2D

Information/*Action*

Professional Services Committee

Discussion of the Agreement with the *Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation* (CAEP)

Executive Summary: This agenda item presents information about the agreement that California is developing with CAEP to govern joint accreditation activities.

Policy Question: Does the Commission have any direction to the COA and staff as the CAEP Partnership Agreement is finalized?

Recommended Action: That the Commission discuss the issues surfaced in this agenda item and direct staff regarding appropriate next steps.

Presenter: Cheryl Hickey, Administrator, and Teri Clark, Director, Professional Services Division

Strategic Plan Goal

II. Program Quality and Accountability

- Develop and maintain rigorous, meaningful, and relevant standards that drive program quality and effectiveness for the preparation of the education workforce and are responsive to the needs of California's diverse student population.

Discussion of the Agreement with the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)

Introduction

This agenda item presents information about the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) and the agreement that California is developing to govern accreditation activities when an institution has elected to seek both accreditation by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing and CAEP.

Background

Education Code §44374(f) allows an institution to seek national accreditation and if the national accreditor and the institution meet the criteria established by the Committee on Accreditation (COA), the work toward national accreditation may substitute for accreditation by the Commission. The Commission has a long history of working in partnership with national accrediting bodies to allow those institutions who voluntarily seek national accreditation in addition to state accreditation to do so in a streamlined and coherent fashion. Partnership agreements clarify common expectations regarding processes and procedures to accomplish the objectives of both the Commission and the national accrediting bodies. Unlike some states, National accreditation is not required for operation of educator preparation programs in California. Accreditation by the Commission's Committee on Accreditation is both necessary and sufficient for operation in California.

The first national accreditor that the Commission established a relationship with was the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). For over twenty years institutions have been able to plan for a single joint accreditation visit in which both NCATE and the CTC's accreditation requirements are demonstrated. Beginning in 2010, the Commission entered into an agreement with Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC), the second nationally recognized accreditor of educator preparation programs. Only one California institution has earned accreditation by TEAC, Chapman University, and the TEAC site visit for Chapman University was conducted at the same time as the Commission's accreditation site visit. Although there are over 250 entities (colleges, universities, school districts, county offices of education and other entities) approved to sponsor educator preparation programs in California, fewer than 100 sponsors offer initial teacher or leader preparation. Currently 28 California institutions are jointly accredited by the Commission and CAEP. Three additional institutions are candidates for CAEP accreditation. The institutions that are accredited by CAEP or are a candidate for CAEP accreditation prepared 66% of all educators recommended for credentials in 2012-13 (Appendix A).

The existence of two national accrediting bodies for educator preparation was viewed by many in the field of education to be confusing to the field and to the public. Some states required

NCATE, others required TEAC, and still others required neither. While both entities examine quality, the overall approach and processes used were quite different. The need for a single body that accredits educator preparation in the nation was seen as essential by the national accreditors and others to allow a single voice to speak about the quality of educator preparation programs. Significant activities began in Fall 2010 to unify the two federally approved accrediting bodies for educator preparation, TEAC and NCATE, into a single accreditor. As of July 1, 2013 the unification of TEAC and NCATE officially took place and the one national accrediting organization for educator preparation is now CAEP.

One of the first major activities of the unification of the two entities was to develop and adopt new CAEP standards. The initial set of CAEP Standards was adopted by the CAEP Board of Directors in August 2013 (http://caepnet.files.wordpress.com/2013/09/final_board_approved1.pdf). In addition, the new CAEP board has adopted an implementation timeline for transitioning accreditation activities from the NCATE or TEAC model of accreditation to the CAEP model. For the 2014-15 academic year, an institution may elect to seek national accreditation and focus on the prior NCATE or TEAC standards, or may choose to be reviewed under the new CAEP standards. (All California institutions with a joint site visit in 2014-15 are being reviewed under the NCATE standards). Beginning in the 2015-16 year all institutions seeking national accreditation will need to meet the CAEP Standards. Staff is monitoring the progress being made in developing the CAEP accreditation processes.

