

## CAEP EVALUATION RUBRIC FOR VISITOR TEAMS

For use with the EPP Self-Study Report

For use by: EPPs, Site Visitors, and Accreditation Council Members

### Visitor Team Evaluation Rubric: Standard 1

The rubrics described in the chart below are **draft** guides for EPPs, members of CAEP Visitor Teams, and the CAEP Accreditation Council. The rubrics will be piloted over the next year and changes will be made based on feedback from EPPs, Visitor Teams, and the Accreditation Council. The rubrics are included in this draft to provide opportunities for stakeholders to offer guidance and feedback on their clarity, alignment to Standards/components, and usefulness to the accreditation process. Any feedback specific to the rubrics should be sent to Lauren Alexander at [lauren.alexander@caepnet.org](mailto:lauren.alexander@caepnet.org)

The *CAEP Accreditation Handbook* defines the principal role of the Visitor Team to “investigate the quality of the provider’s evidence, including its accuracy and its consistency or inconsistency with the provider’s claims.” The team analyzes the strength of the evidence “in demonstrating satisfaction of the CAEP Standards and (2) the description of particular strengths or deficiencies.” The Team does not determine that individual Standards are met. Instead, the team evaluates the completeness, quality, and strength of evidence for each Standard overall.

There are references in the Visitor Team Evaluation Rubric below to the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric, on which some of the criteria are based in the Evaluation Rubric for Standard 1; where applicable, references to the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric appear. \*For EPP-created assessments to provide sufficient evidence/data for standards and/or components, the assessment should be at the CAEP “Sufficient Level” on the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric. All of the rubrics are constructed around examples that appear in the *Handbook’s* Evidence Table. Providers are welcome to employ different measurements from those described in the Accreditation Table examples. If different evidence is submitted, the provider is responsible for showing that it has addressed the intent of the CAEP Standards or component in an equally effective way. The intent is to make all of these CAEP guides consistent and mutually reinforcing.

As Visitor Teams investigate evidence and interpret it through these rubrics below, they will usually find that individual pieces of evidence are best described by criteria identified at more than one level. A decision by the Visitor Team is not based on a single piece of evidence, but the preponderance of evidence across multiple indicators. The Visitor Team summary analysis must determine the preponderance of weight across all of the accumulated evidence, taking into account the array and distribution pattern that the teams finds. All of the criteria at the minimal level of sufficiency should be addressed, but reviewers base the final decision on the preponderance of evidence at the standard level.

#### General Rules Reminder for Standard 1:

- All data must be disaggregated by specialty licensure area for Standard 1.
- At least three cycles of data must be submitted and analyzed. 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 CAEP Sufficient Level as defined on the CAEP Assessment Evaluation 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.

## EVALUATION RUBRIC

*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.*

### EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES BELOW SUFFICIENT LEVEL

### CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL DRAFT Component 1.1

### EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES ABOVE SUFFICIENT LEVEL

–

- **EPP-created assessments are evaluated below the minimal level of sufficiency.**
- **No data/evidence disaggregated by specialty licensure area.**
- **Data/evidence presented do not align with indicators on assessments.**
- **No or only partial attempt is made to interpret data/evidence or data/evidence are misinterpreted.**
- **No indicators/measures specific to the application of knowledge are provided.**

- All general rules for the Standard are met.
- All four of the InTASC categories are addressed with multiple indicators across the four categories.
- The 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.
- Analysis of data/evidence includes identification of trends/patterns, comparisons, and/or differences.
- Data/evidences supports interpretations and conclusions.
- Class average at or above acceptable levels on the EPP scoring guide indicators specific to the four categories of InTASC Standards.
- If applicable, providers demonstrate that candidate performance is comparable to non-candidate 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).

+

- EPP-created assessments are consistently scored above the minimal level of sufficiency on the CAEP Assessment Rubric.
- All criteria at the minimal level of sufficiency are met.
- Interpretations and conclusions are supported by data/evidence from multiple data/evidence sets.
- Data/evidence are triangulated across data/evidence sets.
- Specialty licensure area performance are benchmarked with both state and national averages.

*Component 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.*

**EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES  
BELOW SUFFICIENT LEVEL**

**CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL  
DRAFT  
Component 1.2**

**EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES ABOVE  
SUFFICIENT LEVEL**

—

- **EPP-created assessments are evaluated below the minimal level of sufficiency.**
- **Planning, implementing, and evaluating of learning experiences are informal and not research or evidence/data based.**
- **No documentation provided on candidates' use of data to reflect on teaching effectiveness or to assess student progress.**

- All general rules for Standard 1 are met.
- Data/evidence document effective candidate use of research and evidence for planning, implementing, and evaluating P-12 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.

+

- All criteria at the minimal level of sufficiency are met.
- EPP-created assessments are evaluated above the minimal level of sufficiency on the CAEP Assessment Rubric.
- Multiple data/evidence sources document effective candidate use of research
- Evidence for planning, implementing, and evaluating learning experiences is documented.
- Candidates demonstrate data literacy.

*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).*

**EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES  
BELOW SUFFICIENT LEVEL**

**CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL  
DRAFT  
Component 1.3**

**EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES ABOVE  
SUFFICIENT LEVEL**

—

- **EPP-created assessments are evaluated below the minimal level of sufficiency.**
- **No or only partial external 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.).**

- All general rules for Standard 1 are met.
- The provider presents 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.
- The providers makes comparisons and identifies trends across specialty licensure areas based on data.
- Assessments submitted for the Program Review with Feedback option are at the minimal level of sufficiency.

+

- EPP-created assessments are evaluated above minimal level of sufficiency on the CAEP Assessment Rubric.
- Documentation from more than one source that candidates apply content and pedagogical knowledge at specialty licensure area levels (SPA or state reports, disaggregated specialty licensure area data, NBCT actions, etc.).
- All SPA reports have achieved National Recognition or all

- Under 51% of SPA reports or state program reports have achieved National Recognition or have been state-approved.
- Answers to specific specialty licensure areas questions are incomplete and provide no analysis of data.

