Data-driven Continuous Improvement: CAEP Standard 5 (CAEP 201)

Christine Carrino Gorowara, CAEP

Vice President for the IB Pathway and CAEP Evidence

Standard 5

The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development.

The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers.

The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.

Goals of the quality assurance system

- Internal: Ability to monitor and improve program quality
- External: Ability to demonstrate program quality to others

CAEP
Council for the
Accreditation of
Educator Preparation

Common questions for internal and external audiences

- Do the candidates have the right knowledge and skills (CAEP Standard 1)?
- Are their clinical skills developed well (CAEP Standard 2)?
- Do the selected candidates show promise throughout the program (CAEP Standard 3)?
- Do they have a positive impact on P-12 students once they are working in the field (CAEP Standard 4)?
- **Is the EPP using quality evidence to inform themselves about these questions (CAEP Standard 5)?**

The quality evidence ideal vs. the messy evidence reality: Example 1

- 20% of sample missing

	ITEM 1	ITEM 2	ITEM 3	ITEM 4	ITEM 5	ITEM 6	ITEM 7	ITEM 8
Student 001								
Student 002	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3
Student 003								
Student 004	4	2	4	4	2	4	3	4
Student 005	4	2	3	4	2	4	2	4
Student 006	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4
Student 007	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	4
Student 008	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	3
Student 009	4	3	4	4	2	3	2	3
Student 010	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4

What does the data tell you and not tell you?

- Provides information about 80% of candidates
- Which 80%–
  - Random?
  - Candidates who completed a self-assessment (or other requirement)?
  - Candidates assigned to full-time supervisors?
- Compare 80% to full sample to determine representativeness

Council for the
Accreditation of
Educator Preparation

What improvements would you make going forward?

Depending on reasons for missing data:

- Modify procedures to ensure greater filing of evaluations

- De-couple candidate responsibilities with supervisor responsibilities so that evaluation filing does not depend on candidate

- Better connect adjunct supervisors with program, explore specific challenges of the adjunct role

The quality evidence ideal vs. the messy evidence reality: Example 2

- Low inter-rater reliability

Item 1	Rating	N	%	Item 2	Rating	N	%	Item 3	Rating	N	%
	1	0	0%		1	0	0%		1	3	15%
	2	0	0%		2	1	5%		2	12	60%
	3	20	100%		3	19	95%		3	5	25%

What does the data tell you and not tell you?

- Items 1 and 2 can be rated pretty reliably; data for Item 3 is inconclusive

OR

- Strong performance is easy to rate; medium performance is more difficult

- Compare other results to test these hypotheses

What improvements would you make going forward?

Depending on reasons for the low inter-rater agreement:

- Revise item to be less ambiguous
- Revise training to ensure common understandings about levels of performance

CAEP
Council for the
Accreditation of
Educator Preparation

The quality evidence ideal vs. the messy evidence reality: Example 3

- Low correlation (low concurrent validity)

	Major GPA	Content Licensure Test Score
Major GPA	1	
Content Licensure Score	0.24*	1

- *significant at the 0.05 level

What does the data tell you and not tell you?

- The correlation is positive, so there is some connection between the content test and major GPA, but not a strong connection
- The assessments measure different abilities—
  - Could be different content
  - Could be different skills (e.g., timed writing vs. project management)

Council for the
Accreditation of
Educator Preparation

What improvements would you make going forward?

Depending on the reasons for the low correlation:

- Based on independent measures of validity, rely on one assessment or the other more heavily

- Revise curricular requirements to better match licensure content OR advocate for revision of licensure content to better match curricular requirements

- Conclude that assessments measure important but different aspects of content and determine how many candidates meet threshold for both

Themes in using messy data

- What does the data tell you and not tell you?
- What improvements would you make going forward?

Council for the
Accreditation of
Educator Preparation

Following up

Engaged feedback is vital to CAEP. You will have an opportunity to complete a survey at the end of the conference. Surveys will be sent via email on Friday, April 10. We encourage your participation. Thank you.

Further questions:

christine.gorowara@caepnet.org

CAEP
Council for the
Accreditation of
Educator Preparation