



EPP Connect

EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROVIDER



Dr. Chris Craig,
Deputy Provost
and
Head of EPP

MSU TRAVELS TO CAEPCon 2016

CAEP hosted their CAEPCon in Washington, DC on September 23 through October 1. Members of MSU's EPP were in attendance to further prepare for our upcoming visit. Several key changes since the last CAEPCon were noted and are being shared with committees and personnel. You can read the available handouts from the conference at this link:

<http://www.caepnet.org/about/2016-fall-caepcon>

Click on the Presentations tab under the green 2016 Fall CAEPCon stripe to access the handouts.

CAEP REPORT

Dr. Deborah Eldridge, former NCATE President and CAEP consultant, visited MSU September 19 & 20. The full report is attached.

2016 FALL MACTE CONFERENCE

This fall's MACTE Conference is at Lake Ozark, MO from October 24-26. The theme is, "Myth vs. Reality: Quality Teacher Education in Missouri." MSU representatives from EPP, Secondary Education, and COE will be in attendance. Updates from the conference will be in a future EPP Connect.

REVISED SPRINGFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOLS VIDEOTAPING POLICY

Springfield Public Schools revised their videotaping policy to permit the district to allow pre-service and student teachers to record themselves teaching for educational purposes. Please see the attached. The policy pertaining to student teachers is highlighted yellow on page 2.

MoPTA DATES & DEADLINES

Task 4 Deadline	November 22
Resubmission Registration Opens	December 21
Resubmission Registration Closes	January 10, 2017

In this issue:

- ✓ CAEPCon Fall 2016
- ✓ CAEP Report
- ✓ Upcoming MACTE Conference
- ✓ SPS Videotaping Policy
- ✓ MoPTA Dates & Deadlines



Chris Craig thanked Scott Fiedler for his many years of service to MSU at the September 2016 EPP meeting. Scott is now College Director for Admissions/Registrar at Ozark Technical College. EPP presented to Scott a Certificate of Appreciation for his hard work and valuable assistance over the years.

Date	Committee	Time	Location
October 24	EPP Screening Committee Meeting	11:15 a.m.	Hill 314
October 24	EPP Executive Committee Meeting	3:00 p.m.	Hill 314

SUBMISSIONS

We would like to hear from you!

Email us what you would like to promote or showcase in EPP Connect.

We are looking for faculty accomplishments, community projects, grants, etc. Email EPPConnect@missouristate.edu.



Report of CAEP Consultant Visit

**Missouri State University
College of Education**

September 19-20, 2016

Deborah Eldridge, Consultant
LCVinc1@gmail.com

Table of Contents

I. Initial and Advanced Programmatic Recommendations	2
CAEP Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge	2
CAEP Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice	3
CAEP Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment and Selectivity	3
II. EPP-wide Recommendations	4
III. MSU-wide Recommendation	6
Appendix A: Summary of Documents and Interviews	7
Review of NCATE Offsite and Action Reports prior to September 19, 2016 (A)	7
Review of Assessments prior to September 19, 2016 (B)	7
Interviews on September 19 and 20, 2016.....	8
Appendix B: Methodology	12
Appendix C: Table of CAEP Standards and Components Compared with NCATE	14

I. Initial and Advanced Programmatic Recommendations

In this section of the report recommendations are presented in relation to each of the CAEP standards in two parts: (1) at *initial* program level, and (2) at *advanced* program level. EPP-wide recommendations are presented in Section II. An MSU-wide recommendation is presented in Section III.

CAEP Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

The key challenge in meeting CAEP's standard 1 will be the College's (unit's) ability to aggregate and disaggregate data for each program offered to prepare educators at the initial level of licensure and to ensure advanced program data is available.

Initial Teacher Licensure Areas:

1. It is recommended that points of assessment commonality be established **across all initial level programs** to ensure that the four key proficiency areas in Component 1.1 are addressed: Content, Learner and Learning, Instructional Practice, and Professional Responsibility. Rubrics must show alignment with these categories.
2. It is recommended that all initial licensure programs identify assessment items to provide other than state licensure data on the other CAEP components related to research/assessment (1.2); access for all student to College and Career-Ready Standards (CCRS in 1.4); and technology (1.5). Alignment with other standards (component 1.3), such as professional standards, etc., can be accomplished by presenting alignment tables or matrices, such as those included in the Missouri program reports and any Specialty Professional Association (SPA) reports. Reports themselves must be uploaded as evidence. Most MSU-SPA reports have expired and/or do not appear to be renewed—Elementary and Early Childhood are recognized through 2019 but appear not to have been submitted for renewal in 2016 which is three years in advance of the self-study. MSU will want to decide how to explain this variation from past practice.

