CAEP Council for the
Accreditation of
Educator Preparation

Highlight features of the *CAEP Handbook: Initial-Level Programs 2018*

Feature	Explanation
1. Standard 5 is placed first because EPP management and continuous improvement depend on an effective quality assurance system. When that is in place, the system also gathers and analyzes accreditation self-study evidence	• Making a case that any CAEP standard is met **depends on the capacities of the quality assurance system** and the use of data for internal monitoring of the EPP's progress. • Continuous improvement is a critical feature of CAEP's standards (in Standard 5). • Continuous improvement is also a requirement that all accreditors' must address under standards of the higher education accreditation agency, CHEA. • Standard 5 is placed first because **continuous improvement can only happen when the EPP has an effective quality assurance system** that produces data on relevant topics and has capability to create analyses of relationships found in the data. (see p. 21)
2. There are guidelines on conducting self-studies and writing self-study reports (SSRs)	• Materials from different parts of the 2016 CAEP Accreditation Handbook (Version 3), and from "general rules" in Evidence Sufficiency Criteria distributed at recent CAEPCons, have been brought together in one place. • Part B of the handbook addresses **conducting self-studies, writing reports, building a case that each standard is met, using data in self-studies, the role of program review and reporting on CAEP's themes of diversity and applications of technology**. (see pages 6-16) • Part B also provides a list of CAEP's digital template contents so that EPPs will be introduced to what the template will ask them to insert.

3. The handbook identifies key concepts for each standard, then follows those concepts through all steps of self-study preparation	• The handbook **identifies the key concepts that underlie each standard together with its components** (see, pp. 23, 29, 35, 40, 45, 51 and 52). Those concepts are the basis for other features in the handbook, including:
	  ➢ **Examples** that are suggested for EPP evidence
	  ➢ Self-study **writing prompts and reflection questions** that help EPPs develop their most compelling case for each standard; these are built on the key concepts for each CAEP standard as well as the diversity and technology themes
	  ➢ An *Appendix* to the handbook that describes evidence, what reviewers do with evidence, and the criteria that guide site team and Accreditation Council **evaluation of evidence**.

4. The key concepts woven into CAEP Standard 1 and its components are stated explicitly, and the role of "program review" in providing evidence for part of those concepts is explained	• "Program review" is the label that CAEP uses for **evidence on the four InTASC categories that underlie Standard 1: the learner and learning, content and content pedagogy knowledge, instructional practice, and professional responsibilities.**
	  ➢ The review begins with an EPP's submission in advance of a site visit (see B.4, pp. 14-16) that follow options for (1) **CAEP Program Review with Feedback**, submitted two years before a scheduled site visit; (2) **Specialized Professional Association (SPA) review** submitted three years before a site visit and, when fully successful, results in SPA National Recognition; or (3) a **state program review/approval** process.
	  ➢ Both the submitted reports and their evidence, and any feedback that EPPs receive in response, will be a part of the EPP's case that Standard 1 is met and will be available to the site team.
	• In addition, the self-study report also addresses Standard 1 concepts on **college and career readiness for initial teaching** and the **CAEP crosscutting themes—diversity and technology** (see introduction to Standard 1 examples, p. 30, and self-study prompts, p. 52).

5. There are more complete guidelines for the CAEP diversity and technology themes	• CAEP policy (5.03) specifies that self-study reports provide "complete evidence for all CAEP Standards and cross-cutting themes" (see. p. 16) • Explicit references to **diversity and technology themes that appear in Standards 1, 2, and 3** are to be addressed. (see p. 51 on diversity, p. 53 on technology) • Diversity is further elaborated, asking EPPs **to show how they use the diversity already represented in their programs, faculty, and candidates** *but also* to be explicit about **how they challenge themselves to meet diversity goals beyond what they already demonstrate.** (see p. 52, Self-study reflection questions) • New Evidence Sufficiency Criteria for the themes are included in Appendix A. (see pp. 83-84)
6. The text clarifies (a) that evidence used to make a case for one standard need not be repeated for another standard, and (b) the organization-wide purpose of Standard 5.	• Standard 1 is a general standard about candidate competence and "making a case" will include competence in subject content, content pedagogy, and ability to use that knowledge effectively in diverse instructional situations (also see Highlight 4, above). • Standard 3 asks that candidates meet challenging "exit" criteria (component 3.5), and understand professional responsibilities and ethics (component 3.6). Evidence for both of these would contribute to making an effective case for Standard 1, so the EPP can use it there and then **simply cross- reference it** in its case for Standard 3. (see pp. 30 and 40) • EPP cases for Standards 1-4 will tag evidence so that site teams can access information about data qualities (component 5.2) and use of data for continuous improvement (component 5.3). The emphasis in Standard 5 evidence, however, is **not to repeat these but to focus on** quality assurance system (component 5.1) and other concepts in relation to the **EPP as an organization**—how it functions, how it undertakes self-improvement, how it informs itself about opportunities for meeting its goals? (See introductory notes on evidence examples about data quality, p. 24; continuous improvement, p. 26; and for the Standard 5 self-study prompts and reflection questions, p. 27).