

The CAEP Idea

The overall CAEP goal is to ensure that preparation completers acquire knowledge and skills that equip them to have positive effects on P-12 student learning and development. The five CAEP standards are interrelated and support each other toward this goal. The central focus of Standards 1, 2, and 3 draws from findings of a 2010 National Research Council report on teacher preparation: factors “likely to have the strongest effects” on outcomes for students are content knowledge; field experiences; and the quality of teacher candidates. Standard 4 calls for multiple measures of completers’ impact, the results that matter. Standard 5 says that the EPP faculty have crafted a system of quality control and continuous improvement that is characteristic of a high-performing education organization. Taken together, these five standards are a statement based on research and professional practice knowledge that outlines high quality educator preparation— that is, programs whose graduates can consistently add value to their own students.

Questions and answers on 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 teacher preparation in all phases of the program. This process is ultimately determined by programs’ meeting of Standard 4.

The intent of Standard 3 is to ensure that candidates’ quality is a continuing and purposeful part of EPP responsibilities, “the goal of educator preparation in all phases of the program.” The components of the standard address six facets of quality:

- **Recruitment for academic ability and diversity (component 3.1)**—The education workforce should be more academically able and it should have the same diversity as P-12 student enrollment. To achieve both of these purposes, providers need to deliberately recruit candidates. Practices for admitting candidates should be aligned with the EPP’s mission and with employment opportunities available for their completers (based on past EPP experience and expected employment trends). Providers should have a recruitment plan specific to employment trends, diversity, hard-to-staff schools, and high need content areas. This requires EPPs to move beyond institutionally-based recruitment actions (i.e., open houses, drop-in days, etc.) to a more deliberate and focused outreach strategy.
- **Admission for academic ability/achievement (3.2)**—CAEP requires that each self-study report address academic achievement/ ability of candidates. This component sets CAEP minimum criteria for admissions (GPA of 3.0 and performance on a nationally normed test of academic achievement/ ability in the upper 50%), and applies those criteria to the overall average for a cohort of candidates. It also encourages alternative admissions criteria based on different academic as well as non-academic factors from those stated in the component. All alternative admission strategies should be data driven and candidate performance should be tracked over time (see, also, 3.4 and 3.5 below as well as Standard 4). CAEP has commissioned a study to

examine the criteria for academic ability/achievement in more detail, including the requirement of nationally normed-test performance levels above 50%. The Board will review the study results at its meeting in December 2015.

- **Setting and investigating non-academic factors (3.3)**—CAEP encourages EPPs to use non-academic factors both in admissions and throughout preparation, along with multiple measures of candidate attributes and progression. These are important and may be selected especially to align with the EPPs mission.
- **Monitoring the progression of candidates (3.4)**—Ensuring quality of candidates should be a continuing process throughout preparation.
- **Employing high exit criteria (3.5)** – Exit evaluations should be rigorous.
- **Developing understanding of professional/ethical aspects of teaching (3.6)** Academic quality is necessary but not sufficient for educator preparation.

The “ultimate” validation of Standard 3 is found in the impact that completers have once they are employed (see Standard 4).

EPPs are encouraged to put forth their evidence built around their own choices of measures, and to make arguments for those decisions demonstrating that the standard is met. CAEP holds providers responsible for the quality and relevance of the evidence they use for their continuous improvement and that they select to document in the self-study.

SPECIAL NOTE TO READERS about Standard 3, component 3.2:

Among the questions that CAEP is asked about Standard 3, the most persistent ones address the admissions criteria that are described in component 3.2—that is, 3.0 GPA and 50% or above performance on a normed test of achievement and ability.

Please note: **There are no CAEP-prescribed measures for component 3.2.** Readers of CAEP standards frequently misperceive the intent of component 3.2 references to SAT, ACT and GRE test results. They are not required measures. They are examples. **What the component calls for is evidence of academic achievement/ ability in the upper half of rigorous assessment results.**

There is also an explicit alternative stated in the standard (see component 3.2) that encourages different admissions criteria—either academic or non-academic—from those set out in the Standard if there is evidence.

