

Discussion of Crosswalk from the CAEP Standards to the Commission's Standards

February 2014

Introduction

This agenda item continues a discussion of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) Standards. Agenda items on the plans for the unification of the National Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (NCATE) and the Teacher Education Accrediting Council (TEAC) into a single accrediting body known as CAEP were presented to the COA at the June 2010 meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2010-06/2010-06-item-17.pdf>), the March 2011 meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2011-03/2011-03-item-13.pdf>) and the February 2013 meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2013-02/2013-02-item-10.pdf>). A preliminary discussion of the draft CAEP Standards began with COA at the June 2013 meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2013-06/2013-06-item-20.pdf>). At the October 2013 meeting, the CAEP Standards were presented with a draft crosswalk of the CAEP Standards to the Commission's Common Standards (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2013-10/2013-10-item-13.pdf>).

Staff Recommendation

To discuss the concepts identified in the CAEP Standards but not present in the Commission's Common Standards and to identify any concepts that the COA believes should be considered for inclusion in the Commission's standards.

Background

The need for a single body that accredits educator preparation in the nation was seen as essential to allow a single voice to speak about the quality of educator preparation programs. Significant activities began in Fall 2010 to move this process forward by unifying the two federally approved accrediting bodies for educator preparation – TEAC and NCATE into a single body known as CAEP. Staff has been monitoring the progress being made in developing the CAEP accreditation process. As of July 1, 2013 the unification of TEAC and NCATE has officially taken place and the one national accrediting organization for educator preparation is now CAEP.

CAEP Standards

The CAEP standards were adopted by the CAEP Board of Directors on August 29, 2013 (http://caepnet.files.wordpress.com/2013/09/final_board_approved1.pdf). One of the underlying principles that has been cited by James Cilbulka of CAEP is that the new standards are higher and leaner. The adopted standards are presented here:

Standard 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.

Standard 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.

Standard 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.

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.

Standard 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.

Although there are only five CAEP standards rather than the prior 6 NCATE standards, there are a number of sub-elements for each of the 5 CAEP Standards. The full text of the CAEP Standards and the sub-elements is provided in the left hand column of Appendix A. CAEP developed a complex rationale for each of the five standards. The rationales are based on a variety of research and policy documents. The rationale language for the CAEP standards is provided in Appendix B. In addition, CAEP developed a short glossary for the standards. The glossary is provided in Appendix C.

Concepts in the CAEP Standards that Might be Considered for use in California

The table found in Appendix A of this agenda item provides an initial analysis of the CAEP Standards against the Commission's Common Standards. The table identifies in a light peach highlight a number of concepts that will be required for any Educator Preparation Program (EPP) that is accredited by CAEP, but are not currently required for all California educator preparation institutions. If the COA could discuss the identified language and provide feedback as to its importance for educator preparation programs, that will assist staff in continuing discussions on reviewing and revising the Commission's Common Standards.

Next Steps

Staff will continue to monitor the development of the CAEP accreditation procedures. Staff will note the language that the COA identifies in the CAEP Standard's as having promise for use in California's educator preparation programs.

Appendix A

CAEP Standards that Exceed or Require Concepts that are not found in the Commission’s Standards

(Peach highlighted sections are not addressed by the Commission’s standards and yellow highlighted text identifies concepts in the Common Standards that do not appear in the CAEP Standards)

CAEP Standards (2013)	Commission’s Common Standards (2009)
<p>Standard 1: CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE <i>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.</i></p> <p>Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions</p> <p>1.1 Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the 10 InTASC standards at the appropriate progression level(s)² in the following categories: the learner and learning; content; instructional practice; and professional responsibility.</p> <p>Provider Responsibilities</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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).</p>	<p>Standard 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.</p>

CAEP Standards (2013)	Commission's Common Standards (2009)
<p>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).</p> <p>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.</p>	

CAEP Standards (2013)	Commission’s Common Standards (2009)
<p>Standard 2: CLINICAL PARTNERSHIPS AND PRACTICE <i>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.</i></p> <p>Partnerships for Clinical Preparation</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Clinical Educators</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Clinical Experiences</p> <p>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,</p>	<p>Standard 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.</p> <p>Standard 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.</p> <p>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.</p>

