

# Common Standards-CAEP Alignment Matrix

## January 2016

### Overview

This item provides the draft Common Standards-CAEP Alignment Matrix, the feedback collected from individuals who have reviewed the draft matrix, and possible modifications to the matrix for the COA's discussion and possible adoption.

### Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the COA discuss the draft alignment matrix, modify it if appropriate, and then adopt the Common Standards Alignment Matrix.

### Background

California law provides that institutions may elect to seek both state and national accreditation through a single set of accreditation activities if the COA has adopted a protocol with the other accrediting entity as defined in the [Accreditation Framework](#). The CAEP protocol or agreement has been finalized and defines how the joint visit will be conducted.

The COA has the responsibility to review national standards and determine the alignment between the national standards and California's adopted standards (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/accred-align.html>). If the alignment is quite close, the national standards may be used in California's accreditation activities in lieu of the California adopted standards. If the national standards are aligned in some areas, but other areas of the California adopted standards are not adequately addressed, the COA may determine that an institution may use the national standards and address the identified portions of California's adopted standards.

California had an agreement with the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) for many years and developed an agreement with the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) since 2009. NCATE and TEAC unified and the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) was formed in July 2013. The CAEP Standards (Appendix B) were adopted in August 2013 and beginning with the 2016-17 accreditation site visits, all institutions must meet the CAEP standards rather than the NCATE or TEAC legacy visits that have been taking place. In addition, the Commission adopted revised Common Standards at the October 2015 meeting. Therefore an alignment matrix that identifies where the Common Standards concepts are addressed in the CAEP Standards and which concepts in the Commission's Common Standards are not addressed by the CAEP Standards needed to be developed.

### Draft Alignment Matrix

Once the Commission adopted the revised Common Standards in October 2015, staff developed the draft Common Standards-CAEP alignment matrix and shared it with all CAEP Accredited institutions to collect feedback. The letters within the Common Standards are used for ease of discussion purposes. Language shaded blue indicates that staff proposed that this Common Standard language is not adequately addressed by the CAEP Standards and all CAEP-

accredited Institutions would need to address this concept for continued accreditation by the Commission. The CAEP Standard(s) that align with the Commission’s Common Standards are identified in the right hand column. The CAEP Standards identified in the right hand column with lavender shading have been proposed as additional areas of alignment with the Commission’s Common Standards.

**DRAFT Common Standards-CAEP Alignment Matrix**

Common Standard	Aligned
<b>Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation</b>	<b>CAEP</b>
Each Commission-approved <i>institution</i> has the infrastructure in place to operate effective educator preparation programs. Within this overall infrastructure:	
a. The <i>institution</i> and education <i>unit</i> create and articulate a <i>research-based vision</i> of teaching and learning that fosters coherence among, and is clearly represented in all educator preparation programs. This vision is consistent with preparing educators for California public schools and the effective implementation of California’s adopted standards and curricular frameworks.	
b. The <i>institution</i> actively involves <i>faculty</i> , instructional personnel, and relevant <i>stakeholders</i> in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs.	2.1?, 5.5?
c. The education <i>unit</i> ensures that <i>faculty</i> and instructional personnel regularly and systematically collaborate with colleagues in P-12 settings, college and university units and members of the <i>broader educational community</i> to improve educator preparation.	2.1, 5.5
d. The <i>institution</i> provides the <i>unit</i> with sufficient resources for the effective operation of each educator preparation program, including, but not limited to, coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum, <i>professional development/instruction</i> , field based supervision and <i>clinical experiences</i> .	
e. The <i>Unit Leadership</i> has the authority and institutional <i>support</i> required to address the needs of all educator preparation programs and considers the interests of each program within the <i>institution</i> .	
f. Recruitment and <i>faculty</i> development efforts support hiring and retention of <i>faculty</i> who represent and <i>support</i> diversity and excellence.	
g. The <i>institution</i> employs, assigns and retains only <i>qualified persons</i> to teach courses, provide <i>professional development</i> , and supervise field-based and <i>clinical experiences</i> . Qualifications of <i>faculty</i> and other instructional personnel must include, but are not limited to: a) current knowledge of the content; b) knowledge of the current context of public schooling including the California adopted P-12 content standards, frameworks, and accountability systems; c) knowledge of diversity in society, including diverse abilities, culture, language, ethnicity, and gender orientation; and d) demonstration of effective professional practices in teaching and learning, <i>scholarship</i> , and <i>service</i> .	
h. The education <i>unit</i> monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that	