The following pages address questions posed at CAEP conferences and the CAEP Clinic, as well as inquiries to CAEP staff. They have been grouped into clusters:

- 1) **recruitment** (p. 2),
- 2) **cohorts** (p. 3),
- 3) **CAEP admissions criteria** (p. 4), [component 3.2, i.e., GPA of 3.0 and performance at the 50th percentile or above on a normed test of academic achievement/ ability.]
- 4) **alternative admissions criteria** (p. 6), [different admissions criteria, which may be either academic or non-academic factors. The EPP shows evidence of the validity of the alternative criteria in terms of completer’s effects on P-12 learning.]
- 5) **optional measures for CAEP criteria** (p. 7, [examples of measures that might be used in making the EPPs case for component 3.2 besides SAT, ACT and GRE]
- 6) **quality measures during preparation** (p. 9), and

7) the standard itself (p. 9).

1. RECRUITMENT

Q: What is the purpose of recruitment? We take our candidates from those already enrolled in our institution.

A: The purpose of recruitment is to ensure sufficient pools of applicants so that EPPs can select cohorts of candidates who are both academically able and diverse. Component 3.1, on recruitment, is a companion to 3.2, on selectivity criteria; neither component stands alone. Preparation providers can influence the effectiveness of their completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development by selecting applicants who are academically able and who represent the wide diversity of America's P-12 students. However, selecting cohorts of able and diverse candidates requires extending the number, abilities and diversity of applicants through recruitment.

Self-study reports would document an EPP's recruitment efforts and results. These efforts would be planned and deliberate, and the results would be monitored:

- A responsible provider would engage faculty in development of a plan that describes significant and specific outreach activities to locate potential candidates.
- That plan would cover several years, establish numerical goals and base data, set steps to monitor progress for each cohort of admitted candidates, schedule analyses of the year by year progress, and include faculty evaluation of the adequacy of progress toward the EPP's admissions goals.
- Specific targets would be identified based on knowledge of employment opportunities for the provider's completers, the diversity of P-12 students in the districts where completers are likely to be employed and the interests of potential candidates for employment in shortage fields such as STEM, English-language learning, students with disabilities and hard-to-staff schools.

The self-study report, then, would provide evidence that the strategies are in place and describe their progress and results.

Q: What does CAEP expect as evidence of "diversity" in admissions?

- A:** A self-study should include documentation of the provider's understanding of P-12 student diversity in schools where its completers are likely to be employed, and show the progress of its efforts to recruit candidates with similar diversity.
- Individual EPPs are affected differently by such an interpretation of diversity. There are well established and clear mismatches of the teacher workforce in America with the diverse characteristics of America's P-12 students and community cultures. The teacher workforce needs, for example, higher proportions of African-Americans, Hispanics, and other minorities; more males; and more teachers who represent and understand diverse cultures.
 - Some institutions might have candidates who already help move the nation to this greater diversity, but the provider might need to focus greater attention on candidate academic achievement/ability, other selectivity factors, and males.
 - Some institutions might have candidates who are less reflective of the diversity of P-12 student population and would need to aggressively recruit—and support—a more diverse candidate population overall.

- If the EPP changes its preparation toward different employment opportunities for candidates (e.g., more in STEM fields, more for hard-to-staff schools), then its self-study would document the modification in its applicant pool, and the progress it achieves toward such new goals.

Q: When designing a recruitment plan, how do you take into consideration the needs of the region vs. the diversity of America’s P-12 students?

A: EPPs should know the employment opportunities for their own completers. They may document in their self-study reports the actual employment locations of previous and current completers, indicating trends over time. Depending on the mission of the EPP, those reports might describe employment in a geographic region, or state, a multi-state, or even national market. EPPs should document employment outcomes for their completers in surplus and shortage areas, hard to staff schools and other post-completion outcomes.

Q: Is there a mechanism in CAEP to address “unintended consequences” of the admissions criteria in a timely fashion?