Development of Initial CAEP Agreement

California's NCATE Protocol expires at the end of December 2014. CAEP is working with states to develop agreements that will guide the manner in which joint accreditation activities in each state will be conducted. To allow an agreement between California and CAEP to be approved by both the Committee on Accreditation (COA) and the CAEP Board, the agreement must be completed by the end of Summer 2014. CAEP has provided each state with boiler plate language for use in the development of the state agreement. The COA had initial conversations about the CAEP Agreement in April 2014 and will be discussing this topic again at its meeting in June and August 2014. The Agreement with CAEP will address both the processes and procedures of accreditation and what, if any, additional information California institutions will need to provide to fully address the Commission's standards.

Stakeholder Meeting on Joint CAEP-CTC Accreditation

On May 30, 2014 staff held a meeting for interested stakeholders to discuss the development of the initial CAEP Partnership Agreement. Approximately 50 individuals participated in the discussion and 26 out of California's 28 CAEP accredited institutions were represented as well as institutions that are candidates for CAEP accreditation and other institutions that may be considering CAEP accreditation. The discussions were rich and the group reached consensus on a number of issues discussed in this agenda item.

Analysis of CAEP Standards against the Commission's Standards

The Commission adopts standards for educator preparation in California based on Education Code §44372(b). The COA is authorized by Education Code §44373(c)(3) to make judgments about the comparability of Commission adopted and national standards.

In the partnership agreement with NCATE, the NCATE Unit standards were determined by the COA to be very closely aligned to the Commission's Common Standards. In fact, if an institution was found to be meeting the NCATE Unit standards, there were only 4 sentences from the Commission's Common Standards that the institution had to address in addition to the NCATE standards to satisfy California's requirements. These sentences are provided below:

Commission Common Standard 1: Educational Leadership

1.5 The Education Unit implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.

Commission Common Standard 6: Advice and Assistance

6.1 Qualified members of the unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, professional and personal development, and to assist each candidate's professional placement.

6.2 Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of all program requirements.

6.3 The institution and/or unit provide support and assistance to candidates and only retains candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession.

The adoption of the new CAEP standards now makes the current alignment outdated after 2014-15. CAEP Standards are comprised of the following five standards:

Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge
Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice
Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity
Standard 4: Program Impact
Standard 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

One of the major objectives identified by the CAEP Standards board was to develop national accreditation standards for educator preparation providers that were higher and leaner than the prior NCATE standards. In addition, the CAEP board expressed its intent to focus more on outcomes than inputs, ensure a strong clinical component in all programs, and place an emphasis on P-12 student learning data.

The COA has discussed the CAEP Standards at a number of COA meetings and begun the process to examine the alignment of the CAEP Standards with the Commission's Common Standards—see draft alignment matrix provided in Appendix B. The **bold underlined** text in the alignment matrix indicates concepts in the set of standards that are not found in the other set of Standards. There are concepts in the Common Standards that are not in the CAEP Standards as well as concepts in the CAEP Standards that are not in the Common Standards.

As Appendix B illustrates, the CAEP Standards are not as closely aligned with the Commission's Common Standards as the NCATE Standards were found to be. Staff is aware that the Commission may want to revise the Common Standards and has been waiting to finalize the CAEP-CTC Alignment Matrix until it was clear what direction the Commission might move regarding its Common Standards.

During the May 30, 2014 meeting, stakeholders analyzed the commonalities and differences between the Commission's Common Standards and the CAEP Standards. The CAEP Standards include a focus on P-12 student learning that the Commission's current standards do not. Stakeholders admit that they are challenged by the CAEP requirement to focus on P-12 student learning and program impact but also point out that it is important for the Commission to consider increasing its focus on P-12 student learning and asking institutions to provide information demonstrating that their programs are having an impact. Further, the Commission's Common Standards focus on a number of inputs, such as Resources and Educational Leadership at the institution, whereas the CAEP Standards focus on program outcomes rather than inputs.

In addition, the CAEP Standards require institutions to collect data that the Commission does not currently require. Many California institutions have expressed concerns about specific components of the CAEP standards. The CAEP standards where the most concerns have been expressed are Standard 3.2 related to Admission and Standard 4 related to Program Impact presented below:

Admission Standards Indicate That Candidates Have High Academic Achievement and Ability
3.2 The provider sets admissions requirements, including CAEP minimum criteria or the state's minimum criteria, whichever are higher, and gathers data to monitor applicants and the selected pool of candidates. The provider ensures that the average grade point average of its accepted cohort of candidates meets or exceeds the CAEP minimum of 3.0, and the group average performance on nationally normed ability/achievement assessments such as ACT, SAT, or GRE:

- is in the top 50 percent from 2016-2017;
- is in the top 40 percent of the distribution from 2018-2019; and
- is in the top 33 percent of the distribution by 2020.