- specialty areas have been state approved.
- Answers specific to specialty licensure area questions are complete, insightful, and supported by an analysis and accurate interpretation of specialty licensure area data

*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).*

**EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES BELOW SUFFICIENT LEVEL**

**CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL  
DRAFT  
Component 1.4**

**EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES ABOVE SUFFICIENT LEVEL**

- 
- **EPP-created assessments are evaluated below the minimal level of sufficiency.**
  - **No or only one or two indicators specific to evaluating proficiencies for college- and career-readiness are provided.**
  - **No or only one or two indicators of candidates' ability to demonstrate differentiation of instruction for diverse learners.**
  - **No or only one or two indicators of candidates' ability to have students apply knowledge to solve problems and think critically.**
  - **No or only one or two indicators of candidate's ability to include cross-discipline learning experiences and to teach for transfer of skills.**
  - **No or only one or two indicators of candidate's ability to design and**

- All general rules for Standard 1 are met.
- 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):
  - candidates' ability to provide effective instruction for all students (differentiation of instruction).
  - candidates' ability to have students apply knowledge to solve problems and think critically.
  - candidates' ability to include cross-discipline learning experiences and to teach for transfer of skills.
  - candidates' ability to design and implement learning experiences that require collaboration and communication skills.

- +
- All criteria at the minimal level of sufficiency are met.
  - EPP-created assessments are evaluated above minimal level of sufficiency on the CAEP Assessment Rubric.
  - Data/evidence are triangulated across data/evidence sets specific to college- and career-readiness:
    - candidates' ability to demonstrate differentiation of instruction for diverse learners across data sets
    - candidates' ability to have students apply knowledge to solve problems and think critically
    - candidates' ability to design and implement learning experiences that require collaboration and communication
    - candidates' ability to include cross-

implement learning experiences that require collaboration and communication skills.

discipline learning experiences and to teach for transfer of skills.

*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.*

**EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES BELOW SUFFICIENT LEVEL**

**CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL  
DRAFT**

**EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES ABOVE SUFFICIENT LEVEL**

**Component 1.5**

—

- **EPP-created assessments are evaluated below the minimal level of sufficiency.**
- **No or only partial evidence specific to technology standards (e.g., ISTE) in coursework and/or clinical experience.**
- **No or only partial evidence specific to demonstrated proficiencies in the use of technology.**
- **No or only partial evidence provided on candidates' ability to design and facilitate digital learning.**
- **No or partial evidence provided on candidates' ability to track and share student performance data digitally.**

- All general rules for Standard 1 are met.
- 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.

+

- All criteria at the minimal level of sufficiency are met
- EPP-created assessments are evaluated above the minimal level of sufficiency on the CAEP Assessment rubrics.
- Documentation of candidates' ability to use social networks as resources.

## Visitor Team Evaluation Rubric: Standard 2

The rubrics described in the chart below are **draft** guides for EPPs, members of CAEP Visitor Teams, and the CAEP Accreditation Council. The rubrics will be piloted over the next year and changes will be made based on feedback from EPPs, Visitor Teams, and the Accreditation Council. The rubrics are included in this draft to provide opportunities for stakeholders to offer guidance and feedback on their clarity, alignment to standards/components, and usefulness to the accreditation process. Any feedback specific to the rubrics should be sent to Lauren Alexander at [lauren.alexander@caepnet.org](mailto:lauren.alexander@caepnet.org)

The *CAEP Accreditation Handbook* defines the principal role of the Visitor Team to “investigate the quality of the provider’s evidence, including its accuracy and its consistency or inconsistency with the provider’s claims.” The team analyzes the strength of the evidence “in demonstrating satisfaction of the CAEP Standards and (2) the description of particular strengths or deficiencies.” The Team does not determine that individual standards are met. Instead, the team evaluates the completeness, quality, and strength of evidence for each Standard overall.

There are references in the Visitor Team Evaluation Rubric below to the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric, on which some of the criteria are based in the Evaluation Rubric for Standard 2; where applicable, references to the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric appear. \*For EPP-created assessments to provide sufficient evidence/data for standards and/or components, the assessment should be at the CAEP “Sufficient Level” on the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric. All of the rubrics are constructed around examples that appear in the *Handbook’s* Evidence Table. Providers are welcome to employ different measurements from those described in the Accreditation Table examples. If different evidence is submitted, the provider is responsible for showing that it has addressed the intent of the 2013 CAEP Standards or component in an equally effective way. The intent is to make all of these CAEP guides consistent and mutually reinforcing.

As Visitor Teams investigate evidence and interpret it through these rubrics below, they will usually find that individual pieces of evidence are best described by criteria identified at more than one level. A decision by the Visitor Team is not based on a single piece of evidence, but the preponderance of evidence across multiple indicators. The Visitor Team summary analysis must determine the preponderance of weight across all of the accumulated evidence, taking into account the array and distribution pattern that the team it finds. All of the criteria at the minimal level of sufficiency should be addressed, but reviewers base the final decision on the preponderance of evidence at the standard level.

### General Rules for Standard 2:

- **At least three cycles of data must be submitted and analyzed. 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 CAEP Sufficient Level as defined on the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric.**
- **All components must be addressed in the self study.**
- **There are no required components for Standard 2.**

**EVALUATION RUBRIC**

*2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements, including technology-based collaborations, for clinical preparation and share responsibility for continuous improvement of candidate preparation. Partnerships for clinical preparation can follow a range of forms, participants, and functions. They establish mutually agreeable expectations for candidate entry, preparation, and exit; ensure that theory and practice are linked; maintain coherence across clinical and academic components of preparation; and share accountability for candidate outcomes.*

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES  
BELOW SUFFICIENT LEVEL

**CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL  
DRAFT**

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES  
ABOVE SUFFICIENT LEVEL

**Component 2.1**

–

- Evidence is one directional (EPP to P-12 schools or P-12 schools to EPP).
- Limited or no evidence of a shared responsibility model.

