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SESSION OVERVIEW

This session will focus on the intent of program review as part of the CAEP accreditation process

• Content will reference the following:
  ▪ program review as defined by CAEP-state agreements
  ▪ program review options available to educator preparation providers-
    • Program Review with National Recognition using specialized professional association (SPA) standards (in detail)
    • CAEP Program Review with Feedback (in detail)
    • State review
  ▪ Program review related resources on the CAEP website
VOCABULARY

1. **EPP:** Educator Preparation Provider that prepares professionals in various licensure or certification areas to serve in a P-12 setting

2. **PROGRAM:** A planned sequence of academic courses and experiences leading to a degree, a recommendation for a state license, or some other credential that entitles the holder to perform professional education services in schools (P-12)

3. **CANDIDATES:** Pre service educators

4. **STUDENTS:** P-12 students

5. **SPA:** Specialized professional associations

6. **SPA Program Report:** A report submitted at a program level to provide evidence to meet standards developed by SPAs

7. **SPA RECOGNITION REPORT/DECISION REPORT:** Report providing SPA feedback and recognition decision—used as partial evidence for CAEP Standard 1
Program review decisions factor into CAEP Component 1.3, which says:

“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).”
Program review decisions factor into **CAEP Component A.1.2**, which says:

“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 (NBPTS), and standards of other accrediting bodies [e.g., Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)].”
CAEP SCOPE AND PROGRAM REVIEW

• CAEP accredits EPPs
• EPP offered programs leading to licensing degrees, certificates, or endorsements of P-12 professionals fall under the scope
• All endorsements use CAEP Advanced-Level Standards
• Programs licensing “Other school professionals” use CAEP Advanced-Level Standards
• Programs accredited by other national accrediting bodies (CACREP, NASM, etc.):
  ▪ EPP may choose to exempt from review by CAEP (will not be recognized as accredited by CAEP)
  ▪ EPP may choose to include in the CAEP accreditation process (will be included in EPP-wide assessments, annual report, and program review)
PROGRAM REVIEW OPTIONS

• CAEP-state agreements determine program review options for EPPs within state (28 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)
## EXAMPLES: STATE-SELECTED PROGRAM REVIEW OPTIONS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>SPA REVIEW</th>
<th>CAEP PROGRAM REVIEW WITH FEEDBACK</th>
<th>STATE REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARKANSAS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELAWARE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIANA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KANSAS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW JERSEY</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Information on program review options by state is available on the CAEP website: [http://caepnet.org/working-together/state-partners/state-partnership-agreements](http://caepnet.org/working-together/state-partners/state-partnership-agreements)
QUESTIONS THAT PROGRAM REVIEW ADDRESSES

• What degree of competence in content knowledge do candidates demonstrate?
• Can candidates successfully develop a conceptual plan for their teaching and other professional education responsibilities?
• Can candidates implement their conceptual plan with students and colleagues?
• Are candidates effective in promoting student learning?
• Do candidates meet state licensure requirements?
CONSIDER:

1. Did the EPP update the program review option in AIMS for each program?

2. Does the program list match the licensure, certification, or endorsement programs list on the EPP’s catalog?

3. Does the selection of program review option meet CAEP-state agreement (if applicable)?

4. Does the program level evidence (SPA report, state agency report, self-study addendum) presented on the self-study report match the selected review option?

Remember: 1 licensing program = 1 review option → evidence type
# Program Details (PrgID: 24194)

## Basic Information

- **Program Name:** Social Studies 5-9
- **Level:** ITP
- **Certificate Level for Degree(s):** (7) 7: Endorsement only
- **Program Category:** 51: Social Studies Education

## Program Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>NCSS</td>
<td>Recognized w/ c</td>
<td>Expired 2/1/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Review with Feedback</td>
<td>Feedback Options</td>
<td>Feedback Options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Review with Feedback</td>
<td>Feedback Options</td>
<td>Feedback Options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Year</th>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th># of candidates</th>
<th># of completers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Delivery/Site

- [ ] Off-campus Program
- [ ] Distance Learning Program
- [ ] Alternate Route Program

## Comment:

[Blank space for comment]
SPA PROGRAM REVIEW OPTION WITH NATIONAL RECOGNITION

Two Steps in CAEP Accreditation Process if Selecting SPA Review Option:

Step #1: **Initial review report** submitted to SPA three years prior to site visit *(Program level review)*

*Example:* Site Visit in **Fall 2020** → Initial SPA review in **Fall 2017**

Step #2: **Self-study report** submitted to CAEP nine months prior to site visit *(Provider level review)*

*Example:* Site Visit in **Nov. 2020** → Self-study report in **Mar. 2020**
SPA REVIEW EXPECTATIONS: WHAT THE SITE TEAM WILL LOOK FOR

