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Purpose of the Workshop

To provide an **overview** of the CAEP accreditation review process and Self-Study under the Selected Improvement Pathway
Objectives

• Understanding **steps** of the SI Pathway review

• Understanding the **CAEP** Standards and Components

• Understanding the Self-Study Report **process**
The **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.
SI Timeline/Plan
Selected Improvement

step 1

EPP
- Application, New
  - Prepare, online
  - Submit, online
- Self Study, Legacy
  - Submit, online

CAEP
- Application
  - Consults
Selected Improvement

step 2

EPP
- Submit
  - Assessments
  - Scoring guides

CAEP
- Review
  - Assessments
  - Scoring guides
  - Experts...Feedback
Selected Improvement

step 3

EPP
- Call-for-comments
- 6 to 8 months, site visit
- Provider, call-for-comment announcement
- All specified parties

CAEP
- Call-for-comments
- Upload Calls in AIMS
- Notify provider
**Selected Improvement**

*step 4*

**EPP**
- SI Self-Study Report
- 8 months Provider submits SI self-study report, AIMS

**CAEP**
- SI Self-Study Report
- 18 months self-study shell in AIMS
- 2 +/− months CAEP Visitor Team review
- 2 +/− weeks Team’s Formative Feedback Report (FFR), AIMS
Selected Improvement

SI Self-Study

- Progress Report
Sample CAEP
Self-Study Template

Login to the **sample** SI Self-Study Report template and Evidence Room in AIMS

[www.aims.caepnet.org](http://www.aims.caepnet.org)

Login ID: 24319 | Password: caep
Overview of Provider

The **context** of the Provider

- Age, history, framework, and distinctive features;
- Demographics, profile, and/or structure of institution and the provider;
- Provider’s place in the institution;
- Preparation characteristics, requirements of program;
- The vision, mission, and goals of provider;
- The local, state, national (or international) employment of completers;
- Policy(ies) that shape the program
Standards

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

Content and Pedagogical Knowledge
Standard 1

Key Language

Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

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.
Component 1.1
Suggested Evidence

- Learner and learning
- Observation instrument, e.g. academic qualifications
- Field observation/Clinical experience (internship) instrument
- Disposition measures
- Grades from required courses
- Assessments that are course embedded and/or at end-of-course
- Work samples/Portfolios
- edTPA or PPAT
- State licensure tests
Component 1.1
Suggested Evidence

- Content and Instructional Practice
- Observation instrument, e.g. teaching effectiveness
- Application of knowledge from Field/Clinical observation instrument(s), work samples, lesson/unit plans, etc.
- Disposition Measures
- Any impact on student learning measures
- Assignments/Assessments with scoring guides
- Grades from required classes
- edTPA or PPAT
- State licensure tests
Component 1.1
Suggested Evidence

• Professional Responsibility
• Observation instrument, e.g. professional attributes
• Disposition Measures
• Any professional participation requirements
  • Faculty and/or committee meeting, Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), specialty meetings
  • Professional development and coaching
  • Student/professional memberships to professional associations, e.g. state and national
# Observation Instrument Data  
(Disaggregated by Specialty Licensure Area)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Uses discussion strategies to promote high-level thinking through accountable talk and academic conversation.</td>
<td>2013 N = 23 M = 3.0</td>
<td>2014 N = 26 M = 3.1</td>
<td>2013 N = 133 M = 2.8</td>
<td>2014 N = 126 M = 2.9</td>
<td>2013 N = 96 M = 2.6</td>
<td>2014 N = 93 M = 2.6</td>
<td>2013 N = 12 M = 2.5</td>
<td>2014 N = 14 M = 2.7</td>
<td>2013 N = 11 M = 2.4</td>
<td>2014 N = 16 M = 2.9</td>
<td>2013 N = 5 M = 2.7</td>
<td>2014 N = 8 M = 2.8</td>
<td>2013 N = 6 M = 3.1</td>
<td>2014 N = 7 M = 3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Provider Responsibilities

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 own professional practice.
Component 1.2
Suggested Evidence

- Evidence specific to candidates’ use of research and evidence
  - Portfolio planning elements
  - Lesson or unit plan reflections
  - Field observation/Clinical experience (internship)
  - edTPA or PPAT
Component 1.3
Key Language

Provider Responsibilities

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.
Component 1.3
Suggested Evidence

• Evidence specific to application of content knowledge

• Plans, assignments, and observational data demonstrate candidates’ skills for
  • Standards/Outcomes
  • Indicators
  • Learning Opportunities
  • Essential and Guiding Questions
  • Assessments
  • Performance Criteria/Rubrics

• Make sure the evidence is congruent with the “application” of Content and Pedagogical Knowledge
• Evidence includes SPA reports or state review of program specific data, States can add specific requirements to this component
Component 1.4
Key Language

Provider Responsibilities

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).
Component 1.4
Suggested Evidence

- Evidence specific to college- and career-readiness

- Plans, assignments, and observational data demonstrate candidates’ skills for
  - Deep content knowledge
  - Eliciting P-12 student application of their knowledge to solve problems and think critically
  - Cross-discipline teaching
  - Differentiation instruction
  - Ability to identify and interpret assessments to match P-12 college- and career-readiness goals/objective
Component 1.5
Key Language

Provider Responsibilities

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.
Component 1.5
Suggested Evidence

- Evidence specific to technology

- Teaching and Learning with Technology

- Instructional technology methods, software, hypermedia, and tools to support academic learning

- Knowing why, when, and how to aid student access

- Ability to design and facilitate digital approach, and evaluation digital use toward content and learning

- Using digital platforms to report and track student academic learning
Design
• Analysis of Learning and Teaching

Facilitate
• Planning for Integration of Instructional Technology

Evaluate
• Post-Instruction Evaluation and Review

- Instructor prepares material to be delivered in class.
- Students listen to lectures and other guided instruction in class and take notes.
- Homework is assigned to demonstrate understanding.

- Instructor records and shares lectures outside of class.
- Students watch/listen to lectures before coming to class.
- Class time is devoted to applied learning activities and more higher-order thinking tasks.
Component 1.1
What are reviewers looking for?

The provider shows candidates understand the 10 InTASC Standards, instructional practices, & professional responsibility.

