

CAEP Standard 3: Its language, suggested evidence, and questions to address

Webinar for EPPs
Tuesday, March 29th
(5:00 pm EST)

Presented by Deborah Eldridge, CAEP Advisor

- Deb.Eldridge@gmail.com

Webinar Basics

- Please **MUTE** your phones.
- Remember to unmute when you want to talk.
- To ask a question during the presentation USE the CHAT.
- The recording of the webinar will be posted on You-Tube by April 15th along with the PPT.

Goal and Objectives

- **Goal:** To *update* information on addressing Standard 3 and its components in the CAEP self-study.
- **Objectives:** Participants will be able to (PWBAT):
 - Identify the key points of Standard 3 and its components,
 - List the kinds of evidence that CAEP recommends for each of the components for Standard 3,
 - Describe how the standard and its components will be evaluated by CAEP reviewers, and
 - Outline when an Area for Improvement (AFI) or stipulation might be assigned

Standard 3: Key points in the language of the standard

- 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.

Components of Standard 3: In Brief and In Relation to the Standard

- The components of the standard address six facets of **quality and selectivity**:
- 3.1 = **Recruitment** for academic ability and diversity
- 3.2 = **Admission** for academic ability/achievement
- 3.3 = Setting and investigating non-academic factors (**decisions that completers are prepared to teach effectively**)
- 3.4 = **Monitoring the progression** of candidates
- 3.5 = Employing high exit criteria (**decisions that completers are prepared to teach effectively and recommended for certification**)
- 3.6 = Developing understanding of professional/ethical aspects of teaching (**recommended for certification**)

Feedback and Question Pause



Component 3.1: Key language

Plan for Recruitment of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs

3.1 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.

So, think: What recruitment evidence (plans and goals) do I have that demonstrates attracting diverse candidates to meet identified needs?

Component 3.1: Possible Evidence

- Recruitment plan with:
 - Outreach strategies to reach diverse and academically able applicants (**including ELL, students with disabilities**)
 - Evidence that goals are based on completer's' existing and forecasted employment **needs**/opportunities, including STEM, ELL, hard-to-staff schools
 - Evidence of collaboration with other providers
- Report on:
 - Numerical goals and baseline data on admitted cohorts (**Application, acceptance, enrollment**)
 - Disaggregation of data by SES, gender, ethnicity, etc.

3.1: What are reviewers looking for?

- Documentation of existence of a recruitment plan, **with baseline data**, based on EP mission with targets for 5 to 7 years out
 - Recruitment plan and its implementation have moved the provider to the goal of greater candidate diversity
- Data on admitted and enrolled candidates are disaggregated by race/ethnicity and gender
- Evidence that results are recorded, monitored, **and used**
- STEM, **special education**, ELL, and **hard-to-staff schools** are explicitly addressed
- **Evidence that the provider monitors the influence of employment opportunities and enrollment patterns.**
 - Such that results are used in planning and preparation for shifting cohorts include modifications to recruitment strategies

Criteria for sufficiency

- Recruitment plan, based on mission, with baseline points and goals (including academic ability, diversity, and employment needs) for five years
- 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
- Knowledge of and action that addresses employment opportunities in schools, districts, and/or regions where completers are likely to seek employment
- STEM and ELL, special education, and hard-to-staff school needs are explicitly addressed in analysis of shortage areas
- The recruitment plan and its implementation have moved the provider toward the goal of greater candidate diversity and academic achievement.
- Evidence that the provider monitors the influence of employment opportunities on enrollment patterns.

AFI or Stipulation may be assigned if...

- Limited or no evidence of a recruitment plan.
- Data are not disaggregated by race/ethnicity, SES, and/or sex.
- Limited or no evidence that EPP has identified employment opportunities/needs in schools, districts, and/or region.
- STEM and ELL opportunities are not addressed in the EPP analysis of shortage area employment needs.

Feedback and Question Pause



Component 3.2: Key language—Part I

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

- 3.2 The provider **sets admissions requirements**, including CAEP minimum criteria, the state's minimum criteria, or graduate school minimum criteria, whichever is highest, 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**, or the group average performance on 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 (Frozen at this level);**
 - **is in the top 40 percent of the distribution from 2018-2019; and**
 - **is in the top 33 percent of the distribution by 2020.** (Temporarily suspended)

Component 3.2: Key language—Part II

Admission Standards Indicate That Candidates Have High Academic Achievement and Ability

- 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.
- 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.