CAEP Standards (2013)	Commission's Common Standards (2009)
<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>Standard 3: CANDIDATE QUALITY, RECRUITMENT, AND SELECTIVITY <i>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.</i></p> <p>Plan for Recruitment of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Admission Standards Indicate That Candidates Have High Academic Achievement And Ability</p> <p>3.2 The provider sets admissions requirements, including CAEP minimum criteria or the state's minimum criteria, whichever are higher, and</p>	<p>Standard 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.</p> <p>Standard 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Evidence regarding candidate progress and performance is consistently utilized to guide advisement and assistance efforts.</p>

CAEP Standards (2013)	Commission’s Common Standards (2009)
<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 2020.²⁸ <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Additional Selectivity Factors</p> <p>3.3 Educator preparation providers establish and monitor attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability that candidates must demonstrate</p>	<p>Standard 1: Educational Leadership</p> <p>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. The vision provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance and experiences, scholarship, service, collaboration, and unit accountability.</p> <p>The faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders are actively involved in the organization, coordination, and governance of all professional preparation programs.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The education unit implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.</p>

CAEP Standards (2013)	Commission's Common Standards (2009)
<p>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.</p> <p>Selectivity During Preparation</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Selection At Completion</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
<p>Standard 4: PROGRAM IMPACT <i>The provider demonstrates the impact of its completers on P-12 student learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools, and the</i></p>	

CAEP Standards (2013)	Commission's Common Standards (2009)
<p><i>satisfaction of its completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.</i></p> <p>Impact on P-12 Student Learning and Development</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Satisfaction of Employers</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Satisfaction of Completers</p> <p>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.</p>	

CAEP Standards (2013)	Commission's Common Standards (2009)
<p>Standard 5: PROVIDER QUALITY ASSURANCE AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT <i>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.</i></p> <p>Quality and Strategic Evaluation</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Continuous Improvement</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>5.5. The provider assures that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others</p>	<p>Standard 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.</p>

CAEP Standards (2013)	Commission's Common Standards (2009)
defined by the provider, are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence.	
	<p>Standard 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
	<p>Standard 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.</p> <p>A process for selecting supervisors who are knowledgeable and supportive of the academic content standards for students is based on identified criteria.</p> <p>Supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.</p>

Appendix B

CAEP Rationales

Standard 1: CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE

This standard asserts the importance of a strong content background and foundation of pedagogical knowledge for all candidates. Teaching is complex and preparation must provide opportunities for candidates to acquire knowledge and skills that can move all P-12 students significantly forward—in their academic achievements, in articulating the purpose of education in their lives and in building independent competence for life-long learning. Such a background includes experiences that develop deep understanding of major concepts and principles within the candidate’s field, including college and career-ready expectations.³ Moving forward, college- and career-ready standards can be expected to include additional disciplines, underscoring the need to help students master a range of learner goals conveyed within and across disciplines. Content and pedagogical knowledge expected of candidates is articulated through the InTASC standards. These standards are:

- **Standard #1: Learner Development.** The teacher 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.
- **Standard #2: Learning Differences.** The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.
- **Standard #3: Learning Environments.** The teacher works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.
- **Standard #4: Content Knowledge.** The teacher 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.
- **Standard #5: Application of Content.** The teacher understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.
- **Standard #6: Assessment.** The teacher 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.
- **Standard #7: Planning for Instruction.** The teacher 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.
- **Standard #8: Instructional Strategies.** The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.
- **Standard #9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice.** The teacher 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, other professionals,

and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner.

- **Standard #10: Leadership and Collaboration.** The teacher seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning and development, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth, and to advance the profession.

Content knowledge describes the depth of understanding of critical concepts, theories, skills, processes, principles, and structures that connect and organize ideas within a field.⁴ Research indicates that students learn more when their teachers have a strong foundation of content knowledge⁵

[T]eachers need to understand subject matter deeply and flexibly so they can help students create useful cognitive maps, relate one idea to another, and address misconceptions. Teachers need to see how ideas connect across fields and to everyday life. This kind of understanding provides a foundation for pedagogical content knowledge that enables teachers to make ideas accessible to others.⁶

These essential links between instruction and content are especially clear in Darling-Hammond’s description of what the Common Core State Standards mean by “deeper learning”:

- An understanding of the *meaning* and *relevance* of ideas to concrete problems
- An ability to *apply* core concepts and modes of inquiry to complex real-world tasks
- A capacity to *transfer* knowledge and skills to new situations, to build on and use them
- Abilities to *communicate* ideas and to *collaborate* in problem solving
- An ongoing ability to *learn to learn*⁷

Pedagogical content knowledge in teaching includes:

core activities of teaching, such as figuring out what students know; choosing and managing representations of ideas; appraising, selecting and modifying textbooks; . . . deciding among alternative courses of action and analyze(ing) the subject matter knowledge and insight entailed in these activities.”⁸ It is crucial to “good teaching and student understanding.”⁹

The development of pedagogical content knowledge involves a shift in teachers’ understanding from comprehension of subject matter *for themselves*, to advancing *their students’* learning through presentation of subject matter in a variety of ways that are appropriate to different situations—reorganizing and partitioning it and developing activities, metaphors, exercises, examples and demonstrations—so that it can be grasped by students.¹⁰

Understanding of pedagogical content knowledge is complemented by knowledge of learners—where teaching begins. Teachers must understand that learning and developmental patterns vary among individuals, that learners bring unique individual differences to the learning process, and that learners need supportive and safe learning environments to thrive. Teachers’ professional knowledge includes the ways in which cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical development occurs.¹¹ Neuroscience is influencing education, and future educators should be well-versed in findings from brain research, including how to facilitate learning for students with varying capacities, experiences, strengths and approaches to learning.

To be effective, teachers also must be prepared to collaborate with families to support student success.¹² When teachers understand families and communicate and build relationships with them, students benefit. Many studies confirm that strong parent–teacher relationships relate to positive student outcomes for students, such as healthy social development, high student achievement and high rates of college enrollment.¹³ Thus, by giving teachers the support they need to work with families, educator preparation providers can have an even greater impact on student learning and development.

The Commission’s development of this standard and its components was influenced especially by the InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards, the Common Core State Standards Initiative,¹⁴ and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards’ Five Core Propositions.¹⁵ Additionally the Commission used the work of the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE)¹⁶ and the Harvard Family Research Project (HFRP).¹⁷

STANDARD 3: CANDIDATE QUALITY, RECRUITMENT, AND SELECTIVITY

High-quality clinical experiences are early, ongoing and take place in a variety of school- and community-based settings, as well as through simulations and other virtual opportunities (for example, online chats with students). Candidates observe, assist, tutor, instruct and may conduct research. They may be student-teachers or interns.²³ These experiences integrate applications of theory from pedagogical courses or modules in P-12 or community settings and are aligned with the school-based curriculum (e.g., Next Generation Science Standards, college- and career-ready standards, Common Core State Standards). They offer multiple opportunities for candidates to develop, practice, demonstrate, and reflect upon clinical and academic components of preparation, as well as opportunities to develop, practice, and demonstrate evidence-based, pedagogical practices that improve student learning and development, as described in Standard 1.

The members of the 2010 Panel on clinical preparation and partnerships consulted both research resources and professional consensus reports in shaping their conclusions and recommendations, including proposed design principles for clinical experiences.²⁴ Among these are: (1) a student learning and development focus, (2) clinical practice that is integrated throughout every facet of preparation in a dynamic way, (3) continuous monitoring and judging of candidate progress on the basis of data, (4) a curriculum and experiences that permit candidates to integrate content and a broad range of effective teaching practices and to become innovators and problem solvers, and (5) an “interactive professional community” with opportunities for collaboration and peer feedback. Howey²⁵ also suggests several principles, including tightly woven education theory and classroom practice, as well as placement of candidates in cohorts. An ETS report proposed clinical preparation experiences that offer opportunities for “Actual hands-on ability and skill to use . . . types of knowledge to engage students successfully in learning and mastery.”²⁶ The report of the National Research Council (2010) concluded that clinical experiences were critically important to teacher preparation but that the research, to date, does not tell us what specific experiences or sequence of experiences are most likely to result in more effective beginning teachers.²⁷

Until the research base for clinical practices and partnerships is more definitive, “wisdom of practice” dictates that the profession move more forcefully into deepening partnerships; into clarifying and, where necessary, improving the quality of clinical educators who prepare the

field's new practitioners and into delivering field and clinical experiences that contribute to the development of effective educators.

