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Standard 3 – Candidate Quality, Recruitment and Selectivity

• Standard 3: The provider demonstrates that the quality of candidates is 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.
General Rules for Standard 3

- At least **three cycles** of data must be submitted. If revised assessment is submitted with less than three cycles of data, data from the original assessment should be submitted.
- Cycles of data must be **sequential** and be the **latest available**.
- EPP-created assessments should be scored at the **CAEP Sufficient Level** as defined on the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric.
- All components must be addressed.
- **Component 3.2 is required.**
Component 3.1: The provider presents a plan 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 reflect the diversity of American’s P-12 students. The provider demonstrates efforts to know and address community, state, national, or local needs for hard-to-staff schools and shortage fields, currently, STEM, English-language learning, and students with disabilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Evidence</th>
<th>Minimal Level of Sufficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Recruitment plans</td>
<td>• Recruitment plan with baseline points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resources moving toward target areas of STEM, ELL, and students with disabilities</td>
<td>• Disaggregated data on applicants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence of marketing and recruitment of racially and culturally diverse candidates</td>
<td>• Recruitment results are recorded, monitored and used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence of collaboration with other providers</td>
<td>• Knowledge of and action that address employment opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employment needs in area hard-to-staff schools</td>
<td>• STEM, ELL, special education, &amp; hard-to-staff schools are explicitly addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report on –</strong></td>
<td>• Recruitment plan and its implementation have moved the provider to goal of greater candidate diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Application, acceptance and enrollment rates</td>
<td>• Evidence that the provider monitors the influence of employment opportunities and enrollment patterns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Disaggregation of data by such things as SES, gender, ethnicity, and others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Required Component 3.2

• Component 3.2 – The provider sets admissions requirements, including CAEP minimum criteria or the state’s minimum criteria, whichever are higher, and gather data to monitor applicants and the selected pool of candidates. The provider ensures that the average GPA 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% from 2016-2017 (currently frozen at this level)
Component 3.2 – Research TPA

• **Charge to Teacher Preparation Analytics**
  - To investigate the viability of CAEP’s benchmarks as identified in option 1 of component 3.2
  - To inform the CAEP Board of Directors’ discussion and final action on component 3.2
  - Four streams of evidence were used
    - In-depth literature review
    - Empirical data from selected states
    - Extensive survey of all CAEP EPPs (national and international)
    - Interviews with selected EPP leaders
Study Components

• Review of empirical research literature on relationship between academic achievement of teacher candidates and subsequent performance
  ▪ Review studies that employed measures of academic achievement
  ▪ Explore relationship between academic achievement and
    • Retention and completion
    • Earned GPA
    • Performance on licensure examinations
    • Performance of program candidates and graduates in P-12 classrooms
    • Evidence of P-12 learning
    • Choice of teaching fields and levels
Study Components (cont.)

- **Empirical data from North Carolina, Washington, and New York City**
  - Within samples data are disaggregated by EPP, race/ethnicity, teaching level/field, and completer status
  - Simple cross tabulations between SAT/ACT scores with outcomes such as graduation/program completers, teacher persistence, and teacher value-added scores
  - Not a causal relationship, but whether or not a correlation may be a possibility
  - Explored the historical relationship on enrollment of various subgroups if no other measures have been taken to increase recruitment of subgroups
Study Components (cont.)

• **Survey results**
  - 912 CAEP constituents (57% return rate on first question and 26% on last question)
  - 26 item survey
  - Included national, international, & alternative routes
  - Illuminate practices of EPPs in the use of standardized entrance examination scores
  - Low return rate – survey did not provide scientifically valid representation of the population sample
  - Provide context on the experiences and attitudes of reasonable large number of respondents
Study Components (cont.)