If any state can meet the CAEP standards, as specified above, by demonstrating a correspondence in scores between the state-normed assessments and nationally normed ability/achievement assessments, then educator preparation providers from that state will be able to utilize their state assessments until 2020. CAEP will work with states through this transition.

Over time, a program may develop a reliable, valid model that uses admissions criteria other than those stated in this standard. In this case, the admitted cohort group mean on these criteria must meet or exceed the standard that has been shown to positively correlate with measures of P-12 student learning and development.

The provider demonstrates that the standard for high academic achievement and ability is met through multiple evaluations and sources of evidence. The provider reports the mean and standard deviation for the group.

Standard 4: Program Impact
The provider demonstrates the impact of its completers on P-12 student learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools, and the satisfaction of its completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.

Impact on P-12 Student Learning and Development
4.1 The provider documents, using multiple measures, that program completers contribute to an expected level of student-learning growth. Multiple measures shall include all available growth measures (including value-added measures, student-growth percentiles, and student learning and development objectives) required by the state for its teachers and available to educator preparation providers, other state-supported P-12 impact measures, and any other measures employed by the provider.

Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness
4.2 The provider demonstrates, through structured and validated observation instruments and student surveys, that completers effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve.

Satisfaction of Employers
4.3 The provider demonstrates, using measures that result in valid and reliable data and including employment milestones such as promotion and retention, that employers are satisfied with the completers' preparation for their assigned responsibilities in working with P-12 students.

Satisfaction of Completers
4.4 The provider demonstrates, using measures that result in valid and reliable data, that program completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job, and that the preparation was effective.

Addressing CAEP Standards 3 and 4
Stakeholders have identified particular challenges for California institutions in addressing CAEP Standards 3 and 4. Standard 3 includes measurements used prior to admission to the bachelor's degree yet the vast majority of educator preparation programs in California are offered as post baccalaureate programs. CAEP's Standard 4 aligns with efforts in those states where statewide data systems and value added measures (VAM) are being used and data is available to the educator preparation programs on P-12 student learning. California does not have such a statewide data system and there is no plan for such a data system at this time. Staff is working with California's CAEP accredited institutions as well as consulting with staff at CAEP to understand the requirements of these two standards and how California institutions will be able to gather data that addresses the components of these standards.

Accreditation Processes

Three pathways to CAEP accreditation

CAEP has identified three approaches through which an *institution* may demonstrate that it meets the CAEP Standards. Two of these approaches are closely aligned with former NCATE accreditation activities while the third approach is very closely aligned with TEAC's accreditation model. The CAEP policies require that each educator preparation provider (EPP) select one of CAEP's three approaches to accreditation. The CAEP Policy Manual (http://caepnet.files.wordpress.com/2014/02/caep_policy_manual.pdf) describes the three accreditation processes as follows:

1. **A continuous improvement (CI)** self-study in which evidence provided by the EPP shows that all CAEP standards are met and that the EPP is moving significantly toward target levels in one or more standards that indicate that the candidates' professional competence will be improved;
2. **An inquiry brief (IB**) self-study in which the EPP presents evidence of candidates' professional competence and its own capacity for program quality that satisfy CAEP standards; and
3. **A transformation initiative (TI)** self-study in which, in addition to meeting all CAEP standards, the EPP reports the results of a reform effort it has undertaken that will contribute to the research-base of educator preparation and can ultimately be linked to the candidates' improved professional competence.

No matter which approach to accreditation an institution selects, the institution is responsible to demonstrate that it is meeting CAEP standards. Most institutions will participate in CAEP's Continuous Improvement accreditation process where a self-study is due to CAEP a minimum of 8 months prior to the site visit. The self-study, along with supporting data, is reviewed by the team members during an Off-Site Review meeting. A Formative Feedback Report developed during the Off-Site Review is returned to the institution. The institution then develops a Self-Study addendum that addresses the feedback received. The Self-Study addendum must be provided to the team a minimum of 60 days prior to the on-site visit.

