for –
  - Add-on
  - Tracks
  - Programs
  - Certificate
  - Concentration
Revised Submission Shell

• Access revised shell through your AIMS log-in
  - Sample below is for CAEP University (24319) with “caep” as the password
  - Left hand side – Visit Reports
    • Click on Self-Study Report
    • Click on question mark – video appears with instructions on the system works
    • [http://aims.caepnet.org/AIMS_MainFrame.asp](http://aims.caepnet.org/AIMS_MainFrame.asp)

• Tentative method for submission of advanced level programs through a template
Questions raised from EPP Feedback

1. Concerns with the process of a joint decision for both initial and advanced for each EPP –
   - Rationale - the EPP is ultimately responsible for all academic programs within the EPP related to P-12 education. The process of having just one decision will require that EPPs concentrate on having high quality programs at all levels. The hope is that EPPs will increase their communication with all programs offered and related to P-12 education.
Questions raised from EPP Feedback (cont.)

• What are the differences between probationary status, stipulations, and areas for improvement?

  ▪ An area for improvement (AFI) is a weakness in the evidence presented for a standard/component that needs to be addressed over the seven-year cycle of accreditation. The identified weakness is not severe enough to warrant that the standard be unmet, but is an area that the EPP needs to strengthen moving forward. Areas for improvement are reported each year through the annual report process and removed as part of the next site visit. If the area for improvement is not resolved by the end of the accreditation cycle, the Accreditation Council has the option of moving the AFI to a stipulation.
Questions raised from EPP Feedback (cont.)

• A **stipulation** is a deficiency in the evidence that is serious enough to warrant that the deficit be addressed within 2 years of the accreditation decision. Stipulations can be related to standards and/or components. Any awarding of a stipulation requires EPPs to submit to CAEP evidence that the stipulation has been addressed within 24 months of the accreditation decision. Removal of stipulation(s) does not require a site visit. A Review Team is assigned and makes a recommendation to Accreditation Council, who determines if the stipulation has been successfully addressed or an AFI can be assigned.
Questions raised from EPP Feedback (cont.)

- **Probationary status** is granted if an EPP has failed to meet a CAEP Standard. The EPP has 2 years (24 months) to address the standard (EPP submits a probationary report) and will have a site visit scheduled 30 months after the original date of the probationary status. If the Accreditation Council determines the standard has been successfully addressed, the EPP is granted full accreditation for the additional four years of the original accreditation cycle.

- EPPs with **probationary status with stipulations** on other standards, must address the unmet standard and all stipulations during the probationary site visit. All stipulations and unmet standards must be removed within the 30-month time period for full CAEP Accreditation to be awarded.
How will content knowledge be assessed for Advanced Level Programs?

- Evidence of content knowledge might include grades, application of content knowledge through clinical experiences, and/or capstone projects such as thesis or dissertation. EPPs would determine the evidence to be submitted for content knowledge at the advanced level. This could include a state or content area licensure test. CAEP will not mandate the evidence for content knowledge. The expectation is that the EPP will make the case for the content knowledge of its candidates.
Program level data

• The expectation at the advanced level will be the same for program level data as it is defined at the initial level. The same three program options exist at the advanced level as the initial level. These options are driven by state partnership agreement.
Questions and Answers -

GOOD QUESTION