

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation CAEP: The Commission Options

*Sandi Cohen, Chair of the TEAC Board and
Frank Murray, President of TEAC*

CAEP GOALS

Raise the performance of candidates as practitioners in the nation's P-12 schools.

Raise the stature of the profession by raising standards for the evidence the field relies on to support its claims of quality.

CAEP Standards

1. Candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for effective work in schools.
2. Data drive decisions about candidates and programs.
3. Resources and practices support candidate learning.

STANDARD ONE: KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITIONS

- Candidates know subject matter and pedagogy.
- They can teach students effectively and demonstrate their impact on P-12 student learning.
- They nurture the academic and social development of all students.
- They use technology to enhance teaching, classroom management, and communications with families and assessment of student learning.
- They work collaboratively with the community and school personnel.
- They engage in ongoing learning that improves practice.

STANDARD TWO: DATA DRIVE DECISIONS ABOUT CANDIDATES AND PROGRAMS

- Decisions are based on evidence from multiple measures of candidate learning and completers' performance in the schools.
- The unit has a system for routine self-assessment.
- The reliability and validity of each assessment measure are known and adequate.
- The unit reviews and revises assessments and data sources regularly and systematically.
- The unit uses data for program improvement and disaggregates the evidence for discrete program options or certification areas.

STANDARD THREE: RESOURCES AND PRACTICES SUPPORT CANDIDATE LEARNING

- Program components meet state and/or national standards.
- Field experiences / clinical practice offered in collaboration with P-12 schools.
- Candidates have opportunities to work with diverse P-12 students and teachers.
- Faculty members (full-time and part-time) are qualified.
- Support services are appropriate and adequate.
- Administrative structures & financial resources support candidate learning and show parity at the institution.

STANDARD THREE: RESOURCES AND PRACTICES SUPPORT CANDIDATE LEARNING, continued

- Admissions and mentoring policies encourage recruitment and retention of high quality candidates.
- Provision exists for candidates / completers to voice complaints.
- Policies and practices are transparent and consistent.

CAEP Logic of Accreditation

1. Evidence of Capacity for Program Quality
2. Evidence of Candidate Competence
3. Evidence of a System of Quality Control & Program Improvement

CAEP Pathways to Accreditation

Commission	Focus of Research & Report	Focus on Improvement and Report
<i>“TEAC”</i>	<i>Program Inquiry Brief</i>	<i>Quality Mechanisms Program Quality Audit Report</i>
<i>“NCATE”</i>	<i>The Field Transform Initiative</i>	<i>Target Program Improvement</i>

Two Key Questions

- Do the program's graduates understand what the faculty claim they know and can do?
- What have the faculty learned from their monitoring and inquiry into the program's quality?

Assurance based on evidence

- Upon what evidence does the program faculty rely
 - to support their claims that the program's graduates are *competent*?
 - to convince themselves that their assessments are reliable and valid?
 - to convince themselves that program changes & requirements improve the program's quality?

Generally available indicators of program quality

Grades (major, pedagogy, & clinical)

Scores on Standardized tests

(candidates' entrance, exit, and license scores and perhaps graduates' own students' scores)

Surveys – students, alumni, employers

• Ratings – portfolios, work samples, cases

Basis for Rates – hiring/tenure, gain scores, certification, graduate study, professional awards, publications, NBPTS, etc.

Inquiry Brief: main sections

- 1. Introduction (demographics & values)**
- 2. Claims and rationale for assessments**
- 3. Methods of assessing**
- 4. Results**
- 5. Discussion of results and plan of inquiry**
- 6. References**

Inquiry Brief: Appendices

- A. *Internal audit* of quality control system – it works as designed and makes things better**
- B. Evidence of capacity and commitment**
- C. Qualifications of the program faculty**
- D. Program requirements & alignments with state and/or professional association standards**
- E. Inventory: analysis of available measures**
- F. Copies of locally developed assessments**
- G. *Programs accredited by other agencies***

Focus of the *Inquiry Brief*

1.0 Evidence of Candidate Acquisition of

1.1 Subject Matter Knowledge

1.2 Pedagogical Knowledge

1.3 Caring & Effective Teaching Skill

1.4 Each includes evidence of three cross-cutting themes & evidence of validity

- Learning how to learn (critical reflection)
- Multicultural perspectives & accuracy
- Technology

1.5 *Valid interpretations of the assessment evidence*

The Program Quality Audit Report

- Program Demographics & Claims
- Description of the Quality Control System
- Method of Conducting Internal Audit
- Findings from the Internal Audit with regard to each part of the TEAC system
- Interpretation of the Findings
- Plans for modifications and further inquiry

Focus of the PQAR

What has the faculty learned about –

- 1. Whether its quality control system works as designed**
- 2. The validity of its assessments**
- 3. The results of its assessments**
- 4. The results of its inquiry into what factors influence candidate learning**
- 5. The need for further inquiry**

Capacity in the IB & PQAR

- The *Quality Control System* monitors & investigates the capacity of the faculty, curriculum, students, facilities, resources, etc. for quality
- Parity on common program features with other units at the institution
- Sufficiency on unique features of the program (clinical, curriculum

What is a single program?

- Program structure. Essentially the same requirements, rationale, logic, and faculty
- Quality control system. Share the same quality control system
- Evidence. The evidence can be aggregated

Accuracy of *IB* or *PQAR*: Audit Opinions

- ***Clean Opinion***: At least 90% targets verified
- ***Qualified Opinion***: At least 75% targets verified and/or more than 25% have errors of any kind (trivial and consequential)
- ***Adverse Opinion***: More than 25% of the targets are not verified
- ***Disclaimer Opinion***: More than 25% of the targets could not be audited
- ***Disclaimer + Not Verified*** is more than 25%

Standards of evidence

- Evidence is reliable: chance is not a credible explanation for them
- Evidence is valid: rival explanations are not credible & evidence is consistent with claims
- Evidence is of sufficient magnitude: 75% guideline or heuristic is applied to the empirical maximum (the mean of the top ten percent) when no other guidance is available.

TEAC accreditation process at a glance

- Application & Candidate status
- Formative evaluation (optional)
- *Inquiry Brief* or *Program Quality Audit Report* submitted and declared auditable
- Call-for-comment and Online Surveys of Faculty, Students, Cooperating Teachers, etc.
- Audit visit and Audit Report
- Analysis of the case by panelists & staff
- Accreditation Panel recommendation
- Accreditation Committee decision
- Acceptance or appeal of the decision
- Annual Report (Appendix E, updated data tables, updated enrollment and graduation data)