Program Review

Both National and State Accreditation focus on the institution as a whole, including all of the educator preparation programs that institution offers. The CAEP standards and the CTC Common Standards address institutional issues, but do not focus specifically on programmatic issues and requirements. The Commission adopts program standards that define expectations for the preparation in each credential area offered in the state. CAEP accreditation relies on one of three approaches through which specific educator preparation *programs* may be reviewed. Each state partnership agreement must indicate which of the CAEP Program Review options will be accepted in the state (http://caepnet.files.wordpress.com/2014/02/caep_policy_manual.pdf, page 26). The following summarizes each program review option accepted by CAEP:

1. **Program Review with National Recognition**: An EPP's specialty areas submit program reports responding to standards defined by the specialized professional association

(SPA). These program reports are reviewed by the appropriate SPA, which provides a report on its findings and determines its national recognition of programs.

2. **Program Review with Feedback**: An EPP's specialty areas are reviewed in three clusters against standards selected by a state or relevant government agency for international EPPs. The three clusters will be (1) cross-grade programs such as elementary education and special education; (2) secondary programs such as mathematics education and English language arts education; and (3) other school professionals such as school psychologists and principals. 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.
3. **State Program Review:** An EPP's specialty areas are reviewed by the state or relevant government agency for international EPPs. State or country reviews of programs are available to the EPP and CAEP site visitors.

California has historically required that California educator preparation programs participate in the Commission's program review (Biennial Reports and Program Assessment) processes (Option #3). This is the only option that ensures that educator preparation programs are aligned with Commission adopted standards. For that reason, the COA, staff, and stakeholders recommend that all Commission-approved educator preparation programs be required to participate in the Commission's program review process be maintained as the initial CAEP Agreement is developed. This is the current Commission policy.

If an educator preparation program is nationally accredited by a Specialized Professional Association (SPA) such as the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP), the COA has adopted alignment matrices so that the program does not need to complete work for California that it has already completed for the national accreditor. Information on national accreditation and alignment matrices can be found on this web page: http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/accred-alignment.html. A program that successfully completes the SPA/CAEP review will earn National Recognition from the SPA and CAEP.

The participants at the May 30, 2014 stakeholder meeting concurred that requiring all Commission-approved educator preparation programs to participate in the Commission's Biennial Report and Program Assessment process for program review is appropriate. The group discussed how a program that has earned national recognition by one of the Specialized Professional Associations could be able to complete the Commission's Program Assessment process by using the work already completed for the SPA as well as any additional California-focused work required by the Commission.

Summarization of the Stakeholder meeting: Commission agreements with national accreditors have always defined how the site visit will be conducted. The goal is to reduce work for the institution, coordinate the work of the Commission's site visitors with the national site visitors, and produce a report that meets the requirements of both the Commission and the national accreditor, to the extent possible. From experience, specific topics have been identified that need

to be clearly agreed upon to support the work of the site visit team. A listing and brief description of these topics is provided here for the Commission's information:

- *Nature of the visit:* Site visits at an institution seeking national accreditation can be organized as joint activities (national and state teams working together) or as concurrent visits (national and state teams conducting reviews at the same time but not working in concert). Over the years, the work with NCATE had evolved to be a true joint site visit. The team members worked together, shared information and data across the state and national members of the team, and all team members had responsibility for the team's decision making. Staff suggests that working to develop a true joint visit would be the most effective way to work with CAEP and reduce duplication of work for institutions. *Participants at the May 30 stakeholder meeting agreed that a joint visit should be standard for California institutions seeking accreditation from both the Commission and CAEP.*

- *Team Members:* The agreement between the state and the national accreditor has always defined the composition of the team. The current NCATE agreement provides that two California team members, who have completed the state's training regarding serving on site visit teams, serve as part of the joint site visit team. In addition, the Commission assigns individuals to serve on the team as program reviewers. Staff suggests that the Commission should continue to place two California team members on the joint team focusing on the CAEP Standards as well as place the appropriate number and type of program review team members on the team. *Participants at the May 30 stakeholder meeting agreed that it is important to have two California team members on each CAEP visit in California. This will be in addition to the California team members who are completing the program review process during the site visit.*