Advanced Level Programs: CAEP's standards for advanced programs are currently available on the CAEP website.

3. It is recommended that a minimum number (perhaps 3) of common assessment measures and/or assessment points be developed across all advanced programs. As with initial programs, the challenge is to establish commonality in the proficiency areas to be addressed and then develop common rubric items and levels to assess the development of those proficiencies. For example, a common assessment point and measure could be GPA for content knowledge with each advanced program determining the content courses to be included in the GPA for their own program. What gets reported to CAEP is the 'n', the mean GPA, and the GPA range for each program's group of content courses across three semesters or three years of data gathering. In addition, some common skills for advanced programs can be defined (as there are not four proficiency areas identified by CAEP in component 1.1 as there are for initial programs). However, component 1.1 in

the advanced standards is data-rich and assessment literacy heavy. A study of standard 1 and its components for advanced programs is essential.

CAEP Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

Initial Licensure Areas:

4. It is recommended that **all** initial programs develop and align field experiences leading to student teaching into a purposeful, developmental sequence. Currently, few of MSU's educator preparation programs appear to maximize any Missouri-required hours of pre-student teaching field experiences as purposeful, sequential, performance-based demonstrations leading to student teaching. These practices are missed opportunities to align purposes to a performance-based developmental sequence of experiences.

Advanced Level Programs:

5. It is recommended that each advanced level program establish clinical partnerships for clinical practices/internships. Although clinical practices can occur in candidates' own schools and classrooms, the expectations are nearly identical to that of initial programs. Thusly, the clinical components of educator preparation, whether initial or advanced, need to demonstrate that these hands-on experiences are "central to preparation" and mutually beneficial.

CAEP Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment and Selectivity

Advanced Level Programs:

6. It is recommended that advanced programs discuss how admissions, established as a GPA minimum of 2.75 for the graduate school, will meet CAEP minimum criteria of a GPA cohort average of 3.0. Alternatively the advanced standards allow for a group average on a nationally normed assessment in reading, writing (and eventually writing). Programs will need to determine what test(s) will be submitted as evidence to CAEP, if this is the admissions selectivity option chosen.

II. EPP-wide Recommendations

By CAEP definition an Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) is the administrative entity that provides oversight of all educator preparation programs at all levels. The following recommendations are intended for EPP-wide consideration, planning, and implementation. The recommendations refer to all programs at all levels.

1. CAEP Standard 1. It is recommended that all programs contribute programmatic data to provide reliable and valid evidence of candidates' progress through preparation programs. Performance-based outcomes are non-negotiable in Standard 1. For example, evidence for component 1.4 must show how initial candidates demonstrate their ability to teach, or create supportive environments (for advanced programs), in order to support the attainment of CCRS. This should not simply be evidence of inputs (syllabi), GPAs, or state licensure requirements. Whether initial or advanced, programs must be able to provide EPP-based evidence of performance-based outcomes from program candidates to demonstrate continued development of skills and monitoring of skills development for ongoing selectivity within programs.
2. CAEP Standard 1. It is recommended that the diversity proficiencies identified in the dispositions document be further defined in measurable, observable, performance-based terms to be able to submit evidence in CAEP component 1.4 and the cross-cutting theme.
3. CAEP Standard 1. It is recommended that technology proficiencies be identified for all initial programs. CAEP's expectation for component 1.5 is that programs can provide evidence of 3 of the following 4 proficiency areas: (1) Accessing databases, digital media, and tools to improve P-12 learning, (2) Knowing why and how to help P-12 students to access and assess quality digital content, (3) Ability to design and facilitate digital learning, mentoring and collaboration including the use of social networks, and (4) Use of technology to track, share, and evaluate student learning.
4. CAEP Standard 2 (Components 2.1 and 2.2). It is recommended that the disparity in partnerships and selection of clinical educators be harmonized across all programs to meet the rigor of CAEP's expectations. Memoranda of Understanding should be developed and implemented.
5. CAEP Standard 2 (Component 2.3). It is recommended that all programs at all levels fully develop and assess clinical experiences, including culminating experiences and internships, as a set of coherent, sequenced, purposeful and performance-based demonstrations of the development of the knowledge and skills necessary to be effective in their licensure area, whether secondary science instruction, dual licensure, or educational leadership. Evidence must be submitted, beyond state licensure data, to demonstrate that the EPP is monitoring the development of candidate content knowledge through clinical experiences (also CAEP 3.4)