- **Telephone Interviews**
  - Purposely selected 5 deans or directors from HBCUs, Research 1 universities, small colleges, alternative route programs, & state universities
  - Purpose was to gain a more nuanced understanding than provided from survey data
    - Challenges various preparation programs face in raising program admission standards
    - Effects of raising standards in EPPs that have done so
    - Attitudes toward CAEP Component 3.2
On-going Focus Groups (CAEP Sponsored)

- CAEP sponsoring or have sponsored a series of focus groups on component 3.2
  - AACTE
  - National Board
  - CAEPCon
  - State Clinic
Review of Research Literature on Component 3.2

• 110 research reports, studies, and monographs
  ▪ Identified quantitative studies that were peer-reviewed and reasonably sized study population
  ▪ Included numerous publications on value-added research that included teacher characteristics as explanatory or control variables

• 4 broad areas for review
  • Studies on predictive validity of standardized tests consider for admission into higher education
  • Standardized tests in other professions and their relationship
  • Research into postsecondary level academic performance of students who take teacher tests
  • Studies/reports about teacher characteristics relevant to teaching effectiveness and persistence in profession (subject area/teaching level)
Criteria for Inclusion in Review of Literature

• Included
  ▪ Identify quantitative studies
  ▪ Peer reviewed
  ▪ Reasonably sized study population
  ▪ Focused on predictive validity of standardized tests
  ▪ Included research studies specific to value-added data related to teacher characteristics

• Excluded
  ▪ Studies that focused on a single institution
  ▪ Small number of students, candidates, or teachers
  ▪ Studies not specific to academic achievement
Relationship of Teacher Academic Characteristics and Ability to Student Achievement

• Findings:
  ▪ Multiple studies show that measures of teacher verbal ability are associated with student achievement
  ▪ Fewer studies find evidence of the same connection between math and student math achievement
  ▪ Several studies found a link between teachers academic characteristics and student outcomes specific to “at risk” students
  ▪ National Research Council (2010)
    • Preparation programs should attract and select academically able teacher candidates
Relationship of Teacher Academic Characteristics and Ability to Student Achievement

- Harris and Sass (2008) found exceptions to the overall findings
  - Used Florida’s extensive “data warehouse” to analyze relationships between teacher preparation and K-12 student achievement
    - Found that teacher SAT scores were not related to value-added outcomes of students after controlling for other variable in the explanatory model
    - Overall undergraduate GPA was relevant to student learning outcomes
Predictive Validity of SAT/ACT and GPA

- Published research and reports support the predictive validity of nationally normed standardized tests such as the SAT and the ACT as good predictors of
  - College level performance and completion
  - Minimal “differential prediction” of college performance by student subgroups
    - Over-predicts college GPA for students from lower SES backgrounds, men, and for minority students
    - Under-predicts college GPA for women, white, and Asian students
    - A better predictor when combined with high school GPA
Potential Enrollment Impact of CAEP Component 3.2

- Collected data for the years 2000-2014 from three states specific to 50% level on nationally normed test
  - Ranged from 47% to 62% across the three states
  - Differences in average SAT or ACT scores based on
    - Racial/ethnic backgrounds
    - Different fields in education
  - Used 15 different EPPs in three states
Other Findings from the Three State Review

• In one state –
  ▪ “The academic ability of both individuals certified and those entering teaching has increased since 1999.”
  ▪ Change driven by state policy and increasing benchmarking scores at the state level
  ▪ Change driven by changes at the federal level on program policies and practice

• In all three states
  ▪ SAT highest percentile scores occurred in secondary education fields
  ▪ SAT lowest percentile scores occurred in elementary education, special education, and physical education
Other Findings from the Three State Review

• All three states
  ▪ SAT average was highest for white and Asian students
  ▪ SAT average was lowest for African-American students
  ▪ Students who identified as multiracial scored below white and Asian, but higher than African-American

• For Hispanic students
  ▪ Varied from state to state
  ▪ Closer to white students in one state
  ▪ Closer to African-American students in two states
Other Measures

- Oklahoma General Education Test (OGET)
- Based on scores from 19 of their 23 EPPs
- Competed a study on the relationship of OGET test and ACT
  - Found a relationship (.76) between the ACT and OGET test
  - CAEP had two psychometric professionals review the data and study – agreed with the findings
    - CAEP accepted the OGET as an alternative measure
    - Benchmark was set at the 50% of ACT for the OGET test
    - All 19 EPPs reporting in Oklahoma were currently at the 50% and above level
Other Measures

• Currently ETS is completing a study using PRAXIS Core data and SAT scores
  ▪ Report will be submitted to CAEP for review
  ▪ Benchmark will be set for PRAXIS Core at the 50% and shared with the field
• Michigan has submitted their state test for review
  ▪ Currently is being reviewed by two psychometric professionals for their recommendation
  ▪ Michigan should have an answer by May
Concept: Retaining a Focus on Academic Achievement and Diversity

• The provider meets CAEP minimum criteria or state’s minimum requirement for academic achievement, whichever are higher, and gathering data on the enrolled pool of candidates.