- *Co-Chairs:* Historically, the joint teams under NCATE have been led by two Co-Chairs – one appointed by the national accrediting body and one appointed by the Commission. Together these two individuals ensure that the two teams work in a coherent and collaborative process. The agreement with CAEP needs to specify if there is a California Co-Chair who will work in tandem with the CAEP Chair. Staff suggests that a California Co-Chair be assigned to each joint site visit team. *Participants at the May 30 stakeholder meeting agreed that a California Co-Chair should be placed on the site visit team for all California's joint CAEP-CTC site visits. The California Co-Chair will not be a primary author on any of the CAEP Standards but will be a part of the Off-Site Visit and review the Off-Site Report.*

- *Written Accreditation Report:* The national accreditor has a process that the CAEP report from the site visit must complete. The CAEP process includes time for factual corrections by the institution, review by the team and CAEP staff, followed by time for a rejoinder from the institution with a review by the team and CAEP staff. The finalized report from the site visit is presented to the appropriate CAEP board in fall for visits conducted in the prior spring or in the spring for visits conducted in the prior fall.

  The California report from an accreditation site visit is usually presented to the Committee on Accreditation at the next regularly scheduled COA meeting, usually 4-8

weeks after the site visit. The current NCATE agreement specifies that when the site visit concludes, the NCATE portion of the report is provided to the institution and the state. This report serves as the report on the Common Standards and is joined by the program specific reports to make the full report from the site visit. Staff suggests it be required that each institution receive information on the standard findings and any areas for improvement that have been identified and that if possible, the draft of the CAEP report should be provided to the institution and the state at the conclusion of the joint site visit. *Participants at the May 30 stakeholder meeting believe that the focus at the site visit should be on deliberations and coming to sound findings and if necessary, instead of a full report being provided to the institution at the conclusion of the site visit, a statement of the findings and areas for improvement would be acceptable. The state team would provide, at minimum the findings on the standards and rational for any standard less than full met as well as any stipulations being recommended by the team. Timelines and procedures for completing the final report are still to be developed.*

- *Observers at the visit:* The CAEP process, like the prior NCATE process, allows for observers to attend the site visit. According to NCATE the observer is usually a P-12 practitioner from within the state or an individual from outside the state who recently completed the training to be a site visit team member. The observer participates in all team meetings, interviews, and assists in collecting data but does not participate in the decision making.

  In the NCATE Protocol, language was included that specified that all observers had to understand and agree to the Team Member Code of Ethics and not have a conflict of interest, such as geographic proximity. Staff recommends that similar language be included in the CAEP Agreement regarding observers serving on joint site visit teams. *Participants at the May 30 stakeholder meeting agreed that language should be included in the CAEP Partnership Agreement defining the criteria and expectations for observers on joint CAEP-CTC site visits.*

Questions for Commission Discussion

1. Does the Commission agree with the recommendations listed above related to the conduct of joint visits?
2. Does the Commission wish to provide direction to the COA and staff related to any of the other issues identified in this agenda item?

Next Steps

Based on discussion at the June Commission staff will prepare an agenda insert for the COA. The Committee on Accreditation (COA) meets the last week in June 2014 and will discuss the CAEP Agreement at its meeting.

In addition, participants at the May 30, 2014 meeting requested that periodic meetings be held with California's CAEP accredited institutions, and other interested stakeholders in the future to discuss issued raised by the new CAEP process and requirements. The next meeting is planned for Fall 2014 after the CAEP Conference is held in October 2014.