-
6. CAEP Standard 3 (Component 3.1). It is recommended that MSU's CoE develop a targeted recruitment plan for all programs. The focus of the recruitment effort is to attract diverse candidates and to meet the needs to close the gap in local and national shortage areas. It is common for EPPs to offer open house events and to engage in general recruitment strategies such as brochures and local outreach. However, CAEP's expectation is that there is a concentrated strategy, not a generalized or localized effort, and that it includes all programs across all educator preparation programs. The strategic recruitment plan should result in a candidate pool that "reflects the diversity of America's P-12 students" (or "teachers" for advanced programs), and the plan can target specific shortage areas such as male candidates for early childhood and elementary education, female candidates for STEM licensure areas, etc. Additional resources may be needed to address this expectation and a collective conversation about recruitment targets needs to be based on data.
 7. CAEP Standard 3 (Component 3.3). It is recommended that the EPP Assessment Committee investigate the dispositions associated with a positive impact on student learning. Useful sources of reference are the InTASC progression levels for beginning teacher candidates and beginning teachers, CAEP's references related to component 3.3, and Ron Ferguson's work on the seven characteristics of teachers that are associated with student achievement, part of the Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) study funded by the Gates Foundation. Dispositions are often associated with CAEP's standard 3 components of 3.3 (additional selectivity) and 3.6 (professional ethics). However, CAEP's expectations related to dispositional data focus on the relationship of the disposition(s) to impact on P-12 student learning. To use dispositional data for self-study purposes, individual items from MSU's current dispositional assessment measures need to be aligned with performance-based behaviors that can reliably infer dispositions shown to impact student learning and development.
 8. CAEP Standard 4 (all components). It is strongly recommended that the EPP engage in focused discussions about how this standard on in-service graduates will be addressed. Standard 4 and all its components must be met in order to be accredited.
 9. CAEP Standard 5 (Component 5.2). It is recommended that MSU's CoE submit EPP-wide assessments for quality evaluation as part of CAEP's optional Early Instrument Review process. Feedback from CAEP on the quality of assessment instruments can be used in the self-study to formulate and implement plans for establishing validity and reliability. Prior to submission the faculty should consider revising their rubrics using the CAEP Assessment rubric as a guide. For example, with the advanced program research and cultural autobiography rubrics, the proficiency levels can be better defined if the faculty were to engage in scoring a set of research papers or autobiographies together and then conduct an analysis of the scoring. What were the characteristics of the highly scored papers (to extract the features to include at the *exceeds* level)? What were the characteristics of the lowest scoring papers (to extract features to include in the *Does not meet* level)?

-
10. CAEP Standard 5 (component 5.1). It is recommended that all programs be required to submit programmatic data through TaskStream. The EPP-investment in this software platform ensures that disaggregated data for all licensure areas can be submitted to CAEP (as required) and that data beyond state licensure tests and assessments can ensure monitoring the development of candidate knowledge and skills (also required). This EPP-level data collection also provides MSU's CoE with the evidence it needs to address the lingering NCATE AFI in Standard 6 about unit authority in regards to all programs.

 11. Selected Improvement Plan (SIP). It is recommended that the College engage in a discussion of priorities in terms of possible improvement areas to include in its Selected Improvement Plan (SIP). Component 5.3 concerns Continuous Improvement as evidenced by the use of data for programmatic and EPP-wide improvements, including the impact of selectivity criteria. This component must be met for the standard to be met and for accreditation to be achieved. Part of the CAEP process is for an EPP to submit a Selected Improvement Plan as part of the self-study. It is a data-based plan that calls for the identification of goals and a plan for monitoring progress and success. This process is akin to NCATE's "Moving to Target" initiative. Involved in a Transformation Initiative for its NCATE visit in fall 2011, MSU has not previously identified a "target" for improvement. Although clinical partnerships and practice can be strengthened through earlier recommendations about establishing Memoranda of Understanding and monitoring candidate progress with purposeful and sequential performance-based field experiences, there may be other priority areas to consider, such as program impact (Standard 4), selectivity (Standard 3), and data quality (Standard 5).

