Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Questions and answers on Standard 4, Program Impact

The provider demonstrates the impact of its completers on P-12 student learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools, and the satisfaction of its completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.

The central idea for Standard 4 is that information about completers employed in the classroom provides the most direct and compelling evidence of an EPP's results. The information is essential to continuous improvement.

Standard 4 calls for measures demonstrating four aspects of preparation program impact:

- Component 4.1—P-12 student learning and development;
- Component 4.2—completer's teaching knowledge and skills, based on observations and/or P-12 student surveys;
- Component 4.3—employer satisfaction with the completer's preparation and also completer's retention, promotion or transfer; and
- Component 4.4—completer satisfaction with preparation.

Preparation providers are encouraged to put forth their own evidence built around their own choices of measures, and to make arguments for those decisions demonstrating that the standard is met. CAEP holds providers responsible for the quality and relevance of the evidence they use for their own continuous improvement and that they select for self-study documentation.

Some providers will have access to state data that inform components of Standard 4, and others will have only their own sources to rely on. Many will assemble Standard 4 evidence from state sources supplemented with data they create themselves. When data are derived from samples, providers should ensure that results are representative of completers. See the CAEP Evidence Guide for details on "representativeness" in Section V, item c.

Finally the intent of Standard 4 is to judge programs by examining how well P-12 students learn and develop from the completers of the preparation program. This is a complex and evolving effort that will take creativity, courage, and hard work on the part of all—the EPPs, the states, and CAEP.

SPECIAL NOTE TO READERS about Standard 4:

Note that under CAEP policy, all four components of Standard 4 must be met for an EPP to be fully accredited.

The Standard 4 topics are challenging to measure, especially components 4.1 and 4.2. EPP representatives have said:

- They have little or no control over in-service data and would face difficult hurdles in gaining

access;

- States and districts are increasingly gathering data for some or all of the components, but there are differences across states and school districts in what is measured and how;
- While P-12 student surveys are more widely used each year, they still are completed by only a small fraction of enrolled students and may or may not be linked with teacher evaluations; and
- If states or districts fail to share results of their measures with educator preparation providers, then EPPs will need to make more substantial efforts to document their evidence for Standard 4.

The context for Standard 4 accreditation evidence is changing. There are growing state interests in issues surrounding program approval, educator licensing and use of data for continuous improvement. In addition, pending Federal regulations for Title II reporting could influence the relevance, amount and availability of Standard 4 accreditation data.

While the challenges are difficult, Standard 4 states unequivocally that information about on-the-job performance of preparation completers is an essential, "ultimate", basis for evaluating preparation.

At its meeting in October, 2015, the CAEP Accreditation Council will take action on additional procedural steps to phase-in the implementation of Standard 4.

The following responses are compiled from actual questions posed at CAEP conferences, the CAEP Clinic and inquiries that come directly to CAEP staff. They are grouped into clusters, in the following order:

1. Questions on all of Standard 4 (p. 2). These are questions about self-study report evidence across all or several of the Standard 4 components.
2. Impact on student learning and development (component 4.1) (p. 5).
3. Indicators of teaching effectiveness (component 4.2) (p. 7). These are questions about teacher observation measures and student perception surveys.
4. Satisfaction of employers (component 4.3) and satisfaction of completers (component 4.4) (p. 8). These are questions about surveys and other options for evidence of employer and completer satisfaction.

1. QUESTIONS ON ALL OF STANDARD 4

Q: We do not have any evidence for this new standard. If our self-study is scheduled soon, how will our lack of evidence affect our overall accreditation decision? Will our plans for the future be considered as evidence this time around?

A: If the EPP is in a state that shares data about impact of completers on P-12 learners with providers, it must include those data in its self-study report. The self-study report would (1) describe the sources of the P-12 student learning impact data that are returned to EPP and (2) provide the EPP's analysis and interpretation of the state data. Section 7 of the CAEP Evidence Guide contains additional details. Note, however, that even though the EPP reports what the state has shared, it may conclude that the state data are invalid for its demonstration that Standard 4 is met. It could, instead, use other evidence that it finds valid and stronger, making its case for that assertion.

If the EPP is in a state that does not gather or share evidence on impact of completers on P-12 learners, then it can address that through a phase-in plan that shows its steps to develop the evidence. Here are some sources to consider:

- Teacher-linked P-12 student learning data from school districts or from individual schools where significant numbers of a provider's completers are employed (e.g. student growth measures, standards of learning, student learning objectives)
- Teacher information from district or school administered tests where significant numbers of completers are employed
- Teacher action research information on P-12 student learning, perhaps in the form of a "portfolio" of different teacher experiences and results with P-12 student learning.
- CAEP will provide specific examples from EPPs that have completed the new accreditation procedures, and accreditation actions, as soon as they are available—probably by fall of 2016.