Appendix A

California Institutions Accredited by CAEP and Candidates for CAEP Accreditation

Institution	2012-13 Completers	Type*	California Cohort	Next Site Visit
Accredited by CAEP				
Azusa Pacific University	1,047	CI	Indigo	Spring 2015
California Lutheran University	164	CI	Green	Fall 2016
California Polytechnic State San Luis Obispo	200	CI	Orange	Spring 2019
Chapman University	160	IB	Orange	Spring 2019
CSU Channel Islands	76	CI	Green	Spring 2016
CSU Chico	341	CI	Indigo	Spring 2015
CSU East Bay	464	CI	Green	Spring 2017
CSU San Marcos	419	CI	Indigo	Spring 2015
CSU Bakersfield	392	CI	Indigo	Fall 2014
CSU Dominguez Hills	634	CI	Red	Spring 2020
CSU Fresno	823	CI	Violet	Spring 2014
CSU Fullerton	922	CI	Blue	Fall 2015
CSU Long Beach	988	CI	Indigo	Spring 2015
CSU Los Angeles	691	CI	Red	Fall 2019
CSU Monterey Bay	168	TI**	Violet	Spring 2014
CSU Northridge	915	CI	Yellow	Fall 2017
CSU San Bernardino	506	CI	Green	Spring 2017
CSU Stanislaus	340	CI	Yellow	Spring 2018
Loyola Marymount University	881	CI	Yellow	Spring 2018
Point Loma Nazarene University	558	CI	Red	Spring 2020
San Diego State University	654	CI	Yellow	Spring 2017
San Jose State University	622	CI	Orange	Spring 2019
Sonoma State University	323	CI	Red	Spring 2020
Stanford University	115	CI	Blue	Spring 2016
University of LaVerne	315	CI	Orange	Spring 2019
University of San Diego	112	TI	Red	Fall 2019
University of Southern California	322	CI	Violet	Fall 2020
University of the Pacific	182	CI	Orange	Spring 2019
Total 2012-13 Completers	**13,334**	**51% of all 12-13 Recommendations**		

Candidate for CAEP Accreditation

National University	2,670	CI	Violet	Spring 2014
Brandman University	1,215	CI	Indigo	Spring 2015
Argosy University	15	CI	Indigo	Spring 2015
Total 2012-13 Completers	**3,900**	**15% of all 12-13 Recommendations**		

*** CI – Continuous Improvement** **TI Transformation Initiative** **IB – Inquiry Brief**

**** TI withdrawn and moving toward CI**

Appendix B: CTC Common Standards-CAEP Standards Alignment Matrix

Commission's Common Standards (2009)	CAEP Standards (2013)
1: Educational Leadership **<u>The institution and education unit create and articulate a research-based vision for educator preparation that is responsive to California's adopted standards and curriculum frameworks.</u>** **<u>The vision provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance and experiences, scholarship, service, collaboration, and unit accountability.</u>** The faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders are actively involved in the organization, coordination, and governance of all professional preparation programs. **<u>Unit leadership has the authority and institutional support needed to create effective strategies to achieve the needs of all programs and represents the interests of each program within the institution.</u>** The education unit implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.	**Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement** **5.5.** The provider assures that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider, are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence. **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 **<u>positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development</u>**.

Appendix B: CTC Common Standards-CAEP Standards Alignment Matrix

Common Standards (2009)	CAEP Standards (2013)
2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation The education unit implements an assessment and evaluation system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement. The system collects, analyzes, and utilizes data on candidate and program completer performance and unit operations. Assessment in all programs includes ongoing and comprehensive data collection related to candidate qualifications, proficiencies, and competence, as well as program effectiveness, and is used for improvement purposes.	**5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement** *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.* **Quality and Strategic Evaluation** 5.1 The provider's quality assurance system is comprised of multiple measures that can monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness. Evidence demonstrates that the provider satisfies all CAEP standards. 5.2 The provider's quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable measures, and produces **empirical evidence that interpretations of data are valid and consistent**. **Continuous Improvement** 5.3. The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the **effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion,** and uses results to improve program elements and processes. 5.4. Measures of completer impact, including available outcome data on **P-12 student growth**, are summarized, **externally benchmarked,** analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision-making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction. 5.5. The provider assures that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider, are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence.

