Work Group CAEP Standard 5

**Standard 5: Provider Quality, Continuous improvement and Capacity**

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.

**Components**

**Quality and Strategic Evaluation**

5.1 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.

FINDINGS: Multiple measures exist across programs to measure candidate progression and success. These measures are identified on YASU-DAR and relate directly to SPA or CAEP standards.

5.2 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.

Task: Review assessments collected for program evaluation and reporting with rationale for choice of assessment. Determine criteria for evidence across assessments. This is an *initial overview* and not a drill-down to details analysis.

Goal: Identify gaps in data collection based on CAEP 2015 Evidence Guide.

• Construct validity -To what extent does the evaluation measure what it claims to measure?

• Content validity - Are the right attributes being measured in the right balance?

• Predictive validity - Is there evidence that teachers graduating from highly rated TPPs prove

more effective in the classroom?

• Face validity - Is a measure subjectively viewed as being important and relevant to assessing

TPPs?

(CAEP Evidence Guide, 2015, p.17).

* Representativeness. The guiding question for this principle should always be “**is the evidence drawn from situations that are typical and potentially generalizable**?” (CAEP Evidence Guide, 2015, p.19).
* Cumulativeness. Triangulation…. qualitative methods ….. describe the method used to analyze those data. **Usually this involves triangulation of the data using one or more methods** (CAEP Evidence Guide, 2015, p.19).
* Fairness. **free from bias …… range of client perspectives** including the program, the student, the employer, and the state or jurisdiction (CAEP Evidence Guide, 2015, p.20-21).
* Robustness. A guiding question here should be, **“is the evidence direct and compelling?”** (CAEP Evidence Guide, 2015, p.21).
* Actionability. A guiding question here is **“why is the evidence important?** ….**suggest program improvements**…… **standards of comparison**…… (CAEP Evidence Guide, 2015, p.21).

FINDINGS: Programs report rationale for assessment to be aligned with SPA or CAEP Standards. A lack of predictive validity and the need for qualitative data collection is indicated.

**Continuous Improvement**

5.3 **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.

FINDINGS: The YASU-DAR addresses regular and systematic performance assessment, specifically based on goals formulated through data analysis to improve program elements

1. *Have the change(s) in response to data that you documented last year had the desired effect on your program? Please provide specifics referencing prior changes that you submitted in Fall XXX, covering AY XXXX-XXXX.*
2. *What significant findings emerge from your examination of these data?*
3. *How have you involved faculty in your identification of the implications of these data?*
4. *What specific actions will you take in response to these data?*
5. *Is your program pursuing a multi-year goal? If so, please describe the goal, the data used to measure progress toward the goal, and any program plans under consideration to achieve the goal in the coming academic year.*

A review of data set across all programs is completed by TEEB assessment subcommittee reporting details of strengths and areas of concern.

**POSSIBLE GAPS**:

* tracks results over time (How are we tracking over time?)[ “The concerns, which are listed below were identified as *year-over-year concerns* by the interns.”]
* tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion (Status quo or innovations happening?)
* improve program processes (How can we/are we making the process more efficient, valid and reflective?)

5.4 **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.

**IDENTIFIED GAPS**:

Information from reports on completer impact is not widely available. Return rate is low; little access to this information.

* Report 6: First Year Alumni Survey
* Report 7: Third Year Alumni Survey
* Report 8: First Year Employer Survey

5.5 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.

**IDENTIFIED GAPS:**

* Evidence for feedback from candidates exists; evidence from “completers” is limited.
* Collaboration with appropriate stakeholders is needed beyond alumni, employers, practitioners
* More collaboration with appropriate stakeholders

Reference: http://caepnet.org/standards/standard-5

Review of Program Measures

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Assessment Measure** | **Rationale for Selection** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Rationale for Selection**: EPPs should provide the reasons why they chose the evidence they provide; this should be an “intentional and conscious” selection much like the entries in a student portfolio. (CAEP Evidence Guide, 2015, p. 22).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria for Evidence Collected** | **Assessment Measures** | | | | | | | **** | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
| **Validity** |  | | | | | | | | |
| Construct Validity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
| Content Validity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
| Predictive Validity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
| Face Validity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
| **Relevance** |  | | | | | | | | |
| Connection to a CAEP Standard |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
| Course work/Experience align to assessment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
| **Representative** |  | | | | | | | | |
| Evidence is typical and potentially generalizable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
| **Cumulative** |  | | | | | | | | |
| Triangulation of data/Multiple Measures in place |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
| Qualitative – data collection Method |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
| **Fair** |  | | | | | | | | |
| Free from Bias |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
| Range of Perspectives |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
| **Robust** |  | | | | | | | | |
| Direct and compelling evidence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
| **Actionable** |  | | | | | | | | |
| Support program evaluation decisions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |

Evaluations typically make use of multiple measures rather than a single test, but key questions about validity, including the following, apply to TPP evaluation:

* To what extent does the evaluation measure what it claims to measure?

(This is sometimes referred to as ***construct validity****.*)

* Are the right attributes being measured in the right balance?

(This is sometimes referred to as ***content validity****.*)

* Is there evidence that teachers graduating from highly rated TPPs prove more effective in the classroom?

(This is sometimes referred to as ***predictive validity****.*)

* Is a measure subjectively viewed as being important and relevant to assessing TPPs?

(This is sometimes referred to as ***face validity****.*)

(CAEP Evidence Guide, 2015, p.17).

**Representativeness.** Any measure put forward should be typical of an underlying situation or condition, not an isolated case…..There are occasions when a "purposeful" sample is preferable or necessary, a sample that is designed to meet a particular and intentionally limited objective. This approach might be appropriate when access to data are limited, or when issues of practicality intrude…….**The guiding question for this principle should always be “is the evidence drawn from situations that are typical and potentially generalizable?**” All evidence should be drawn from situations that are typical (CAEP Evidence Guide, 2015, p.19).

**Cumulativeness.**  Measures gain credibility as additional sources or methods for generating them are employed. The resulting **triangulation** helps guard against the inevitable flaws associated with any one approach…… The EPP should provide an explanation as to the way these measures are reinforcing and, if they are not, an explanation for that lack of congruence. Providers using **qualitative methods** to analyze qualitative data (e.g., candidate reflections and journals, mentor teacher qualitative feedback, etc.) should **describe the method used to analyze those data**. Usually this involves triangulation of the data using one or more methods (CAEP Evidence Guide, 2015, p.19).

**Fairness.** Measures should be **free from bias** and be able to be justly applied by any potential user or observer…… Another aspect of fairness is that a sound set of measures should respect a **range of client perspectives including the program, the student, the employer, and the state or jurisdiction** (CAEP Evidence Guide, 2015, p.20-21).

**Robustness.** A robust body of evidence will lead to the same set of conclusions in the face of a good deal of “noise” or measurement error. Triangulation and replication will bolster the credibility of any set of measures in this respect**. A guiding question here should be, “is the evidence direct and compelling?”** (CAEP Evidence Guide, 2015, p.21).

**Actionability.**  A guiding question here is “**why is the evidence important**? The intent of the evidence presented should be clear and the evidence should directly **suggest program improvements**……Actionability also depends on the evidence having clear **standards of comparison**……Measures can be compared across programs, against peers, against established “best practices,” against established goals, against national or state norms, or over time (CAEP Evidence Guide, 2015, p.21).