

# STANDARD 1/A.1

Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

**Tatiana Rivadeneyra, Ed.D.**

Accreditation Director  
Site Visitor Development and EPP Accreditation  
[Tatiana.Rivadeneyra@caepnet.org](mailto:Tatiana.Rivadeneyra@caepnet.org)

**Banhi Bhattacharya, Ph.D.**

Accreditation Director  
Senior Director of Program Review  
[Banhi.Bhattacharya@caepnet.org](mailto:Banhi.Bhattacharya@caepnet.org)



Kansas City, Missouri  
March 2018

# JOIN THE SESSION ON THE APP

- Follow along with the slides or handouts
- Send in questions through the "Ask a Question" feature on this session
  - Up-vote the questions of others if you would also like it answered



## Session Overview

- Of CAEP Initial and Advanced Standards 1/A.1. Including suggested evidence, evidence sufficiency criteria, and additional CAEP resources available.
  - *Content will reference the evidence sufficiency criteria and evidence evaluation exercise (handouts)*

# SCOPE OF CAEP ACCREDITATION AND PROGRAM REVIEW

**CAEP national accreditation:** Programs leading to licensing degrees, certificates, or endorsements of P-12 professionals

[See Accreditation Policy 3.01 (Initial) and 3.02 (Advanced):

<http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/accreditation-resources/accreditation-policy.pdf?la=en>, pp. 9, 10]

- **Initial:** Programs at the baccalaureate or post-baccalaureate levels leading to initial-licensure, certification, or endorsement that are designed to develop P-12 teachers.
- **Advanced:** Programs designed to develop P-12 teachers who have already completed an initial preparation program, currently licensed administrators, other certificated (or similar state language) school professionals for employment in P-12 schools/districts

# CAEP Standard 1/A.1

1.1  
A.1

- *Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and/or Professional Dispositions*

1.2-1.5  
A.1.2

- *Provider Responsibilities*

# EVIDENCE SUFFICIENCY: RESOURCES

## CONSULT:

---

- Evidence Sufficiency Criteria
  - Evaluation Criteria for Self-Study Evidence - Standard 1
  - [CAEP Guidelines for Plans](#) for phase-in plan content
    - F18-S20 **can** present plans with progress data
    - Site visits in F20 and beyond are **not eligible** for phase-in
- Assessment Sufficiency Criteria
  - [CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments](#)

# Guidance for Standard

- Key concepts in standard and components are addressed
- EPP-created assessments meet CAEP's assessment sufficiency criteria
- At least three cycles of data that are sequential and most recent available
- Results disaggregated by specialty field area (when appropriate)
  - Also for main and additional campuses, on site and online programs (if applicable)
- Data/evidence analysis includes discussion of trends/patterns, comparisons, and/or differences.

## Special for Standard 1

- No required components
- All data disaggregated by specialty licensure area
- Evidence from Standard 1 cited in support of continuous improvement, part of overall review system

# Standard 1: Context and Purpose

The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the **critical concepts and principles of their discipline** [components 1.1, 1.3] and, by completion, **can use discipline-specific practices** flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards [component 1.4].

## Standard 1, Guidance from Component 1.1

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.**

*Consider:* What evidence do I have that would demonstrate developing an understanding over time in these four categories?

# Evidence Sufficiency Criteria, 1.1

## CANDIDATES DEMONSTRATE UNDERSTANDING OF 10 InTASC STANDARDS

- All four of the InTASC categories are addressed with multiple indicators across the four categories
  - Multiple indicators/measures specific to application of content knowledge in clinical settings are identified
  - Data/evidence are analyzed including identification of trends/patterns, comparisons, and/or differences
    - Averages at/above acceptable levels on EPP's scoring indicators, on InTASC standards (categories)
    - If applicable, demonstration candidates performance is comparable to non-candidates' performance in same courses or majors
    - Performances indicate competency and benchmarked against the average licensure area performance of other providers
  - Interpretations and conclusions are supported by data/evidence

# EPP Created- Assessments

Initial Standards  
(*suggested evidence*)

*Resource:*

[CAEP Evaluation Framework for  
EPP-Created Assessments](#)

## Standard 1, component 1.1

- Clinic Experience/Observation Instruments
- Lesson/Unit Plans
- Portfolios
- Teacher Work Samples
- GPA, Courses Specific P-12 Learner
- Dispositional Data
- Comparisons of Education and other IHE attendees on provider end-of-major projects
- End of Course/Program Assessments
- Pre-Service Measures of Candidate Impact
- Capstone/Thesis