Appendix B: CTC Common Standards-CAEP Standards Alignment Matrix

Commission's Common Standards (2009)	CAEP Standards (2013)
3: Resources **The institution provides the unit with the necessary budget, qualified personnel, adequate facilities and other resources to prepare candidates effectively to meet the state-adopted standards for educator preparation.** **Sufficient resources are consistently allocated for effective operation of each credential or certificate program for coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum and professional development, instruction, field-based supervision and/or clinical experiences, and assessment management.** **Sufficient information resources and related personnel are available to meet program and candidate needs.** **A process that is inclusive of all programs is in place to determine resource needs.**	CAEP Standards do not address resource issues or inputs

Appendix B: CTC Common Standards-CAEP Standards Alignment Matrix

Commission's Common Standards (2009)	CAEP Standards (2013)
4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel Qualified persons are employed and assigned to teach all courses, to provide professional development, and to supervise field-based and/or clinical experiences in each credential and certificate program. **Instructional personnel and faculty have current knowledge in the content they teach, understand the context of public schooling, and model best professional practices in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service. They are reflective of a diverse society and knowledgeable about diverse abilities, cultural, language, ethnic and gender diversity. They have a thorough grasp of the academic standards, frameworks, and accountability systems that drive the curriculum of public schools. They collaborate regularly and systematically with colleagues in P-12 settings/college/university units and members of the broader, professional community to improve teaching, candidate learning, and educator preparation.** The institution provides support for faculty development. The unit regularly evaluates the performance of course instructors and field supervisors, recognizes excellence, and retains only those who are consistently effective.	**Clinical Educators** 2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators, both provider- and school-based, who demonstrate a **positive impact on candidates' development** and **P-12 student learning and development**. In collaboration with their partners, providers use multiple indicators and appropriate technology-based applications to establish, maintain, and refine criteria for selection, professional development, performance evaluation, continuous improvement, and retention of clinical educators in all clinical placement settings.

Appendix B: CTC Common Standards-CAEP Standards Alignment Matrix

Common Standards	CAEP Standards (2013)
5: Admission In each professional preparation program, applicants are admitted on the basis of well-defined admission criteria and procedures, including all Commission-adopted requirements. Multiple measures are used in an admission process that encourages and supports applicants from diverse populations. The unit determines that admitted candidates have appropriate **pre-professional experiences and personal characteristics, including sensitivity to California's diverse population, effective communication skills,** basic academic skills, and prior experiences that suggest a strong potential for professional effectiveness.	**3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity** *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.* **Plan for Recruitment of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs** 2.1 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.** **Admission Standards Indicate That Candidates Have High Academic Achievement And Ability** 3.2 The provider sets admissions requirements, **including CAEP minimum criteria or the state's minimum criteria, whichever are higher, and gathers data to monitor applicants and the selected pool of candidates. The provider ensures that the average grade point average of its accepted cohort of candidates meets or exceeds the CAEP minimum of 3.0, and the group average performance on nationally normed ability/achievement assessments such as ACT, SAT, or GRE:** • **is in the top 50 percent from 2016-2017;** • **is in the top 40 percent of the distribution from 2018-2019; and** • **is in the top 33 percent of the distribution by 2020.** **If any state can meet the CAEP standards, as specified above, by demonstrating a correspondence in scores between the state-normed assessments and nationally normed ability/achievement assessments, then educator preparation providers from that state will be able to utilize their state assessments until 2020. CAEP will work with states through this transition.** **Over time, a program may develop a reliable, valid model that uses admissions criteria other than those stated in this standard. In this case, the admitted cohort group mean on these criteria must meet or exceed the standard that has been shown to positively correlate with measures of P-12 student learning and development.** The provider demonstrates that the standard for high academic achievement and ability is met through multiple evaluations and sources of evidence. **The provider reports the mean and standard deviation for the group.** **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.

Appendix B: CTC Common Standards-CAEP Standards Alignment Matrix

Commission's Common Standards (2009)	CAEP Standards (2013)
6: Advice and Assistance Qualified members of the unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, professional and personal development. Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of all program requirements. The institution and/or unit provide support and assistance to candidates and only retains candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession. Evidence regarding candidate progress and performance is consistently utilized to guide advisement and assistance efforts.	**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.