A: The question implies that CAEP admissions criteria will lead to less diversity in the pool of admitted candidates. CAEP admissions criteria require that completers reflect the wide diversity of America’s classrooms. Two considerations for addressing the potential of such unintended consequences are:

- First, Component 3.1 recognizes that aggressive recruitment can provide strong leverage to avoid unintended consequences—so long as those recruitment actions are paired with purposeful admissions criteria and followed up with effective support of admitted candidates.
- Second, CAEP guidelines for evidence make clear that recruitment plans need to mirror employment opportunities, provide disaggregated data on the demographic characteristics of candidates, provide information on the academic and non-academic factors that are applied at admissions, and track these data to monitor progress. If recruitment and related selectivity efforts fall short, that will quickly be apparent to EPPs, and they can take corrective action.

2. COHORTS

Q: Do all candidates need to meet the CAEP criteria?

A: No. The CAEP criteria are applied to the admitted cohort as a group. This permits the EPP to make decisions about the promise of particular individuals who may fall short on some of the criteria, while other applicants may be close to or exceed the criteria. EPPs include the admitted candidates’ cohort average in their self-study reports, and do not identify individual applicants or their scores in the self-study documentation. The CAEP standards describe the group average this way:

“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.”

Q: What is a “cohort”?

A: The CAEP standards describe a cohort this way:

“a group of candidates admitted at the same time, e.g., a class entering in a fall semester.”

3. CAEP ADMISSIONS CRITERIA

CAEP Criteria

Q: If we do not use SAT or ACT or GRE, or our institution has open enrollment, do we need to start requiring those tests? If the SAT and ACT are not requirements, but are “examples of what can be used,” then that needs to be made very clear. This is not what most people understand to be true. Can you give a good example of a normed test that can be used to compare all of our candidates? Can we use different normed tests for different applicants (if all do not have scores for the same college entrance test, for example)?

- A:** There is no need to require SAT, ACT, or GRE. CAEP is implementing the first step on the “normed test” performance criterion (above 50%), while it undertakes additional study to determine what bar might be appropriate and when that might be implemented. There are five critical points here:
- SAT, ACT, and GRE are only examples of academic achievement/ability measures. There are others with national norms (e.g., AP exams, IB exams, SAT subject tests).
 - The Standard sets “CAEP minima” as a 3.0- GPA and top 50% on a nationally normed test of academic achievement/ability in component 3.2. CAEP policy requires that EPPs address academic achievement/ability of admitted candidates, even if they make use of the alternative described in the second bullet point below.
 - Nothing in the Standard requires that EPP admissions decisions all use the same measure. Some applicants might have taken the SAT, others the ACT, for example. The EPP would want to show that it is being even-handed across applicants.
 - Component 3.2 encourages EPPs to use admissions criteria beyond those specified. These might be different academic measures (e.g., end of course projects or high school exit tests), or they might be non-academic measures (e.g., EPP assessments or interviews or endorsements of applicant’s “grit” or “leadership” or “persistence” or some other quality associated with effective teaching). In this case the EPP would provide information about the association of these measures with completer’s P-12 learning and development impact. An EPP that chooses to take this approach would develop a “plan” or “case study” in which they specify the steps and timeline to gather data and analyze relationships in the findings. CAEP expects an EPP to start that planning this year (2015) and to have at least some initial data in calendar 2018--even if the entire study is not completed until some years later.
 - All EPPs must show evidence of candidates’ academic quality.

Q: Are there floors of GPA or SAT that are established for the teacher candidate cohort by CAEP?

- A:** EPPs need to make judgments on individual candidates in the way that works best for them and fits their mission. The Standard states that the provider ensures the average GPA of its accepted cohort of candidates meets or exceeds the CAEP minimum GPA of 3.0 and a group average performance in the top half of those who pass a nationally normed admission assessment such as ACT, SAT, or GRE. That is the point of using cohort averages. As an example, an individual candidate could have a 2.5 average, provided other candidates have a higher average.

Q: When will the normed-test “top 40% and 33%” requirements be implemented? What is the impact on EPPs when the admitted cohorts will score in the top 33%? What is the potential impact of raising the bar for diverse candidate recruitment and retention?

