

Technical Guide: CAEP Program Review with Feedback

A. CAEP Program Review Options

Review of licensure area programs is integral to the CAEP accreditation process. Evidence from program review is used to determine if CAEP Standard 1 (CAEP Standards for Initial Licensure Programs) or A.1 (CAEP Standards for Advanced-Level Programs) on content and pedagogical knowledge is met.

The [State Partnership Agreement](#) signed between CAEP and a particular state (or relevant governmental agencies for international educator preparation providers) delineates the review options available to educator preparation providers (EPPs). CAEP's state or non-U.S. governmental partners can select from, and then approve for availability to EPPs in their state, three options for licensure area program review: Specialized Professional Association (SPA) review with National Recognition, CAEP Program Review with Feedback, and/or State Program Review. The State Partnership Agreement may identify more than one program review option available to providers within their respective states, and providers can select any of the options approved by the state for inclusion in the self-study. All providers should check with their state's department of education or another governing body to determine the program review option(s) available in their state.

Providers in a state that does not have an agreement with CAEP will be able to seek CAEP accreditation after meeting the state requirements for EPPs. In the absence of a CAEP-state agreement, EPPs can choose among the three program review options. However, if the state program review option is selected, the EPP must coordinate with its respective state to receive and provide to CAEP the state agency report with evidence of candidates' performance in each licensure area at the program level.

B. Overview of CAEP Program Review with Feedback

CAEP Program Review with Feedback is a streamlined alternative to the SPA and state review options for licensure area program review. Like the other two options, CAEP Program Review with Feedback requires evidence that candidates have the knowledge and skills to be effective P-12 educators in those areas. Unlike the other options, the CAEP Program Review with Feedback process is incorporated as part of CAEP's formative review of providers seeking accreditation, whereby program level evidence is submitted as an addendum to the self-study report.

For the CAEP Program Review with Feedback option, EPPs will provide data by licensure area programs as evidence to meet CAEP Standard 1 (or Standard A.1). The evidence is built into the self-study process and requires no additional report. EPPs submit their self-study report nine months before the scheduled site visit. Evidence for CAEP Program Review with Feedback is developed through the analysis of data that are disaggregated by licensure areas. The process involves two parts: (a) a review of the alignment of the licensure

area data with InTASC standards on content and pedagogy (Standards 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8), or state-specified standards and requirements, and (b) a review of the alignment of licensure area program level data with CAEP Standard 1¹ or A.1.

An EPP's licensure area programs may be reviewed in clusters against the specified InTASC standards, standards selected by a state, or by a relevant government agency for international providers. The clusters may include cross-grade programs such as elementary education and special education; or, secondary programs such as mathematics education and English language arts education. Programs with low enrollments and licensure areas without a corresponding specialized professional association (SPA) may also be reviewed using the Feedback option. These reports are read by CAEP reviewers who will prepare a feedback report for the EPP, CAEP, and the state or relevant government agency for international EPPs. The CAEP Program Review with Feedback option does not lead to National Recognition of programs.

C. General Rules for all CAEP Standards (Also Applies to Evidence Provided for CAEP Standard 1 and A.1)

- 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 are also submitted
- Disaggregated data must be 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 must be scored at the *CAEP Sufficient Level* as defined on the [CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments](#)

The types of evidence described in the *CAEP Accreditation Handbook* to meet CAEP Standard 1 (or Standard A.1) are intended only as examples. Providers are welcome to employ different measurements from those described in the *CAEP Accreditation Handbook* and to select the ones they believe will make the strongest case that the EPP has met each standard.

If different evidence is submitted, the provider is responsible for showing that it has addressed the intent of the CAEP Standard or component in an equally effective way.

Regardless of which measures are used, providers must demonstrate the quality of the data, including its reliability and validity (minimally content validity) in the context of the CAEP standards they are to inform. All evidence must be tagged to a specific CAEP Standard and component.

D. Use of the Evidence in the Self-Study Report

¹ Refer to Appendix B: Alignment of InTASC Principles with CAEP Standard 1

In assembling self-study reports, providers should focus on making the case that standards and required components are met. The case should do the following:

- Frame the argument (i.e., what is the EPP claiming it has achieved with respect to the standard or required component)
- Describe the data sources used to support the argument (Refer to the [CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments](#) for key features of measures to discuss)
- Explain why the data are credible indicators for the standard/required component. This includes discussing qualities of good evidence outlined in the *CAEP Evidence Guide* (such as reliability and validity) and describing methods of data analysis/evaluation
- Present the results in a way that aligns with the standard (Note: data collected for EPP purposes likely exceeds what is relevant for CAEP accreditation, please provide direct evidence only and omit extraneous results)
- Draw a conclusion about the extent to which the results support the argument that the standard or required component is met
- Discuss the implications of the findings for subsequent action by the provider
- Discuss the provider's completed, ongoing, and/or planned uses of data for continuous improvement

As part of this process, providers must disaggregate data and results by specific licensure areas for CAEP Standard 1 (or A.1). The review of data at this level is required as part of the overall accreditation decision. Disaggregation helps to identify noteworthy variations that could provide targets for continuous improvement efforts or may provide evidence of consistency across licensure areas within the EPP. Providers should examine the data for patterns, such as variations over time or after changes to the program or context. These monitoring actions are key functions of the quality assurance system referenced in CAEP Standard component 5.1 (or component A.5.1 and feed into additional aspects of Standard A.5).