Standard 3: Frequently Asked Questions

- Posted on CAEP website. Go to Accreditation, then Accreditation Resources, scroll down to the bottom to find Standards, click on Standard 3-FAQs.
- <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/caep-accreditation-resources>

Teacher Preparation Analytics Study

- Study of component 3.2 was commissioned by the CAEP Board in February 2015.
- Preliminary report is currently available on the CAEP website. Go to accreditation and program review, then accreditation resources, click on Standard 3 FAQs. Click on the link to the report.
- OR go to
- <http://www.caepnet.org/standards/standard-3/resources>

Component 3.2: Possible Evidence

- EPP's data on admission criteria and the cohort average are explicit so they can be compared with CAEP minima.
- EPP's provide data from a reliable model with P-12 student learning outcomes
- Data-based evidence:
 - Includes the "N" for the data set broken out by year or semester
 - Low enrollment programs (under 10 graduates over three years) can aggregate data by licensure area for three cycles
 - Data requirement is for three cycles of data
 - Provides comparison point(s) for the data reported
 - If reporting a mean score, the range/standard deviation as well as percentage of students below 3.0 should also be reported

3.2: What are reviewers looking for?

- EPP documents that the average score of each cohort of admitted candidates meets CAEP minima: a GPA of 3.0 and performance on a nationally normed test of academic achievement/ability in the top 50%.
- **OR** similar average cohort performance using a state-normed test of academic achievement /ability in the top 50%
- **OR** EPP has a “reliable, valid model” in which they use admissions criteria different from those specified in 3.2 that result in positive correlation with measures of P-12 student learning.

Criteria for sufficiency

- All general rules for the Standard 3 are met.
- 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 in the top 50%.
 - OR similar average cohort performance using a state normed test, corresponding with a national normed test, of academic achievement in the top 50%.
 - OR EPP 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.

AFI or Stipulation may be assigned IF...

- EPP fails to document cohort average on CAEP criteria and/or state alternative
- EPP has superficial information but no “reliable, valid model” that uses different criteria from those stated in CAEP minima

Feedback and Question Pause



Component 3.3: Key language

Additional Selectivity Factors

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.

So, think: What data can I present to demonstrate the other things (besides GPA and test scores) we look for at admissions that result in selecting high quality candidates?

Research References from CAEP

- Duckworth, A. L., Peterson, C., Matthews, M. D., & Kelly, D. R. (2007). Grit: Perseverance and passion for long-term goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92(6), 1087- 1101.
- Haberman, M. (2000). What makes a teacher education program relevant preparation for teaching diverse students in urban poverty schools? (The Milwaukee Teacher Education Center Model)
- Harding, H. (2012). Teach for America: Leading for change. *Educational Leadership*, 69(8), 58-61.
- Dobbie, W. (2011). Teacher characteristics and student achievement: Evidence from Teach for America. Harvard University. Retrieved from http://www.people.fas.harvard.edu/~dobbie/research/TeacherCharacteristics_July2011.pdf.
- Danielson, C. (2009). A framework for learning to teach. *Educational Leadership*, 66. Retrieved from <http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/summer09/vol66/num09/A-Framework-for-Learning-to-Teach.aspx>.

Component 3.3: Possible Evidence

Non-Academic Factors: “grit”, empathy, cultural awareness, commitment, etc.

- EPP established attributes and dispositions at admissions and/ or during the program
 - »That factors were grounded in research literature
- Assessments used for non-academic admission criteria have established minimum content validity
- Protocols and criteria are established for interviews or other alternative forms of evaluation
- Description of how these non-academic factors are applied at admission and monitored during preparation
- Evidence that supports the use of the identified criteria

Criteria for sufficiency

- The provider documents evidence of established nonacademic criteria used during admissions.
- The provider's rationale for established non-academic criteria makes an evidence-based case (existing literature or provider investigations) for the selection and implementation.
- The EPP monitors candidate progress on established nonacademic criteria at multiple points and takes appropriate actions based on results.
- The provider associates/correlates non-academic criteria with candidate and completer performance.

AFI or Stipulation may be applied if...

- EPP does not establish additional selectivity factors at admission or during preparation.
- No evidence that the EPP monitors progress of individual candidates.
- Limited or no association/correlation of non-academic criteria with candidate and completer performance.

Feedback and Question Pause



Component 3.4: Key language

Selectivity During Preparation

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.

So, think: What data can I present to demonstrate that my EPP continues to be selective of candidates throughout our programs?