From the Rubric:

- The InTASC category of Instructional Practice is addressed from clinical experiences.
- Multiple indicators/measures specific to application of content knowledge in clinical settings are identified with performance at or above the acceptable level on rubric indicators.
- An analysis of data/evidence, which includes identification of trends/patterns, comparisons, and/or differences.
Component 1.2
What are reviewers looking for?

The provider ensures that completers use research and evidence to develop an understanding of teaching

**From the Rubric:**

- The provider provides data/evidence that documents effective candidate use of research and evidence for planning, implementing, and evaluating P-12 students’ progress

- The provider provides data/evidence that documents effective candidate use of data to reflect on teaching effectiveness and their own professional practice

- The provider provides data/evidence that documents effective candidate use of data to assess P-12 student progress and to modify instruction based on student data
Component 1.3
What are reviewers looking for?

The provider ensures that completers apply content and pedagogical knowledge

From the Rubric:

- The provider present at least one source of evidence that candidates apply content and pedagogical knowledge at specialty licensure area levels (SPA or state reports, disaggregated specialty licensure area data, NBCT actions, etc.)

- The majority (51% or above) of SPA program reported achieved National Recognition

- The provider makes comparisons and identifies trends across specialty licensure areas based on data
Component 1.4
What are reviewers looking for?

The provider ensures that candidates demonstrate skills and commitment to provide all P-12 students access to rigorous college- and career-ready standards

From the Rubric:

- Multiple indicators/measures specific to evaluating proficiencies for college- and career- readiness
  - Candidates’ ability to provide effective instruction for all students (differentiation of instruction).
  - Candidates’ ability to have students apply knowledge to solve problems and think critically.
  - Candidates’ ability to design and implement learning experiences that require collaboration and communication skills.
Component 1.5
What are reviewers looking for?

The provider ensures that candidates model and apply technology standards as they design, implement and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning.

**From the Rubric:**

- Candidates demonstrate the ability to track and share student performance data digitally.
- Candidates demonstrate knowledge and skill proficiencies including accessing databases, digital media, and/or electronic sources.
- Candidates demonstrate the ability to design and facilitate digital learning.
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**.
Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

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 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.
Partners CO-Construct

- Evidence that partners collaborate in decision-making

- Evidence that placements, observational instruments, and evaluations are co-constructed with partners

- Documentation that the partnership is being implemented as described

- Technology-based collaborations

- Description of Partnerships (e.g. MOU)
Clinical Experience
MOU Sample
CAEP UNIVERSITY

Education Preparation Provider

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

PARTIES

This agreement defining CAEP University (CAEPU) is entered into between the __________ program of study and the __________ School District.

MISSION

The mission of CAEPU is to promote and facilitate candidates in education with clinical experiences designed to increase their knowledge and understanding about careers in teaching. Throughout the semester, candidates are expected to relate concepts taught within programs of study to those being practiced in the classroom: in areas such as cognitive development, learning styles, content, pedagogy, classroom management, differentiated instruction, and 21st century teaching.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

A. Establish 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 candidates.

B. Communities will consist of three collaborative teams representing:
   a. Candidates, including but not limited to recruitment, retention, and transition;
   b. Education Preparation Provider, including all programs study; and
   c. School District, including other programs or services relating to Candidates education

C. Etc…
Component 2.1
Suggested Evidence

Partners CO-Construct

- Clinical Experience handbooks (section specific to this component, NOT the entire handbook)
- Common expectations set for all candidates
- Candidates’ participation in professional development through clinical sites
- Schedule of joint meetings between partners purpose/topics covered in the meeting
- Orientation of clinical educators
- Retention of clinical educators
Clinical Educators

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.
Component 2.2
Suggested Evidence

Partners CO-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain

- Joint curriculum development/design/redesign
- Clinical educator training/coaching
- Performance evaluations
- Survey of clinical educators, candidates, employers, and/or human resources
- Record of counseling out of clinical educator roles
1: Please rate the course/ clerkship overall.
   - Poor
   - Fair
   - Good
   - Very Good
   - Excellent

2: Please comment on the following: a) specific strengths of the course/ clerkship; b) specific weaknesses of the course/ clerkship; c) suggestions for improvement. Please be thoughtful, professional and constructive in your feedback.

3: The learning objectives of the course/ clerkship were clear.
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Neutral
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree
   - No Opinion

4: The learning activities were appropriate for the specific course/ clerkship competencies.
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Neutral
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree
   - No Opinion

5: The methods of instruction were consistent with the course/ clerkship objectives.
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Neutral
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree
   - No Opinion

6: The methods of evaluation were consistent with the course/ clerkship objectives.
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Neutral
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree
   - No Opinion

7: Formative feedback was useful.
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Neutral
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree
   - No Opinion

8: Please rate the level of the workload required for the course.
   - Much Too Light
   - Light
   - Okay
   - Heavy
   - Much Too Heavy
   - No Opinion

9: Overall, the instructors were sensitive to individual student differences such as gender, race, religion, sexual orientation, socioeconomic factors, ethnic origin, and students with disabilities.
   - Almost Never
   - Rarely
   - Sometimes
   - Usually
   - Almost Always
   - No Opinion

10: Comments on sensitivity to student differences question:
Clinical Experiences

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.
Component 2.3
Suggested Evidence