Because all data have limitations, one means to moderate the limitations is to draw on multiple sources of data in framing the case that each standard or required component is met. Multiple sources allow providers to triangulate data – helping to document different aspects of a facet of preparation and to enrich analyses through indications of convergence in cases where findings are mutually reinforcing. In the self-study report, the EPP should highlight confirming and conflicting findings from data. When possible, providers should make comparisons between their data and any existing benchmarks (e.g., cut scores), normative comparisons to peers (e.g., pass rates across EPPs), or performance standards (e.g., competency requirements to garner proficient ratings on internship evaluations). These final steps generate a context for considering the implications of findings for program-related decisions and continuous improvement.

As a general rule, CAEP expects self-study reports to make the provider's case based on trends derived from at least three data points, or cycles, during which the provider has administered assessments, surveys, or other measures. The frequency would depend on the

particular data set, with some – perhaps gateway measures – administered only once per year or once per cohort of candidates or completers. Other measures might closely monitor progress during preparation more frequently. In either case, three cycles would help to affirm trends as well as the status of the phenomenon under investigation.

There may be situations when one or two or data points are available. This is especially likely when new assessments are under development or when an assessment is modified, and the provider initiates a new data collection series within a few years of a site visit. Both CAEP and the provider should consider this circumstance as evidence of continuous improvement. CAEP may request that results be submitted in the provider’s annual reports for a year or two until stability with the revised measures is evident.

Finally, faculty and administrators, state policymakers, and accrediting bodies must all make decisions about the merits of programs. These decisions should be made with the best evidence that can be obtained now, rather than the evidence we might like to have, or that might be available in the future.

E. Distinguishing Features of CAEP Program Review with Feedback (Reporting of Licensure Area Data on Self-Study Report Nine Months Before the Scheduled Site Visit)

EPPs provide evidence related to **CAEP Standard 1 (or A.1)**, Content and Pedagogical Knowledge, under **Section II- CAEP Standards and Evidence** of the self-study report. The evidence would consist of an on-line table that disaggregated evidence by each licensure area program to demonstrate ways in which the program met either the InTASC Standards or standards specified by the state. The evidence would include valid and reliable assessments, scoring guides or rubrics and data to determine if candidates met the standards. Institutions could choose the assessments but must include (1) the state test for the licensure area, if there is such a test evaluating candidates’ knowledge of the content. In absence of a state licensure test, EPPs may include data from a comprehensive examination required of all completers for licensure in a specific area, (2) an assessment of the candidate’s pedagogical knowledge in each licensure area, and (3) an assessment of the candidate’s impact on student learning as applicable to each licensure area. EPPs submit the following evidence for review:

- Evidence for meeting CAEP Standard 1 (or A.1) through the analysis of data from state licensure examinations, if required by the state, or other proficiency measures. The data that are disaggregated by licensure area demonstrate candidate’s content knowledge.
- Assessment data on each licensure area demonstrating candidates’ content pedagogical knowledge and skills.
- Assessment data on candidate’s impact on student learning as applicable to the professional area certification that will be recommended by each program.

- Data disaggregated by licensure/certification area must be provided from assessments required of all candidates as criteria for program completion (Guidance on data submission available in the [CAEP Evidence Guide](#), pp. 24-25)
- Assessment description and scoring guides² if proprietary assessments (i.e., state licensure tests, edTPA, etc.) are reported
- Address the following questions for each assessment:
 - What artifact is used to provide evidence?
 - How was the assessment developed?
 - How does the assessment provide evidence for meeting the state identified standards?
 - How was the quality of the assessment/evidence determined or assured?
 - What criteria of success have been established or measured, and how?
- As a norm, align the licensure area data with the InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards on content and pedagogy (standards 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8)
 - These must be used for CAEP Program Review with Feedback if a state has required standards as specified in an [agreement](#)³ with CAEP, other than the InTASC Standards
 - International providers use standards set by a relevant government agency
- Align the licensure area data with CAEP Standard 1 (or A.1)
- Analyze evidence through comparison, benchmarking, trend interpretation, etc. to make a case that the standard is met
- Respond to the following questions for the program selecting the CAEP Program Review with Feedback option:
 - Based on the analysis of the disaggregated data, how have the results of licensure area(s) been used to inform the program's decision-making process to improve instruction and candidate learning outcomes?
 - Based on the analysis of licensure area data, how have individual licensure areas used data as the basis for change?
 - How does the licensure area data align with and provide evidence for meeting the state-selected (or InTASC) standards?

CAEP site team reviews program level evidence presented as part of the self-study report submitted for CAEP Program Review with Feedback. The site team provides feedback on CAEP Standard 1 to the provider and to the state through formative and site reports. The review is based on guidance provided in the *CAEP Evidence Guide*. The formative feedback allows providers to improve the quality of their assessments before the site visit. All the reports are used by the Accreditation Council to understand the extent to which a

² Refer to Appendix A for a sample scoring guide, assessment, and data chart.

