



Council for the
Accreditation of
Educator Preparation

CAEP Standard 1

Teachers Know Their Content and Teach Effectively

Stevie Chepko, CAEP
Stevie.chepko@caepnet.org

Tatiana Rivadeneyra, CAEP
Tatiana.Rivadeneyra@caepnet.org

The Self Study – Standard 1 (Sample 1) EPP Created Assessments

- Create a folder in the Evidence Room for all EPP created assessments
 - Sub-folders would hold each of the EPP created assessments and for each assessment the following would be included:
 - Narrative specific to administration and purpose of the assessment
 - Point or points when assessment is administered
 - Purpose of assessment and use for decision making
 - Narrative specific to information provided to candidates
 - Candidates given a description of purpose of the assessment
 - Expectations and level of performance are identified (What is the minimal level of sufficiency?)

The Self Study – Standard 1 (Sample 2)

EPP Created Assessments

- Description of or plan for the establishment of (at minimum) content validity using a research-based methodology
- Description of or plan for the establishment of inter-rater reliability
- Copy of the assessment
 - Each indicator tagged to a specific CAEP Component
 - For Component 1.1
 - » Tag each indicator to InTASC Standard and CAEP Component
 - » EPP electing the feedback option – tag to InTASC, CAEP, and state standards
 - Scoring Guide or Rubric defining the at least the minimum level of sufficiency for each indicator
 - Data chart (tagged) and disaggregated by specialty licensure area
- EPP created assessments are evaluated using the CAEP Evaluation Rubric

Submission of Self Study – Standard 1

- Self-study is submitted by Standard or Claims
 - Specialty area evidence is disaggregated and submitted as part of CAEP Standard 1
 - Data submitted as evidence for CAEP Standard 1 is embedded into the narrative text of the report
 - Only evidence specific to components of Standard 1 is submitted –
 - EPPs submit only data specific to the component
 - Requires EPPs to disaggregate data from assessments/data charts specific to that component
 - Evidence based case is made for meeting Standard 1

The Self Study – Standard 1 Proprietary Assessments (Sample 3)

- Proprietary assessments are assessments used by the EPP where the property rights to the assessments are owned by another entity such as -
 - State required licensure test
 - edTPA or PPAT
 - State surveys
 - Any state data provided for Standard 4
- For Proprietary assessments, the EPP provides validity and reliability information from the owner of the assessment if the information is available
- Proprietary assessments **are not** subject to review using the CAEP Evaluation Rubric

Sample of Proprietary Assessments – State Licensure Exams



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%

Submission of Self Study – Standard 1

- Standard Evidence
 - Each component should be addressed (1.1–1.5) and data supporting each component are embedded in text
 - Threads of diversity and technology are also addressed
 - After data are reported in Standard 1, the same data are referenced in supporting of other standards (*not represented or repeated, but referenced*)
 - Most candidate based data are reported in Standard 1
 - Prompts or questions will be provided to aid EPPs in organizing their answers and data

Standard 1 – Component 1.1

- Candidates **demonstrate** an understanding of the **10 InTASC standards** at the appropriate progression level(s) [\[i\]](#) in the following categories: *the learner and learning; content; instructional practice; and professional responsibility*
 - Must provide evidence for each category of InTASC Standards
 - Learner and Learning
 - Content
 - Instructional practice
 - Professional responsibility
 - **Do Not** have to address each of the 10 InTASC Standards just provide evidence in each category (still tag by InTASC standard number)
 - All data are disaggregated by licensure area

Standard 1 – Component 1.1

- **Types of evidence for the learner and learning**
 - Clinical Experience Observational Instrument
 - Lesson and/or unit plans
 - Portfolios – specific portion dedicated to learner and learning
 - Teacher Work Sample
 - Content Knowledge Licensure Test (sub-scores)
 - Pedagogical Content Licensure Test
 - GPA
 - Courses listed specific to the learner and learning
 - Content specific methods courses that have learner development embedded into the coursework

Sample chart

ASSESSMENT #1: CLINICAL OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT DATA

