

*CAEP Standard 1: Its language,
suggested evidence, and questions to
address*

Webinar for EPPs
Tuesday, February 23rd
(5:00 pm EST)

Presented by Deborah Eldridge, CAEP Advisor
• LCVinc1@gmail.com

Webinar Basics

- Please MUTE your phones.
- Remember to unmute when you want to talk.
- To ask a question during the presentation use the CHAT or unmute yourself when I open it up to questions.
- The recording of the webinar and PowerPoint will be posted on YouTube by March 1st.

Goal and Objectives

- **Goal:** To provide updated information on addressing Standard 1 and its components in the CAEP self-study.
- **Objectives:** Participants will be able to (PWBAT):
 - Identify the key points of Standard 1 and its components,
 - List the kinds of evidence that CAEP recommends for each of the components for Standard 1, and
 - Describe how the standard and its components will be evaluated by CAEP reviewers.

Standard 1: Key points in the language of the standard

- 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**.

Components of Standard 1: In Brief and In Relationship to the Standard

- 1.1 **Deep understanding** of: the learner and learning; content; instructional practice; and professional responsibility.
- 1.2 **Using discipline specific practices** in: research and evidence and use both to measure their P-12 students' progress and their own professional practice.
- 1.3 **Using discipline specific practices to:** apply content and pedagogical knowledge from outcome assessments in response to standards.
- 1.4 **Attainment of College-and Career Ready Standards** that demonstrate skills and commitment that advance the learning of all P-12 students. (Cross-cutting theme of diversity)
- 1.5 **Using discipline specific practices to** model and apply technology standards to engage students and improve learning; and enrich professional practice. (Cross-cutting theme of technology)

Feedback and Question Pause



Component 1.1: Key language

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.**

So, think: What evidence do I have that would demonstrate proficiency as a beginning teacher in these four InTASC areas ?

Component 1.1: What evidence will site visitors look for?

- **Content Knowledge disaggregated by program from:**
 - State licensure test(s)
 - Conclusions from one of the 3 program review options
 - *Ability to apply* both content knowledge and content pedagogical knowledge in instructional situations
 - » from observation instrument(s),
 - » work samples,
 - » unit plans, etc.
 - » EdTPA or PPAT
 - » Portfolios
 - » Video clips

Component 1.1: Data chart conventions

- Evidence is provided directly informing on candidate proficiency for each of the four InTASC categories
- Data are **disaggregated by licensure area/program**
- **At least one comparison point is available for analysis**
- Data charts are clearly labeled

Sample chart:

2014-2015 Candidate Proficiency Data on InTASC Categories from Clinical Observation Instrument: Disaggregated by Program/Licensure Area

Provides a comparison point

Disaggregated by licensure area/program

Informs each InTASC category

InTASC	Observation Item	EPP Mean			Elementary Education (1-6)			English Education (7-12)		
		Spr-2014	Fall-2014	Spr-2015	Spr-2014	Fall-2014	Spr-2015	Spr-2014	Fall-2014	Spr-2015
Learner and learning	Develops learning experiences appropriate for the grade level and connected to standards	N = 149 M = 3.2	N = 143 M = 3.4	N = 126 M = 3.4	N = 133 M = 3.1	N = 126 M = 3.6	N = 115 M = 3.2	N = 16 M = 3.3	N = 17 M = 3.2	N = 11 M = 3.6
Instructional practice	Uses discussion strategies to promote high level thinking	N = 149 M = 3.1	N = 143 M = 3.4	N = 126 M = 3.5	N = 133 M = 2.9	N = 126 M = 3.2	N = 115 M = 3.7	N = 16 M = 3.3	N = 17 M = 3.6	N = 11 M = 3.5
Professional responsibility	Participates in professional development	N = 149 M = 2.9	N = 143 M = 3.2	N = 126 M = 3.4	N = 133 M = 3.1	N = 126 M = 3.0	N = 115 M = 3.6	N = 16 M = 2.7	N = 17 M = 3.4	N = 11 M = 3.2