Appendix B: CTC Common Standards-CAEP Standards Alignment Matrix

Commission's Common Standards (2009)	CAEP Standards (2013)
7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice The unit and its partners design, implement, and regularly evaluate a planned sequence of field-based and clinical experiences in order for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support all students effectively so that P-12 students meet state-adopted academic standards. For each credential and certificate program, the unit collaborates with its partners regarding the criteria for selection of school sites, effective clinical personnel, and site-based supervising personnel. Field-based work and/or clinical experiences provide candidates opportunities to understand and address issues of diversity that affect school climate, teaching, and learning, and to help candidates develop research-based strategies for improving student learning.	**2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice** *The provider ensures that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to demonstrate positive impact on all P-12 students' learning and development.* **Partnerships for Clinical Preparation** 2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements, including technology-based collaborations, for clinical preparation and share responsibility for continuous improvement of candidate preparation. Partnerships for clinical preparation can follow a range of forms, participants, and functions. They establish mutually agreeable expectations for candidate entry, preparation, and exit; ensure that theory and practice are linked; maintain coherence across clinical and academic components of preparation; and share accountability for candidate outcomes. **Clinical Educators** 2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators, both provider- and school-based, **who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates' development and P-12 student learning and development**. In collaboration with their partners, providers use multiple indicators and appropriate technology-based applications to establish, maintain, and refine criteria for selection, professional development, performance evaluation, continuous improvement, and retention of clinical educators in all clinical placement settings. **Clinical Experiences** 2.3 The provider works with partners to design clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration to ensure that candidates demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students' learning and development. Clinical experiences, including technology-enhanced learning opportunities, are structured to have multiple performance-based assessments at key points within the program to demonstrate candidates' development of the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, as delineated in Standard 1, that are associated with **a positive impact on the learning and development of all P-12 students**.

Appendix B: CTC Common Standards-CAEP Standards Alignment Matrix

Commission's Common Standards (2009)	CAEP Standards (2013)
8: District-Employed Supervisors District-employed supervisors are **certified** and experienced in either teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential. A process for selecting supervisors who are knowledgeable and supportive of the academic content standards for students is based on identified criteria. Supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and **recognized** in a systematic manner.	**Clinical Educators** 2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators, both provider- and school-based, who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates' development and P-12 student learning and development. In collaboration with their partners, providers use multiple indicators and appropriate technology-based applications to establish, maintain, and refine criteria for selection, professional development, performance evaluation, continuous improvement, and retention of clinical educators in all clinical placement settings.

Appendix B: CTC Common Standards-CAEP Standards Alignment Matrix

Common Standards (2009)	CAEP Standards (2013)
9: Assessment of Candidate Competence Candidates preparing to serve as professional school personnel know and demonstrate the professional knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting the state-adopted academic standards. Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission-adopted competency requirements, as specified in the program standards.	**1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge** *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.* **Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions** 1.1 Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the 10 InTASC standards at the appropriate progression level(s) in the following categories: the learner and learning; content; instructional practice; and professional responsibility. **Provider Responsibilities** 1.2 Providers ensure that **completers use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession and use both to measure their P-12 students' progress and their own professional practice.** 1.3 Providers ensure that completers 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). 1.4 Providers ensure that completers demonstrate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college- and career-ready standards (e.g., Next Generation Science Standards, National Career Readiness Certificate, Common Core State Standards). 1.5 Providers ensure that completers model and apply technology standards as they design, implement and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning; and enrich professional practice. **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.** 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.

Appendix B: CTC Common Standards-CAEP Standards Alignment Matrix

Common Standards (2009)	CAEP Standards (2013)
Not currently required by the Commission's Common Standards	**Standard 4: PROGRAM IMPACT** *The provider demonstrates the* ***impact of its completers on P-12 student learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools, and the satisfaction of its completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.*** **Impact on P-12 Student Learning and Development** 4.1 The provider documents, using multiple measures, that **program completers contribute to an expected level of student-learning growth.** Multiple measures shall include all available growth measures (including value-added measures, student-growth percentiles, and student learning and development objectives) required by the state for its teachers and available to educator preparation providers, other state-supported P-12 impact measures, and any other measures employed by the provider. **Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness** 4.2 **The provider demonstrates, through structured and validated observation instruments and student surveys, that completers effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve.** **Satisfaction of Employers** 4.3. **The provider demonstrates, using measures that result in valid and reliable data and including employment milestones such as promotion and retention, that employers are satisfied with the completers' preparation for their assigned responsibilities in working with P-12 students.** **Satisfaction of Completers** 4.4 **The provider demonstrates, using measures that result in valid and reliable data, that program completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job, and that the preparation was effective.**