• INITIAL REVIEW DUE DATE: 3 years prior to site visit
  Example: site visit in Fall 2020 → initial SPA review in Fall 2017

• SPA reports initiated more than three years before = old data
  Did the EPP receive an extension to account for older Recognition Reports?
PROGRAM REVIEW EVIDENCE: SPA REVIEW

• What evidence will the site team look for?
  ▪ A SPA Recognition/Decision Report
  ▪ 3 year out timing of Initial Review: “All Programs” → Review by” column → ...(history)

• How will the site team determine if CAEP expectations are met when an EPP selects the SPA option?
  ▪ Minimum sufficiency criteria: 51% of the total number of programs selecting SPA review option have full National Recognition from a 3 year out submission

• Which SPA recommendations on the Decision Report will be used?
  ▪ Comments in Part E (Areas for consideration)
  ▪ Comments in Part F (Additional comments)
  ▪ SPA decisions or conditions for the program to address in Part G
SPA REVIEW: TIMING AND CYCLES

• PURPOSE:
  ▪ Gather evidence for current accreditation cycle (CAEP Standard 1)
  ▪ Initiate process to receive full National Recognition by visit date
  ▪ Initiate process to continue prior National Recognition status before expiration

• REVIEW CYCLES: 2 times per year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring Cycle Due Date: March 15</th>
<th>Fall Cycle Due Date: September 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring Cycle Decisions: August 1</td>
<td>Fall Cycle Decisions: February 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STAGES OF SPA REVIEW PROCESS

• INITIAL SUBMISSION: 3 years before site visit

• SHELL REQUESTS BEGIN: 1 year before submission date

• SHELL REQUESTS ENDS (moving forward): 5 days before submission date (March 10 for spring cycle and September 10 for fall cycle)

• SHELL REQUEST SUBMISSION:
  ▪ List all programs preparing P-12 professionals in each specialization area in AIMS to enable shell request submission
  ▪ Submit shell requests through CAEP’s Accreditation Information Management System (AIMS): http://aims.caepnet.org/AIMS_login.asp
  ▪ Directions requesting shells provided on CAEP website: http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/spa-program-review-policies-and-procedur
  ▪ CAEP staff creates shells after receiving request
Please note that confidentiality is an integral part of the accreditation process. This database includes sensitive information related to the accreditation process. CAEP board members, reviewers, and staff accessing this information are expected to observe the CAEP Code of Conduct, which requires Site Visitors, Program Reviewers, policy board members, and staff to consider all information related to the accreditation process as confidential. The information in AIMS, CAEP’s database, should not be shared, discussed, or used in any context other than the review of the EPP and its programs.

OK

- Mozilla Firefox version 2.0 or above (2.0 ONLY for MAC)
- Netscape Navigator version 8.0 or above
- Safari for Macintosh

To use this system, you will need Adobe Acrobat Reader version 7.0 or higher. To download a free copy of the latest version, click here. Macintosh users please click here.
SPA REPORT FORMAT: OPTION- A
(MOST COMMONLY SELECTED AND SPA RECOMMENDED)

MEETING SPA STANDARDS USING 6-8 ASSESSMENTS AS REQUIRED BELOW:

• **Assessment 1**: State Licensure Examination Data (demonstrating candidates' content knowledge)
• **Assessment 2**: Additional Assessment of Candidates’ Content Knowledge
• **Assessment 3**: Assessment of Candidates’ Ability to Plan Instruction
• **Assessment 4**: Assessment of Student Teaching/Internship Performance
• **Assessment 5**: Assessment of Candidate Impact on Student Learning
• **Assessment 6**: Additional Assessment (To Meet Specific SPA Requirements)

• Assessments 7 and 8: Optional
SPA REPORT FORMAT: OPTION- B (EPP-DEFINED ASSESSMENTS)

MEETING SPA STANDARDS USING MAXIMUM 8 ASSESSMENTS INCLUDING:

- State licensure examination data
- Additional evidence of candidates’ content knowledge
- Evidence of candidates’ pedagogical content knowledge and skills
- Evidence of candidates’ impact of student learning
## TYPES OF SPA REPORTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPORT TYPES BY SEQUENCE</th>
<th>RELATION TO PRIOR DECISIONS</th>
<th>OPPORTUNITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INITIAL REVIEW REPORT</td>
<td>Nationally Recognized/ Not Recognized</td>
<td>Once (3 years before site visit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPONSE TO CONDITIONS REPORT</td>
<td>Nationally Recognized With Conditions</td>
<td>Maximum Of Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVISED REPORT</td>
<td>Further Development Required/ Nationally</td>
<td>Maximum Of Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognized With Probation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DATA REQUIREMENTS BASED ON REPORT TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPORT TYPES BY SEQUENCE</th>
<th>DATA REQUIREMENT</th>
<th>ASSESSMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INITIAL REVIEW REPORT</td>
<td>2 Most Recent Applications</td>
<td>6-8 Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3 Applications Of State Licensure Examination Data)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPONSE TO CONDITIONS REPORT</td>
<td>1 Most Recent Applications Of Revised Assessments</td>
<td>Only Assessments Undergoing Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVISED REPORT</td>
<td>1 Most Recent Applications Of Revised Assessments</td>
<td>6-8 Assessments Undergoing Revision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SPA REVIEW: DISCUSSION ON SELF-STUDY REPORT

• The EPP addresses the following questions for programs selecting SPA Program Review:
  ▪ How was the SPA feedback on specialty licensure area used to inform decision making and improve instruction and candidate learning outcomes?
  ▪ What was learned about different specialty licensure areas as a result of the review of the disaggregated data?
  ▪ What trends do the comparison of data across specialty licensure areas indicate and how do they provide evidence for meeting the CAEP and state expectations and standards?

• Accreditation Decision: Evidence meets CAEP sufficiency criteria, OR, evidence indicates potential area for improvement (AFI)
What is CAEP Program Review with Feedback?
- An alternative option to SPA and state review
- Requires evidence of candidates’ knowledge of content and pedagogical content knowledge for each licensure area program

How do programs report evidence for this option?
- Incorporate evidence as part of the self-study report
- Analyze data from state licensure exams and/or other proficiency measures required by EPP to demonstrate candidates’ content knowledge in the licensure area
- Analyze data to demonstrate candidates’ pedagogical knowledge in the area
- Analyze data from assessment of candidates’ impact on student learning in the area
- Provide assessment description and scoring guide in each case
PROGRAM REVIEW EVIDENCE: CAEP PROGRAM REVIEW WITH FEEDBACK

• How do programs report evidence for this option (Continued)?
  
  Address the following questions for each assessment:
  
  ▪ What artifact(s) is used to provide evidence?
  ▪ How was the assessment developed?
  ▪ How does the assessment provide evidence for meeting standards (next slide)?
  ▪ How is the quality of the assessment/evidence determined or assured?
  ▪ What criteria of success were established or measured, and how?

• Refer to the Technical Guide for CAEP Program Review with Feedback:
  http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/program-review-options/caep-program-review-with-feedback
APPENDIX A: Sample Scoring Guide, Assessment Rubric, and Data Chart for Assessment Review

Sample Scoring Guide:

- **Above Sufficient Level (3)** = Candidate demonstrates teaching behaviors above expectations.
- **CAEP Sufficient Level (2)** = Candidate demonstrates teaching behaviors that meet expectations at the minimal level.
- **Below Sufficient Level (1)** = Candidate demonstrates teaching behaviors that are below the

Sample Assessment Rubric: Teacher Candidate Assessment of Competence

Domain A: Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Scale 1 – 3 (see above)</th>
<th>Assessment Number</th>
<th>Alignment with InTASC Standard</th>
<th>Assessment Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Goals/objectives of lesson are appropriate for the level of students and content to be taught.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning experience(s) in the lesson are aligned with the goals/objectives of the lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Formative assessments are appropriate for the goals/objectives of the lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning experiences in the lesson ensure student engagement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Technical Guide for CAEP Program Review with Feedback
Sample Data Chart:
The content area data are disaggregated on the chart and reported at the level they are collected. A sample of a disaggregated data chart is provided below.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Licensure Concentration</th>
<th>Early Childhood</th>
<th>Middle Level</th>
<th>All AYA</th>
<th>Language Arts</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Social Studies</th>
<th>Combined Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Candidates (N)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014 M**</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD***</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>Na</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015 M</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>Na</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016 M</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>Na</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N= Number of candidates
**M= Mean
***SD= Standard deviation

Source: Technical Guide for CAEP Program Review with Feedback
INITIAL-LICENSEURE EVIDENCE: CAEP PROGRAM REVIEW WITH FEEDBACK

• What standards are used for this option?