III. MSU-wide Recommendation

To accomplish these programmatic and EPP-wide recommendations, it is strongly recommended that Missouri State University-wide leadership support the College of Education as it works with the other colleges' educator preparation programs to consolidate the pedagogical sequence of courses, field experiences, and assessments under CoE administrative, academic, and data management oversight. Currently, there appear to be 100 points of light across the university's educator preparation programs with strengths and weaknesses in each program's understanding of and accountability for quality control and data gathering. However, it is the College of Education that will be held accountable for candidate outcomes and meeting CAEP's standards; and it will be the College of Education's accreditation that is at stake.

Appendix A: Summary of Documents and InterviewsReview of NCATE Offsite and Action Reports prior to September 19, 2016 (A)

Prior to arriving at MSU, key NCATE documents were reviewed. These included the summer 2013 Board of Examiner's offsite report; and the action report from the (then) Unit Accreditation Board (UAB) assigning AFIs, dated May 2014. The following key challenges/questions were derived from those documents.

1. AFI in Standard 1: Dispositions are important to CAEP as part of Standard 3. How are dispositions being used as additional selectivity criteria for advanced programs at admissions (3.3)? How are dispositions monitored throughout advanced level programs (3.4)?
2. AFI in Standard 2: How is the unit systematically collecting and analyzing data at both initial and advanced level programs? This is very important for CAEP component 5.3 which must be met for Standard 5 to be met.
3. AFI in Standard 3: How are field experiences in advanced programs being assured, including data collection and analysis for the development and demonstration of knowledge and skills (1.1, 2.3, and 3.4)?
4. AFI in Standard 4: What are the diversity proficiencies and how are they being assessed?
5. AFI in Standard 6: How are all programs engaged in data collection and analysis (see also AFI in standard 2)?

Review of Assessments prior to September 19, 2016 (B)

Prior to arriving at MSU, key assessment documents were reviewed. These included:

1. Initial Programs: Status of Taskstream Assessments and Data
2. Advanced Programs: Status of Taskstream Assessments and Data
3. SPA reports in AIMS (Elementary and Early Childhood)
4. Rubrics for Advanced programs: Research and Cultural Autobiography

The following key challenges/questions were derived from those documents.

1. The status charts for initial and advanced programs appear to reveal that not all programs are contributing consistently to the data collection efforts in TaskStream.
2. There does not appear to be a set of common assessments for the initial programs. How is this data to be collected, analyzed, and aggregated to meet CAEP Standard 1?
3. For initial programs, it appears that the unit plan is a fairly common assessment that can be utilized across all initial programs to provide evidence of Instructional Planning and Practice (InTASC). However, does it provide evidence of candidate performance in the following areas: Learner and Learning (InTASC; CAEP 1.1)? Content knowledge (InTASC; CAEP 1.1)? Professional responsibility (InTASC; CAEP 1.1)? Assessment/research (CAEP 1.2)? Teaching to CCRS (CAEP 1.4)? Technology (CAEP 1.5)?

4. It would seem that evidence of student teaching would also be a common assessment to provide candidate performance data on the areas listed above. However, the rubric must be at the CAEP sufficient level or above. Checking rubrics in the SPA submissions, it is unlikely that the instrument would be acceptable to CAEP. How will the quality of the rubrics be raised and how will reliability and validity be established?
5. At the advanced program level, there are few commonalities across these programs. Diversity and the final project appear to be common assessments. However, how will these programs demonstrate the focus on assessment and research in CAEP's standard 1 for advanced programs, specifically A.1.1?
6. What are the advanced programs' transition points?
7. Where are clinical experiences occurring in advanced programs and how is candidate performance assessed in advanced programs?
8. Rubrics do not represent measurable, objective distinctions from level to level. Language is confined to "clear and substantial" at the highest levels of *Exceeds* and "inadequate or insufficient" at the lowest level of *Does not Meet*. Some categories contain distinctions that are too vague or subjective, such as "astute" synthesis for findings/conclusions or "highly warranted" in reflection/discussion in the research rubric.