Providers work with partners

- Evidence that clinical experiences have “...sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration”
- Description of clinical experience goals and operational design
- Documentation that clinical experiences are implemented as described
- Scope and sequence matrix is provided that charts the depth, breadth, and diversity of clinical experiences
- Experiences are deliberate, purposeful, sequential, and assessed using performance-based protocols
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Clinical Experiences &amp; Associated Description (Observation, Practicum, and/or Internship)</th>
<th>Licensure Areas</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Assessments</th>
<th>Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| EDU 220 Introduction to Education   | This **clinical experience** exposes candidates in education with seminars and practical experiences designed to increase their knowledge about careers in teaching. The course will include a minimum of 25 hours of observation and participation in the candidate’s intended licensure area – in an elementary, middle, or secondary school setting. In addition, five seminars and experiences will be required to further explore the career of teaching and to allow education majors to validate their areas of interest in teaching. | All             | 25 hours of Observation and Participation | Criminal Record Check  
Candidate Performance in Field  
Candidate Field Experiences Feedback  
Reflection Rubric | High Performing/Low Poverty  
North Elementary  
South Middle  
East High School  
West Academy |
| EDU 320 Child and Adolescent Development Curriculum | This **clinical experience** is designed to assist candidates to better understand the developmental characteristics of P-12 learners. Throughout the semester, candidates are expected to relate concepts taught in class to those being practiced in the classroom in areas such as cognitive development, learning styles, classroom management, differentiated instruction and 21st century teaching. Candidates reflect in each of these areas and lead classroom discussions based on these experiences. | All             | 25 hours of Observation, Participation, and Direct Teaching | Candidate Performance in Field  
Candidate Field Experiences Feedback  
Reflection Rubric  
Service Learning Survey  
Summary and Reflection Events | Low Performing/Diverse  
Northeast Jr High  
Southwest Montessori  
Central High School  
Central High School |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Field Experiences &amp; Associated Hours (Observation and/or Practicum)</th>
<th>Clinical Experiences &amp; Associated Hours (Student Teaching or Internship)</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial Undergraduate Program Field Experiences and Clinical Practice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| BS, Elementary Education                          | • EDU 320 - 20 hours of field-based observations  
• EDU 490 - 40 service learning hours  
• EDU 552, EDU 553, EDU 554, EDU 555, EDU 556 (Practicum) - 200 hours observation, participation, and direct teaching                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | • EDU 500 - 400 hours of observation, participation, and direct teaching                                                                                                                                 | 660   |
| BS, Middle School Education                       | • EDU 320 - 20 hours of field-based observation  
• EDU 490 - 40 service learning hours  
• EDU 540 (Practicum) - 200 hours of observation, participation, and direct teaching                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | • EDU 500 - 400 hours of observation, participation, and direct teaching                                                                                                                                 | 660   |
| **Advanced Graduate Program Field Experiences and Clinical Practice**                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |       |
| MEd, Secondary Mathematics Education              | • EDU 552, EDU 553, EDU 554, EDU 555, EDU 556 (Practicum) - 300 hours observation, participation, and direct teaching                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | • EDU 699 - 600 hours of observation, participation and direct teaching                                                                                                                                 | 900   |
| MEd, English as a Second Language (TESL)          | • TESL 501 (Practicum) - 250 hours of observation, participation and direct teaching                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | • EDU 699 - 600 hours of observation, participation and direct teaching                                                                                                                                 | 950   |
Component 2.1
What are reviewers looking for?

The provider has mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements for clinical preparation and share responsibility for continuous improvement of candidate preparation.

From the Rubric:

- Evidence that P-12 schools and the provider have both benefitted from the partnership.
- Evidence that a collaborative process is in place and is reviewed annually.
- The provider regularly (at least twice a year) seek input from P-12 teachers and/or administrators on candidate preparation, including developing or refining criteria for entry/exit into clinical experiences.
Component 2.2
What are reviewers looking for?

The provider’s partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support and retain high quality clinical educators, who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates’ development and P-12 student learning and development.

From the Rubric:

- Evidence that school-based clinical educators evaluate provider-based clinical educators and candidates and share results.
- Provider-based clinical educators and candidates evaluate school-based clinical educators and share results.
- The provider’s and P-12 clinical educators use data collected to modify selection criteria, determine future assignments of candidates, and make changes in clinical experiences.
Component 2.3
What are reviewers looking for?

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.

**From the Rubric:**

- Evidence that documents that both candidates and students have used technology to enhance learning
- Evidence that documents that candidates have used technology to track student progress and growth
- Candidates are assessed throughout the program with data supporting increasing levels of candidate competency
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 process is ultimately determined by a program’s meeting of Standard 4.
Component 3.1
Key Language

Plan for Recruitment of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs

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.
Component 3.1
Suggested Evidence

- **Plans for Recruitment**

- **Outreach strategies to reach diverse and academically able applicants**
  - Numerical goals and baseline data on admitted cohorts
  - Evidence that goals are based on completer’s existing and forecasted employment opportunities, including STEM, ELL, hard-to-staff schools

- Evidence that progress is monitored, analyzed, adequacy judged, results used, and recruitment strategies are redefined as needed
Recruitment Plan

Common Subjects

Introduction and Planning
- Organization, College, Department, etc...
- Background of College/Department
- College/Department Self-Assessment

Recruitment of Candidates
- Develop EPP’s “Message”
- Develop “How To” Recruit
- Develop, Schedule, Conduct Orientations

Retention of Candidates
- Assign Support/Supervisor
- Provide Learning Opportunities of Foundations, Methods, and Clinical Experiences
- Evaluate Content and Pedagogical Development
- Provide Academic/non-Academic Resources

Transition of Completers
- Communicate with Completers regularly via surveys, polls, questionnaires, census
- Recognize professional support, supervisor(s), and resources

Managing and Evaluating
- Design the Evaluation
- Collect, Organize, and Analyze Data
- Report Results, Conclusions Reached, and Recommendations
- Resources
Component 3.2

Key Language

Admission Standards Indicate that Candidates Have High Academic Achievement and Ability

REQUIRED COMPONENT: The provider sets admissions requirements, including CAEP minimum criteria or the state’s minimum criteria, whichever are higher, 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
- is in the top 40 percent of the distribution from 2018-2019
- is in the top 33 percent of the distribution by 2020.
Component 3.2

Key Language

Admission Standards Indicate That Candidates Have High Academic Achievement And Ability (MUST MEET)

- **[ALTERNATIVE 1]** If any state can meet the CAEP standards, as specified above, by demonstrating a correspondence in scores between the state-normed assessments and nationally normed ability/achievement assessments, then educator preparation providers from that state will be able to utilize their state assessments until 2020. CAEP will work with states through this transition.

- **[ALTERNATIVE 2]** Over time, a program may develop a reliable, valid model that uses admissions criteria other than those stated in this standard. In this case, the admitted cohort group mean on these criteria must meet or exceed the standard that has been shown to positively correlate with measures of P-12 student learning and development.

