

CAEP Conference, Fall 2016
CAEP Standards for Advanced Programs
Evidence Sufficiency Criteria

This handout presents some key features regarding how evidence for meeting CAEP Standards for Accreditation will be evaluated. These evaluation “look-fors” inform both what site visitors will seek to verify and what Accreditation Council members will use as the basis for their decisions about accreditation status as well as Areas for Improvement (AFIs) and Stipulations.

These criteria listed below can best be understood as the frame (or set of sufficiency targets for which to aim), but should not be approached by EPPs – and will not be approached by site visitors or Councilors – as a list of requirements which must all be met for the component or standard to be successfully addressed. Criteria are presented for each component and can assist with determinations of whether an AFI or stipulation is warranted, but decisions about whether standards are met are based on the preponderance of the evidence across components, with the exception of the required components which must be met for the standard in which they are situated to be considered met.

The required components, indicated with an asterisk below, are A.3.2, both components of Standard A. 4 (A.4.1 - A.4.2), and two of the *continuous improvement* components of Standard 5 (A.5.3 and A.5.4). In the case of these components, the preponderance of evidence relates to the weight of evidence for meeting the set of sufficiency targets within the component.

To aid understanding of preponderance as it relates to the standard as a whole, each standard has a set of general rules. Those that are common across components are presented below as Common General Rules for CAEP Standards and the additional rules that are unique to each standard are presented as Special Rules for each standard.

Common General Rules for all CAEP Standards

- All components of each standard must be addressed in the self-study report
- At least three cycles of data must be submitted and analyzed. If a revised assessment is submitted with less than 3 cycles of data, the data from the original assessment should be submitted.
- Disaggregated data is provided on enrolled candidates for main and branch campuses, if any, for technology-based preparation, and for individual preparation (licensure or certification area) programs.
- 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 rubric.

STANDARD A.1

Special Rules for Standard A.1 (in addition to the General Rules):

- All data must be disaggregated by specialty field area for Standard A.1.
- Evidence from Standard A.1 is cited in support of continuous improvement and part of an overall system of review (Standard 5 / A.5).
- All components must be addressed in the self study
- There are no required components for Standard A.1

Standard A.1 Sufficiency Criteria:

Component A.1.1

- All of the professional skills stated in A.1.1 are addressed.
- At least three of the six generic skill areas are informed, for each professional specialty field, by multiple indicators/measures that adapt the generic skills to a professional specialty field
- EPP-created assessments have been reviewed at the minimum level of sufficiency on CAEP's assessment rubric.
- Analysis of data/evidence includes identification of trends/patterns, comparisons, and/or differences.
- Data/evidence supports interpretations and conclusions.
- Class average is at or above acceptable levels on the EPP scoring guide for EPP-created assessments.

Component A.1.2

- Present sources (at least 1) of evidence that candidates apply advanced preparation knowledge at specialty area levels (SPA or state reports, disaggregated specialty area data, actions, etc.).
- A majority (51% or above) of SPA program reports have National Recognition,
- **OR** documentation is provided on periodic state review of program-level outcome data.
- Answers to specific specialty area questions are complete, and supported by an analysis and accurate interpretation of specialty area data.
- Makes comparisons and identifies trends across specialty areas based on data.
- Assessments submitted for advanced preparation fields under the Program Review with Feedback option are at the minimal level of sufficiency.

Note: The Specialty Area Questions are:

1. How have the results of specialty area or SPA evidence been used to inform decision making and improve instruction and candidate learning outcomes?
2. What has been learned about different specialty areas as a result of the review of the disaggregated data?
3. How does the specialty area data provide evidence for meeting the state-selected standards?
4. How is specialty area evidence aligned with the identified state standards?

STANDARD A.2

Special Rules for Standard A.2 (in addition to the [General Rules](#)):

- All components must be addressed in the self study
- There are no required components for Standard A.2

Standard A.2 Sufficiency Criteria:

Component A.2.1

- Evidence is presented that P-12 schools and EPPs have both benefitted from the partnership.
- Evidence presented that a collaborative process is in place and reviewed annually.
- Provider regularly seeks input from P-12 educators with professional responsibilities relevant to the specialty fields for which candidates are being prepared, including developing or refining criteria for entry/exit into clinical experiences
- A shared responsibility model that includes these components:
 - Co-construction of instruments and evaluations
 - Evidence of co-constructed clinical experiences
 - Involvement in ongoing decision-making
 - Input into curriculum development
 - EPP supervisor and/or P-12 educators provide descriptive feedback to candidates.

- Opportunities for candidates to observe and implement appropriate and effective strategies for their fields of specialization.

Component A.2.2

- Evidence documents that all candidates have active clinical experiences.
- EPP investigates particular attributes of varied and developmental clinical settings in relation to candidate outcomes.
- Investigations employ both formative and summative assessments in more than one clinical setting and have
 - used two comparison points,
 - used the results to guide preparation decision-making, and
 - modified instruction and clinical experiences based on results.
- Evidence documents that candidates have used technology in applications appropriate to their field of specialization.
- Evidence documents a sequence of clinical experiences with specific goals that are focused, purposeful, and varied.
- The EPP assesses clinical experiences using performance-based criteria.
- Evidence documents the relationship between clinical experiences and coursework (coherence).