Interviews on September 19 and 20, 2016

- A. Monday, September 19, 2016, 8:30 to 10:30am: Meeting with Assessment Team to review TaskStream.
 1. TaskStream is relatively new. The EPP is still acquiring rubrics and not all faculty are embracing the use of TaskStream to facilitate data collection and analysis. How can data collection be harmonized, consistent, and trustworthy?
 2. There are many state-mandated and administered assessments MEEES (?), MOCA, MOGEA, MOPTA, etc. What EPP-based assessments will supplement the MO data to demonstrate to CAEP that the EPP is monitoring candidate performance throughout their programs (1.1, 2.3, and 3.4)? NOTE: in guidelines for accreditation decisions, submission of only state licensure data in Standard 1 can be the basis for an area for improvement.
 3. What is the consequentiality of programmatic key assessments at transition points?
 4. Rubrics are aligned to Missouri standards. How will these be supplemented to show alignment to InTASC (at a minimum) as well as CAEP?
 5. The rating scale for diversity proficiencies and influence on student learning read like standards. No rubric is provided. How can the instrument be revised to show measurable, observable, performance behaviors? How will reliability and validity be assured on data derived from EPP-created assessments that are to be submitted as evidence to CAEP?
 6. How are the dispositions linked to impact on P-12 teaching and learning?
- B. Monday, September 19, 2016, 10:45 to 11:45am: Meeting with Assessment Committee
 1. Admissions to graduate work is set by MSU at 2.75 GPA. GRE is not required. How will advanced program demonstrate admissions selectivity and meet CAEP minimum expectations for A.3.2?

2. There is a process that CAEP uses to establish a state exam as meeting the criteria for nationally normed achievement testing. This was done with Oklahoma, for example. Perhaps Missouri will consider working with CAEP to be able to use MOCA as an admission test.
3. How is the recruitment plan for admissions being determined for initial and advanced programs (CAEP A.3.1)?
4. There was an extended discussion of the Areas for Improvement (AFIs) from the NCATE visit. Questions emerging from this discussion include items for follow-up with CAEP (listed in meeting minutes by Vicki and in C.1 below).
5. There was conversation about programs that do not have data in TaskStream. How is it ensured that data from all advanced programs are being collected and analyzed? This question gets to the heart of the Standard 6 AFI that states that the *unit governance does not allow the unit to manage and coordinate the education programs that are located in other units of the institution.*

C. Monday, September 19, 2016, 1:00 to 2:30pm: Meeting with Advanced Programs

1. Discussion of admissions and selectivity issues of CAEP raised a number of specific questions that need to be addressed to CAEP directly:
 - a) Can Praxis II be submitted in place of the GRE?
 - b) Can CAEP verify that ACT and SAT scores up to ten years old can be used for graduate admissions?
 - c) When is the 50th percentile cohort average required for nationally normed achievement tests? At the point when the test was taken? Or at the point of admission to teacher preparation?
 - d) What kind of achievement testing can be submitted for international candidates? TOEFL?
2. Diversity was discussed in depth, particularly in regard to advanced programs and contributions to the cross-cutting theme with evidence of program inputs, candidate performance, diversity of peers (CAEP A.3.1), faculty, and clinical experiences.
3. Again, there was an extended discussion of AFIs.
4. Clinical experiences are required for all advanced programs.
5. The advanced program standards focus heavily on data literacy, assessment and research. The following points appear in the advanced standards in A.1.1, A.2.2, and A.3.4:
 - a) Applications of data literacy;
 - b) Use of research and understanding of qualitative, quantitative and/or mixed methods research methodologies; and
 - c) Employment of data analysis and evidence to develop supportive school environments.

D. Monday, September 19, 2016, 2:45 to 4:15pm: Meeting with Initial Programs

1. Related to CAEP Standard 3.2, can the ACTFL oral proficiency test be used as a content knowledge assessment in Foreign Language teaching?
2. Impact on P-12 learning was discussed and how it will be demonstrated in the evidence during programs and upon graduation (CAEP 4.1).