- All general rules for the Standard 2 are met.
- The provider presents evidence that P-12 schools and EPPs have both benefitted from the partnership.
- The provider presents evidence that a collaborative process is in place and is reviewed annually.
- The provider regularly (at least twice a year) seek input from P-12 teachers and/or administrators on candidate preparation, including developing or refining criteria for entry/exit into clinical experiences.
- Providers document a shared responsibility model that includes these components:
  - Co-construction of instruments and evaluations
  - Co-construction of criteria for selection of mentor teachers
  - Involvement in on-going decision-making
  - Input into curriculum development
  - EPP and P-12 educators provide descriptive feedback to candidates
  - Opportunities for candidates to observe and implement effective teaching strategies linked to coursework.
  -

+

- All criteria at the minimal level of sufficiency are met.
- EPP-created assessments are evaluated above the minimal level of sufficiency on the CAEP Assessment Rubric.
- Input from P-12 teachers and/or administrators is on-going and continuous (at least 4 times per year).

*Component 2.2: Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support and retain high quality clinical educators, both EPP and school-based, who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates' development and P-12 student learning and development. In collaboration with their partners, providers use multiple indicators and appropriate technology-based applications to establish, maintain and refine criteria for selection, professional development, performance evaluation, continuous improvement and retention of clinical educators in all clinical placement settings.*

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES  
BELOW SUFFICIENT LEVEL

**CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL  
DRAFT**

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES  
ABOVE SUFFICIENT LEVEL

**Component 2.2**

–

- P-12 teachers and/or administrators have a limited role or no role in

- All general rules for the Standard 2 are met.
- EPP and P-12 clinical educators and/or administrators co-construct criteria for selection of clinical educators and make co-selections.
- School-based clinical educators evaluate EPP-based clinical educators and candidates and share results.

+

- All criteria at the minimal level of sufficiency are met.

- the selection of clinical educators.
- No system is in place for mutual evaluation of university supervisors, candidates, and clinical educators.
- Only in-person professional development is available.
- Decisions specific to clinical educators, candidates, and university supervisors are not data driven
- EPP-based clinical educators and candidates evaluate school-based clinical educators and share results.
- EPPs and P-12 clinical educators use data collected to modify selection criteria, determine future assignments of candidates, and make changes in clinical experiences.
- Supervisory resources and professional development opportunities are available on-line to ensure access to all clinical educators.
- All clinical educators receive professional development and are involved in creating of professional development opportunities on the use of evaluation instruments, evaluating professional disposition of candidates, setting specific goals/objectives of the clinical experience, and providing feedback.
- EPP-created assessments are evaluated above minimal level of sufficiency on the CAEP Assessment Rubric.
- All supervisory resources and professional development are interactive and available on-line.

*Component 2.3: The provider works with partners to design clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence and duration to ensure that candidates demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students' learning and development. Clinical experiences, including technology-enhanced learning opportunities, are structured to have multiple, performance-based assessments at key points within the program to demonstrate candidates' development of the knowledge, skills and professional dispositions, as delineated in Standard 1, that are associated with a positive impact on the learning and development of all P-12 students.*

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES BELOW SUFFICIENT LEVEL

**CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL  
DRAFT  
Component 2.3**

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES ABOVE SUFFICIENT LEVEL

—

- Evidence documents no or limited clinical experiences in diverse settings.
- No attempt is made to link attributes (depth, breath, diversity, coherence, and duration) to student outcomes and candidate/completer performance documented in Standards 1 and 4.
- Only one or two clinical experiences are documented.
- Only informal assessments are documented.
- Limited or no evidence is provided that candidates use data to guide instructional decision-making.
- Clinical experiences are not sequential or progressive.**

- All general rules for the Standard 2 are met.
- Evidence documents that all candidates have active clinical experiences in diverse settings.
- Attributes (depth, breath, diversity, coherence, and duration) are linked to student outcomes and candidate performance. Standard 1 evidence shows that candidate have purposefully assessed impact on student learning using both formative and summative assessments in more than one clinical setting and have:
  - used two comparison points,
  - used the impact data to guide instructional decision-making,
  - modified instruction based on impact data, and
  - have differentiated instruction.
- Evidence documents that both candidates and students have used technology to enhance learning
- Evidence documents that candidates have used technology to track student progress and growth.
- Specific criteria for appropriate use of technology are identified
- Evidence documents a sequence of clinical experiences with specific goals that are focused, purposeful, and varied.
- Clinical experiences include focused teaching experience where specific strategies are practiced.
- Clinical experiences are assessed using performance-based criteria.

+

- All criteria at the minimal level of sufficiency are met.
- EPP-created assessments are evaluated above minimal level of sufficiency on the CAEP Assessment rubric.
- Attributes (depth, breath, diversity, coherence, and duration) are linked to student outcomes and candidate performance in Standards 1 and 3.
- Specific guidelines are identified for the effective use of technology and social media to enhance instruction and communication.
- Candidates are assessed throughout the program in multiple clinical experiences with data supporting



- Candidates are assessed throughout the program with data supporting increasing levels of candidate competency.
- Evidence documents the relationship between clinical experiences and coursework (coherence).

increasing levels of candidate competency.

### Visitor Team Evaluation Rubric: Standard 3

The rubrics described in the chart below are **draft** guides for EPPs, members of CAEP Visitor Teams, and the CAEP Accreditation Council. The rubrics will be piloted over the next year and changes will be made based on feedback from EPPs, Visitor Teams, and the Accreditation Council. The rubrics are included in this draft to provide opportunities for stakeholders to offer guidance and feedback on their clarity, alignment to standards/components, and usefulness to the accreditation process. Any feedback specific to the rubrics should be sent to Lauren Alexander at [lauren.alexander@caepnet.org](mailto:lauren.alexander@caepnet.org)

The *CAEP Accreditation Handbook* defines the principal role of the Visitor Team to “investigate the quality of the provider’s evidence, including its accuracy and its consistency or inconsistency with the provider’s claims.” The team analyzes (1) the strength of the evidence “in demonstrating satisfaction of the CAEP Standards and (2) the description of particular strengths or deficiencies.” The Team does not determine that individual standards are met. Instead, the team evaluates the completeness, quality, and strength of evidence for each Standard overall.