Educator preparation providers (EPP) have a critical responsibility to ensure the quality of their candidates. This responsibility continues from purposeful recruitment that helps fulfill the provider's mission to admissions selectivity that builds an able and diverse pool of candidates, through monitoring of candidate progress and providing necessary support, to demonstrating that candidates are proficient at completion and that they are selected for employment opportunities that are available in areas served by the provider. The integration of recruitment and selectivity as EPP responsibilities to ensure quality is emphasized in a 2010 National Research Council report:

The quality of new teachers entering the field depends not only on the quality of the preparation they receive, but also on the capacity of preparation programs to attract and select academically able people who have the potential to be effective teachers. Attracting able, high-quality candidates to teaching is a critical goal.³⁰

The majority of American educators are white, middle class, and female.³¹ The makeup of the nation's teacher workforce has not kept up with changing student demographics. At the national level, students of color make up more than 40 percent of the public school population, while teachers of color are only 17 percent of the teaching force.³² The mismatch has consequences. Dee; Goldhaber, and Hansen; and Hanushek and colleagues³³ found that student achievement is positively impacted by a racial/ethnicity match between teachers and students.

While recruitment of talented minority candidates is a time- and labor-intensive process,³⁴ “teachers of color and culturally competent teachers must be actively recruited and supported.”³⁵ Recruitment can both increase the quality of selected candidates and offset potentially deleterious effects on diversity from more selective criteria—either at admissions or throughout a program.³⁶ “Successful programs recruit minority teachers with a high likelihood of being effective in the classroom” and “concentrate on finding candidates with a core set of competencies that will translate to success in the classroom.”³⁷ There is evidence that providers of alternative pathways to teaching have been more successful in attracting non-white candidates. Feistritzer reports alternative provider cohorts that are 30 percent non-white, compared with 13 percent in traditional programs.³⁸

The 2010 NCATE panel on clinical partnerships advocated attention to employment needs as a way to secure greater alignment between the teacher market and areas of teacher preparation.³⁹ The U.S. Department of Education regularly releases lists of teacher shortages by both content-area specialization and state.⁴⁰ Some states also publish supply-and-demand trends and forecasts and other information on market needs. These lists could assist EPPs in shaping their program offerings and in setting recruitment goals.

There is a broad public consensus that providers should attract and select able candidates who will become effective teachers. The 2011 Gallup Phi Delta Kappan education poll⁴¹ reported that 76 percent of the U.S. adult public agreed that “high-achieving” high school students should be recruited to become teachers. Another example is found in a 2012 AFT report on teacher preparation, recommending setting GPA requirements at 3.0, SATs at 1100 and ACT scores at

24.0 in order to “attract academically capable students with authentic commitment to work with children.”⁴²

Researchers such as Ball, Rowan, and Hill; Floden, Wayne, and Young⁴³ conclude that academic quality, especially in verbal ability and math knowledge, impacts teacher effectiveness. A study for McKinsey and Company⁴⁴ found that high-performing countries had a rigorous selection process similar to that of medical schools. Whitehurst⁴⁵ suggests that educator preparation providers should be much more selective in terms of their candidates’ cognitive abilities. When looking at the cost of teacher selection, Levin⁴⁶ found “that recruiting and retaining teachers with higher verbal scores is five-to-ten times as effective per dollar of teacher expenditure in raising achievement scores of students as the strategy of obtaining teachers with more experience.” Rockoff, Jacob, Kane, and Staiger concluded that “teachers’ cognitive and non-cognitive skills...have a moderately large and statistically significant relationship with student and teacher outcomes, particularly with student test scores.”⁴⁷

Programs do not all start at the same place in their history of recruiting an academically strong and/or diverse candidate pool. Some programs will need to set goals and move successively toward achieving them. As better performance assessments are developed and as various licensure tests are shown to be predictors of teacher performance and/or student learning and development, CAEP may be able to put more emphasis on exit criteria rather than on entrance criteria. Irrespective of changes CAEP may make, this does not reduce the program’s responsibility to recruit a diverse candidate pool that mirrors the demography of the student population served.