- A:** Component 3.2, evidence of candidates’ normed-tests at 50%, is required for self-study reports submitted in 2016. **The Board has deferred steps toward implementation of the higher performance scores until it can give consideration to results from an additional study that it authorized, now underway.**
- The contractor, Teacher Preparation Analytics, will undertake a detailed investigation of what is known from research about the association of academic ability and achievement with P-12 student learning.
 - It will document potential effects of implementing higher criteria, potential effects on the diversity of the candidate pool, experiences in other professions, and state commitments that are relevant to these criteria.
 - Results from the study will be considered by the CAEP Board in December 2015.

Q: What if we are a non-traditional or alternative program, or one in which candidates enter as career changers and have long been out of college--what should we do?

- A:** A non-traditional or alternative program, like all programs, can make a choice between applications that are based on academic achievement/ ability measures and on non-academic factors. Note the CAEP policy is that all self-study reports must report on academic achievement/ ability of admitted candidates, even if non-academic criteria are used for admissions.
- If the EPP uses criteria different from the GPA and normed tests in component 3.2, the alternative provision requires EPPs to provide evidence of the associations between those criteria and the impact on P-12 learning of completers once they are on the job. Examples might include criteria based on rigorous high school projects that could substitute for the component 3.2 academic criteria, interviews, or other sources of evidence for leadership, communications, or persistence behaviors as non-academic choices. Again, EPPs must provide evidence of the associations between those criteria and the impact on P-12 learning of completers once they are on the job. An EPP that chooses to take this approach would develop a “plan” or “case study” in which they specify the steps and timeline to gather data and analyze relationships in the findings. CAEP expects an EPP to start that planning this year (2015) and to have at least some initial data in calendar 2018--even if the entire study is not complete until later.
 - Some EPPs may have a preparation program that prepares career changers for roles in education; candidates’ college experiences may have been long ago. The EPP could opt to use alternative criteria, either academic ones or non-academic, as the Standard provides. If the career changer focus was for a particular group—for example, military career retirees—then non-academic attributes such as leadership, grit, or persistence might be considered. The military might also provide academic opportunities and demonstrations of knowledge/skills that could serve as appropriate criteria. CAEP would look to the EPP to suggest what they propose in such a situation and to defend it in their self-study report as meeting the standard of candidates’ academic quality.

Q: What should we do about transfer students?

- A:** If transfer students are admitted in the sophomore year, and begin in the junior year along with students from the EPP’s institution, they would all be in the same cohort.

- Their college academic record, GPA, in comparison with non-candidate students, would cover the GPA part of the admissions criteria.
- A challenging, norm-referenced, external measure is one option under the standard. Transfer entrants' ACT or SAT, AP, IB, or SAT subject tests would be potential examples.
- The alternative admissions criteria provision is also a choice. Component 3.2 encourages EPPs to use admissions criteria different from those specified. These might be different academic measures (e.g., end of course projects or high school exit tests), or they might be non-academic measures, or perhaps several in combination (e.g., EPP assessments or interviews or endorsements of applicant's "grit" or "leadership" or "persistence" or some other quality associated with effective teaching). In this case the EPP would provide information about the association of these measures with completer's P-12 learning and development impact. Note, though, that CAEP policy requires that EPPs report academic achievement/ ability of admitted candidates.

When criteria apply

Q: Does "admission" refer to the college/ university or to the preparation program?

A: Since the EPP has the most direct responsibility for admissions to its program, the criteria would be applied at the point of preparation admission. In some cases that will be when a group is admitted to the college/university and some of the college/ university admissions factors may be applicable to the 3.2 options. In many cases it will be at the close of the sophomore year, or beginning of the junior year. For graduate level initial preparation, it would be at the point of graduate admission.

Q: At what point is the 3.0 GPA calculated and what courses are to be included?

