

*CAEP Standard 4: Its language,
suggested evidence, and questions to
address*

Monday, April 25th
(5:00 pm EDT)

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 speak up when there are question and feedback pauses.
- The recording of the webinar will be posted on the CAEP website by May 15th, including the PPT.

Goal and Objectives

- **Goal:** To provide updates information on addressing Standard 4 and its components in the CAEP self-study.
- **Objectives:** Participants will be able to (PWBAT):
 - Identify the key points of Standard 4 and its components,
 - List the kinds of evidence that CAEP recommends for each of the components for Standard 4, and
 - Describe how the standard and its components will be evaluated by CAEP reviewers, and
 - Outline when Areas for Improvement or Stipulations may be assigned.

Standard 4: Key points in the language of the standard and in the CAEP process


- 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.
- This standard and all its components **MUST** be met to be **fully** accredited.

Components of Standard 4: In Brief

- The components provide multi-dimensional measures of preparation impact
 - 4.1 Impact on P-12 learning and development
 - 4.2 Indicators of teacher effectiveness
 - 4.3 Satisfaction of employers
 - 4.4 Satisfaction of completers (in-service graduates)
 - **Each** component **MUST** be met for the standard to be met.
 - The components of this standard are routinely reported upon in the annual report.

A reminder on CAEP's Phase-In Schedule

CAEP's Phase-In Policy for Standard 4

| | EPP selects prior or new CAEP standards | | New CAEP standards required for all accreditation self-studies, reviews, and decisions. | | | | |
|---|--|------|---|------|----------------|------|------|
| If your next accreditation self-study is submitted in calendar year  | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
| Program Impact (standard 4), including P-12 student learning, teacher observations/student surveys; employer satisfaction/persistence; and completer satisfaction— These will benefit from new state databases (already available in some states) for consistency and completeness, and be cost effective for providers | Plans and after Accreditation Council approval of the plan, progress is reported in the annual reports | | Plans and progress, progress in annual report | | Fully in place | | |
| Program Outcomes, including: licensure, completions, and hiring rates; and consumer information (encouraged but not part of accreditation) | Annual report will specify request each year | | | | | | |

General Rules for Standard 4 (AH, p. 54)

- All phase-in requirements are met
- All components are required
- At least 3 cycles of data submitted and analyzed: if a revised assessment is submitted with less than 3 cycles, submit original assessment as well.
- Cycles of data must be sequential and the latest available
- EPP-created assessments scored at CAEP sufficient level from the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric

Feedback and Question Pause



Component 4.1: Key language

Impact on P-12 Learning and Development

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.

So, think: What evidence do I have that would demonstrate graduates' impact on P-12 student learning?

Component 4.1: Suggested evidence for ALL EPPs

- Direct measures of student learning and development
 - Addresses diverse subjects and grades
- P-12 impact or growth data from state teacher evaluations (if available)

If state data are not available:

- Teacher-linked student assessments from districts
- Teacher-conducted action research

EPPs that have access to data from states about completer impact:

- Demonstrate that they **are familiar** with the sources of the P-12 student learning impact data and the state's model for preparing the data that are attributed to the EPP's preparation program.
- Document the EPP's analysis and evaluation of information provided on P-12 student learning.
- Interpret the data
- Judge the implications of the data and analyze for the improvement of the preparation program

What does “be familiar” mean?

- New Accreditation Handbook (March 2016)
 - See page 50 (middle of the page) to the top of page 51
 - Sources of the data (psychometric soundness, complementary sources)
 - P-12 students from whom the data come
 - Proportion of completers represented
 - Degree of attrition
 - Manner by which data are linked with teachers
 - The state’s practice in reporting data
 - Level of disaggregation
 - Criteria used to establish minimum number of completers
 - Decisions as to # of years of performance is associated with EPP
 - Disaggregated data for comparison
 - Disaggregated data for comparison by ELL, SPED, attendance, etc.

EPPs that do not have access to state P-12 student learning data:

- The EPP creates data similar to state data in conjunction with student assessment and teacher evaluations conducted *in school districts where some portion of its completers are employed.*
 - This type of EPP study could be phased in
 - By 2016, all EPPs should at least have a design in place and pilot data collection under way
 - One year of data needed for 2017-2018
 - EPP collaborations encouraged
- These alternative approaches can also be presented by EPPs that are supplementing state or district data with data on subjects or grades not covered

What are some examples?

- See memo on Standard 4 by Stevie Chepko dated 2/16/16
 - Learning objectives and metrics specific to schools/districts
 - Follow a small group of completers, representative of various licensure areas: case study, action research
 - Induction program with teacher-created assessments combined with observations
 - Six case studies of teaching strategies taught by EPP with pre-post
 - Virtual case study: reflective journal, blogs, learning communities, virtual meetings. Gathering qualitative and quantitative data.
- Comparison points?
 - Completers with other completers/licensure areas
 - Completers with completers from another cohort year
 - Information on the schools in which completers are teaching; comparison by school type

Component 4.1: What are all reviewers/auditors looking for?

- **All evidence** for Standard 4 is **from in-service sources**, when an EPP's completers are working in schools.
- The EPP plan/data collection for studies under component 4.1 **addresses diverse subjects and grades**, making use of State VAM and or growth data **where available**.
- AH, page 55 provides the evaluation rubric for 4.1
 - At least one measure of impact from a representative sample of completers
 - Analysis and interpretation
 - Context and description of the source of P-12 data
 - Description and explanation of representativeness

When might an AFI or Stipulation be assigned?