Disaggregated data by specialty licensure areas

Multigrade Data Cluster

Tag CAEP	Tag InTASC	Tag State	Item on Instrument	EPP Mean		Elementary		Early Childhood		Physical Education		Music Education		Art Education		Dance Education	
				2013 N = M =	2014 N = M =	2013 N = M =	2014 N = M =	2013 N = M =	2014 N = M =	2013 N = M =	2014 N = M =	2013 N = M =	2014 N = M =	2013 N = M =	2014 N = M =	2013 N = M =	2014 N = M =
1.1	1		Develops learning experiences which are appropriate for the subject and grade level and are connected appropriately to the standards.	2013 N = 23 M = 3.2	2014 N = 26 M = 3.4	2013 N = 133 M = 3.4	2014 N = 126 M = 3.59	2013 N = 96 M = 3.1	2014 N = 93 M = 2.9	2013 N = 12 M = 3.0	2014 N = 14 M = 3.3	2013 N = 11 M = 3.2	2014 N = 16 M = 3.1	2013 N = 5 M = 2.9	2014 N = 8 M = 3.0	2013 N = 6 M = 3.1	2014 N = 7 M = 3.2
1.1	8		Uses discussion strategies to promote high-level thinking through accountable talk and academic conversation.	2013 N = 23 M = 3.0	2014 N = 26 M = 3.1	2013 N = 133 M = 2.8	2014 N = 126 M = 2.9	2013 N = 96 M = 2.7	2014 N = 93 M = 2.6	2013 N = 12 M = 2.5	2014 N = 14 M = 2.7	2013 N = 11 M = 2.4	2014 N = 16 M = 2.9	2013 N = 5 M = 2.7	2014 N = 8 M = 2.8	2013 N = 6 M = 2.4	2014 N = 7 M = 2.6
1.1	9		Participates in school-related professional development opportunities.	2013 N = 23 M = 3.7	2014 N = 26 M = 3.8	2013 N = 133 M = 3.5	2014 N = 126 M = 3.4	2013 N = 96 M = 3.7	2014 N = 93 M = 3.6	2013 N = 12 M = 3.5	2014 N = 14 M = 3.2	2013 N = 11 M = 3.2	2014 N = 16 M = 3.4	2013 N = 5 M = 3.5	2014 N = 8 M = 3.6	2013 N = 6 M = 3.4	2014 N = 7 M = 3.3

Standard 1 – Component 1.1

- **Types of evidence for Content Knowledge**
 - Content Knowledge Licensure Test
 - Clinical Experience Observational Instrument with items specific to the application of content knowledge
 - Lesson and/or unit plans
 - GPA
 - Courses listed specific to content knowledge
 - Data chart to include mean GPA for education majors and non-majors in the same course(s)
 - Data disaggregated by specialty licensure area

Required Course - Sample Submission Chart

Cluster Multi-grade Cluster – Initial



Discipline Specific Required Content Courses – Elementary Education				
<i>Course Number and Name</i>	<i>Catalog Course Description</i>	<i>Tag CAEP</i>	<i>Tag InTASC</i>	<i>Tag State</i>
Discipline Specific Required Content Courses – Early Childhood				
<i>Course Number and Name</i>	<i>Catalog Course Description</i>			
Discipline Specific Required Content Courses – Physical Education				
<i>Course Number and Name</i>	<i>Catalog Course Description</i>			



GPA Content – Sample Data Chart

Appendix B (cont.)

Guidelines for Using and Reporting GPAs as Evidence

Sample of Data Table for Discipline Specific Content Courses Mean GPAs

Cluster 2 - Secondary

Content Area	N for Teacher Candidates by Year			Mean GPA for Teacher Candidates By Year			N for Non-Teacher Candidates by Year			Mean GPA for Non-teacher Candidates by Year		
	2012	2013	2014	2012	2013	2014	2012	2013	2014	2012	2014	2015
History	7	8	6	3.1	3.0	3.3	127	99	145	2.8	2.6	2.9
English	12	13	15	2.5	2.7	2.4	104	72	98	3.3	3.5	3.2
Math	4	1	1	Aggregated for 3 yrs. 3.2			61	45	51	2.5	2.1	2.6
Science/Physics	1	0	2	Aggregated for 3 yrs. 3.0			56	22	25	2.3	2.7	3.3

Standard 1 – Component 1.1 (cont.)