There is strong support from the professional community that qualities outside of academic ability are associated with teacher effectiveness. These include “grit,” the ability to work with parents, the ability to motivate, communication skills, focus, purpose, and leadership, among others. Duckworth, et al, found “that the achievement of difficult goals entails not only talent but also the sustained and focused application of talent over time.”⁴⁸ A Teach for America (TFA) study concluded that a teacher’s academic achievement, leadership experience, and perseverance are associated with student gains in math, while leadership experience and commitment to the TFA mission were associated with gains in English.⁴⁹ Danielson asserts that “teacher learning becomes more active through experimentation and inquiry, as well as through writing, dialogue, and questioning.”⁵⁰ In addition, teacher evaluations involve “observations of classroom teaching, which can engage teachers in those activities known to promote learning, namely, self-assessment, reflection on practice, and professional conversation.” These “other” attributes, dispositions and abilities lend themselves to provider innovation. Some providers might emphasize certain attributes because of the employment field or market for which they are preparing teachers.

Research has not empirically established a particular set of non-academic qualities that teachers should possess. There are numerous studies that list different characteristics, sometimes referring to similar characteristics by different labels. Furthermore, there does not seem to be a clear measure for these non-academic qualities, although a few of them have scales and other measures that have been developed. The CAEP Commission recognizes the ongoing development of this knowledge base and recommends that CAEP revise criteria as evidence

emerges. The Commission recognizes the InTASC standards' set of dispositions as a promising area of research.

Standard 4: PROGRAM IMPACT

Standards 1 through 3 address the preparation experiences of candidates, their developing knowledge and skills, and their abilities at the point of program completion. Candidate progress and provider conclusions about the readiness of completers at exit are direct outcomes of the provider's efforts. By contrast, Standard 4 addresses the results of preparation at the point where they most matter—in classrooms and schools. Educator preparation providers must attend to candidate mastery of the knowledge and skills necessary for effective teaching, but that judgment is finally dependent on the impact the completers have on-the-job with P-12 student learning and development.

The paramount goal of providers is to prepare candidates who will have a positive impact on P-12 students. Impact can be measured in many ways. Component 4.1 enumerates some of these approaches. The Commission underscores here what also is said in the Recommendations on Evidence section, below, that multiple measures are needed for these and other accreditation evidence. One approach being adopted by several states and districts is known as “value-added modeling” (VAM). A large research effort supported by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, the Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) project, provides useful guidance about the circumstances under which this model can most validly be used. These findings are consistent with those noted in *Preparing Teachers: Building Evidence for Sound Policy* (NRC, 2010): “Value-added models may provide valuable information about effective teacher preparation, but not definitive conclusions and are best considered together with other evidence from a variety of perspectives.”⁶¹

The Commission recommends that CAEP encourage research on the validity and reliability of VAM for program evaluation purposes.⁶² Because members expect that methodologies for measuring teacher impact on P-12 student learning and development will continue to evolve and hopefully improve, the Commission recommends that CAEP also make certain that its standards and processes reflect the profession's best current thinking on appropriate use of evidence for program improvement and accreditation decisions. In this regard, providers should refer to the Data Task Force, the American Psychological Association guidance on preparation measures, and the University of Wisconsin Madison Value-Added Research Center reports regarding use of multiple sources of data, including value-added data, for program evaluation.⁶³

Multiple types of surveys can serve as indicators of teaching effectiveness (Component 4.2), satisfaction of employers (Component 4.3), and satisfaction of completers (Component 4.4). Research by Ferguson, for example, shows that K-12 student surveys are a valid means for understanding aspects of teaching effectiveness.⁶⁴ The Commission recommends that CAEP consider the development of common survey items and instruments for employers and completers. CAEP also should participate in the validation of student survey instruments for use in teacher pre-service programs.

5. PROVIDER QUALITY ASSURANCE AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

Effective organizations use evidence-based quality assurance systems and data in a process of

continuous improvement. These systems and data-based continuous improvement are essential foundational requirements for effective implementation of any of the three CAEP accreditation pathways an educator preparation provider (EPP) chooses—whether it is the Inquiry Brief, Continuous Improvement, or Transformational Initiative pathway.

A robust quality assurance system ensures continuous improvement by relying on a variety of measures, establishing performance benchmarks for those measures (with reference to external standards where possible), seeking the views of all relevant stakeholders, sharing evidence widely with both internal and external audiences, and using results to improve policies and practices in consultation with partners and stakeholders.⁶⁵

The quality of an EPP is measured by the abilities of its completers to have a positive impact on P-12 student learning and development.⁶⁶ Program quality and improvement are determined, in part, by characteristics of candidates that the provider recruits to the field; the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions that candidates bring to and acquire during the program; the relationships between the provider and the P-12 schools in which candidates receive clinical training; and subsequent evidence of completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development in schools where they ultimately teach.⁶⁷ To be accredited, a preparation program must meet standards on each of these dimensions and demonstrate success in its own continuous improvement efforts.