- The provider demonstrates that the standard for high academic achievement and ability is met through multiple evaluations and sources of evidence. The provider reports the mean and standard deviation for the group.
## Monitoring Table of Candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY ASSESSMENT DATA 2015-2016</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Transition Point I Admission into Program</th>
<th>GPA on a 4.00 scale</th>
<th>Program Admission Assessment</th>
<th>Transition Point II Admission into Clinical Internship</th>
<th>GPA on a 4.00 scale</th>
<th>Professional Knowledge Assessment</th>
<th>Transition Point III Program Completion</th>
<th>Key Assessment I GPA</th>
<th>Key Assessment II Professional Content Knowledge - PCK</th>
<th>Key Assessment III Pedagogical &amp; Professional Knowledge &amp; Skills Planning - PPK</th>
<th>Key Assessment IV Electronic Portfolio EP</th>
<th>Key Assessment V CLINICAL INTERNSHIP INSTRUMENT (CII)</th>
<th>Key Assessment VII Professional &amp; Personal Dispositions</th>
<th>Key Assessment VIII Teacher Work Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>ECE, N=94</td>
<td>ECE n=3</td>
<td>Passed Score of 220+</td>
<td>ECE n=7</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>Passed Score of 220+</td>
<td>ECE n=7</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>Table 1.a</td>
<td>Table 1.d</td>
<td>Table 1.g</td>
<td>Assessment Not Utilized in 15/16</td>
<td>Table 1.p</td>
<td>Table 1.q</td>
<td>Assessment Not Utilized in 15/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Grades, N=18</td>
<td>Middle Grades n=2</td>
<td>Passed Score of 220+</td>
<td>Middle Grades; Language Arts; Social Studies n=3</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>Passed Score of 220+</td>
<td>Middle Grades; Language Arts; Social Studies n=3</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>Table 1.b</td>
<td>Table 1.e</td>
<td>Table 1.h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary, N=23; English, n=11; History, n=1; Biology, n=8; and Mathematics, n=3</td>
<td>Secondary; Biology n=3; English n=3</td>
<td>Passed Score of 220+</td>
<td>Secondary; English n=2</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>Passed Score of 220+</td>
<td>Secondary; English n=2</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>Table 1.c</td>
<td>Table 1.f</td>
<td>Table 1.i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note: Enrollment represents the number of students who have declared Education as a major</td>
<td>Note: Sample numbers of candidates in all programs reflect only admitted candidates.</td>
<td>GPA on a 4.00 scale</td>
<td>Note: Assessment reports if candidates meet passing requirements of at least 220.</td>
<td>GPA on a 4.00 scale</td>
<td>Note: Assessment has a minimum score of 220, same as GACE I</td>
<td>Note: Sample numbers of Candidates in Transitions II and III are the same.</td>
<td>GPA on a 4.00 scale</td>
<td>See tables which include multiple indices averaged on a scale of: Key Unsatisfactory (0) - Never Demonstrates these competencies Emerging (1) - Rarely demonstrates these competencies Acceptable (2) - Often demonstrates these competencies Exceptional (3) - Always demonstrates these competencies</td>
<td>See tables which include multiple indices averaged on a scale of: Key Unsatisfactory (0) - Never Demonstrates these competencies Emerging (1) - Rarely demonstrates these competencies Acceptable (2) - Often demonstrates these competencies Exceptional (3) - Always demonstrates these competencies</td>
<td>No rubric was provided and measures were on a 0-10 pt. scale</td>
<td>See tables which include multiple indices averaged on a scale of: Key Unsatisfactory (0), Emerging (1), Acceptable (2), and Exceptional (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Selectivity Factors

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.
Non-Academic Factors

- EPP establishes attributes and dispositions at admissions and/or during the program.
  - Factors were selected from research or practice knowledge, associates with impact on P-12 student learning.
## Admission to Teacher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete 45 Units of Common Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative GPA of 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass all Sections of Program Entry Exam I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete 40 Volunteer Hours (with P-12 children)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Pre-Dispositions Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete EDU 220 Foundations of Education (with a grade of “C” or better)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete 15 Field Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Background Check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership in a Professional Organization for Teacher Educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Admission to Clinical Experience

- Submit Application for Clinical Experience (one semester prior to clinical)
- Complete all requirements in the Major Field
- Have a grade of C or better in all courses constituting the Major
- Earn a Cumulative GPA of 3.0 or better
- Submit a Clear Background Check
- Proof of Membership in a Professional Education Organization
- Passing Score on the Professional Knowledge Examination (in area(s) of preparation, one or both tests as stipulated)
Component 3.4
Key Language

Selectivity During Preparation

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.
**Component 3.4**

**Suggested Evidence**

**Monitoring candidate progression**

- Two or more measures from key decision points
- Measures on developing proficiencies in critical areas:
  - Pedagogical knowledge and skills
  - Content knowledge
  - Developing dispositions
  - Ability to integrate technology into instruction
  - Impact on P-12 student learning
  - Ability to teach to college- and career-ready standards
## Monitoring Table of Candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Transition Point I Admission into Program</th>
<th>GPA on a 4.00 scale</th>
<th>Program Admission Assessment</th>
<th>Transition Point II Admission into Clinical Internship</th>
<th>GPA on a 4.00 scale</th>
<th>Professional Knowledge Assessment</th>
<th>Transition Point III Program Completion</th>
<th>Key Assessment I GPA</th>
<th>Key Assessment II Professional Content Knowledge - PCK</th>
<th>Key Assessment III Pedagogical &amp; Professional Knowledge &amp; Skills Planning - PPK</th>
<th>Key Assessment V Electronic Portfolio EP</th>
<th>Key Assessment VI Clinical Internship Instrument (CI)</th>
<th>Key Assessment VII Professional &amp; Personal Dispositions</th>
<th>Key Assessment VIII Teacher Work Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>ECE, N=94</td>
<td>ECE n=3</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>Passed Score of 220+</td>
<td>ECE n=7</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>Passed Score of 220+</td>
<td>ECE n=7</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>Table 1.a</td>
<td>Table 1.d</td>
<td>Table 1.g</td>
<td>Assessment Not Utilized in 15/16</td>
<td>Table 1.p</td>
<td>Table 1.q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Grades, N=18</td>
<td>Middle Grades n=2</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>Passed Score of 220+</td>
<td>Middle Grades; Language Arts/Social Studies n=3</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>Passed Score of 220+</td>
<td>Middle Grades; Language Arts/Social Studies n=3</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>Table 1.b</td>
<td>Table 1.e</td>
<td>Table 1.h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary, N=23; English, n=11; History, n=11; Biology, n=6; and Mathematics, n=1</td>
<td>Secondary; Biology n=3; English n=3</td>
<td>2.92, 1.43</td>
<td>Passed Score of 220+</td>
<td>Secondary; English n=2</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>Passed Score of 220+</td>
<td>Secondary; English n=2</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>Table 1.c</td>
<td>Table 1.f</td>
<td>Table 1.i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Enrollment represents the number of students who have declared Education as a major.
Note: Sample numbers of candidates in all programs reflect only admitted candidates.
Note: Assessment reports if candidates meet passing requirements of at least 220.
Note: Sample number are of candidates already in program and do not include Transition I samples.
Note: Assessment has a minimum score of 220, same as GACE I.
Note: Sample numbers of Candidates in Transitions II and III are the same.