+ *Proprietary Assessments/Measures*

+ *State Assessments/Measures*

## Initial Level Standards

- *Proprietary Assessments/Measures*
- *State Assessments/Measures*

### STATE

- Relevant surveys
- Assessments (value added) of completers
- Licensure examinations
- Additional measures utilized toward compliance of other accreditors (e.g., for reporting requirements; WASC, NASC, HLC (aka NCA), SACS, MSA, NEASC)

### Proprietary

Assessment	Test or Section	3.2 Domain— NOTE: proficiency must be met for each domain	Group average performance requirements of candidates whose preparation began during the 2016-2017 academic year or earlier
ACT	"Reading"	Reading	21.25
ACT	"Math"	Math	21.25
ACT	"Writing"	Writing	6.60
SAT	"Evidence-Based Reading and Writing"	Reading	543.33
SAT	"Math"	Math	532.50
SAT	"Essay – Writing dimension."	Writing	5.30
Praxis Core	"Reading"	Reading	168.06
Praxis Core	"Mathematics"	Math	162.14
Praxis Core	"Writing"	Writing	165
OGET	"Oklahoma General Education Test (OGET)"	Reading, Math, and Writing	258**

## Standard 1, Guidance from Component 1.2

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.

*Consider:* What evidence do I have that would demonstrate using research and assessment (evidence) for student and professional learning?

# Evidence Sufficiency Criteria, 1.2

## CANDIDATES USE RESEARCH/EVIDENCE TOWARD TEACHING PROFESSION

---

- Data/evidence document effective Candidate use of
  - Research/evidence for planning, implementing, and evaluating students progress
  - Data to reflect on teaching effectiveness and own practice
  - Data to assess P-12 student progress and then modify instruction based on student data

## Standard 1, Guidance from Component 1.3

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 (e.g., National Association of Schools of Music – NASM).

*Consider:* What evidence do I have that would demonstrate the application of content knowledge and in response to other professional standards?

# PURPOSE OF PROGRAM REVIEW

Program review → Evidence of candidate competence key to CAEP Standard 1/ A.1

---

- *Evidence of candidates':*
  - *deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline (InTASC Principle B- Content)*
  - *ability to use discipline-specific practices flexibly (InTASC Principles C- Instructional Practice and D- Professional Responsibility)*
  - *ability to advance the learning of all students (InTASC Principle A- Learner and Learning)*
  - *ability to advance student learning toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards (InTASC Principle C- Instructional Practice)*

# EVIDENCE SUFFICIENCY CRITERIA, 1.3

## SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE

---

- Documents that the programs enrolling majority of the EPP's candidates meet the standards of the selected program review option(s)
  - SPA National Recognition from a three-years out review; or,
  - Other evidence from state review or CAEP Program Review with Feedback demonstrating INTASC or other relevant standards have been achieved
  - In case the above remain unmet, EPPs demonstrate how remaining conditions and feedback relevant to CAEP Standards (e.g., instrument quality) have been addressed
- Includes a discussion of performance trends and compares across specialty areas addressing the 3 Specialty Licensure Area questions on the self-study report

# PROGRAM REVIEW OPTIONS

- **CAEP-state agreements determine program review options for EPPs within state** (33 agreements signed to date)
- **Available program review options for EPPs in states with agreements:**
  - SPA review with National Recognition (*3 years prior to site visit*)
  - CAEP program review with feedback (*part of self-study report*)
  - State review of programs (*determined by state*)
- **Available program review options for EPPs in states without agreements:**
  - SPA review with National Recognition (*3 years prior to site visit*)
  - CAEP program review with feedback (*part of self-study report*)
  - State review of programs (*EPP coordinates with state to obtain and provide state agency report*)

# PROGRAM REVIEW EVIDENCE: BY OPTIONS

- **Review of Reports, Site Team will look for:**
  - A SPA Recognition/Decision Report from 3 years-out review (SPA Option)
  - Feedback on disaggregated data by licensure program using Feedback Report template (Feedback Option)
  - State's decision report on program approval following state review (State Review Option)
- **How will the site team determine if CAEP expectations are met when an EPP selects the SPA option?**
  - EPP has provided evidence documenting that preparation programs enrolling a majority of the EPP's candidates have achieved National Recognition from SPAs, or have other evidence -such as from a state review process or CAEP Program Review with Feedback - that demonstrates INTASC or other relevant standards have been achieved.

## Standard 1, Guidance from Component 1.4

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).