There are references in the Visitor Team Evaluation Rubric below to the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric, on which some of the criteria are based in the Evaluation Rubric for Standard 3; where applicable, references to the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric appear. \*For EPP-created assessments to provide sufficient evidence/data for standards and/or components, the assessment should be at the CAEP “Sufficient Level” on the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric. All of the rubrics are constructed around examples that appear in the *Handbook’s* Evidence Table. Providers are welcome to employ different measurements from those described in the Accreditation Table examples. If different evidence is submitted, the provider is responsible for showing that it has addressed the intent of the 2013 CAEP Standards or component in an equally effective way. The intent is to make all of these CAEP guides consistent and mutually reinforcing.

As Visitor Teams investigate evidence and interpret it through these rubrics below, they will usually find that individual pieces of evidence are best described by criteria identified at more than one level. A decision by the Visitor Team is not based on a single piece of evidence, but the preponderance of evidence across multiple indicators. The Visitor Team summary analysis must determine the preponderance of weight across all of the accumulated evidence, taking into account the array and distribution pattern that the team it finds. All of the criteria at the minimal level of sufficiency should be addressed, but reviewers base the final decision on the preponderance of evidence at the standard level.

#### General Rules for Standard 3:

- **At least three cycles of data must be submitted and analyzed. 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 CAEP Sufficient Level as defined on the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric.**
- **All components must be addressed in the self study.**
- **Component 3.2 is required.**

**EVALUATION RUBRIC**

*3.1 The provider presents plans and goals to recruit and support completion of high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations to accomplish their mission. The admitted pool of candidates reflects the diversity of America’s P-12 students. The provider demonstrates efforts to know and address community, state, national, regional, or local needs for hard-to-staff schools and shortage fields—currently, STEM, English-language learning, and students with disabilities.*

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES  
BELOW SUFFICIENT LEVEL

**CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL  
DRAFT**

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES  
ABOVE SUFFICIENT LEVEL

**Component 3.1**

The provider includes the following documented evidence:

- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <p style="text-align: center;">—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited or no evidence of a recruitment plan.</li> <li>• Data are not disaggregated by race/ethnicity, SES, and/or sex.</li> <li>• Limited or no evidence that EPP has identified employment opportunities/needs in schools, districts, and/or region.</li> <li>• STEM and ELL opportunities are not addressed in the EPP analysis of shortage area employment needs.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All general rules for the Standard 3 are met.</li> <li>• Recruitment plan, based on mission, with baseline points and goals (including academic ability, diversity, and employment needs) for five years</li> <li>• Disaggregated data on applicants, those admitted, and enrolled candidates by relevant demographics including race/ethnicity, SES, and/or sex</li> <li>• Recruitment results are recorded, monitored, and used in planning and modification of recruitment strategies</li> <li>• Knowledge of and action that addresses employment opportunities in schools, districts, and/or regions where completers are likely to seek employment</li> <li>• STEM and ELL, special education, and hard-to-staff school needs are explicitly addressed in analysis of shortage areas</li> <li>• The recruitment plan and its implementation have moved the provider toward the goal of greater candidate diversity and academic achievement.</li> <li>• Evidence that the provider monitors the influence of employment opportunities on enrollment patterns.</li> </ul> | <p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All criteria at the minimal level of sufficiency are met.</li> <li>• EPP-created assessments are evaluated above minimal level of sufficiency on the CAEP Assessment Rubric.</li> <li>• Implications or results are evaluated, and EPP considers possible changes in marketing strategies if targets are not met.</li> </ul> |
|--|---|--|

**3.2 REQUIRED COMPONENT:** *The provider sets admissions [requirements](#), including CAEP minimum criteria or the state’s minimum criteria, whichever are higher, and gathers data to monitor applicants and the selected pool of candidates. The provider ensures that the average grade point average of its [accepted](#) cohort of candidates meets or exceeds the CAEP minimum of 3.0, and the group average performance on nationally normed ability/achievement assessments such as ACT, SAT, or GRE:*

- *is in the top 50 percent from 2016-2017;*
- *is in the top 40 percent of the distribution from 2018-2019; and*
- *is in the top 33 percent of the distribution by 2020.[j]*

*[ALTERNATIVE 1] If any state can meet the CAEP standards, as specified above, by demonstrating a correspondence in scores between the state-normed assessments and nationally normed ability/achievement assessments, then educator preparation providers from that state will be able to utilize their state assessments until 2020. CAEP will work with states through this transition.*

*[ALTERNATIVE 2] Over time, a program may develop a reliable, [valid](#) model that uses admissions criteria other than those stated in this standard. In this case, the admitted cohort group mean on these criteria must meet or exceed the standard that has been shown to positively correlate with measures of P-12 student learning and development.*

The provider demonstrates that the standard for high academic achievement and ability is met through multiple evaluations and sources of evidence. The provider reports the mean and standard deviation for the group.

[Board amendment adopted February 13, 2015] CAEP will work with states and providers through this transition regarding nationally or state normed assessments. Alternative arrangements for meeting this standard (beyond the alternative stated above for “a reliable, valid model that uses admissions criteria other than those stated in this standard”) will be approved only under special circumstances. The CAEP staff will report to the Board and the public annually on actions taken under this provision. In all cases, EPPs must demonstrate the quality of the admitted candidates.