As a norm, align the assessments for initial-licensure programs with the InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards on content and pedagogy

**Standard 4** (Content Knowledge),

**Standard 5** (Application of Content),

**Standard 6** (Assessment),

**Standard 7** (Planning for Instruction), and

**Standard 8** (Instructional Strategies)

• If a state requires use of other standards for the CAEP Program Review with Feedback option (state agreement), EPP will align evidence to those standards
ADVANCED-LEVEL PROGRAM EVIDENCE: CAEP PROGRAM REVIEW WITH FEEDBACK

• What standards are used for this option?
  As a norm, align the assessments for Advanced-Level Programs with the NBPTS Standards in respective areas of specialization

• If a state requires use of other standards for the CAEP Program Review with Feedback option (state agreement), EPP will align evidence to those standards
CAEP PROGRAM REVIEW WITH FEEDBACK OPTION:
TIMING AND PURPOSE

• EVIDENCE SUBMISSION: Included as part of self-study report

• REVIEWED BY: site team

• PURPOSE:
  ▪ Gather program level evidence for current accreditation cycle
  ▪ Provide evidence for CAEP Standard 1/A.1
  ▪ Receive formative feedback on meeting CAEP Standard 1/A.1
  ▪ Feedback used by CAEP’s Accreditation Council to make accreditation decisions
  ▪ Feedback may be used by states to understand if program meets state expectations
CAEP PROGRAM REVIEW WITH FEEDBACK OPTION: GENERAL EXPECTATIONS

• 3 cycles of data submitted and analyzed as part of self-study report

• Disaggregated data provided on candidates enrolled for main and branch campuses

• Cycles of data must be sequential and latest available

• The review is based on guidance provided in the CAEP Evidence Guide
PROGRAM REVIEW WITH FEEDBACK: DISCUSSION ON SELF-STUDY REPORT

• The EPP addresses the following questions for programs selecting the CAEP Program Review with Feedback Option:
  ▪ Based on the analysis of the disaggregated data, how are the results of specialty licensure area evidence used to inform decision making and improve instruction and candidate learning outcomes?
  ▪ Based on the analysis of specialty licensure area data, how have individual licensure areas used data as the basis for change?
  ▪ How do the specialty licensure area data align with and provide evidence for meeting the state-selected (or InTASC) standards?
C. PROGRAM REVIEW EVIDENCE: STATE REVIEW

- **Evidence type:** State agency report that indicates evidence-based approval of programs as meeting state standards

- **Evidence submission:** May be included as part of self-study report, or, provided by state following a CAEP-state concurrent visit

- **Evidence validity:** Check for approval timeline to ensure reporting of current evidence
The EPP addresses the following questions for Component 1.3:

- How was the program review feedback on specialty licensure areas used to inform decision making and improve instruction and candidate learning outcomes?
- What was learned about different specialty licensure areas as a result of the review of the disaggregated data?
- What trends do the comparison across specialty licensure area data indicate and how do they provide evidence for meeting the CAEP and state expectations and standards?

Decision: Met/ AFI?
The EPP addresses the following questions for programs selecting the CAEP Program Review with Feedback Option:

- Based on the analysis of the disaggregated data, how have the results of specialty licensure area evidence been used to inform decision-making and improve instruction and candidate learning outcomes?
- Based on the analysis of specialty licensure area data, how have individual licensure areas used data as the basis for change?
- How does the specialty licensure area data align with and provide evidence for meeting the state-selected (or InTASC/) standards?
MORE DETAILS ON SPA AND REVIEW WITH FEEDBACK OPTIONS

• Policies on the SPA review option: Guidelines with Program Review with National Recognition.


  CAEP website: [http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/program-review-options/caep-program-review-with-feedback](http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/program-review-options/caep-program-review-with-feedback)
RESOURCES ON PROGRAM REVIEW

• SPA PROGRAM REVIEW POLICIES AND PROCEDURES:
  http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/spa-program-review-policies-and-procedur


• CAEP PROGRAM REVIEW WITH FEEDBACK POLICIES AND PROCEDURES:
  http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/program-review-options/caep-program-review-with-feedback
MORE RESOURCES

• CAEP-STATE AGREEMENTS:
  http://caepnet.org/working-together/state-partners/state-partnership-agreements

• SPA COORDINATORS’ CONTACT INFORMATION:
  http://caepnet.org/working-together/member-partners
CONTACTS: PROGRAM REVIEW STAFF

- Banhi Bhattacharya, Senior Director, Program Review: banhi.bhattacharya@caepnet.org
  [Policies on program review; CAEP Program Review with Feedback; new elementary standards]

- Sabata Morris, Senior Accreditation Associate: sabata.morris@caepnet.org
  [Primary SPA liaison; SPA specific queries]

- Lewis McIlwain, Accreditation Associate: lewis.mcilwain@caepnet.org
  [Shell requests and associated questions]
CALL FOR SERVICE

• Interested in serving as a CAEP volunteer?
• Have questions, comments or suggestions regarding CAEP accreditation?
• Contact us: http://caepnet.org/about/staff-listing
QUESTIONS?

Consider Attending:

*SPA Success Stories Session*
Monday, September 25, 11:00AM- 12:00 PM