- **Types of evidence for Instructional Practice**
 - Assessment
 - Teacher Work sample
 - Impact of student learning instruments
 - Portfolios
 - Lesson and/or unit plans
 - Planning for Instruction
 - Lesson and/or unit plans
 - Portfolios
 - Work Samples

Standard 1 – Component 1.1 (cont.)

- **Types of evidence for Instructional Practice**
 - Instructional Strategies
 - Clinical Observation Instruments
 - Lesson and/or unit plans
 - Portfolios
 - Focus teaching experiences
 - Video analyzes

- **Types of evidence for Professional Responsibility**
 - Dispositional instruments
 - Professional Development data
 - Clinical Observational Instruments

General Rules for Standard 1

- **All data** must be disaggregated by specialty licensure area in Standard 1.
- At **least three cycles** of data are required. If a revised assessment is submitted with less than 3 cycles of data, the data from the original assessment should be submitted.
- Cycles of data must be **sequential and be the latest available**.
- EPP created assessments should be scored at the minimal level of sufficiency on the **CAEP Instrument Rubric**.
- **All components** must be addressed in the self study.
- Evidence from Standard 1 is cited in support of continuous improvement and part of an overall system of review (Standard 5).
- There are **no required components** for Standard 1.

CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL

DRAFT Component 1.1 (Sample 4)

- At least three cycles of data/evidence are presented and analyzed
- All four of the InTASC categories are addressed with multiple indicators across the four categories
- InTASC category of Instructional Practice is addressed from clinical experiences
- Multiple indicators/measures specific to application of content knowledge in clinical settings are identified with performance at or above the acceptable level on rubric indicators
- Data/evidence are analyzed including identification of trends/patterns, comparisons, and/or differences
- Interpretations and conclusions are supported by data/evidence
- Class average at or above acceptable levels on the EPP scoring guide indicators specific to the four categories of InTASC Standards
- If applicable, demonstration that candidate performance is comparable to non-candidates performance in the same courses or majors
- Specialty licensure area performance indicates competency and is benchmarked against the average licensure area performance of other providers (comparisons are made with scaled scores and/or state/national data when available)

Standard 1 – Component 1.2

- Providers ensure that completers **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**.
- **Types of evidence**
 - Portfolio
 - Reflections or narratives
 - Work Samples
 - Pre & Post data
- Demonstrates use of data for instructional decision-making; research evidence is cited in narratives (e.g., edTPA, PPAT, reflections, or portfolios)
 - Criteria identified and expectations defined

Component 1.2 - (Sample 5)

- **Measures or Types of Evidence**

- Candidates use of research and evidence for planning, implementing, and evaluating students' progress
- Candidates use of data to reflect on teaching effectiveness and their own professional practice with performance at or above acceptable levels on rubric indicators
- Candidates use of data to assess P-12 student progress and to modify instruction based on student data (data literacy)

- **CAEP Sufficient Level**

- At least three cycles of data/evidence are presented and analyzed
- Data/evidence document effective candidate use of research and evidence for planning, implementing, and evaluating students' progress, with performance at or above acceptable level on rubric indicators
- Data/evidence document effective candidate use of data to reflect on teaching effectiveness and their own professional practice with performance at or above the acceptable level on rubric indicators
- Data/evidence document effective candidate use of data to assess P-12 student progress and to modify instruction based on student data (data literacy), with performance at or above acceptable level on rubric indicators

Standard 1 – Component 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).
- **Types of evidence**
 - SPA Program Reports
 - Alignment with state standards
 - Evidence of meeting specific state requirements (i.e. anti-bullying training, etc.)
 - National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

Standard 1 – component 1.3 (Sample 6)

• Measures or Types of Evidence

- SPA reports
- Other specialty area accreditor reports
- Specialty area-specific state standards achieved OR evidence of alignment of assessments to other state/national standards
- Number of completers who have been awarded National Board Certified Teacher (NBCT) status by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS)

Note: Trends and comparisons within and across specialty licensure area data should be made.