<b>Common Standard</b>	<b>Aligned</b>
candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.	
<b>Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support</b>	<b>CAEP Standards</b>
Candidates are recruited and <i>supported</i> in all educator preparation <i>programs</i> to ensure their success.	3.2
a. The education <i>unit</i> accepts applicants for its educator preparation <i>programs</i> based on clear criteria that include <i>multiple measures</i> of candidate qualifications.	
b. The education <i>unit</i> purposefully recruits and admits candidates to diversify the educator pool in California and provides the <i>support, advice, and assistance to promote their successful entry and retention in the profession.</i>	3.1 (First sentence of 2b only)
c. Appropriate information and personnel are clearly identified and accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of <i>program</i> requirements.	3.4, 3.5
d. Evidence regarding progress in meeting competency and performance expectations is consistently used to guide advisement and candidate <i>support</i> efforts. A clearly defined process is in place to identify and <i>support</i> candidates who need additional assistance to meet competencies.	3.4, 3.5
<b>Standard 3: Course of Study, Fieldwork and Clinical Practice</b>	<b>CAEP Standards</b>
a. The <i>unit</i> designs and implements a planned sequence of coursework and <i>clinical experiences</i> for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills to educate and <i>support P-12 students</i> in meeting state-adopted content standards.	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, 2.3
b. The unit and its programs offer a high-quality course of study focused on the knowledge and skills expected of beginning educators and grounded in current research on effective practice.	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5
c. Coursework is integrated closely with field experiences to provide candidates with a cohesive and comprehensive program that allows candidates to learn, practice, and demonstrate competencies required of the credential they seek.	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, 2.3
d. The <i>unit</i> and all programs collaborate with their <i>partners</i> regarding the criteria and selection of clinical personnel, <i>site-based supervisors</i> and school sites, as appropriate to the <i>program</i> .	2.2
e. Through site-based work and <i>clinical experiences</i> , programs offered by the <i>unit</i> provide candidates with opportunities to both experience issues of diversity that affect school climate and to effectively implement research-based strategies for improving teaching and student learning.	2.1, 2.3
f. <i>Site-based supervisors</i> must be <i>certified</i> and experienced in teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential.	2.2
g. The process and criteria result in the selection of <i>site-based supervisors</i> who provide effective and knowledgeable <i>support</i> for candidates.	2.2
h. <i>Site-based supervisors</i> are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role,	2.2

<b>Common Standard</b>	<b>Aligned</b>
<i>evaluated</i> and recognized in a systematic manner.	
i. All <i>programs</i> effectively implement and <i>evaluate</i> fieldwork and clinical practice.	2.1, 2.2, 2.3
j. For each <i>program</i> the <i>unit</i> offers, candidates have significant experience in <i>California public schools</i> with diverse <i>student</i> populations and the opportunity to work with the range of <i>students</i> identified in the <i>program</i> standards.	2.3?
<b>Standard 4 – Continuous Improvement</b>	<b>CAEP Standards</b>
a. The education <i>unit</i> develops and implements a comprehensive continuous improvement process at both the <i>unit</i> level and within each of its <i>programs</i> that identifies program and <i>unit</i> effectiveness and makes appropriate modifications based on findings.	5.1, 5.2, 5.3
b. The education unit and its programs regularly assess their effectiveness in relation to the course of study offered, fieldwork and clinical practice, and support services for candidates.	5.1, 5.2, 5.3
c. Both the <i>unit</i> and its <i>programs</i> regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and <i>program completer</i> data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of <i>unit</i> operations to improve <i>programs</i> and their <i>services</i> .	5.1, 5.2, 5.3
d. The continuous improvement process includes multiple sources of data including 1) the extent to which candidates are prepared to enter professional practice; and 2) feedback from <i>key stakeholders</i> such as employers and community <i>partners</i> about the quality of the preparation.	5.1, 5.5
<b>Standard 5 – Program Impact</b>	<b>CAEP Standards</b>
a. The institution ensures that candidates preparing to serve as professional school personnel know and demonstrate knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting state adopted academic standards. Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission adopted competency requirements as specified in the program standards.	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5
b. The <i>unit</i> and its <i>programs</i> evaluate and demonstrate that they are having a positive impact on candidate learning and competence and on <i>teaching and learning</i> in schools that serve California's <i>students</i> .	4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4

### Feedback on the Draft Alignment Matrix

Staff opened the feedback survey in late October 2016 and sent the draft alignment matrix to all institutions that are CAEP-accredited as well as posting the matrix on the Commission's accreditation web page. Feedback was accepted through December 18, 2015. The survey has responses from 19 individuals, from 13 different institutions, but not all responders responded to all questions.