A: Nothing in the Standard specifies how the 3.0 is determined. EPP's make and defend their decisions. The EPP's self-study report should specify what the EPP considers the point of admission and defend the way it calculates GPA. Some guidelines to consider are:

- When high school GPA is used, the overall average is appropriate, or the way that average is officially calculated by the applicant's high school. If the EPP prefers to count the average only for particular courses, (e.g., math courses for math educator preparation) that could be suitable as well.
- When applicants are admitted after some college experiences, the college GPA would appropriately be considered for all courses or for particular ones. If the EPP chooses to use GPAs only for particular courses (e.g., math courses for math educator preparation), it might consider course selections so that it can compare GPA of applicants with non-applicants taking the same courses.
- When applicants are admitted at the graduate level, then the college GPA or the GPA in particular courses would be possible options.

4. ALTERNATIVE AMISSIONS CRITERIA

Q: What can an EPP do when it does not have access to any of the test results that the component describes?

A: Component 3.2 encourages EPPs to use admissions criteria different from those specified. These might be different academic measures (e.g., end of course projects or high school exit tests), or they might be non-academic measures, or perhaps several in combination (e.g.,

EPP assessments or interviews or endorsements of applicant’s “grit” or “leadership” or “persistence” or some other quality associated with effective teaching). In this case the EPP would provide information about the association of these measures with completer’s P-12 learning and development impact. Note, though, that CAEP requires that EPPs address academic achievement/ ability of admitted candidates.

Q: Examples of achievement measures are listed but no formal non-academic ability measures have been provided as examples. Angela Duckworth’s work would serve as a good place to start with finding resources that would be useful to EPPs.

A: The CAEP standards rationale that follows Standard 3 lists several “qualities outside of academic ability (that) are associated with teacher effectiveness.” Some include grit, ability to work with parents, ability to motivate, communication skills, focus, purpose and leadership. Research on Teach for America has shown leadership experience and perseverance are predictors of successful teaching. And Danielson research shows experimentation and inquiry, writing, dialogue and questioning are qualities of effective teachers.

The CAEP 2013 Standards include references to several research studies that helped to shape these aspects of Standard 3. Among them are:

- ✓ Duckworth, A. L., Peterson, C., Matthews, M. D., & Kelly, D. R. (2007). Grit: Perseverance and passion for long-term goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92(6), 1087- 1101.
- ✓ Haberman, M. (2000). What makes a teacher education program relevant preparation for teaching diverse students in urban poverty schools? (The Milwaukee Teacher Education Center Model)
- ✓ Harding, H. (2012). Teach for America: Leading for change. *Educational Leadership*, 69(8), 58-61.
- ✓ Dobbie, W. (2011). Teacher characteristics and student achievement: Evidence from Teach for America. Harvard University. Retrieved from http://www.people.fas.harvard.edu/~dobbie/research/TeacherCharacteristics_July2011.pdf.
- ✓ Danielson, C. (2009). A framework for learning to teach. *Educational Leadership*, 66. Retrieved from <http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/summer09/vol66/num09/A-Framework-for-Learning-to-Teach.aspx>.

CAEP agrees that Professor’s Duckworth’s research is a possible starting point for proposing alternative ways to address non-academic factors, and there may be others as well.

5. OPTIONAL MEASURES FOR CAEP CRITERIA

Q: “We license native Spanish, Chinese, Portuguese (etc.) speakers to teach in our dual immersion schools. They score poorly on English language norm referenced tests. What is an “equally effective way” to provide a norm score?

A: CAEP asks the EPP to select options that it believes fulfill the intent of Standard 3 and document their rationale. The EPP might have data that could be aligned with the component 3.2 criteria, or, alternatively might have data that fits the option included in 3.2 for use of different academic measures or of non-academic factors. For example, the EPP

might investigate use of normed tests other than English-based ones—tests in the applicant’s native language, perhaps, or in mathematics. This would be an important aspect of an EPP’s self-study report, conveying the context of their preparation experiences, their applicants, the admissions criteria, and their mission, all as means of reaching the P-12 learning and development focus of CAEP’s standards.

Q: Our state is planning to implement Smarter Balanced testing. Would the results of this test be applicable to the normed test requirement?