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES  
BELOW SUFFICIENT LEVEL

**CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL  
DRAFT**

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES  
ABOVE SUFFICIENT LEVEL

**Component 3.2 - Required**

–

- EPP fails to document cohort average on CAEP criteria and/or state alternative.
- EPP has superficial information but no “reliable, valid model” that uses different criteria from those stated in CAEP minima.

- All general rules for the Standard 3 are met.
- All/data evidence is disaggregated by specialty licensure area, as well as aggregated.
- The average score of each admitted cohort meets CAEP minima: GPA of 3.0 and performance on a nationally normed test of academic achievement in the top 50%.
- **OR** similar average cohort performance using a state normed test, corresponding with a national normed test, of academic achievement in the top 50%.
- **OR** EPP has a reliable, valid model in which the use of admissions criteria results in a positive correlation with academic achievement or positive impact on P-12 student learning.

+

- Average score of each admitted cohort meets CAEP minima: GPA of 3.0 and performance on a nationally normed test of academic achievement in the top 60%.
- **OR** similar average cohort performance using a state normed test of academic achievement in the top 60%.
- **OR** EPP has a reliable, valid model in which the use of admissions criteria results in a positive correlation with measures of P-12 student learning.

*3.3 Educator preparation providers establish and monitor attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability that candidates must demonstrate at admissions and during the program. The provider selects criteria, describes the measures used and evidence of the reliability and validity of those measures, and reports data that show how the academic and non-academic factors predict candidate performance in the program and effective teaching.*

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES  
BELOW SUFFICIENT LEVEL

**CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL  
DRAFT  
Component 3.3**

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES  
ABOVE SUFFICIENT LEVEL

—

- EPP does not establish additional selectivity factors at admission or during preparation.
- No evidence that the EPP monitors progress of individual candidates.
- Limited or no association/correlation of non-academic criteria with candidate and completer performance.

- All general rules for the Standard 3 are met.
- The provider documents evidence of established non-academic criteria used during admissions.
- The provider’s rationale for established non-academic criteria makes an evidence-based case (existing literature or provider investigations) for the selection and implementation.
- The EPP monitors candidate progress on established non-academic criteria at multiple points and takes appropriate actions based on results.
- The provider associates/correlates non-academic criteria with candidate and completer performance.

+

- All criteria at the minimal level of sufficiency are met.
- EPP-created assessments are evaluated above minimal level of sufficiency on the CAEP Assessment Rubric.
- Evidence supports that selected factors were determined from research or practice knowledge.

*3.4 The provider creates criteria for program progression and monitors candidates’ advancement from admissions through completion. All candidates demonstrate the ability to teach to college- and career-ready standards. Providers present multiple forms of evidence to indicate candidates’ developing content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and the integration of technology in all of these domains.*

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES  
BELOW SUFFICIENT LEVEL

**CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL  
DRAFT  
Component 3.4**

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES  
ABOVE SUFFICIENT LEVEL

—

- EPP uses beginning and exit measures but has no evidence of monitoring of progression during preparation.
- Measures provide no evidence of developing candidate proficiencies during preparation.

- All general rules for the Standard 3 are met.
- The provider documents two or more measures/gateways of candidate progression (from key decision points).
- The provider presents explicit criteria for monitoring/assessing with a focus on candidate development throughout preparation.
- **Or** evidence of developing proficiencies of candidates at two or more measures/gateways of candidate progression (from key decision points) in:
  - Ability to teach to college- and career-ready standards
  - Content knowledge
  - Pedagogical content knowledge;
  - Pedagogical skills

+

- All criteria at the minimal level of sufficiency are met.
- EPP-created assessments are evaluated above minimal level of sufficiency on the CAEP Assessment Rubric.
- Provider documents three or more measures/gateways of

- Integration of use of technology
- Results and stated candidate progressions criteria align with evidence of actions taken such as the following:
  - Changes in curriculum or clinical experiences
  - Providing interventions
  - Counseling outs.
- candidate progression (from key decision points).
- Evidence shows provider interventions for candidates failing in one or more areas.

*3.5 Before the provider recommends any completing candidate for licensure or certification, it documents that the candidate has reached a high standard for content knowledge in the fields where certification is sought and can teach effectively with positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development.*

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES  
BELOW SUFFICIENT LEVEL

**CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL  
DRAFT  
Component 3.5**

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES  
ABOVE SUFFICIENT LEVEL

—

[Evidence the same as that for 1.1]

- Evidence documents effective teaching, including positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development for all candidates as noted in Standard 1.

+

*3.6 Before the provider recommends any completing candidate for licensure or certification, it documents that the candidate understands the expectations of the profession, including codes of ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant laws and policies.*

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES  
BELOW SUFFICIENT LEVEL

**CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL  
DRAFT  
Component 3.6**

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES  
ABOVE SUFFICIENT LEVEL

—

- Limited or no documentation of candidates' understanding of codes of ethics and professional standards of practice .
- EPP provides limited or no documentation that candidates have knowledge of relevant laws and policies.
- All general rules for the Standard 3 are met.
- Evidence documents candidates' understanding of codes of ethics and professional standards of practice.
- Evidence documents candidates' knowledge of relevant laws and policies (e.g., 504 disability provisions, education regulations, bullying, etc.).

+

- All criteria at the minimal level of sufficiency are met.
- EPP-created assessments are evaluated above the minimal level of sufficiency on the CAEP Assessment Rubric.
- Evidence documents candidate's understanding and application of codes of ethics and professional standards of practice.

#### Visitor Team Evaluation Rubric: Standard 4

The rubrics described in the chart below are **draft** guides for EPPs, members of CAEP Visitor Teams, and the CAEP Accreditation Council. The rubrics will be piloted over the next year and changes will be made based on feedback from EPPs, Visitor Teams, and the Accreditation Council. The rubrics are included in this draft to provide opportunities for stakeholders to offer guidance and feedback on their clarity, alignment to standards/components, and usefulness to the accreditation process. Any feedback specific to the rubrics should be sent to Lauren Alexander at [lauren.alexander@caepnet.org](mailto:lauren.alexander@caepnet.org)

The *CAEP Accreditation Handbook* defines the principal role of the Visitor Team to “investigate the quality of the provider’s evidence, including its accuracy and its consistency or inconsistency with the provider’s claims.” The team analyzes (1) the strength of the evidence “in demonstrating satisfaction of the CAEP Standards and (2) the description of particular strengths or deficiencies.” The Team does not determine that individual standards are met. Instead, the team evaluates the completeness, quality, and strength of evidence for each Standard overall.