Effective quality assurance systems function through a clearly articulated and effective process for defining and assuring quality outcomes. Reasons for the selection of each measure and the establishment of performance benchmarks for individual and program performance, including external points of comparison, are made clear. Providers show evidence of the credibility and dependability of the data that inform their quality assurance systems, as well as evidence of ongoing investigation into the quality of evidence and the validity of their interpretations of that evidence. Providers must present empirical evidence of each measure's psychometric and statistical soundness (reliability, validity, and fairness).⁶⁸

Continuous improvement systems enable programs quickly to develop and test prospective improvements, deploy what is learned throughout the organization, and add to the profession's knowledge base and repertoire of practice.⁶⁹ CAEP should encourage providers to develop new models for evaluating and scaling up effective solutions. Research and development in the accreditation framework can deepen the knowledge of existing best practices and provide models of emerging innovations to transform educator preparation.⁷⁰

Appendix C

CAEP Glossary

All P-12 students: Defined as children or youth attending P-12 schools including, but not limited to, students with disabilities or exceptionalities, students who are gifted, and students who represent diversity based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, language, religion, sexual identification, and/or geographic origin.

Candidate: In this report, the term “candidate” refers to individuals preparing for professional education positions.

Clinical Educators: All EPP- and P-12-school-based individuals, including classroom teachers, who assess, support, and develop a candidate’s knowledge, skills, or professional dispositions at some stage in the clinical experiences.

Cohort: A group of candidates admitted at the same time, e.g., a class entering in a fall semester.

Completer: A term to embrace candidates exiting from degree programs and also candidates exiting from other higher education programs or preparation programs conducted by alternative providers that may or may not offer a certificate or degree.

Group average: The GPA and standardized test scores are averaged for all members of a cohort or class of admitted candidates. Averaging does not require that every candidate meet the specified score. Thus, there may be a range of candidates’ grades and scores on standardized tests.

Note: In Standard 1, the subjects of components are “candidates.” The specific knowledge and skills described will develop over the course of the preparation program and may be assessed at any point, some near admission, others at key transitions such as entry to clinical experiences and still others near candidate exit as preparation is completed.

Partner: Organizations, businesses, community groups, agencies, schools, districts, and/or EPPs specifically involved in designing, implementing, and assessing the clinical experience.

Partnership: Mutually beneficial agreement among various partners in which all participating members engage in and contribute to goals for the preparation of education professionals. This may include examples such as pipeline initiatives, Professional Development Schools, and partner networks.

Provider: Educator preparation provider (EPP) – An inclusive term referring to the sponsoring organization for preparation, whether it is an institution of higher education, a district- or state-sponsored program, or an alternative pathway organization.

Stakeholder: Partners, organizations, businesses, community groups, agencies, schools, districts, and/or EPPs interested in candidate preparation or education.

STEM: Science, technology, engineering and mathematics

Appendix D

ANNUAL REPORTING AND CAEP MONITORING

The Commission recommends that CAEP gather the following data and monitor them annually from all providers:

Measures of Program Impact:

- **Impact on P-12 learning and development** (data provided for component 4.1)
- **Indicators of teaching effectiveness** (data provided for component 4.3)
- **Results of employer surveys, including retention and employment milestones** (data provided for component 4.2)
- **Results of completer surveys** (data provided for component 4.4)

Measures of Program Outcome and Consumer Information:

- **Graduation rates**
- **Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements** (e.g., through acceptable scores and pass rates on state licensure exams)
- **Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they were prepared**
- **Student loan default rates and other consumer information**

The Commission recommends that CAEP identify levels and significant amounts of change in any of these indicators that would prompt further examination by the CAEP Accreditation Council's Annual Monitoring Committee. Outcomes could include: (1) requirement for follow-up in future years, (2) adverse action that could include revocation of accreditation status or (3) recognition of eligibility for a higher level of accreditation. In addition, the Commission recommends that CAEP include these data as a recurring feature in the CAEP annual report.