A: CAEP expects that the new Smarter Balanced and PARCC high school completion tests will soon be available as one possible source of evidence for component 3.2 criteria. Results could serve as a source of evidence for the nationally normed test criterion in baccalaureate level admissions. CAEP will revisit that assumption as the new tests come into use and psychometric reports become available. These are tests in English Language Arts and mathematics, so, by construct, are measures of academic ability and achievement. In addition, the results will be available for virtually all high school graduates, permitting the performance of preparation applicants to be compared with the population.

Q: In our state, State XYZ, we have the XYZ admissions exam that is used for teacher candidacy and has been intentionally developed by Pearson to be at a higher level than Praxis I. Would that work?

A: CAEP staff are not familiar with that State admissions exam. However, there is an option in component 3.2 for use of state normed tests in lieu of nationally normed ones. Use of that provision would be considered by CAEP at the state’s initiation. If State XYZ wants to make a case that the XYZ admissions test has a correspondence in scores on nationally normed exams, CAEP would work with the state so that the tests could be used by all EPPs in the state.

Q: Is the Praxis I permitted to show this admission standard is met?

A: Praxis I is a basic skills test, not the kind of challenging academic achievement and ability test that the Standard calls for.

Q: Can we use the Praxis Core test for the CAEP 3.2 admissions selectivity criterion?

A: The intent of CAEP component 3.2 is that accredited educator preparation programs (EPPs) implement selective admissions procedures, in part, by including a challenging academic skills test. The examples provided—SAT, ACT, and GRE—are national tests used for general college undergraduate and graduate admissions. They are not designed specifically for candidates entering EPPs.

ETS tells CAEP that the Praxis Core Academic Skills for Educators (Core) test is specifically designed for candidates who are currently enrolled at an institution and are applying for admission to an EPP. The Praxis Core test is derived from the Common Core State Standards with an emphasis on reading, writing, and mathematics. The content areas were established to reflect the knowledge and skills required to be successful in an EPP. ETS researchers conducted a multistate, multiple-panel standard-setting study and recommend passing scores that reflect the level of knowledge and skills associated with success in EPPs.

CAEP’s current stance is that Core is an appropriate test of academic ability/achievement. However, at this time there is no evidence of the equivalence of Praxis Core with nationally normed standardized measures of academic achievement. CAEP would welcome such

evidence from the research community and will review the Standard 3 requirements as additional information is obtained.

In the meantime, CAEP encourages EPPs to use Praxis Core as a measure of academic ability and achievement and to study its relationship with the “normed test” criterion. An EPP could take advantage of the “alternative” option in the Standard; it could demonstrate the use of different admissions criteria (e.g., Praxis Core) from the ones stated in component 3.2 (e.g., for two cohorts of admitted candidates):

- An EPP could use the Praxis Core test as one among other selectivity factors, or by itself and conduct a study under the alternative option.
- An EPP could use extant data about candidate attributes to make comparisons of candidates’ Praxis Core results with their SAT or ACT scores. An EPP could determine whether CORE would provide documentation that the criterion had effectively been met.
- An analyses could be conducted by several EPPs together.
- The provider’s state could gather and match the Praxis Core and SAT, ACT or other comparison data. This could provide a basis for documenting the admissions selectivity criterion in component 3.2 for all providers in a state.

This use of the Praxis Core test would put providers on the leading edge for systematically testing innovations and using data to make program improvements. The results could help both the provider and, potentially, colleagues in other EPPs who have the same question.

Graduate level admissions

Q: What are the options for graduate level programs? If a student has completed an undergraduate degree with an overall GPA meeting a requirement such as a 3.0 will they need a score from an ACT, SAT or GRE? If so, it appears CAEP is making no distinction between percentile on SAT and percentile on GRE even though these are based on distinctive populations.