Component 3.4: Possible Evidence

Monitoring candidate progression:

- Two or more measures from key decision points (including decision points on candidate retention, assessments, provider interventions, the results, and provider explanations for actions taken)
- Measures on developing proficiencies in critical areas, such as candidates':
 - Ability to teach to college- and career-ready standards;
 - Content knowledge;
 - Pedagogical content knowledge;
 - Pedagogical skills;
 - Integration of technology with instruction

Criteria for sufficiency

- The provider documents two or more measures/gateways of candidate progression (from key decision points).
- The provider presents explicit criteria for monitoring/assessing with a focus on candidate development throughout preparation.
 - Or evidence of developing proficiencies of candidates at two or more measures/gateways of candidate progression (from key decision points) in:
 - Ability to teach to college- and career-ready standards
 - Content knowledge
 - Pedagogical content knowledge;
 - Pedagogical skills
 - Integration of use of technology

Criteria for sufficiency--continued

- Results and stated candidate progressions criteria align with evidence of actions taken such as the following:
 - Changes in curriculum or clinical experiences
 - Providing interventions
 - Counseling outs.

AFI or Stipulation may be assigned if...

- EPP uses beginning and exit measures but has no evidence of monitoring of progression during preparation.
- Measures provide no evidence of developing candidate proficiencies during preparation.

Feedback and Question Pause



Component 3.5: Key language

Selection At Completion

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.

So, think: What data can I present to demonstrate that exit criteria are rigorous?

Component 3.5: Possible Evidence

- Exit Standards
 - Evidence used for part of the documentation for standard 1 (1.1 on candidate competence and 1.3 on alignment with specialty area standards)
 - Documentation of pre-service positive candidate **impact on P-12 students learning and development.**
 - Using:
 - Methods courses, clinical experience, or exit
 - Capstone assessments (lesson plans, teaching artifacts, examples of student work, observations and/or videos by trained reviewers)

Criteria for sufficiency

- [Evidence the same as that for 1.1]
- Evidence documents effective teaching, including positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development for all candidates as noted in Standard 1.

Feedback and Question Pause



Component 3.6: Key language

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.

So, think: What data can I present to document that our candidates understand the professional dos and don'ts of teaching?

Component 3.6: Possible Evidence

- Expectations of the Profession:
 - Provider measure of topic knowledge of codes of ethics, professional standards of practice and relevant laws and policies based on course materials/assessments
 - Results of national, state, or provider-created instruments to assess candidates understanding of special education laws (section 504 disability), code of ethics, professional standards, and similar content.
 - Evidence of specialized training (e.g., bullying, state law, etc.)

Criteria for sufficiency

- Evidence documents candidates' understanding of codes of ethics and professional standards of practice.
- Evidence documents candidates' knowledge of relevant laws and policies (e.g., 504 disability provisions, education regulations, bullying, etc.).

AFI or Stipulation may be assigned if...

- Limited or no documentation of candidates' understanding of codes of ethics and professional standards of practice .
- EPP provides limited or no documentation that candidates have knowledge of relevant laws and policies.

Feedback and Question Pause



Standard 3: Key points in the language of the standard

- 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.

General rules for all of standard 3

- At least 3 cycles of data
- Data are sequential and latest available
- EPP-created assessment score at the CAEP sufficient level
- All components are addressed.
- Component 3.2 is determined to be MET.

AFI or Stipulation might be assigned if...

An Area for Improvement (AFI) could be assigned if:

- EPP-created instruments are judged with significant deficiencies by the CAEP Instrument Rubric
- There are inaccuracies in reporting data from original sources
- There is no significant analysis of evidence and what it says
- Interpretations are not well-grounded in the evidence.
- A stipulation could be assigned if:
 - There is no evidence of internal consideration of the evidence for improvement purposes
 - The EPP provides no indication of efforts to ensure validity of evidence

Standard 3 might be found unmet if...

- Component 3.2 is found to be unmet
- There are two or more stipulations from among those described under 3.1 through 3.6
- EPP instruments are preponderantly rated low
- Data are not disaggregated by licensure area

Final Feedback and Question Pause



Next steps

- Feedback survey sent via email by April 1st
- Webinars for April and May:

Topic	Date and Time	Link	Audio Dial-In	Access code
Standard 4	April 25th at 5pm EDT	https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/526875645	1 866 899 4679	526-875-645
Standard 5	May 26th at 5pm EDT	https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/562953453	1 866 899 4679	562-953-453