<b>Commission's Common Standards</b>	<b>CAEP Accredited Institutions Would Need to Address the Following Common Standards</b>	<b>Feedback</b>
CS 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	1a-b, 1d-h	all 15 responders agreed
CS 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support	part of 2b, 2c and 2d	14 of the 15 responders agreed
CS 3: Course of Study, Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	3j	11 of the 13 responders agreed
CS 4: Continuous Improvement	Nothing	all 14 responders agreed
CS 5: Program Impact	Nothing	all 14 responders agreed

All feedback submitted for Common Standards 1, 2 and 5 were that the proposed alignment matrix is appropriate. For Common Standards 2 and 3, stakeholder feedback suggests that there are some additional concepts in the Common Standards that are addressed by the CAEP Standards. The feedback from the stakeholders is provided below for the COA's discussion and consideration.

*Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support*

The responder who disagreed with the proposed matrix indicated that their opinion is that Common Standard 2c and 2d are addressed by the CAEP language in Standards 3.4 and 3.5. Two responders stated that they believed that Common Standard 3j is addressed by CAEP Standard 2.3. Staff suggests that the COA discuss the identified elements of these two Common Standards and determine if the concepts are adequately addressed by the CAEP Standards.

<b>Common Standards</b>	<b>CAEP Language</b>
2c: Appropriate information and personnel are clearly identified and accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of program requirements	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. 3.5- Before the provider recommends any completing candidate for licensure or certification, it
2d: Evidence regarding progress in meeting competency and performance expectations is consistently used to guide advisement and candidate support efforts. A clearly defined process is in place to identify	

Common Standards	CAEP Language
and support candidates who need additional assistance to meet competencies.	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.
3j: For each program the unit offers, candidates have significant experience in California public schools with diverse student populations and the opportunity to work with the range of students identified in the program standards	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.

Relative to Common Standard 3, the responder included this information: The CAEP glossary defines "all students" 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."

As staff was completing this agenda item and reviewing the draft alignment matrix a final time, one additional area of the Common Standards was identified as possibly met by the CAEP Standards—Standard 1b.

Common Standards	CAEP Language
1b: The institution actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs.	<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>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.</p>

**Summary** - Options for the COA's consideration:

1. Adopt the Alignment Matrix as developed by staff.
2. Adopt the Alignment Matrix with the inclusion of some or all of Common Standards 1b, 2c, 2d, and 3j identified as the CAEP Standards address these Common Standards.
3. Direct staff to complete additional work or collect additional feedback and bring an agenda item to a future COA meeting.

**Next Steps**

If the COA adopts the Common Standards-CAEP Alignment Matrix or if the COA amends the Common Standards-CAEP Alignment Matrix and then adopts it staff will prepare the matrix for posting and communicate with all CAEP-accredited institutions. If the COA decides not to adopt the Alignment Matrix at this meeting, staff will take direction from the COA and bring the Alignment Matrix back to the next COA meeting.

## Appendix A

### CAEP 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)<sup>1</sup> in the following categories: the learner and learning; content; instructional practice; and professional responsibility.

#### **Provider Responsibilities**

1.2 Providers ensure that candidates 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 candidates 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 candidates 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 candidates model and apply technology standards as they design, implement and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning; and enrich professional practice.

#### **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,

## CAEP Standards

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.

### **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**

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.

#### **Admission Standards Indicate That Candidates Have High Academic Achievement And Ability**

3.2 **REQUIRED COMPONENT** 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.[i]

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.

**[Board amendment adopted February 13, 2015]** CAEP will work with states and providers through this transition regarding nationally or state normed assessments. Alternative arrangements for meeting this standard (beyond the alternative stated above for "a reliable, valid model that uses admissions criteria other than those stated in this standard") will be approved only under special circumstances. The CAEP staff will report to the Board and the public annually on actions taken under this provision. In all cases, EPPs must

## CAEP Standards

demonstrate the quality of the admitted candidates.

### **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.

### **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.[ii]

### **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.

## **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 **REQUIRED COMPONENT** 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 **REQUIRED COMPONENT** The provider demonstrates, through structured and validated observation instruments and/or 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 **REQUIRED COMPONENT** 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**

## CAEP Standards

**4.4 REQUIRED COMPONENT** 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.

### **5: Provider Quality, Continuous Improvement, and Capacity**

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 **REQUIRED COMPONENT** 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 **REQUIRED COMPONENT** 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.