- ³ States have the option to specify questions as part of the CAEP-state partnership that EPPs must address to meet state-defined standards and expectations by specialty licensure areas

program meets CAEP Standard 1 (or A.1). The feedback may be used by the state to understand the extent to which the program meets state specific expectations.

F. Site Visit Team’s Review of Evidence on Self-Study Report for CAEP Program Review with Feedback

The examination of evidence would be completed in an off-site review conducted before the site visit. Depending on the licensure area evidence submitted by the provider, there would be up to three teams or panels to review the documentation. The licensure areas would be clustered, with review teams drawn from experts representing the disciplines in that cluster, into no more than three areas: secondary content (e.g., English, math, science, social studies), cross-age areas (e.g., early childhood, special education, elementary, middle level) and/or school professionals (e.g. technology specialists, administrators, school librarians, school psychologists). CAEP preparation for reviewers would include rigorous and specialized training in the evaluation of the quality of evidence presented through data collected from application of instruments as aligned to InTASC or state specified standards, as applicable. Reviewers would determine if assessments were adequate to demonstrate candidate mastery of the standards, and if the evidence demonstrated that the preponderance of candidates performed at an acceptable level on the assessments.

The *CAEP Accreditation Handbook* defines the principal role of the site team as follows: to “investigate the quality of the provider’s evidence, including its accuracy and its consistency or inconsistency with the provider’s claims.” The team analyzes the strength of the evidence “in demonstrating satisfaction of the CAEP Standards and (2) the description of particular strengths or deficiencies.” The investigating site team does not determine that individual CAEP Standards are met. Instead, the team evaluates the completeness, quality, and strength of evidence for each standard overall.

- Site team reviews each of the assessments, scoring guides, and data charts based on guidelines found in the *CAEP Evidence Guide* and, based on this evaluation, provide feedback to the EPP, the state, and Accreditation Council
- Based on CAEP Standard 5, Component 5.2, reviewers supply feedback on how well the data provide evidence for and are aligned with CAEP Standard (1 or A.1) and InTASC Standards (or state-identified standards)
- Reviewers provide feedback on how much evidence is provided for each content/licensure area
- Reviewers provide feedback on the quality of the EPP’s responses to the questions for each submitted assessment
- Reviewers respond to the following questions for programs reviewed selecting the CAEP Program Review with Feedback option:
 - Based on the analysis of the disaggregated data, how have the results of licensure area or SPA evidence been used to inform decision-making and improve instruction and candidate learning outcomes?
 - Based on the analysis of licensure area data, how have individual licensure areas used data as the basis for change?
 - How does the licensure area data align with and provide evidence for meeting the state-selected standards?

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

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

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.

Student Teacher Evaluations by Licensure Concentration for 2013-2014, 2014-2015, and 2015-2016

Licensure Concentration		Early Childhood	Middle Level	All AYA	Language Arts	Math	Science	Social Studies	Combined Total
Number of Candidates (N*)		37	25	18	6	1	5	6	80
2013-2014	M**	4.11	3.48	4.39	4.33	3.00	4.80	4.33	3.98
	SD***	0.46	0.59	0.85	0.82	Na	0.45	1.03	0.59
2014-2015	M	3.86	3.64	4.67	4.83	3.00	4.60	4.83	3.98
	SD	0.54	0.70	0.59	0.41	Na	0.55	0.41	0.60
2015-2016	M	3.89	3.92	4.33	4.67	3.00	4.40	4.17	4.05
	SD	0.61	0.70	0.69	0.52	Na	0.55	0.75	0.67

*N= Number of candidates

**M= Mean

***SD= Standard deviation

APPENDIX B: Alignment of InTASC Principles with CAEP Standard 1

InTASC Principles	CAEP Standard 1
<p>Principle A: The Learner and Learning</p> <p>Component/Standard #1: Learner Development. The candidate understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.</p> <p>Component/Standard #2: Learning Differences. The candidate uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that allow each learner to meet high standards.</p> <p>Component/Standard #3: Learning Environments. The candidate works with learners to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.</p>	<p>The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.</p>
<p>Principle B: Content</p> <p>Component/Standard #4: Content Knowledge. The candidate understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.</p> <p>Component/Standard #5: Application of Content. The candidate understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to</p>	<p>The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.</p>

<p>engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.</p>	
<p>Principle C: Instructional Practice</p> <p>Component/Standard #6: Assessment. The candidate understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher’s and learner’s decision making.</p> <p>Component/Standard #7: Planning for Instruction. The candidate plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.</p> <p>Component/Standard #8: Instructional Strategies. The candidate understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.</p>	<p>The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.</p>
<p>Principle D: Professional Responsibility</p> <p>Component/Standard #9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice. The candidate engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, and other professionals in the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner.</p> <p>Component/Standard #10: Leadership and Collaboration. The candidate seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth, and to advance the profession.</p>	<p>The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.</p>