There are references in the Visitor Team Evaluation Rubric below to the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric, on which some of the criteria are based in the Evaluation Rubric for Standard 4; where applicable, references to the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric appear. \*For EPP-created assessments to provide sufficient evidence/data for standards and/or components, the assessment should be at the CAEP “Sufficient Level” on the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric. All of the rubrics are constructed around examples that appear in the *Handbook’s* Evidence Table. Providers are welcome to employ different measurements from those described in the Accreditation Table examples. If different evidence is submitted, the provider is responsible for showing that it has addressed the intent of the 2013 CAEP Standards or component in an equally effective way. The intent is to make all of these CAEP guides consistent and mutually reinforcing.

As Visitor Teams investigate evidence and interpret it through these rubrics below, they will usually find that individual pieces of evidence are best described by criteria identified at more than one level. A decision by the Visitor Team is not based on a single piece of evidence, but the preponderance of evidence across multiple indicators. The Visitor Team summary analysis must determine the preponderance of weight across all of the accumulated evidence, taking into account the array and distribution pattern that the team it finds. All of the criteria at the minimal level of sufficiency should be addressed, but reviewers base the final decision on the preponderance of evidence at the standard level.

#### General Rules for Standard 4:

- **All phase-in requirements are met.**
- **All component for Standard 4 are required.**
- **At least three cycles of data must be submitted and analyzed. 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 CAEP Sufficient Level as defined on the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric.**
- **All components must be addressed in the self study.**

**EVALUATION RUBRIC**

*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.*

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES BELOW SUFFICIENT LEVEL

**CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL  
DRAFT  
Component 4.1 - Required**

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES ABOVE SUFFICIENT LEVEL

- 
- No, limited, or inappropriate in-service data provided.
  - Analysis or evaluation of evidence is incomplete or superficial and not supported by data.
  - No or inappropriate context or description of the source of P-12 learning.

- All general rules for the Standard 4 are met.
- Provider submits one or more measures of state-provided impact data at the in-service level when available.
- **OR** provide at least one measure of impact data, utilizing research-based methodology, from a representative or purposive sample of candidates at the in-service level (cases studies, action research, etc.).
- Provider aligns an analysis and interpretation of evidence to standard/component and conclusions are supported by data.
- Provider includes context and description of the source of P-12 learning data.
- Provider includes description and explanation on the representativeness of the data.

- +**
- All criteria at the minimal level of sufficiency are met.
  - EPP-created assessments are evaluated above minimal level of sufficiency on the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric.
  - At least two measures of impact data are provided at the in-service level,
  - **OR** at least two measures of impact data from a representative sample of selected candidates are provided at the in-service level (cases studies, action research, etc.),
  - **OR** phase-in plan is complete for collection of impact data including timelines, future steps, and pilot.



*4.2 The provider demonstrates, through structured and validated observation instruments and/or student surveys, that completers effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve.*

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES  
BELOW SUFFICIENT LEVEL

**CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL  
DRAFT  
Component 4.2 - Required**

EXAMPLES OF  
ATTRIBUTES ABOVE  
SUFFICIENT LEVEL

—

- Student surveys did not meet criteria identified in the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric.
- Survey return rates were too low (15% or below) for the data to be useful or survey data were limited to one or two licensure areas.
- Validity descriptions were not submitted or were inappropriate and failed to meet any research based standard for establishment of validity or no specific type of validity was identified.

- All general rules for the Standard 4 are met.
- Observation and/or student survey assessments measure the application of professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions corresponding with teaching effectiveness and/or P-12 student learning.
- Observation and/or student survey assessments utilized a representative sample inclusive of most licensure areas or a purposive sample to be enlarged over time.
- Survey return rates were at acceptable levels (20% or above) and inclusive of most licensure areas in the EPP.
- Provider identifies specific types of validity and includes appropriate descriptions.
- Provider submits valid interpretations of data that are supported by results.

+

- All criteria at the minimal level of sufficiency are met.
- EPP-created assessments are evaluated above minimal level of sufficiency on the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric.
- Survey return rates of completers were at acceptable levels (40% or above) and inclusive of all licensure areas in the EPP.
- Validity descriptions were detailed, identified a validity coefficient, and specific types of validity were identified.

*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.*

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES  
BELOW SUFFICIENT LEVEL

**CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL  
DRAFT**

EXAMPLES OF  
ATTRIBUTES ABOVE  
SUFFICIENT LEVEL

**Component 4.3 Required**

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>—</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No system for gathering employer satisfaction data is in place or is inadequate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All general rules for the Standard 4 are met.</li> <li>• Provider submits evidence that employers perceive completers' preparation was sufficient for their job responsibilities.</li> <li>• Provider includes appropriate analysis and interpretation of results.</li> <li>• Provider describes a system for the analysis, evaluation, and interpretation of data and conclusions are supported by data.</li> <li>• Provider documentation includes:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ a description of the system for gathering data</li> <li>○ adequate response rates (20% or more)</li> <li>○ a description of the representativeness of the sample</li> <li>○ data specific to high need schools</li> <li>○ data specific to licensure areas</li> <li>○ comparison points for data.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Provider submits documentation of employment milestones, including promotion, employment trajectory, and retention for at least some completers and conducts appropriate analysis.</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>+</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All criteria at the minimal level of sufficiency are met.</li> <li>• EPP assessments are evaluated above minimal level of sufficiency on the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric.</li> <li>• Provider submits documentation that             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Identifies the system for gathering and interpreting data</li> <li>○ Includes evidence of responses rates of 40% or above on surveys or similar instruments</li> <li>○ a representative sample was used</li> <li>○ provides data specific to high needs schools or licensure areas</li> <li>○ Provides multiple comparison</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--	--	--

points for data.