*Consider:* What evidence do I have that would demonstrate skills and commitment to access for all students?

# Evidence Sufficiency Criteria, 1.4

## CANDIDATES DEMONSTRATE TO COLLEGE-AND-CAREER-READY STANDARDS

---

- Multiple indicators/measures specific to evaluating proficiencies for Candidate's ability to
  - Provide effective instruction for all students (differentiation of instruction)
  - Have students apply knowledge to solve problems and think critically
  - Include cross-discipline learning experiences and to teach for transfer of skills
  - Design and implement learning experiences that require collaboration and communication skills

## Standard 1, Guidance from Component 1.5

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**.

*Consider:* What evidence do I have that would demonstrate modeling and application of technology skills to enhance learning for students and self?

# Evidence Sufficiency Criteria, 1.5

## CANDIDATES MODEL AND APPLY TECHNOLOGY

---

- Candidates demonstrate
  - Knowledge and skill proficiencies including accessing databases, digital media, and/or electronic sources
  - The ability to design and facilitate digital learning
  - The ability to track and share student performance data digitally

# STANDARD A.1

Content and Pedagogical Knowledge



Kansas City, Missouri  
March 2018

# EVIDENCE SUFFICIENCY: RESOURCES

## CONSULT:

---

- Evidence Sufficiency Criteria
  - Evaluation Criteria for Self-Study Evidence - Standard A.1
  - [CAEP Guidelines for Plans](#) for phase-in plan content
    - F18 –S19 SSRs, **no evidence** for advanced-level standards included in self-study reports
    - F19-S20 **can** present plans for components A.1.1 and/or A.1.2
    - **Plan with progress** can be submitted in SSRs until 2021-2023
    - Site visits in F23 and beyond are **not eligible** for phase-in
- Assessment Sufficiency Criteria
  - [CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments](#)

# STANDARD A.1: CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE

---

The provider ensures that candidates for professional specialties develop a deep understanding of the **critical concepts and principles of their field** of preparation [component A.1.1] and, by completion, **can use professional specialty practices** flexibly to advance the learning of all P-12 students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards [component A.1.2].

# Standard A.1, Guidance from Component A.1.1

Candidates for advanced preparation **demonstrate** their proficiencies to **understand** and **apply knowledge and skills appropriate to their professional field of specialization** so that learning and development opportunities for P-12 are enhanced, through:

- Application of data literacy;
- Use of research and understanding of qualitative, quantitative and/or mixed methods research methodologies;
- Use of data analysis and evidence to develop supportive school environments;
- Leading and/or participating in collaborative activities with others such as peers, colleagues, teachers, administrators, community organizations, and parents;
- Application of appropriate technology for their field of specialization; and
- Application of professional dispositions, laws and policies, codes of ethics and professional standards appropriate to their field of specialization.
- Evidence of candidate content knowledge appropriate for the professional specialty will be documented by state licensure test scores or other proficiency measures.

## EVIDENCE FOR A.1.1

- *Consider:* What evidence do you have that would demonstrate proficiencies in the specialty content and general skills referenced in Component A.1.1 for a specialization?

# EVIDENCE SUFFICIENCY CRITERIA, A.1.1

## SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE

---

- Demonstrates that most candidates pass state/nationally-benchmarked content/licensure exams
- Addresses all of the professional skills listed in the component
  - Documents proficiency for at least three of the skills for each specialty field
  - Utilizes multiple measures to assess each proficiency
  - Utilizes measures that meet criteria in CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments
  - Phase-In Plans for Component A.1.1 meet the criteria for the CAEP Guidelines for Plans and are consistent with the Phase-In Schedule.

# EPP Created- Assessments

Advanced Standards  
*(suggested evidence)*

*Resource:*

[CAEP Evaluation Framework for  
EPP-Created Assessments](#)

## Standard A.1, component A 1.1

- Action Research
- Capstones/Portfolios/Thesis
- Dispositional/Professional Responsibility Data
- Problem-based projects with coursework/group projects
- Problem-based projects with school/district
- Pre- and post-data and reflections on interpretations and use of data
- End of key-course tests
- Grades, by program field
- Survey Data from Completers/Employers

# Advanced Level Standards

- *State Assessments/Surveys*
- *Other Proficiency Measures*

## STATE

- Relevant surveys
- Assessments (value added) of completers
- Licensure examinations
- Additional measures utilized toward compliance of other accreditors(e.g., for reporting requirements; WASC, NASC, HLC (aka NCA), SACS, MSA, NEASC)