STANDARD A.3

Special Rules for Standard A.3 (in addition to the [General Rules](#)):

- Cycles of data (3-cycles) must be sequential and be the latest available
- All components must be addressed in the self study
- Component A.3.2 is required

Standard A.3 Sufficiency Criteria:

Component A.3.1

- Plans for admitted candidate pool provide base points and annual monitoring (including academic ability, diversity, and employment needs).
- Provide disaggregated data on enrolled candidates by relevant demographics, including race/ethnicity, SES, and/or sex.
- EPP demonstrates knowledge of and action that addresses employment opportunities in schools, districts, and/or regions where completers are likely to seek employment.
- Admission goals and reported enrollment data demonstrate progress from the base point and have moved the provider toward greater candidate diversity and academic achievement.
- Evidence documents that the provider monitors the influence of employment opportunities on enrollment patterns.

Component A.3.2*

- The provider specifies its requirements for academic achievement and other criteria it uses at entry to ensure that enrolled candidates have or develop abilities to complete advanced preparation successfully.
- The average scores for the group of candidates beginning during an academic year meet the CAEP minimum GPA of 3.0
- **OR** performance on nationally-normed, substantially equivalent state-normed, or EPP administered assessments is in the top 50% for all test takers of the selected assessment
 - Assessments examine candidate performance in mathematical and verbal achievement and, beginning in 2021, in writing achievement.
- At least three cycles of data/evidence are presented and analyzed
- Data are disaggregated for enrolled candidates by (1) relevant demographics including race/ethnicity, SES, and sex and (2) branch campuses, if any, mode of delivery, and individual programs.
- Evidence that EPP monitors progress and provides supporting services and counseling for candidates when needed

Component A.3.3

- Documents two or more measures/gateways of candidate progression.
- Present explicit criteria for monitoring/assessing with a focus on candidate development throughout preparation.

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

Component A.3.4

- Evidence for this component would be the same as that assembled for the self study under **component A.1.1**. It can be cross-referenced in the self study, and not repeated unless the EPP prefers to make a special point about exit proficiencies of completing candidates.

STANDARD A.4

Special Rules for Standard A.4 (in addition to the [General Rules](#)):

- All phase-in requirements are met
- All components of Standard A.4 are required

Standard A.4 Sufficiency Criteria:

Component A.4.1*

- Submits evidence that employers perceive completers' preparation was sufficient for their job responsibilities.
- Includes appropriate analysis and interpretation of results.
- Describes a system for the analysis, evaluation, and interpretation of data, and conclusions are supported by data.
- Provider documentation includes the following:
 - A description of the system for gathering data
 - Adequate response rates (20% or more)
 - A description of the representativeness of the sample
 - Data specific to high-need schools
 - Data specific to specialty field
 - Comparison points for data.
- Submit documentation of employment milestones, including promotion, employment trajectory, and retention for at least some completers and conducts appropriate analysis.

Component A.4.2*

- Submit evidence that completers perceive their preparation was sufficient for their job responsibilities.
- Include appropriate analysis and interpretation of results.
- Show evidence of an adequate and representative sample reflected in responses.
- The provider achieves an adequate response rate (20% or more).
- Provide analysis and interpretation of data aligned with the intent of the standard/component.
- Conclusions are supported by the data.

STANDARD A.5

Special Rules for Standard A.5 (in addition to the [General Rules](#)):

- All phase-in requirements are met
- All components must be addressed in the self study
- Components A.5.3 and A.5.4 are required

Standard A.5 Sufficiency Criteria:

Component A.5.1

- Evidence/data from a coherent set of multiple measures are used to inform, modify, and evaluate EPP's operational effectiveness
- Evidence the system operations and data are regularly reviewed
- Evidence the system has the capacity to collect, analyze, monitor, and report data/evidence on all CAEP Standards
- Evidence that the system supports disaggregation of data by specialty licensure area and other dimensions (e.g., over time, by race/ethnicity, gender, etc.)
- System supports the ability to monitor operational effectiveness (e.g., setting program priorities and data tracking)

Component A.5.2

- At least 75% of EPP created assessments used in quality assurance system are scored at the minimal
- Documentation that EPP-created assessments (except for surveys) have: level of sufficiency as defined by the CAEP Assessment Rubric
 - established content validity
 - inter-rater reliability or agreement at .80 or 80% or above (except for surveys)
 - for surveys, questions align to standards
- Documentation that evidence (as defined in CAEP Evidence Guide) is:
 - Relevant (related to standard)
 - Verifiable (accuracy of sample)
 - Representative (specificity on sample characteristics)
 - Cumulative (generally 3 cycles or more)
 - Actionable (in a form to guide program improvement)
 - Documentation that interpretations of evidence are consistent, accurate, and supported by data/evidence

Component A.5.3*

- Documentation that EPP regularly and systematically does the following:
 - reviews quality assurance system data
 - identifies patterns across preparation programs (both strengths and weaknesses)
 - uses data/evidence for continuous improvement
 - tests innovations
- Most (80% or more) change and program modifications are linked back to evidence/data with specific examples provided
- Evidence/data from Standards A.1 through 4 are cited and applied
- Documentation of explicit and appropriate investigation of selection criteria used for Standard A.3 in relation to candidate progress and completion
- Evidence that data-driven changes are ongoing and based on systematic assessment of performance and/or innovations result in overall positive trends of improvement for EPPs, their candidates, and P-12 students

Component A.5.4*

- CAEP's 8 outcome and impact measures are appropriately monitored and reported together with the following:
 - Accurate analysis of trends
 - Comparisons with benchmarks
 - Evidence of corresponding resource allocations
 - Future direction is informed by data
- Evidence that the 8 outcome and impact measures and their trends are posted on the EPP website and in other ways widely shared
- Program changes and modifications are directly linked to evidence/data with specific examples

Component A.5.5

- Specific evidence of diverse stakeholder involvement is documented through multiple sources in each of these areas:
 - Decision-making
 - Program evaluation
 - Selection and implementation of changes for improvement
- EPP identifies at least two examples of input from stakeholders and use of that input