- No, limited, or inappropriate data,
- Analysis/interpretation incomplete, superficial, or not supported by data,
- No or inappropriate context or description of the source of P-12 learning data, or
- General rules are violated.

Feedback and Question Pause



Component 4.2: Key language

Teacher effectiveness

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.

So, think: What evidence (other than measures of P-12 learning) do I have that would demonstrate in-service graduates are effective teachers?

Component 4.2: Suggested Evidence

- **Structured classroom observation evaluations**
 - CLASS:
 - **Social and emotional supports**--classroom climate, teacher sensitivity, regard for student perspectives;
 - **Organizational and management supports**--behavior management, productivity, strategies for engaging students;
 - **Instructional supports**--strategies that foster content knowledge, strategies that foster analysis and reading skills, strategies that foster knowledge of procedures and skills, quality of feedback, instructional dialogue.
 - For Danielson:
 - **planning and preparation,**
 - **the classroom environment,**
 - **instruction,** and
 - **professional responsibilities.**
- EPP-created observation instrument
- P – 12 student surveys, such as the Tripod survey by Ron Ferguson

Component 4.2: What are all reviewers/auditors looking for?

- Observation instruments are structured and inclusive of the application of professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions corresponding to P-12 learning/teacher effectiveness,
- Representative/purposive sample that can be enlarged over time,
- Survey return rates are at acceptable levels (20% or above),
- Identification of types of validity and inclusion of appropriate descriptions, and
- Valid interpretations of data, supported by results.

When might an AFI or Stipulation be assigned?

- Student surveys are not rated as sufficient or better,
- Survey return rates are too low (15% or below),
- Validity descriptions not submitted, inappropriate, or failed to meet research standards, OR
- General rules are violated.

Feedback and Question Pause



Component 4.3: Key language

Satisfaction of employers

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.

So, think: what evidence do I have that would demonstrate the employers are satisfied with our program graduates once hired?

Component 4.3: Suggested Evidence

- Employer satisfaction data – EPP or State instruments
 - Surveys, focus groups, case studies
 - Include instrument, sampling, response rate, timing, population represented, methodology, etc. (AH, Page 52)
 - Descriptive of knowledge and skills that were developed during preparation
- 3 cycles of data on employment milestones
 - Promotion,
 - Employment trajectory,
 - Employment in high needs schools
 - Retention:
 - in position for which initially hired or
 - in another role by the same or different employer

Component 4.3: What are all reviewers/ auditors looking for?

- Any EPP-conducted survey used for employer satisfaction is evaluated at the sufficient level on the CAEP Assessment Rubric
- A State or EPP conducted survey is used for gathering data and descriptive information is provided on:
 - the representativeness of the sample, the characteristics of the respondents, and the survey response rate
 - disaggregated data specific to high need schools or licensure areas
- Data are analyzed, evaluated, and interpreted
 - conclusions are supported by the data, argument is persuasive, and comparison points for data are provided
- EPP gathers employment milestone information from employers and includes the results in the self-study documentation and analysis
- Survey return rates are at acceptable levels (20% or better) and inclusive of most licensure areas in the EPP.

When might an AFI or Stipulation be assigned?

- When there is no system for gathering employer satisfaction data,
- It is inadequate, OR
- General rules are violated.

Feedback and Question Pause



Component 4.4: Key language

Satisfaction of completers

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**.

So, think: what evidence do I have that would demonstrate our program graduates are satisfied now that they have been hired and are on-the-job?

Component 4.4: Suggested Evidence

- Completer satisfaction data – EPP or State instruments
 - Surveys, focus groups, case studies
 - Include instrument, sampling, response rate, timing, population represented, methodology, etc. (AH, Page 53)
 - Descriptive of knowledge and skills that were developed during preparation

Component 4.4: What are all reviewers/auditors looking for?

- Evidence that completers perceive preparation as sufficient for their job responsibilities (AH, Page 58),
- Appropriate analysis and interpretation of results,
- Adequate and representative sample reflected in responses,
- Survey return rates are at acceptable levels (20%),
- Analysis and interpretation aligned with intent of component
- Conclusions supported by data

When might an AFI or Stipulation be assigned?

- When interpretation and analysis are incomplete or conclusion are unsupported by data,
- Only **one or two** were provided:
 - System for gathering data,
 - Response rates of 20%
 - Description of representativeness of sample,
 - Multiple comparison points, and
 - Trends over time.
- General rules are violated.

Feedback and Question Pause



Standard 4: Key points in the language of the standard

- 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.

Making the Case for Standard 4: Holistic Summary Statement

- Information is provided from several sources and provides evidence of program impact on graduates (**in-service**).
- Data are **analyzed**.
- **Differences and similarities across licensure areas and demographical data** are examined.
- **Appropriate interpretations** and **conclusions** are reached.
- **Trends or patterns are identified** that suggest need for preparation modification or “staying the course”.
- Based on the analysis of data, **planned or completed actions for change** are described.

NOTE: on component 5.4

- Further analysis of the 4 program impact measures addressed in standard 4 is expected in component 5.4 (AH, page 63- 64 and page 68-69 of the rubric)
- This requirement also includes the other four measures of program outcomes: completer/graduation rate, licensure rate, and consumer information.

FYI

- Next webinar has been **rescheduled** from May 26th (Thursday) to June 2, 2016 (Thursday) at 5pm Eastern Time.

Log-in: <https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/562953453>

-

You can also dial in using your phone.

United States (Toll-free): 1 866 899 4679

United States : +1 (224) 501-3318

Access Code: 562-953-453

Final Feedback and Question Pause