All Components in Standard 1: Data chart conventions

- Include the “N” for the data set broken out by year or semester
 - Low enrollment programs (under 10 graduates over three years) can aggregate data by licensure area for three cycles
 - Data requirement is for **three cycles** of data
 - **Cycle** is one independent collection of data using the assessment
 - » Could be as long as three years (e.g., small programs that offer a course or clinical experience just once a year)
 - » Some data are required for a three year period (state licensure test scores)
 - » Could be as short as three semesters (courses or clinical experiences offered each semester)

All Components in Standard 1: Data chart conventions

- Data comparison points
 - If grades are used as evidence of content knowledge, the mean for the class should be reported along with the mean for education majors in the same class.
 - If the data chart reports a mean score, range should also be reported
 - If the data chart is reporting a percentage, the percentage should be reported for each level

Sample GPA Chart:

2013-2015 Candidate and Non-Candidate Content Area GPA Disaggregated by Program/Licensure Area

*N for data set broken out by
year (or semester)*



*Comparison point is Non-
Teacher Candidates*



Program/ Licensure areas	N and Mean GPA for Teacher Candidates			N and Mean GPA for Non-Teacher Candidates		
	2013	2014	2015	2013	2014	2015
History	N = 15 M = 3.0 Range: 2.8-3.2	N = 12 M = 3.1 Range: 2.7-3.5	N = 17 M = 3.2 Range: 2.3-3.5	N = 127 M = 2.8 Range: 2.0-3.2	N = 99 M = 2.6 Range: 2.1-3.5	N = 145 M = 2.9 Range: 2.0-3.4
Mathematics	N = 11 M = 2.8 Range: 2.2-3.2	N = 9 M = 2.9 Range: 2.1-3.2	N = 12 M = 2.9 Range: 2.5-3.2	N = 24 M = 3.3 Range: 2.8-3.2	N = 22 M = 3.3 Range: 2.8-3.3	N = 28 M = 3.6 Range: 2.3-3.9
Physics	Aggregated for 3 years. N = 8 M = 3.3 Range = 3.1-3.6			N = 24 M = 3.3 Range = 2.9-3.4	N = 22 M = 3.3 Range = 2.9-3.4	N = 28 M = 3.6 Range = 2.7-3.9
Art	Aggregated for 3 years. N = 5 M = 3.5 Range = 3.3-3.9			N = 14 M = 3.2 Range = 2.9-3.4	N = 12 M = 3.0 Range = 2.5-3.4	N = 18 M = 3.1 Range = 2.6-3.7



Low enrolled program data aggregated for 3 cycles



Range is reported

All Components in Standard 1: Data chart conventions for proprietary assessments

State licensure score data should have comparison points such as –

- Benchmark score for minimal competency required by state
- Possible other points such as national median score for the content area

State's minimum
passing score



National
comparison



Range of actual
EPP candidates'
scores



Academic Years	Number of Students	Qualifying Score	Mean	National Median	Range EPP	% of Candidates Passing
Early Childhood						
2011-2012	N = 35	160	172	177	152-186	100%
2012-2013	N = 33	160	169	176	158-172	100%
2013-2014	N = 31	160	168	176	152-183	100%
Elementary Education (sub-test listed below)						
Reading and Language Arts						
2011-2012	N = 22	157	165	No data	153-174	100%
2012-2013	N = 27	157	160	No data	157-172	100%
2013-2014	N = 25	157	162	No data	155-170	100%
Mathematics						
2011-2012	N = 22	157	165	No data	153-171	100%
2012-2013	N = 27	157	162	No data	155-170	100%
2013-2014	N = 25	157	158	No data	150-162	100%
Social Studies						
2011-2012	N = 22	155	158	No data	149-162	100%
2012-2013	N = 27	155	157	No data	150-162	100%
2013-2014	N = 25	155	159	No data	146-169	100%
Science						
2011-2012	N = 22	159	161	No data	149-168	100%
2012-2013	N = 27	159	164	No data	151-170	100%
2013-2014	N = 25	159	163	No data	155-169	100%

What will reviewers ask about the evidence for **each** component of Standard 1?