The plan, together with implementation actions taken by the time of the self-study and the site visit, will serve as evidence in 2016 and 2017. There must be at least one year of data collection by calendar 2018, and that would be part of any self-study report as well. The CAEP Accreditation Manual describes the CAEP phase-in procedure (see Manual, pp. 81-84). CAEP visitor teams will review plans and the data collected as the plan is implemented.

- For a fall 2015 self-study report submission, the provider includes its plan describing how data will be gathered and validated for Standard 4, and its timeline for doing that. Subsequently, it will be expected to report on its progress against that plan.
- For self-study reports submitted anytime during calendar 2016 or 2017, both plans and initial collections of evidence are expected to be included.
- For self-study reports submitted in calendar 2018 or later years, the planned data collection, validation and analysis of data should be in place.

Q: We are moving from NCATE to CAEP and are awaiting the final ruling on our rejoinder. Will we have to complete the "EPP annual report" that is requested each January, including data related to Standard 4?

A: Yes, all EPPs are required by CAEP to respond to the January "EPP annual report" request (data due in April). Even if you are in a state that does not have data on P-12 learning, you must report what evidence relevant to each component of Standard 4 you do and do not have, as detailed in the EPP annual report instructions.

Q: Why do we need to submit data on CAEP "annual reporting measures" every year?

A: CAEP's intent is to make data from annual EPP reporting of "outcome" and "impact" measures available as public information regarding a few critical aspects of educator preparation. Each EPP will also include trend information from these annual reports as part of its documentation for Standard 5. Over time we hope to use these reports for building peer comparisons and benchmarks of best practices.

Q: In our graduate education program, there are candidates who are not heading into, or coming from, P-12 classroom contexts. Examples would include: a candidate moving into interactive exhibit design for museums; a candidate interested in post-war-trauma counseling for children in Iran; and a candidate involved in corporate training; as well as candidates focused on various kinds of

educational leadership, and including teacher education in overseas contexts. I can see no evidence in the new graduate standards that this diversity of student purpose for graduate study has even been considered. How would CAEP advise that EPPs go about collecting commensurate, valid data for Standard 4 when candidates apply for such diverse fields, and not teaching in P-12 classrooms? How should such data be aggregated?

A: There is nothing explicit in the standard that requires data collection on completers employed in non-P-12 professions. However, for the examples included in the question, completers are entering education-related fields. To meet the intent of Standard 4 and inform continuous improvement, providers need feedback about the in-service experiences for completers employed in education-related positions. The actual measures can be adapted to the particular placement. For example:

- For all of the examples, information on the satisfaction of employers and completers would be appropriate evidence.
- While surveys are not explicitly required, there may be ways to construct surveys of visitors to museums, children who have received counseling, or corporate trainees as indicators of preparation impact.

Such tailored indicators take time to develop, but the EPP should have concrete plans to obtain information analogous to what is specified in Standard 4 that fits the particular preparation program.

Q: We are a small program with a significant number of international students. Graduates may be going on to teach in a variety of educational settings in Africa, Asia, the Middle East, and not all of these contexts are English-speaking. How can we—manageably and affordably—go about collecting commensurable, valid data across such a range of school contexts?

A: These data need not be gathered everywhere and all at once. The primary point is that information about in-service performance of completers is necessary to fulfill responsibilities of EPPs and for their own continuous improvement efforts. Examples of appropriate steps could include:

- Administration of exit surveys that ask for forwarding information.
- Data collection efforts that begin with something that is common across the particular completer placements for an EPP—e.g., education-related positions in one geographic area, or for completers employed as teachers, or individuals in leadership positions.
- Electronically administered satisfaction surveys for employers and for completers, beginning with small scale pilots.
- Administration of surveys to completers' students.
- Conduct of intensive interviews by conference calls or webinars with a sample of preparation graduates, directed toward understanding effects on P-12 student learning.

Over time, several small efforts can return accumulating evidence that will meet Standard 4.

Q: In a CAEP conference session I thought I understood that information about completers two or three years after they are employed would be more meaningful than 1st year teachers. Is that correct?

A: There is a reported research finding that math content preparation improves the outcomes of students of second-year teachers, but not first-year teachers. (Boyd, D. J., Grossman, P. L., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2009). Teacher preparation and student

achievement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *31*(4), 416-440. Another study has reported that new teachers are so overwhelmed by first year experiences, they may not be fully able to apply what they learned in preparation. Additional confirming research is needed. Generally, CAEP's guidance is that meaningful data can be collected each year, but EPPs should be aware of whether the data come from the first or later years of teaching because there could be important differences. Researchers generally tell CAEP that averaging about three years of data helps to stabilize student learning measures, and that by a fifth year, it would be difficult to attribute much effect to preparation.

2. IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT (component 4.1)

Q: Once the candidate has graduated and is employed we have no control over what happens in their school or school district. We cannot tell our school districts to measure impact on student learning in the schools unless it becomes a State mandate. How can our university accreditation be tied to this if we do not have control of whether schools where our graduates teach are willing to provide the information we request?

A: Accreditation decisions require evidence of impact on P-12 student learning, but do not require state data when those are not available. The primary point is that information about in-service performance of completers, including impact on P-12 student learning, is necessary to fulfill responsibilities of EPPs and for their own continuous improvement efforts.

When data are not available from the state, consider these options:

- Teacher-linked P-12 student learning data from school districts or from individual schools where significant numbers of a provider's completers are employed (e.g. student growth measures, standards of learning, student learning objectives)
- Teacher information from district or school administered tests where significant numbers of completers are employed
- Teacher action research information on P-12 student learning, perhaps in the form of a "portfolio" of different teacher experiences and results with P-12 student learning.
- CAEP will provide specific examples from EPPs that have completed the new accreditation procedures, and accreditation actions, as soon as they are available—probably by fall of 2016.

CAEP encourages providers whose completers are employed by the same school districts to collaborate in development and conduct of such options. A collaborative approach could make effective use of resources and expertise from multiple providers, create common instruments that would be meaningful and provide comparable results, and reduce the number of differing data requests that EPPs make to the same districts or schools.

When data are available from the state or its districts, CAEP will encourage states (through state partnerships) to make data available to EPPs from their teacher evaluations and to provide information about the state model (see January 2015 edition of the CAEP Evidence Guide section on P-12 student learning, pp 30-34).
EPPs should:

- **Demonstrate that they are familiar with the sources of the P-12 student learning impact data that are returned to EPP**s. For example, the EPP's information on the psychometric qualities of the P-12 assessments, the alignment of the assessments with the state's curriculum, technical features such as the proportion of students included, the soundness of the student teacher link, the method of forecasting expected student growth, and the adjustments for classroom or school characteristics so that teachers in similar situations can be fairly compared.
- **Provide the EPPs own analysis and evaluation of the state-provided information on P-12 student learning.** EPPs would include, for example, characteristics and patterns in the data (e.g., stability of the data, or trends in the data), their interpretations of the data (e.g., comparisons with completers from other EPPs, possible influences on the data from the particular places in which completers are employed, consistency or differences in data compared with other sources such as employer surveys or teacher observation measures). EPPs could indicate how they have used the P-12 student impact data to consider implications for features of the preparation experiences.

Note, however, that even though the EPP reports data that the state has shared, it may conclude that the state data are invalid for its demonstration that Standard 4 is met. It could, instead, use other evidence that it finds valid and stronger, making its case for that assertion.

Q: How can EPPs measure completers' impact if the state does not collect or share student growth data?

A: As noted, above, use of P-12 student data as part of teacher evaluation is an education practice in which state actions differ and are changing. A number of states are collecting these data currently, and more are preparing to do so, as indicated by an informal CAEP survey of states prior to the May, 2015 Clinic. There are several ways P-12 student learning evidence can be addressed in EPP self-study reports, either with or without state data on student growth.

- The EPP's response can be phased-in, according to the CAEP policy on phase-in (See answer to the first question under section 1, above). More specifically, the CAEP Accreditation Manual describes a phase-in procedure, including a schedule for new forms of evidence such as that for component 4.1 (see Manual, pp. 81-84). CAEP visitor teams will review plans and the data collected as the plan is implemented.
  - ✓ For a fall 2015 self-study report submission, the provider includes its plan describing how data will be gathered and validated for Standard 4, and its timeline for the proposed plan. Subsequently, it will be expected to report on the progress of the plan.
  - ✓ For self-study reports submitted anytime during calendar 2016 or 2017, both plans and initial collections of evidence are expected to be included.
  - ✓ For self-study reports submitted in calendar 2018 or later years, the planned data collection, validation, and analysis of data should be reported.
- State student growth information, even where available, only covers subjects and grades in which statewide testing is occurring regularly, especially grades 3-8 and at exit for English Language Arts and mathematics. For that reason, EPPs would need to consider ways to supplement these sources with information on teachers of other subjects and grades. For example:

- ✓ Teacher-linked P-12 student learning data from school districts or from individual schools where significant numbers of a provider's completers are employed (e.g. student growth measures, standards of learning, student learning objectives)
- ✓ Teacher information from district or school administered tests where significant numbers of completers are employed
- ✓ School arrangements for teacher action research information on P-12 student learning, perhaps in the form of a "portfolio" of different teacher experiences and results with P-12 student learning.