*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.*

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES BELOW SUFFICIENT LEVEL

**CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL  
DRAFT**

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES ABOVE SUFFICIENT LEVEL

**Component 4.4 Required**

—

- Interpretation and analysis of data are incomplete or conclusions are not supported by data.
- Only one or two of the following were provided:
  - system for gathering data
  - adequate response rates (20% or more)
  - description on the representativeness of the sample
  - multiple comparison points
  - trends over time.

- All general rules for the Standard 4 are met.
- Provider submits evidence that completers perceive their preparation was sufficient for their job responsibilities.
- Provider includes appropriate analysis and interpretation of results.
- Provider shows evidence of an adequate and representative sample reflected in responses.
- Provider achieves an adequate response rates (20% or more).
- Analysis and interpretation of data aligned with the intent of the standard/component.
- Conclusions are supported by the data.

+

- All criteria at the minimal level of sufficiency are met.
- EPP-created assessments are evaluated above minimal level of sufficiency on the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric.
- The provider documents
  - the system for gathering and interpreting data and that
  - responses rates were 40% or above.

### Visitor Team Evaluation Rubric: Standard 5

The rubrics described in the chart below are **draft** guides for EPPs, members of CAEP Visitor Teams, and the CAEP Accreditation Council. The rubrics will be piloted over the next year and changes will be made based on feedback from EPPs, Visitor Teams, and the Accreditation Council. The rubrics are included in this draft to provide opportunities for stakeholders to offer guidance and feedback on their clarity, alignment to standards/components, and usefulness to the accreditation process. Any feedback specific to the rubrics should be sent to Lauren Alexander at [lauren.alexander@caepnet.org](mailto:lauren.alexander@caepnet.org)

The *CAEP Accreditation Handbook* defines the principal role of the Visitor Team to “investigate the quality of the provider’s evidence, including its accuracy and its consistency or inconsistency with the provider’s claims.” The team analyzes (1) the strength of the evidence “in demonstrating satisfaction of the CAEP Standards and (2) the description of particular strengths or deficiencies.” The Team does not determine that individual standards are met. Instead, the team evaluates the completeness, quality, and strength of evidence for each Standard overall.

There are references in the Visitor Team Evaluation Rubric below to the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric, on which some of the criteria are based in the Evaluation Rubric for Standard 5; where applicable, references to the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric appear. \*For EPP-created assessments to provide sufficient evidence/data for standards and/or components, the assessment should be at the CAEP “Sufficient Level” on the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric. All of the rubrics are constructed around examples that appear in the *Handbook’s* Evidence Table. Providers are welcome to employ different measurements from those described in the Accreditation Table examples. If different evidence is submitted, the provider is responsible for showing that it has addressed the intent of the 2013 CAEP Standards or component in an equally effective way. The intent is to make all of these CAEP guides consistent and mutually reinforcing.

As Visitor Teams investigate evidence and interpret it through these rubrics below, they will usually find that individual pieces of evidence are best described by criteria identified at more than one level. A decision by the Visitor Team is not based on a single piece of evidence, but the preponderance of evidence across multiple indicators. The Visitor Team summary analysis must determine the preponderance of weight across all of the accumulated evidence, taking into account the array and distribution pattern that the team it finds. All of the criteria at the minimal level of sufficiency should be addressed, but reviewers base the final decision on the preponderance of evidence at the standard level.

#### General Rules for Standard 5:

- **All phase-in requirements are met.**
- **Components 5.3 and 5.4 are required.**
- **At least three cycles of data must be submitted and analyzed. 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 CAEP Sufficient Level as defined on the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric.**
- **All components must be addressed in the self study.**

**EVALUATION RUBRIC**

*5.1 The provider’s quality assurance system is comprised of multiple measures that can monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness. Evidence demonstrates that the provider satisfies all CAEP standards.*

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES  
BELOW SUFFICIENT LEVEL

**CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL  
DRAFT  
Component 5.1**

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES  
ABOVE SUFFICIENT LEVEL

–

- While multiple measures are part of the data review, the system is disjointed with an incoherent set of assessments.
- No system is in place for regular review of the evidence/data.
- Evidence/data are missing for two or more of the CAEP Standards.
- No systematic collection, analysis, or reporting of data/evidence is identified.
- No analysis of specialty licensure area is provided.

- All general rules for the Standard 5 are met.
- The provider uses evidence/data from a coherent set of multiple measures to inform, modify, and evaluate EPP’s operational effectiveness.
- The provider submits evidence that it regularly reviews system operations and data.
- The provider evidence shows that the system has the capacity to collect, analyze, monitor, and report data/evidence on all 2013 CAEP Standards.
- Provider evidence documents that the system supports disaggregation of data by specialty licensure area and other dimensions (e.g., over time, by race/ethnicity, gender, etc.).
- Provider evidence shows that the system supports the ability to monitor operational effectiveness (e.g., setting program priorities and data tracking).
- The provider documents evidence of appropriate access and use by a variety of users for various purposes.

+

- All criteria at the minimal level of sufficiency are met.
- EPP-created assessments are evaluated above minimal level of sufficiency on the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric.
- Evidence demonstrates that the system operations and data are regularly reviewed and actionable.
- Evidence/data confirm that all CAEP Standards and components are met.
- Evidence demonstrates the provider’s ability to collect, analyze, report, and use data to respond to new inquires.
- The system is inclusive of specialty licensure area data review and action.