- Do the data measure what is intended to be measured?
- Do data measure the preponderance of what is specified in the component? (Only the **items specific to the component** are cited as evidence)
- Are EPP-created assessments evaluated at the adequate expectation or above? (See CAEP's Assessment Rubric categories and **sufficient** column for meeting expectations)
- Does an audit check of the data indicate that data are accurately recorded/reported?
- Are data chart conventions used?
- Is data disaggregated for program/licensure areas?

Feedback and Question Pause



Component 1.2: Key language

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.

So, think: What evidence do I have that would demonstrate using research and assessment (evidence) for student and professional learning?

Component 1.2: What evidence will the site visitors look for?

- Evidence specific to candidates' **use** of research and student assessment evidence
 - Work sample
 - Lesson or unit plans
 - Clinical observation instruments
 - edTPA or PPAT

Feedback and Question Pause



Component 1.3: Key language

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).

So, think: what evidence do I have that would demonstrate the application of content and Pedagogical content knowledge in response to other professional standards?

Component 1.3: What evidence will the site visitors look for?

- Evidence specific to **application** of content (CK) and content pedagogical knowledge (PCK)
 - States can add specific requirements to this component
 - For example, specific list of required courses
 - Make sure the evidence is congruent with the application of CK and PCK
- Types of possible evidence
 - SPA reports or state review of program-specific data
 - Clinical observation instrument
 - Work Sample
 - Lesson and unit plans
 - edTPA or PPAT

What are reviewers looking for in Component 1.3 (beyond questions on slide 16)?

- Questions specific to state, SPA or Feedback option are answered with specific references to those reports or data

Feedback and Question Pause



Component 1.4: Key language

1.4 Providers **ensure** that candidates **demonstrate skills and commitment** that afford **all P-12 students access** to rigorous College- and Career-Ready Standards (CCRS, such as Next Generation Science Standards, National Career Readiness Certificate, Common Core State Standards).

So, think: what evidence do I have that would demonstrate skills in teaching to CCRS and commitment to access for all students ?

Component 1.4: What evidence will the site visitors look for?

- Evidence specific to college- and career-readiness
 - Plans, assignments, or observational data demonstrate candidates' skills for –
 - Deep content knowledge in CCRS
 - Eliciting P-12 student **application** of their knowledge to solve problems and think critically
 - Cross-discipline teaching
 - Differentiation of instruction
 - Ability to identify and interpret assessments to match P-12 college and career readiness goals/objectives
- Evidence (in general) that candidates are prepared **to teach diverse** P-12 students **effectively** through **differentiated instruction** using multiple strategies and **use of data** in instructional decision-making

Component 1.4: What evidence will the site visitors look for?

- Plans accepted as evidence through 2017
 - Curriculum changes to include teaching to CCRS
 - Documentation of specific inclusion in coursework or key assignments of knowledge and teaching to CCRS
- Plans, assessments or observation proficiencies are identified that are specific to college and career ready teaching that candidates:
 - demonstrate deep content knowledge
 - require students to apply knowledge to solve problems and think critically in subject area
 - demonstrate the ability to differentiate instruction for students with at least two different needs (e.g., ELA, urban/rural disadvantage, low or high-performing)
 - participate in mentored clinical experiences in which CCRS attributes are the foundation for instruction

Feedback and Question Pause



Component 1.5: Key language

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**.

So, think: what evidence do I have that would demonstrate modeling and application of technology skills to enhance learning for students and self?

Component 1.5: What evidence will the site visitors look for?