A: CAEP recognizes that applying normed tests at the graduate level is different from the undergraduate level. In its recent adoption of standards for advanced preparation programs, it provided explicit criteria for the CAEP minima: college GPA of 3.0, OR (not “and”) normed test results in the upper half of national test taker performance. The rationale is that, nationally, only about 1/3 of the U.S. population have earned BA degrees, so the pool is already selective. Examples of normed tests include GRE and MAT. The full explanation included in the advanced programs reads as follows:

This document is intended to adapt the 3.2 admissions criteria for initial preparation to graduate level advanced preparation programs. . . . there appears to be no nationally representative data, but available statistics suggest that 3.0 is in range of current GPA for college BA level work. The “top half” would be set as a criterion for cohort performance on a normed test of ability/achievement. However, there would be no phase-in period to a higher criterion (moving up to the top 40% and then the top 33%) as there is for initial preparation. Instead, CAEP could evaluate how the 50% level works in actual practice. Currently, for GRE verbal, the “top half” of all test takers who indicate their intended field of graduate study demonstrate similar performance for education as for engineering, physical sciences, life sciences and business. The normed test and GPA requirements would be alternatives (rather than additive) because current admissions criteria vary across institutions and individual graduate programs.

6. MEASURES DURING PREPARATION

Q: How will providers collect data for component 3.4 on progression and advancement?

A: Providers have access to candidate data of many types. For example, clinical observation data, benchmarks for admission to the program, work samples, grades, etc. EPPs should collect these data throughout the program, especially at key transition points (such as entrance to clinical experiences, course completion, etc.) and use them for program improvement.

7. CAEP STANDARD 3

Q: Normed tests are not valid measures of a student's ability to be a great teacher, but a measure of potential for success in college. How can CAEP require use of these tests that are known to have results for candidates that will decrease the diversity of the pool of candidates?

- A: The CAEP Board-approved Standard 3 draws from research conducted over several decades as well as professional consensus. Research consistently concludes that teacher academic achievement and ability have a positive relationship with the performance of P-12 students.
- The 2013 CAEP standards include references to some of the research supporting teacher academic ability as an important factor in P-12 student learning. Among them are:
 - ✓ National Research Council report (2010), *Preparing teachers: Building evidence for sound policy*
 - ✓ Ball, D., Hill, H., Rowan, B. (2005) *Effects of Teachers' Mathematical Knowledge for Teaching on Student Achievement*. *American Educational Research Journal*. 42(2), 371-406
 - ✓ Floden, R. & M. Maniketti. 2005. *Research on the Effects of Coursework in the Arts and Sciences and in the Foundations of Education*.
 - ✓ *In Studying Teacher Education: The report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education*. Eds. Cochran-Smith, M. & K. Zeichner. (Meta-analysis of previous research)
 - ✓ Wayne, A. and P. Young. 2003. *Teacher Characteristics and Student Achievement Gains: A Review*. *Review of Educational Research* 73.1 (2003): 89-122 (Meta-analysis of previous studies).
 - ✓ Whitehurst, G. (2002). *Strengthening teacher quality: Research on teacher preparation and professional development*. White House Conference on Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers. U. S. Department of Education
 - The "SAT, ACT, and GRE" in the component are not requirements, but only examples. There is no intent to claim that these tests are "measures of a student's ability to be a great teacher." They are commonly used assessments of academic ability and achievement, attributes that are associated with effective teaching.
 - The Board has implemented the first part of the national normed test criterion—that candidates be in the upper half of academic ability and achievement—deferring implementation of its criteria at the top 40% and top 33%.
 - The CAEP Board has authorized a more detailed study around issues in Standard 3, now underway:
 - ✓ The contractor, Teacher Preparation Analytics, will undertake a detailed investigation of what is known from research about the association of academic ability and achievement with P-12 student learning.

- ✓ It will document potential effects of implementing higher criteria, potential effects on the diversity of the candidate pool, experiences in other professions, and state commitments that are relevant to these criteria.
- ✓ Results from the study will be considered by the CAEP Board in December 2015.
- Standard 3 calls for both high academic ability/achievement as candidate strengths, but also for diversity in candidates that reflects the diversity of America's school population. Through component 3.1, recruitment, the CAEP standards call for continuing and purposeful actions by the EPP to shape its admitted cohorts of candidates in line with these attributes, with recognition of the employment opportunities available for completers.