GPA on a 4.00 scale
See tables which include multiple indices averaged on a scale of:
- Key Unsatisfactory (0) - Never demonstrates these competencies
- Emerging (1) - Rarely demonstrates these competencies
- Acceptable (2) - Often demonstrates these competencies
- Exceptional (3) - Always demonstrates these competencies

No rubric was provided and markers were on a 0-10 pt scale
Selection of Completers

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.
Component 3.5
Suggested Evidence

Exit Standards

- Evidence used for part of the documentation for Standard 1
- Could cross-reference the exit measures
- Evidence documenting the rigor of exiting requirements
## Monitoring Table of Candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY ASSESSMENT DATA 2015-2017</th>
<th>Key Assessment I GPA</th>
<th>Key Assessment II Professional Content Knowledge - PCK</th>
<th>Key Assessment III Pedagogical &amp; Professional Knowledge &amp; Skills Planning - PKP</th>
<th>Key Assessment V Electronic Portfolio EP</th>
<th>Key Assessment VI Clinical Internship Instrument (CII)</th>
<th>Key Assessment VII Professional &amp; Personal Dispositions</th>
<th>Key Assessment VIII Teacher Work Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECE, N=94</td>
<td>ECE n=7</td>
<td>ECE n=7</td>
<td>Passed Score of 220+</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>Table 1.a</td>
<td>Table 1.d</td>
<td>Table 1.g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Grades, N=18</td>
<td>Middle Grades; Language Arts/Social Studies n=3</td>
<td>Middle Grades; Language Arts/Social Studies n=3</td>
<td>Passed Score of 220+</td>
<td>Passed Score of 220+</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>Table 1.b</td>
<td>Table 1.e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary, N=73; English, n=11, History, n=11, Biology, n=1, Mathematics, n=1</td>
<td>Secondary; English n=2</td>
<td>Secondary; English n=2</td>
<td>Passed Score of 220+</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Passed Score of 220+</td>
<td>Table 1.f</td>
<td>Table 1.h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Enrollment represents the number of students who have declared Education as a major.

Note: Sample numbers of candidates in all programs reflect only admitted candidates.

Note: Assessment reports if candidates meet passing requirements of at least 220.

Note: Sample numbers are of candidates already in program and do not include Transition I samples.

Note: Assessment has a minimum score of 220, same as GACE I

Note: Sample numbers of Candidates in Transitions II and III are the same.

GPA on a 4.00 scale

See tables which include multiple indices averaged on a scale of:

- Unsatisfactory (0) - Never demonstrates these competencies
- Emerging (1) - Rarely demonstrates these competencies
- Acceptable (2) - Often demonstrates these competencies
- Exceptional (3) - Always demonstrates these competencies

See tables which include multiple indices averaged on a scale of:

- Unsatisfactory (0), Emerging (1), Acceptable (2), and Exceptional (3)

No rubric was provided and measures were on a 0-10 pt. scale.
Component 3.6
Key Language

Selection of Completers

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.
Component 3.6
Suggested Evidence

Expectation of the Profession

- Indicators of candidates’ understanding of ethics, professional standards of practice, relevant laws and practices
- Evidence from course materials, stable assessments, proprietary assessments
Component 3.1
What are reviewers looking for?

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.

From the Rubric:

- A recruitment plan, based on mission, with baseline points and goals.
- Disaggregated data on applicants, those admitted, and enrolled candidates by relevant demographics including race/ethnicity, SES, and/or sex.
- Recruitment results are recorded, monitored, and used in planning and modification of recruitment strategies.
- The provider addresses employment opportunities in schools, districts, and/or regions where completers are likely to seek employment.
- The recruitment plan and its implementation have moved the provider toward the goal of greater candidate diversity and academic achievement.
Component 3.2
What are reviewers looking for?

The provider sets admissions requirements and gathers data to monitor applicants and the selected pool of candidates

**From the Rubric:**

- All data/evidence is disaggregated by specialty licensure area, as well as aggregated
- The average score of each admitted cohort meets CAEP minima: GPA of 3.0 and performance on a nationally normed test of academic achievement is in the top 50%
- Provider has a reliable, valid model in which the use of admissions criteria results in a positive correlation with academic achievement or positive impact on P-12 student learning
Component 3.3
What are reviewers looking for?

The provider has established and monitors candidates’ academic ability at admissions and during the program, and reports data that shows how the academic and non-academic factors predict candidate performance in the program.

*From the Rubric:*

- The provider documents evidence of established non-academic criteria used during admissions.
- The provider monitors candidates’ progress on established non-academic criteria at multiple points and takes appropriate actions based on results.
- The provider associates/correlates non-academic criteria with candidate and completer performance.
Component 3.4
What are reviewers looking for?

The provider creates criteria for program progression and monitors candidates’ advancement from admissions through completion

From the Rubric:

- The provider has documentation of two or more measures/gateways of candidate progression
- The provider has explicit criteria for monitoring/assessing candidate development throughout preparation
- The provider presents results and that candidate progressions criteria align with evidence of actions taken
Component 3.5
What are reviewers looking for?

The provider documents that candidates have reached a high standard for content knowledge in the fields where certification is sought and can teach effectively with positive impact on P-12 student learning and development before the provider recommends any completing candidate for licensure or certification.

From the Rubric:

- Evidence documents candidates’ effective teaching, including positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development.
Component 3.6
What are reviewers looking for?

The provider documents that candidates understand the expectations of the profession, including codes of ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant laws and policies before the provider recommends any completing candidate for licensure or certification.