## OTHER

Assessment	Test or Section	3.2 Domain—NOTE: proficiency must be met for each domain	Group average performance requirements of candidates whose preparation began during the 2016-2017 academic year or earlier
GRE	"Verbal Reasoning"	Reading	150.75**
GRE	"Quantitative Reasoning"	Math	152.75**
GRE	"Analytical Writing"	Writing	3.74**

## Standard A.1, Guidance from Component A.1.2

Providers ensure that advanced program completers have opportunities to **learn and apply specialized content and discipline knowledge** contained in **approved state and/or national discipline-specific standards**. These specialized standards include, but are not limited to, Specialized Professional Association (SPA) standards, individual state standards, standards of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, and standards of other accrediting bodies [e.g., Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)].

*Consider:* What evidence do you have that would demonstrate that the program provides candidates the opportunity to both learn and apply content knowledge and skills that are emphasized in professional standards for the specialty area?

# EVIDENCE SUFFICIENCY CRITERIA, A.1.2

## SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE

---

- Documents that the programs enrolling majority of the EPP's candidates meet the standards of the selected program review option(s)
  - SPA National Recognition from a three-years out review; or,
  - Other evidence from state review or CAEP Program Review with Feedback demonstrating the relevant standards have been achieved
  - In case the above remain unmet, EPPs demonstrate how remaining conditions and feedback relevant to CAEP Standards (e.g., instrument quality) have been addressed
- Includes a discussion of performance trends and compares across specialty areas.
- Component A.1.2 is not eligible for Phase-in Plan submission

# Cross-Cutting Themes

*Embedded in Every Aspect of Educator Preparation*

## Coursework

- *Diversity*
- *Technology*

## Fieldwork

- *Diversity*
- *Technology*

## Interpersonal Interactions

- *Diversity*
- *Technology*

# Themes of Diversity and Technology

## Diversity

### Standard 1

- Candidates must demonstrate skills and commitment that provide all P-12 students access to rigorous college and career ready standards.

## Technology

### Standard 1

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

# Themes of Diversity and Technology

## Diversity

### Standard A.1

- Candidates use their professional specialty practices “flexibly to advance the learning of P-12 students toward attainment of college-and career-readiness standards” to enhance “learning and development opportunities” for students.

## Technology

### Standard A.1

- Candidates apply technology appropriate to their field of specialization

## In Summary - The Case for Standard 1/A.1

- **Information is provided from several sources and provides evidence of candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions.**
- Grades, scores, pass rates, and other data are analyzed.
- Differences and similarities across licensure/field areas, comparisons over time, and demographical data are examined.
- Appropriate interpretations and conclusions are reached.
- Trends or patterns are identified that suggest need for preparation modification.
- Based on the analysis of data, planned or completed actions for change that are described.

## Standard 1/A.1's Case

**The development of critical concepts and principles of the field comes together in candidates' ability to use professional specialty practices, and the ability to address all P-12 students.**

CAEP standards for Initial/Advanced Programs, Evidence Sufficiency Criteria

# POTENTIAL ISSUES: Standard 1

## *AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT* MAY BE CITED WHEN:

---

- Evidence:
  - Lack of direct evidence for effective teaching of diverse P-12 students
  - Lack of evidence of candidate modeling and applying technology
- Case:
  - One or more of the four InTASC categories is not informed by EPP evidence, or disaggregated in data
  - Average candidate scores fall below acceptable levels on EPP-created scoring indicators, specific to InTASC categories
  - Limited or no attempt to measure candidate data literacy
- Instrumentation:
  - Only state-required licensure tests are provided as evidence

# POTENTIAL ISSUES: Standard 1

## *STIPULATIONS MAY BE CITED WHEN:*

---

- Evidence:
  - Disaggregated evidence for each preparation program
  - Licensure test scores in the upper half of national median/average field by field **or** the upper half of state median/average field by field
    - No plan for the EPP to improve its performance to be in the upper half
- Case:
  - Limited or no evidence and no plan for evidence of college- and career- readiness levels of instruction

TELL US HOW TO IMPROVE FOR YOUR  
NEXT CAEP CON

COMPLETE YOUR  
SESSION  
FEEDBACK





**Session:** Program Review as Part of the CAEP Accreditation process- SPA Review with National Recognition  
[Wednesday, March 14, 2- 3 PM, Chicago B]

**Session:** Program Review as Part of the CAEP Accreditation process- CAEP Program Review with Feedback  
[Wednesday, March 14, 3:15- 4:15 PM, Chicago B]