- CAEP will provide specific examples from EPPs that have completed the new accreditation procedures, and accreditation actions, as soon as they are available— probably by fall of 2016.

Q: Part-time students may take up to six years to complete a master's degree. Please advise how you think data regarding impact on student learning as a result of participating in the program can be disambiguated from improvements resulting from increased experience and other professional development opportunities. It simply is not the case that students teach before the program and then do the program and then teach again afterwards, so that one could do a clean pre and post comparison. How do you propose making this data valid and reliable?

A: The evidence of impact on P-12 student learning is to come from the period after the completer is employed in a P-12 school. It is not the intent of component 4.1 to document the completer's professional development from beginning to end of preparation, but, rather, to associate their knowledge and skills, as completers, with the growth in their P-12 student's learning.

Q: Will information used by CAEP ever consider pre and post data on completers and their influence on P-12 learners?

A: An EPP might link data it has gathered on a candidate's impact on P-12 student learning with data gathered from the same individual as an in-service teacher, after they had completed preparation. Alternatively, an EPP could conduct a case study to document that its completers have an impact on P-12 student learning for component 4.1.

3. INDICATORS OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS (component 4.2)

Q: I understand that evidence for component 4.2 may come partially from student surveys. Beyond the fact that our school partners are already overwhelmed by the data requests, how does CAEP suggest that we get valid/reliable data from P-12 students, particularly for our pre-school/early childhood candidates?

A: Some states and some districts are leading an effort to gather survey data. There are several corporate sources that are also creating and administering such surveys in schools. The CAEP Board changed the wording of component 4.2 (in June 2015) so that survey data can be used as evidence along with teacher observations, instead of teacher observations, or not at all. Both are no longer required for the component. CAEP anticipates that EPPs will have access to in-service student survey data when states, or local school districts, gather these data

In an informal survey, CAEP found that currently 5 states both collect and share data from student surveys with providers, and that 31 are not collecting these data and have no plans to do so. That is why the CAEP Board of Directors modified the Standard 4 language and the requirement for both teacher observations and student surveys.

4. SATISFACTION OF EMPLOYERS (component 4.3) and SATISFACTION OF COMPLETERS (component 4.4)

Q: You talked about surveys from the state. Will CAEP recommend specific items for the surveys? Will they be standardized or state specific? Or do the EPP's have to search out the information provided by our state?

Q: Response rates for surveys of employers are very low (e.g. 11%). What can be done to increase response rates?

Q: Is CAEP planning to develop common surveys to be used for employers, completers or P-12 students? That would be something that EPP's can use so we're not all trying to spend precious resources on developing our own survey.

Q: Some of these measures seem to be very high in cost with minimal return (surveys, for example).

A: CAEP has found that several states have developed employer and/ or EPP completer surveys over the past two or three years (for example Ohio, Georgia, Kentucky and Missouri) because they find that information the surveys provide is useful for their preparation program approval responsibilities. In an informal survey, CAEP found 17 states already collect, or plan to collect, and share employer survey data and 22 share EPP completer surveys.

From an EPP's perspective, State administration of completer and/or employer surveys has distinct advantages. In addition to lessening the burden of conducting their own surveys, there are significant improvements in response rates compared with EPP-administered surveys. As a further incentive, states sometimes link the responses with stages of teacher licensure. Also, some states are administering parallel surveys both at the end of preparation and again after a year or two of teaching, providing a strong source of data for comparisons.

Each EPP could work with its own state educator preparation staff to confirm what surveys are used. As one example, the Ohio Board of Regents has taken this initiative. EPPs can contact Rebecca Watts, rwatts@regents.state.oh.us to learn about the Ohio experiences.

When state surveys are not an available source, CAEP encourages providers whose completers are employed by the same school districts to collaborate in development and conduct of surveys. A collaborative approach could make effective use of resources and expertise from multiple providers, create common instruments that would be meaningful and provide comparable results, and reduce the number of differing data requests that EPPs make to the same districts or schools. The Minneapolis-based Bush Foundation is conducting the "Network for Excellence in Teaching" (NExT) project similar to this with 14

colleges and universities in several upper Midwest states. Additional information is available at this URL: http://www.bushfoundation.org/network-excellence-teaching

Q: How else can EPP's assess satisfaction of employers or completers besides through surveys?

A: Some EPPs use focus group conversations (e.g., at alumni meetings) as one way to gather feedback from completers. Employers might also be invited to focus group conversations, particularly if they are in a geographically close region. Another possibility would be interviews, which could be conducted in person or by conference call or web technology. Focus groups and interviews are sources of data, of course, and should be gathered and reported following research or case study methodology.

Q: What is the benefit of completer persistence information, other than "for profit" universities?

A: A common claim for formal preparation, is that teachers are preparing for a career in teaching and in education. The persistence measures provide a way to monitor that pattern.