-
3. Reliability and validity must be established for all EPP-created assessments submitted to CAEP as evidence in the self-study.
 4. It appears that not all programs are using TaskStream. This directly impacts the College's ability to respond to the AFI in NCATE standard 6 on governance.
 5. There was a discussion of the MEES. It is not as rigorous as CAEP standard 2 would require.
 6. There was a deep discussion of partnerships and the increased rigor of CAEP standard 2, particularly 2.1 and 2.2. There appears to be a great need for improvement in this area. Programs appear to be placing candidates in a variety of ways, mostly without Memoranda of Understanding that outline the mutuality of benefit and accountability expected by CAEP.
- E. Tuesday, September 20, 2016, 8:30 to 10:00 am: Meeting with EPP Diversity Committee and selected technology faculty and staff
1. It is clear that there has been considerable momentum related to diversity since the focused visit. Significant strides have been made. However, there is a need to maintain that momentum and to be more inclusive of and provide training for faculty. How can faculty be supported and educated about the diversity proficiencies and the assessment of those dispositions?
 2. There appear to have been a number of missed opportunities related to technology. An important consideration will be to establish clear proficiencies (as with diversity) and then have data relative to candidate performance in using technology.
 3. There was a discussion of the diversity "proficiencies" which actually are worded as standards and not measurable, performance-based indicators.
 4. Establishing reliability and validity of EPP-created instrumentation is essential to CAEP component 5.2
- F. Tuesday, September 20, 2016, 10:15 to 11:15: Meeting with EPPC Executive committee and invited deans
1. Discussion centered on the standards and components that must be met in order to become accredited. Appendix C contains a chart of the CAEP standards and components. **BOLD CAPS** indicate those standards and components that must be met. The issue of data gaps was raised to meet these "must-meets". The deans suggested that they felt "out of the loop" on this issue and were willing to support the College. Provost Craig agreed to call a meeting to discuss and resolve.
 2. The need to establish reliability and validity on key EPP-created assessments was discussed.
 3. It is the basis for a CAEP AFI if the unit is submitting only state licensure data to meet CAEP standard 1. Faculty must be encouraged to contribute data to TaskStream so that the CoE can demonstrate that it is monitoring candidate performance throughout the programs (CAEP 3.4) to ensure that knowledge and skills are developed (CAEP 1.1 and 2.3).
 4. Other topics included the strengthened requirements around standard 2 and its call for deeper practices related to partnership accountability and mutuality of

benefit. The disparity in placement practices across the colleges was revealed. This is an EPP-wide issue that should be addressed.

5. Expectations in standard 3 (3.2 on admissions) and Standard 4 (all components) were also explored.

G. Tuesday, September 20, 2016, 11:30 to noon: Meeting with Provost

The focus of the interview/debrief provided an overview of the CAEP Standards and components that must be met in order to be accredited. Brief discussion was held about each item in response to questions from the Provost.

Appendix B: Methodology

Recommendations are based on an analysis of key challenges and questions emerging from the pre-visit review of documents and the onsite meetings. A matrix was created of CAEP standards and components. Challenges and questions were categorized as related to a particular component or components. Some challenges and questions were categorized as more than one component because the challenge/question was related to multiple components.

In the coding column in the table below, the first number refers to the page number from a preliminary set of program meeting notes (all notes are included above in Appendix A), the second letter (A or B) locates the document or interview group, the final number refers to the item from each particular document or meeting. Examples of coding scheme used for analysis:

- 5/2 refers to page 5, item 2
- 8/A/3 refers to page 8, Meeting A, item 3

CAEP Standards	CAEP Component(s)	Coding	Frequency Count
Standard 1	1.1 Candidate CK and PCK	7/A/3; 7/B/2; 8/5; 8/A/2; 8/A/4; 9/C/5; 9/D/1; 10/F/3	8
	1.2 Research and Assessment Use	None	0
	1.3 Other Professional Standards	None	0
	1.4: Impact and access	7/A/4; 8/A/5; 9/C/2; 10/E/3	4
	1.5:Technology	10/E/5	1
Standard 2	2.1: Partnerships	10/6; 10/F/4	2
	2.2 Clinical Educators	10/6	1
	2.3: Clinical practice	7/A/3; 8/7; 8/A/2; 9/C/4; 9/C/5	5
Standard 3	3.1 Recruitment, including A.3.1.	9/3	1
	3.2 Admissions selectivity	8/B/1; 9/2; 11/5	3
	3.3 Other admission criteria	7/A/1; 7/A/4; 8/A/6	3
	3.4 Selectivity throughout programs	7/A/1; 7/A/3; 8/A/2; 9/C/5	4
	3.5 Recommendation for licensure	None	0
	3.6 Professionalism, Ethics	None	0
Standard 4	4.1 through 4.4	9/D/2; 11/5	2
	5.1 Quality assurance system	7/A/2; 7/A/5; 7/B/1; 8/6; 8/A/1; 8/A/3; 9/5; 10/4; 10/F/1; 10/F/3	10
	5.2 Quality of measures	8/4; 8/8; 8/A/5; 10/3; 10/E/4; 10/F/2	6
	5.3 Continuous improvement	7/A/2	1
	5.4 Annual Measures	None	0
	5.5 Stakeholder Input	None	0

	Cross-cutting theme on diversity	7/A/4; 8/A/5; 9/C/2; 10/E/1; 10/E/3	5
	Cross-cutting theme on technology	10/E/2	1
	Selected Improvement Plan (SIP)	None	0

NOTE: items 9/4; 9/C/1; 9/C.3 and 10/5 were not categorized because they referred to questions for follow-up.

Frequency counts do not “tell the whole story” because some components that do not have a high number of items, such as Standard 4 and Components 5.3 and 5.4, are critical components in CAEP accreditation. This standard and these components, including all components of standard 4, **MUST** be met in order to be accredited. Thus, frequency counts illuminate the challenges to be addressed and questions to be answered by faculty across MSU CoE’s numerous programs to prepare for CAEP accreditation, but do not necessarily represent all of the critical accreditation issues for the CoE to address.

Appendix C: Table of CAEP Standards and Components Compared with NCATE

ST. 1: CONTENT KNOWLEDGE AND PEDAGOGICAL CONTENT KNOWLEDGE (CANDIDATES)	ST. 2: CLINICAL (CANDIDATES AND <i>UNIT</i>)	ST. 3: SELECTIVITY (<i>UNIT</i>)	ST. 4: IMPACT (IN-SERVICE AND <i>UNIT</i>)	ST. 5: QUALITY ASSURANCE (QA) AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT (CI) (<i>UNIT</i>)
1.1 Knowledge	<i>2.1 Partnerships</i>	3.1 Recruitment, Diversity, Shortage Areas	4.1 IMPACT ON P-12 LEARNING	5.1 QA System
<i>1.2 Research and Assessment</i>	<i>2.2 Clinical educators</i>	3.2 ADMISSIONS SELECTIVITY	4.2 TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS	5.2 Quality of Measures
1.3 Alignment with Professional Standards	2.3 Clinical Experience	3.3 Additional Selectivity	4.3 EMPLOYER SATISFACTION	5.3 CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT
1.4 Impact and Access (Diversity and CCRS)		3.4 Selectivity during Program	4.4 COMPLETER SATISFACTION	5.4 COMPLETER IMPACT
<i>1.5 Technology Skills</i>		3.5 Selectivity upon Completion		<i>5.5 Stakeholder/ Partner Input</i>
		3.6 Professional Practice, Ethics		

Standard font = similar to NCATE

*Italics = CAEP renewed emphasis***Bold = New in CAEP****BOLD CAPS = MUST BE MET**

Policy

AUDIO AND VISUAL RECORDING

Descriptor Code: KKB

Because the district predominantly serves minors, is subject to a number of confidentiality laws, respects parent/guardian and community concerns about privacy, and seeks to minimize disruption to the education environment, the district prohibits audio and visual recordings on district property, district transportation or at a district activity unless authorized in this policy.

Any recording activity, even activity permitted under this policy, will be prohibited if the activity creates a disruption to the education environment. No recording equipment will be used or placed in areas of the building where the occupant would have a reasonable expectation of privacy, such as restroom facilities or locker rooms. The undisclosed use of visual or audio recording devices by anyone on district property, at district activities or while on district business is prohibited except as allowed below.