From the Rubric:

- Evidence documents candidates’ understanding of codes of ethics and professional standards of practice.
- Evidence documents candidates’ knowledge of relevant laws and policies.
STANDARD 4 (Required Standard)

Program Impact
Standard 4
Key Language

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.
REQUIRED COMPONENT: 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.
Component 4.1
Suggested Evidence

Impact Learning and Development

• Direct measures of student learning and development
  • Addresses diverse subjects and grades

• P-12 impact or growth data from state teacher evaluations (if available)
Access to data from states

- 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.

- Document the EPP’s analysis and evaluation of information provided on P-12 student learning.

- Interpretations of the data.

- Judge the implications of the data and analyses for the preparation program.

- If judged to be invalid, use other valid evidence.
No *or* Limited Access to data from states

- The EPP creates data similar to state data in conjunction with student assessments and teacher evaluations conducted in school districts where some portion of its completers are employed
  - This type of EPP study could be phased in
  - By 2016, all EPPs should at least have a design in place and pilot data collection under way
    - One year of data needed for 2017-2018
    - EPP collaborations encouraged
- Also presented by EPPs that are supplementing state or district data with data on subjects or grades not covered
Component 4.2
Key Language

Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness

**REQUIRED COMPONENT:** 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.
Component 4.2
Suggested Evidence

Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness

- Structured classroom observation evaluations
  - Social and emotional supports – classroom climate, teacher sensitivity, regard for student perspectives;
  - Organizational and management supports – behavior management, productivity, strategies for engaging students;
  - Instructional supports – strategies that foster content knowledge, strategies that foster analysis and reading skills, strategies that foster knowledge of procedures and skills, quality of feedback, instructional dialogue.

- Surveys, polls, questionnaires, census, etc.
Component 4.3
Key Language

Satisfaction of Employers

REQUIRED COMPONENT: 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.
**Component 4.3**

**Suggested Evidence**

**Employers**

- Employer satisfaction data – EPP or State instruments
  - Census, Focus Groups, Case Studies
  - Descriptive, narrative data from approaches would employ a research-based method of qualitative analysis

- Data on employment milestones
  - Promotion, employment trajectory, retention
Component 4.4
Key Language

Satisfaction of Completers

REQUIRED COMPONENT: 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.
Component 4.4
Suggested Evidence

Completers

• Completer satisfaction data – EPP or State instruments
  • Census, Focus Groups, Case Studies
• Descriptive, narrative data from approaches would employ a research-based method of qualitative analysis
• Data on employment milestones
  • Employment/Retention, Professional Development Plans (PDPs), Promotion, etc.
Component 4.1
What are reviewers looking for?

The provider documents, using multiple measures, that program completers contribute to an expected level of student-learning growth

**From the Rubric:**

- Provider has one or more measures of state-provided impact data at the in-service level when available.
- Provider includes context and description of the source of P-12 learning data.
- Provider includes description and explanation on the representation of the data.
Component 4.2
What are reviewers looking for?

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.

From the Rubric:

- Observation and/or student survey assessments measure the application of professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions corresponding with teaching effectiveness and/or P-12 student learning.
- Provider provides valid interpretations of data that are supported by results.
Component 4.3

What are reviewers looking for?

The provider demonstrates, using valid and reliable data, that employers are satisfied with the completers’ preparation for their assigned responsibilities in working with P-12 students.

*From the Rubric:*

- Provider has evidence that employers perceive completers’ preparation was sufficient for their job responsibilities.
- Provider has a system for the analysis, evaluation, and interpretation of data.
- Provider has documentation of employment milestones, including promotion, employment trajectory, and retention for at least some completers and conducts appropriate analysis.
Component 4.4
What are reviewers looking for?

The provider demonstrates, using 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.

**From the Rubric:**

- Provider has evidence that completers perceive their preparation was sufficient for their job responsibilities
- Provider includes appropriate analysis and interpretation of results
- Conclusions are supported by the data.
STANDARD 5

Provider Quality Assurance and Continues Improvement
Standard 5
Key Language

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

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.
Component 5.1
Suggested Evidence

Quality Assurance System

- **Multiple measures:** Coherent set that result in a balance of strengths and weaknesses of individual measures, applied across all program, supporting targeted change (program or candidate levels)

- **Candidate Progress:** Evidence for Standard 1 and 3

- **Completer Achievements:** Evidence for Standard 4

- **Operational Effectiveness:**
  - Description of how evidence submitted in Standard 1 through 4 is collected, analyzed, monitored, and reported.
  - Description of the schedule for continuous review with roles and responsibilities of system users
### Monitoring Table of Candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Key Assessment I GPA</th>
<th>Key Assessment II Professional Content Knowledge - PCK</th>
<th>Key Assessment III Pedagogical &amp; Professional Knowledge &amp; Skills Planning &amp; PPK</th>
<th>Key Assessment V Electronic Portfolio EP</th>
<th>Key Assessment VI Clinical Internship Instrument (CII)</th>
<th>Key Assessment VII Professional &amp; Personal Dispositions</th>
<th>Key Assessment VIII Teacher Work Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECE, N=94</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>Table 1.a</td>
<td>Table 1.d</td>
<td>Table 1.g</td>
<td>Assessment Not Utilized in 15/16</td>
<td>Table 1.h</td>
<td>Table 1.q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Grades, N=18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Grades n=2</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>Passed Score of 220+</td>
<td>Passed Score of 220+</td>
<td>Passed Score of 220+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary, N=23, English, n=1, History, n=1, Biology, n=1, Mathematics, n=1</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>ECE n=7</td>
<td>ECE n=7</td>
<td>Middle Grades; Language Arts/Social Studies n=3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary, Biology n=3, English n=2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary, English n=2</td>
<td>2.92, 1.43</td>
<td>Passed Score of 220+</td>
<td>Passed Score of 220+</td>
<td>Passed Score of 220+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
- Enrollment represents the number of students who have declared Education as a major.
- GPA as averaged based on 4.00 scale.
- Note: Sample numbers of candidates in all programs reflect only admitted candidates.
- GPA as averaged based on 4.00 scale.
- Note: Sample numbers are of candidates already in program and do not include Transition I samples.
- Note: Assessment has a minimum score of 220, same as GACE I.
- GPA as on 4.00 scale.
Quality and Strategic Evaluation

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.
Component 5.2
Suggested Evidence