- Candidates demonstrate facility to employ technology in design, implementation, and assessment of learning experiences to engage students
- Evidence specific to technology in which at least three of the four categories listed below are assessed
 - Accessing databases, digital media, and tools to improve P-12 learning
 - Knowing why and how to help P-12 students to access and assess quality digital content
 - Ability to design and facilitate digital learning, mentoring and collaboration including the use of social networks
 - Use of technology to track, share, and evaluate student learning

Feedback and Question Pause



Standard 1: Key points in the language of the standard

- 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**.

Making the Case for Standard 1

- Information is provided from several sources and provides evidence of candidate proficiencies in content knowledge and pedagogical skills.
- Grades, scores, pass rates and other data are analyzed.
- Differences and similarities across licensure areas, comparisons over time, and demographical data are examined.
- Appropriate interpretations and conclusions are reached.
- Trends or patterns are identified that suggest need for preparation modification.
- Based on the analysis of data, there are planned or completed actions for change that are described.

What will reviewers ask about the evidence for **each** component of Standard 1?

- Do the data measure what is intended to be measured?
- Do data measure the preponderance of what is specified in the component? (Only the **items specific to the component** are cited as evidence)
- Are EPP-created assessments evaluated at the adequate expectation or above? (See CAEP's Assessment Rubric categories and **sufficient** column for meeting expectations)
- Does an audit check of the data indicate that data are accurately recorded/reported?
- Are data chart conventions used?
- Is data disaggregated for program/licensure areas?

When might Areas for Improvement (AFIs) be assigned?

- Licensure test scores are not in the upper half of national median/average field by field (ETS Praxis) OR in upper half of state median/average field by field (Pearson)
- One or more of the 4 InTASC categories are not informed by EPP evidence, or there is not disaggregated data for more than 20% of the candidates
- Only state licensure tests are provided as evidence
- There is no significant analysis of data
- Interpretations of evidence are not well-grounded in evidence provided
- EPP-created instruments have significant deficiencies
- Site visitors report inaccuracies in reporting data

When might a stipulation be assigned?

- Data not disaggregated by licensure/ program areas
- No plan or evidence on CCRS levels of instruction
- No evidence of internal consideration of the data for improvement purposes
- No steps to ensure data quality
- No efforts to ensure validity

How might Standard 1 be found unmet?

- Data are NOT disaggregated by licensure area(s)/program(s)
- Average performance of the completing cohort is in the bottom quarter of licensure tests
 - There is no plan for raising scores in the coming years
- EPP instruments are preponderantly rated low
 - There is no plan to upgrade or validate instruments
- There are 2 or more stipulations in the areas noted on the previous slide
 - Data not disaggregated by licensure/ program areas
 - No plan or evidence on CCRS levels of instruction
 - No evidence of internal consideration of the data for improvement purposes
 - No steps to ensure data quality
 - No efforts to ensure validity

Final Feedback and Question Pause



Sign-ups and Look-Fors

- Sign up for the weekly CAEP updates by emailing Zachary.Everett@caepnet.org
- Nominate yourself to be a site visitor, an assessment reviewer, or a CAEP committee member at <http://caepnet.org/working-together/volunteers/apply-to-volunteer>
- Look for updates of guidance documents on the CAEP website under accreditation/accreditation resources.

Go to CAEP's youtube channel, where you can access this and previous webinars:

<https://www.youtube.com/user/CAEPnet>

Next steps

- Feedback survey sent via email by March 1st
- Webinars in February, March, April and May will walk through each of the CAEP standards in turn.

Dates and Times	Go-To-Meeting links, phone and access code	Topic
Thurs. February 25 5pm EST	https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/725587069 Phone = 877-309-2070 Access Code =725-587-069	Standard 2 and its evidence
Tues. March 29 5pm EST	https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/540099997 Phone = 877-309-2073 Access Code = 540-099-997	Standard 3 and its evidence
Mon. April 26 5pm EST	https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/526875645 Phone = 1 866 899 4679 Access Code = 526-875-645	Standard 4 and its evidence
Thurs. May 26 5pm EST	https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/562953453 Phone =1 866 899 4679 Access Code = 562-953-453	Standard 5 and its evidence