• The CAEP minimum criteria are a grade point average of 3.0 and a group average performance on nationally normed assessments, or substantially equivalent state-normed or EPP administered assessments, of mathematical, verbal, and written achievement in the top 50% for college students.
• Starting in academic year 2016-2017, the CAEP minimum criteria apply to the group average of enrolled candidates whose preparation begins during the academic year.
• The provider determines whether the CAEP minimum criteria will be measured (1) at admission OR (2) at some other time prior to candidate exit at completion.
Component 3.3 – Additional Selective 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.
Component 3.3: 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Evidence</th>
<th>Minimal Level of Sufficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-academic factors such as “Grit”, empathy, cultural awareness, commitment, etc.</td>
<td>• All general rules for the Standard 3 are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Measures must be grounded in research literature</td>
<td>• The provider documents evidence of established non-academic criteria used during admissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assessments used for non-academic admission criteria have established at minimum content validity</td>
<td>• The provider’s rationale for established non-academic criteria makes an evidence-based case (existing literature or provider investigations) for the selection and implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Protocols and criteria are established for interviews or other alternative forms of evaluation</td>
<td>• The EPP monitors candidate progress on established non-academic criteria at multiple points and takes appropriate actions based on results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Description of how these non-academic factors are applied at admission and monitored during preparation</td>
<td>• The provider associates/correlates non-academic criteria with candidate and completer performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence is provided that supports the use of the identified criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Component 3.4 – 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. [ii]
Component 3.4: 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.[ii]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Evidence</th>
<th>Minimal Level of Sufficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to teach to college- and career-ready standards</td>
<td>All general rules for the Standard 3 are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments of content knowledge</td>
<td>The provider documents two or more measures/gateways of candidate progression (from key decision points).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments of pedagogical content knowledge</td>
<td>The provider presents explicit criteria for monitoring/assessing with a focus on candidate development throughout preparation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of pedagogical skills</td>
<td>Or evidence of developing proficiencies of candidates at two or more measures/gateways of candidate progression (from key decision points) in:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of technology with instruction</td>
<td>• Ability to teach to college- and career-ready standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on P-12 students</td>
<td>• Content knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for retention, interventions, and/or counseling out</td>
<td>• Pedagogical content knowledge;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pedagogical skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Integration of use of technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Results and stated candidate progressions criteria align with evidence of actions taken such as the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Changes in curriculum or clinical experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Providing interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Counseling outs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Component 3.5 – Selection at Completion

- 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: *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.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Evidence</th>
<th>Minimal Level of Sufficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Pre-service measures of candidate impact such as work samples, PPAT, edTPA, assessment projects, etc.</td>
<td>[Evidence the same as that for 1.1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Capstone assessments such as teaching observations, lesson plans, unit plans, IEPs, etc.</td>
<td>• Evidence documents effective teaching, including positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development for all candidates as noted in Standard 1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Component 3.6 – Selection at Completion

• 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: 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.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Evidence</th>
<th>Minimal Level of Sufficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Provider measure of topic knowledge of codes of ethics, professional standards of practice and relevant laws and policies, based on course materials/assessments.</td>
<td>• All general rules for the Standard 3 are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Results of national, state, or provider-created instrument(s) to assess candidates’ understanding of special education laws (section 504 disability) code of ethics, professional standards, and similar content.</td>
<td>• Evidence documents candidates’ understanding of codes of ethics and professional standards of practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence of specialized training (e.g., bullying, state law, etc.).</td>
<td>• Evidence documents candidates’ knowledge of relevant laws and policies (e.g., 504 disability provisions, education regulations, bullying, etc.).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>