Assessment System

- **Relevance**: Evidence that the measures provide evidence of what they claim to be assessing
- **Verifiable**: Data records are accurate and analyses can be replicated by a third party with similar results
- **Representative**: Evidence that data samples are free of bias and should be typical of completed assessments, or that the EPP clearly delineates what the sample does and does not represent
- **Cumulative**: Data sets are based on at least 3 administrations of the assessment
- **Actionable**: Analyzed evidence is accessible and in a form that can guide EPP faculty in modeling, implementing, and evaluating innovations
- **Evidence**: that qualitative and quantitative data triangulate and lead to similar conclusions about candidate and completer outcomes and program effectiveness
- **Description**: of assessment instruments and data files provided as evidence for Standard 1 through 4, include how these instruments were constructed, validated and implemented (inter-rater reliability)
- **Empirical** evidence that interpretations of data are reliable/consistent, valid/trustworthy
Component 5.3
Key Language

**Continuous Improvement**

**REQUIRED COMPONENT:** 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.
Component 5.3
Suggested Evidence

Provider Regularly and Systematically Assesses

- Evidence of regular and systematic data-driven modifications (may draw on research and evidence from the field as well as data analyses from the EPP’s quality assurance system for CAEP standards)
## Monitoring Table of Candidates

| KEY ASSESSMENT DATA 2015-2017 | Enrolled | Transition Point I Admission into Program | GPA on a 4.00 scale | Program Admission Assessment | Transition Point II Admission into Clinical Internship | GPA on a 4.00 scale | Professional Knowledge Assessment | Transition Point III Program Completion | Key Assessment I GPA | Key Assessment II Professional Content Knowledge - PCK | Key Assessment III Pedagogical & Professional Knowledge & Skills Planning - PPK | Key Assessment IV Electronic Portfolio EP | Key Assessment V Clinical Internship Instrument (CI) | Key Assessment VI Professional & Personal Dispositions | Key Assessment VII Teacher Work Sample |
|-------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 2015-2016                     | ECE, N=94 | ECE n=3 | 3.01 | Passed Score of 220+ | ECE n=7 | 3.34 | Passed Score of 220+ | ECE n=7 | 3.37 | Table 1.a | Table 1.d | Table 1.g | Assessment Not Utilized in 1516 | Table 1.p | Assessment Not Utilized in 1516 |
|                               | Middle Grades, N=18 | Middle Grades n=2 | 3.43 | Passed Score of 220+ | Middle Grades; Language Arts/Social Studies n=3 | 2.98 | Passed Score of 220+ | Middle Grades; Language Arts/Social Studies n=3 | 3.04 | Table 1.b | Table 1.e | Table 1.h |                                        | Table 1.q |                                        |
|                               | Secondary, N=23; English, n=11; History, n=11; Biology, n=8; and Mathematics, n=4 | Secondary; Biology n=3; English n=3 | 2.92, 3.43 | Passed Score of 220+ | Secondary; English n=2 | 3.20 | Passed Score of 220+ | Secondary; English n=2 | 3.33 | Table 1.c | Table 1.e | Table 1.f | Table 1.i |                                        | Table 1.r |                                        |

Note: Enrollment represents the number of students who have declared Education as a major. Note: Sample numbers of candidates in all programs reflect only admitted candidates. GPA averaged based on a 4.00 scale. Note: Assessment reports if candidates meet passing requirements of at least 220. GPA averaged based on a 4.00 scale. Note: Assessment has a minimum score of 220, same as GACE 1. Note: Sample numbers of Candidates in Transitions II and III are the same. GPA on a 4.00 scale. See tables which include multiple indices averaged on a scale of: Key Unsatisfactory (0) - Never demonstrates these competencies; Emerging (1) - Rarely demonstrates these competencies; Acceptable (2) - Often demonstrates these competencies; Exceptional (3) - Always demonstrates these competencies. See tables which include multiple indices averaged on a scale of: Key Unsatisfactory (0) - Never demonstrates these competencies; Emerging (1) - Rarely demonstrates these competencies; Acceptable (2) - Often demonstrates these competencies; Exceptional (3) - Always demonstrates these competencies. No rubric was provided and measures were on a 0-10 pt. scale. See tables which include multiple indices averaged on a scale of: Unsatisfactory (0), Emerging (1), Acceptable (2), and Exceptional (3).
Component 5.4
Key Language

Continuous Improvement

REQUIRED COMPONENT: 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.
Component 5.4
Suggested Evidence

Measure of Completer Impact

- Evidence of the use of impact and outcome data from the eight annual measures (included in Standard 4 and CAEP’s annual report)

Measure 1: Impact that completers’ teaching has on P-12 learning and development.
Measure 2: Indicators of teaching effectiveness.
Measure 3: Results of employer surveys, and including retention and employment milestones.
Measure 4: Results of completer surveys.
Measure 5: Graduation rates from preparation programs.
Measure 6: Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements.
Measure 7: Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they were prepared.
Measure 8: Student loan default rates and other consumer information.
Continuous Improvement

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.
Provider Assures Appropriate Stakeholders are in Involved

- Description of stakeholders and roles
- Specific examples of shared decision-making and results
- Involvement of stakeholders in program evaluation and defining and implementing improvements
Component 5.1
What are reviewers looking for?

The provider’s quality assurance system is comprised of multiple measures that can monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness.

From the Rubric:

- The provider uses evidence/data from multiple measures to inform, modify, and evaluate the provider’s operational effectiveness.
- The provider has evidence that it regularly reviews system operations and data.
- The provider provides evidence of a system that has the capacity to collect, analyze, monitor, and report data/evidence on all 2013 CAEP Standards.
- The provider has evidence that shows that the system supports the ability to monitor operational effectiveness.
Component 5.2
What are reviewers looking for?

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.

From the Rubric:

- Provider’s interpretations of evidence is consistent, accurate, and supported by data/evidence.

- Provider’s evidence is relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable.

- At least 50% of provider created assessments used in the quality assurance system are scored at the minimal level of sufficiency as defined by the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric.
Component 5.3
What are reviewers looking for?

The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations, and uses results to improve program elements and processes.

**From the Rubric:**

- The provider documents that it regularly and systematically, reviews quality assurance system data, identifies patterns across preparation programs (both strengths and weaknesses), uses data/evidence for continuous improvement, and tests innovations.