Definitions

Audio Recording – Registering sounds on tape, digitally or by other mechanical or electronic means.

Outside Entity – Any individual, group, organization or corporation other than the administration, officers, staff or students of the School District of Springfield R-XII or individuals authorized to act for the district.

Visual Recording – Registering visual images on film, tape, digitally or by other mechanical or electronic means.

Recording by Outside Entities

The School District of Springfield R-XII prohibits the use of visual or audio recording equipment on district property or at district activities by outside entities without permission from the superintendent or designee unless otherwise authorized by law. This prohibition shall not apply to:

1. Performances or activities to which the general public is invited such as athletic competitions, concerts and plays.
2. Recording of staff for the sole purpose of professional training or development.

3. Open meetings of the School District of Springfield R-XII Board of Education or committees appointed by or at the direction of the Board.
4. Recording of an event sponsored by an outside entity using or renting district facilities in accordance with Board policies and established administrative procedures.

Recording by District Personnel or District Agents

The district or designated agents of the district may make audio or visual recordings to provide security, to maintain order, for professional staff development use, for educational purposes or for other purposes related to furthering the educational mission of the district. This may include the use of visual recording equipment in district buildings and on district transportation. Recordings by or on behalf of district personnel that include students will be considered student records and will be maintained in accordance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and other applicable laws.

Pre-Service and Student Teachers

The district may allow student teachers or pre-service teachers to record themselves teaching or otherwise interacting with students when the recording is used for educational purposes in the student teacher or pre-service teacher preparation program. The student teacher or pre-service teacher must obtain permission to do so from the cooperating teacher and the building principal and must have signed Missouri Pre-Service Teacher Assessment permission forms from all students and adults who will appear in the recordings if those recordings will be viewed by any person who is not employed by the district. The district reserves the right to refuse to allow recording or to limit the time and place for such recordings in order to minimize disruption to the educational process.

Recording by Students

The School District of Springfield R-XII prohibits the use of visual or audio recording equipment on district property or at district activities by students except:

1. If required by a district-sponsored class or activity.
2. At performances or activities to which the general public is invited, such as athletic competitions, concerts and plays.

3. At open meetings of the Board of Education or committees appointed by or at the direction of the Board.
4. As otherwise permitted by the building principal.

Recording of Meetings

The Board of Education prohibits the use of audio, visual or other recording devices at meetings held pursuant to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) or Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as well as other meetings among district employees and between district employees and parents/guardians. Exceptions to this prohibition will be made only in accordance with Board policy and law. Requests for such exceptions must be made within a reasonable period of time prior to the scheduled meetings. This prohibition does not apply to conversations held within view of district security cameras.

Secretive Recording or Transmission

The district prohibits secretive recordings where persons involved do not consent to the recording and it is not otherwise obvious that recording equipment is present or being used, unless the superintendent or designee determines in rare circumstances that such recordings are necessary for educational or security reasons. The district prohibits the simultaneous electronic transmission of any conversation by any person to a third party without the consent of all involved in the conversation, even if the conversation is not recorded.

Use of Unmanned Aircraft Systems

All unmanned aircraft systems (UAS) operators seeking to operate a UAS on or over district property or at a district event must receive authorization from the superintendent or designee. Authorization will be granted only when such operation is on behalf of the district, supports the mission of the district or otherwise serves a public purpose.

All UAS with the potential to capture or produce visual images of district property or district events must be operated in accordance with applicable Federal Aviation Administration regulations or safety guidelines.

* * * * *

Note: The reader is encouraged to check the index located at the beginning of this section for other pertinent policies and to review administrative procedures and/or forms for related information.

Last Revised: 6/28/2016

Policy Reference

BDA
BDC
BDDL
ECA
IGBA-1
IGDA
JO

Description

[BOARD MEETINGS](#)
[CLOSED MEETINGS, RECORDS AND VOTES](#)
[RELEASE OF INFORMATION](#)
[BUILDING AND GROUNDS SECURITY](#)
[PROGRAMS FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES](#)
[STUDENT-INITIATED GROUP USE OF DISTRICT FACILITIES](#)
[STUDENT RECORDS](#)

Portions 2016 (3/16), Missouri School Boards' Association, Registered in U.S. Copyright Office.
For Office Use Only: [KKB-C.SPF]