


*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



CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

**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 15<sup>th</sup> along with the PPT.



CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

**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



CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### 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.



CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### 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**)



CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Feedback and Question Pause



CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### 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?



CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### 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.



CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### 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



CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### 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.



CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### 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.



CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Feedback and Question Pause



CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---


---

---



### 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>

 CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

### 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

 CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

### 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.

 CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

**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.

 CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

**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

 CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Feedback and Question Pause**



 CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---

---


---

### 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?



CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### 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/Teacher\\_Characteristics\\_July\\_2011.pdf](http://www.people.fas.harvard.edu/~dobbie/research/Teacher_Characteristics_July_2011.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>.



CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

### 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



CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



### 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.



CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### 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.



CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Feedback and Question Pause



CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

**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?



CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

**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



CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

**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



CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### 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 out.

**CAEP**  
CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### 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.

**CAEP**  
CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

### Feedback and Question Pause



**CAEP**  
CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---

---


---

### 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?



CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

### 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)



CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

### 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.



CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

Feedback and Question Pause



CAEP

CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

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?

CAEP

CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

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.)

CAEP

CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

### 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.).



CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

### 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.



CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---



---

---

---

---

### Feedback and Question Pause



CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### 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.



CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### 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.



CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### 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



CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

### 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

CAEP  CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---


---


---

---

---

### Final Feedback and Question Pause



CAEP  CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

### 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	<a href="https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/526875645">https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/526875645</a>	1 866 899 4679	526-875-645
Standard 5	May 26th at 5pm EDT	<a href="https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/562953453">https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/562953453</a>	1 866 899 4679	562-953-453

CAEP  CONNECT WITH CAEP | [www.CAEPnet.org](http://www.CAEPnet.org) | Twitter: @CAEPupdates

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---