- The provider documents evidence that data-driven changes are ongoing and based on systematic assessment of performance, and/or that innovations result in overall positive trends of improvement for the provider, its candidates, and P-12 students.
Component 5.4
What are reviewers looking for?

The provider’s measurement of completer impact is summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision-making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction.

From the Rubric:

- Evidence that CAEP’s eight outcome and impact measures are systematically monitored and reported.
- Evidence that the eight annual outcome and impact measures and their trends are posted on the provider’s website and shared widely in other ways.
- Program changes and modifications are linked to provider’s own evidence/data for topics described in the eight annual measures.
Component 5.5
What are reviewers looking for?

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

From the Rubric:

- The provider documents specific evidence of diverse stakeholder involvement through multiple sources in decision-making, program evaluation, and selection and implementation of changes for improvement
- The provider identifies at least two examples of input from stakeholders and use of that input
Diversity

Cross-Cutting Theme...

Incorporation of multiple perspectives, respect and responsiveness to cultural differences, and understanding of their own frames of reference

Standard 1

- Emphasizes “all students” must demonstrate skills and commitment that provide all P-12 students access to rigorous college and career ready standards
Diversity

Standard 2
- Clinical experiences that prepare candidates to work with all students

Standard 3
- Providers committed to outreach efforts to recruit a more able and diverse candidate pool
Diversity:
What are reviewers looking for?

- Reviewers determine whether the provider has sufficiently addressed the theme of diversity in their self-studies.

- The theme is not a standard, however, and is not judged by Visitor Teams as a Standard.
- Visitors do not cite stipulations or weaknesses for a crosscutting theme.
- Questions that arise may flag areas that do address components of standards that the team will investigate more closely, particularly where those components address diversity.
Technology

Cross-Cutting Themes...

Incorporation of technology to improve teaching effectiveness, enhance instruction, and manage student and assessment data while engaging students in the application of technology to enhance their learning experiences.

Standard 1

- Endorses InTASC teacher standards
- Providers are to “...ensure that completers model and apply technology standards as they design, implement, and assess learning experiences to engage students and improving learning and enrich professional practice.”
Technology

Standard 2
- Technology-enhanced learning opportunities
- Appropriate technology-based applications
- Technology based collaborations

Standard 3
- Candidates integrate technology into all learning domains
Technology: What are reviewers looking for?

- Reviewers determine whether the provider has sufficiently addressed the theme of technology in their self-studies.
- The theme is not a standard, however, and is not judged by Visitor Teams as a Standard.
  - Visitors do not cite stipulations or weaknesses for a crosscutting theme.
  - Questions that arise may flag areas that do address components of standards that the team will investigate more closely, particularly where those components address technology.
Areas for Improvement

AFIs from Previous Review...

- Rationales serve two purposes:
  1. Assisting the EPP to improve practice
  2. Guiding the Accreditation Council in determining if a standard is met or not met

- Received Action Letter
- Received Action Report

- Respond to cited Areas for Improvement (AFIs)
Select Improvement Plan

- **Description(s)** of the Selected **Area(s)** for Improvement and a **Rationale** for selection

- Identify **goals** and **objectives** with the Selected Area for Improvement

- Provide specific **strategies** and **interventions** to implement Selected Improvement Plan

- Assessment plan, to **evaluate** each set goal and objective

- Resources to **implement** improvement plan
Selected Improvement

step 5

EPP

- Self-Study Addendum
- Submit response and supplemental evidence to Formative Feedback Report,
- Scheduled on-site visit, 60 days

CAEP

- Self-Study Addendum
- Visiting Team reviews
- Prior to on-site visit
## Selected Improvement

### step 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPP</th>
<th>CAEP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Visit</td>
<td>Site Visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with Team Lead</td>
<td>Team verifies evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule, interviews and observations</td>
<td>Formulate questions for visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested, pre-visit and/or Formative Feedback Report</td>
<td>Team prepares site-visit report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare/submit final site-visit report, 4 weeks after</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selected Improvement

**step 7**

**EPP**
- Provider Response
  - On-site report receives, within 7 days
  - Provider responds to accuracy of on-site visit report, within 2 weeks
- *Factual corrections*

**CAEP**
- Provider Response
  - Team Lead receives *factual* corrections
  - Affirms to site visit report, or reverses
  - Response posted in AIMS, within 7 days
Selected Improvement

step 8

**EPP**
- Accreditation Council, Initial Review (Accreditation)
- Optional attendance
- Provider and/or state representative attend meeting

**CAEP**
- Accreditation Council, Initial Review
  - Panel reviews documentation
  - **Affirm** AFIs or Stipulations, if any, recommendations
  - Recommendations regarding standards, met or not met
Selected Improvement

**step 9**

**EPP**
- Joint Review (Accreditation)
- *No action*

**CAEP**
- Joint Review (Accreditation)
- Panel reviews documentation
- **Accepts** Initial Review Panel recommendation, or revises
  - Recommendations regarding standards, met or not met
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 10</th>
<th><strong>Selected Improvement</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPP</th>
<th>CAEP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Accreditation Council, Decision (Accreditation)</td>
<td>• Accreditation Council, Decision (Accreditation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <em>No action</em></td>
<td>• Accreditation decision of provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Accreditation Action Letters sent to EPP and State reps.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selected Improvement

step 11

EPP

- Public Announcement
  - Provider accepts or appeals CAEP’s action, within 30 days
    - Appeals, adverse decision, denial or revocation of accreditation

CAEP

- Public Announcement
  - Announces accreditation/probation decisions
  - Send certification of accreditation
    or
  - Schedule probationary visit
Selected Improvement

*step 12*

**EPP**
- Reconsideration
  - Petition for reconsideration
  - Accreditation with stipulations or probation

**CAEP**
- Reconsideration
  - Chair and Vice Chairs, determine sufficient merit to submit request
  - Advised by CAEP staff
Selected Improvement

**step 13**

**EPP**
- Appeals Process
  - Submit an Appeals Petition
  - Initiates appeals process

**CAEP**
- Appeals Process
  - Decision, *if to deny or revoke of accreditation*, provider appeals decision
Selected Improvement

step 14

EPP
- Annual Report
- Provider, faculty, submit annual reports in AIMS and fees to CAEP

CAEP
- Annual Report
- Reports reviewed
- Feedback provided