*5.2 The provider’s quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations of data are valid and consistent.*

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES  
BELOW SUFFICIENT LEVEL

**CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL  
DRAFT  
Component 5.2**

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES  
ABOVE SUFFICIENT LEVEL

–

- EPP-created assessments used in quality assurance system are below the

- All general rules for the Standard 5 are met.
- At least 50%of EPP created assessments used in the quality assurance system are scored at the minimal level of sufficiency as defined by the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric.
- Documentation that EPP-created assessments (except for surveys) have -
  - established content validity, and

+

- All criteria at the minimal level of sufficiency are met
- EPP-created assessments are evaluated above minimal level of sufficiency

- minimal level of sufficiency.
- No or limited description of content validity or inter-rater reliability are provided.
- No or limited documentation that evidence is characterized by the following attributes:
  - relevant (related to standard),
  - verifiable (accuracy of sample),
  - representative (specificity on sample characteristics),
  - cumulative (generally 3 cycles or more)
  - actionable (in a form to guide program improvement).
- No or limited documentation that data/evidence was interpreted or consistently analyzed.
  - inter-rater reliability or agreement is at .80 or 80% or above (except for surveys)
  - for surveys, questions align to standards.
- Provider document that evidence (as defined in the *CAEP Evidence Guide*) is characterized by the following attributes:
  - relevant (related to standard)
  - verifiable (accuracy of sample)
  - representative (specificity on sample characteristics)
  - cumulative (generally 3 cycles or more), and
  - actionable (in a form to guide program improvement).
- Provider documents that interpretations of evidence are consistent, accurate, and supported by data/evidence.
- on the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric.
- At least 75% of EPP created assessments used in quality assurance system are scored at the minimal level of sufficiency as defined by the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric.
- Documentation that interpretations of evidence are consistent, accurate, multi-leveled, and supported by data/evidence.
- Qualitative and quantitative data triangulates/leads to similar conclusions about strengths and areas for improvement.

**5.3 Required Component:** *The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes.*

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES BELOW SUFFICIENT LEVEL

**CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL DRAFT**

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES ABOVE SUFFICIENT LEVEL

**Component 5.3 Required**

–

- Documentation that EPP regularly and systematically does two or less of the following:
  - reviews quality assurance system data,
  - poses questions,

- All general rules for the Standard 5 are met.
- The provider documents that it regularly and systematically
  - reviews quality assurance system data,
  - identifies patterns across preparation programs (both strengths and weaknesses),
  - uses data/evidence for continuous improvement, and
  - tests innovations.
- Most (80% or more) change and program modifications are linked back to evidence/data with specific examples provided

+

- All criteria at the minimal level of sufficiency are met.
- EPP-created assessments are evaluated above minimal level of sufficiency on the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric.

- identifies patterns across preparation programs (both strengths and weaknesses),
- investigates differences,
- uses data/evidence for continuous improvement, and
- tests innovations.
- Change and program modifications are not supported or linked back to evidence/data.
- No evidence/data from Standards 1 through 4 are cited.
- No documentation of explicit investigation of selection criteria used for component 3.2 in relation to candidate progress and completion.
- Evidence/data from Standards 1 through 4 are cited and applied.
- The provider documents explicit investigation of selection criteria used for Standard 3 in relation to candidate progress and completion.
- The provider documents evidence that data-driven changes are ongoing and based on systematic assessment of performance, and/or that innovations result in overall positive trends of improvement for EPPs, their candidates, and P-12 students.
- All change and program modifications are linked back to evidence/data with specific examples provided
- Evidence/data from Standards 1 through 4 are cited and applied.

**5.4 Required Component: Measures of completer impact, including available outcome data on P-12 student growth, are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision-making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction.**

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES  
BELOW SUFFICIENT LEVEL

**CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL  
DRAFT**

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES  
ABOVE SUFFICIENT LEVEL

**Component 5.4 Required**

—

- Recapitulation of EPP’s annual reports on CAEP’s eight (8) outcome and impact measures together with just one or two of the following:
  - analysis of trends
  - comparisons with benchmarks
  - indication of changes made in preparation
- All general rules for the Standard 5 are met.
- CAEP’s eight (8) outcome and impact measures are systematically monitored and reported together with
  - relevant analysis of trends
  - comparisons with benchmarks
  - evidence of corresponding resource allocations, and
  - alignment of results to future directions anticipated.
- Evidence that the eight (8) annual outcome and impact measures and their trends are posted on the EPP website and in other ways widely shared.
- Program changes and modifications are linked to EPP’s own evidence/data for topics described in the eight (8) annual measures.

+

- All criteria at the minimal level of sufficiency are met
- EPP-created assessments are evaluated above minimal level of sufficiency on the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric.
- Recapitulation of EPP’s annual reports on CAEP’s eight (8) outcome and impact measures together with four or more of the following:

- changes in resource allocations
- future directions anticipated.
- No or limited evidence that eight (8) measures and their trends are posted on the EPP website and in other ways widely shared
- analysis of trends
- comparisons with benchmarks
- indication of changes made in preparation
- changes in resource allocations
- future directions anticipated.

*5.5 The provider assures that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider, are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence.*

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES BELOW SUFFICIENT LEVEL

**CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL DRAFT**

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES ABOVE SUFFICIENT LEVEL

**Component 5.5**

—

- No or limited list of particular stakeholders. involvement is provided
- No or limited examples are provided of stakeholder input.
- No or limited evidence is provided on ways that stakeholders are involved in the process.

- All general rules for the Standard 5 are met.
- Provider documents specific evidence of diverse stakeholder involvement through multiple sources in each of the following areas:
  - decision-making,
  - program evaluation, and
  - selection and implementation of changes for improvement.
- EPP identifies at least two examples of input from stakeholders and use of that input.

+

- All criteria at the minimal level of sufficiency are met
- EPP-created assessments are evaluated above minimal level of sufficiency on the CAEP Assessment Evaluation Rubric.
- Specific evidence of diverse stakeholders involvement is documented through multiple sources in each of these areas:
  - decision-making
  - communication
  - program evaluation
  - selection and implementation of changes for improvement.