• CAEP Sufficient Level

- At least three cycles of data/evidence are analyzed
- At least one source of evidence that candidates apply content and pedagogical knowledge at specialty licensure area levels (SPA or state reports, disaggregated specialty licensure area data, NBCT actions, etc.)
- A majority (51% or above) of SPA program reports have achieved National Recognition –
- **OR** documentation is provided on periodic state review of program level outcome data
- Answers specific to specialty licensure area questions are complete and supported by an analysis and accurate interpretation of specialty licensure area data
- Comparisons are made and trends are identified across specialty licensure areas based on data
- Assessments submitted for the Program Review with Feedback option are at the minimal level of sufficiency

Standard 1 – Component 1.4

- Providers ensure that candidates **demonstrate skills and commitment** that afford **all P-12 students** access to **rigorous college- and career-ready standards** (e.g., Next Generation Science Standards, National Career Readiness Certificate, Common Core State Standards).
- **Types of evidence**
 - Clinical Experience Observational Instruments
 - Lesson and/or unit plans
 - Portfolios
 - Focus teaching experiences
 - Video analyzes

Standard 1 – component 1.4 (Sample 7)

Measures or Types of Evidence

- Observational instruments
- Lesson or unit plans
- Work samples
- Portfolios (such as edTPA or PPAT)

NOTE: Component 1.4 emphasizes college- and career- ready preparation and making that level of instruction available for all P-12 students. All states have standards specific to college- and career- readiness and EPPs should begin with their state specific standards.

CAEP Sufficient Level

- At least three cycles of data/evidence are presented and analyzed
- Multiple indicators/measures specific to evaluating proficiencies for college- and career- readiness are scored at or above the EPP scoring guide indicators at the minimal level of sufficiency (acceptable level):
 - Candidate's ability to provide effective instruction for all students (differentiation of instruction)
 - Candidate's ability to have students apply knowledge to solve problems and think critically
 - Candidate's ability to include cross-discipline learning experiences and to teach for transfer of skills
 - Candidate's ability to design and implement learning experiences that require collaboration and communication skills

Standard 1 – Component 1.4 (cont.)

- Demonstrate the following
 - Engage all students in critical thinking activities, cogent reasoning, and evidence collection
 - Assess P-12 student mastery of multiple standards, checking for student learning
 - Analyze and interpret student data
 - Use assessment and student data to differentiate learning

Standard 1 – Component 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**.
- Types of evidence
 - Clinical Experience Observational Instrument
 - Lesson and/or Unit plans
 - Portfolio
 - Teacher Work Sample with evidence of application and use of technology
 - Technology Key Assessment
 - Candidates use of technology to track student progress
 - Candidates use of technology to communicate student progress

Standard 1: Component 1.5 (Sample 8)

Measures or Types of Evidence

- Student use of technology
- Technology use aligned with lesson objectives
- Technology used to differentiate instruction
- Technology used to track student progress
- Technology used to communicate with other stakeholders
- Technology used to enhance lesson

CAEP Sufficient Level

- At least three cycles of data/evidence are presented and analyzed
- Exiting candidates model and apply technology standards (e.g., ISTE) in coursework and clinical experiences
- Candidates demonstrate knowledge and skill proficiencies including accessing databases, digital media, and/or electronic sources with performance at or above the acceptable level on rubric indicators
- Candidates demonstrate the ability to design and facilitate digital learning with performance at or above the acceptable level on rubric indicators
- Candidates demonstrate the ability to track and share student performance data digitally with performance at or above the acceptable level on rubric indicators
- Technology aligns with lesson objectives and enhances student learning

Self Study – Standard 1

- After addressing each component of the Standard, present the summary case for having met the Standard based on the evidence
 - Cite the data specifically when making the case
 - Provide specific examples on how data were used to make program or EPP level changes
 - Identify both strengths and areas for improvement based on evidence
 - Compare and contrast data across specialty areas
 - Note trends

Self Study – Specialty Area Data

- At the end of Standard 1
 - Separate section specific to the disaggregated data by specialty licensure area
 - EPPs will address and answer specific questions on how the disaggregated data by specialty licensure area informed EPP and program area decisions
 - Based on the analysis of the disaggregated data, how have the results from the specialty licensure area or SPA evidence been used to inform decision making and improve instruction and candidate learning outcomes?
 - Address trends across licensure areas
 - Address any areas of concern or strengths
 - What has been learned about individual licensure areas based on the disaggregated data
 - Based on the analysis of the disaggregated specialty licensure area data, how have individual licensure areas used data for change?
 - Provide examples of individual licensure area changes based on the analysis



Q
&
A