

## Examples for “Impact on P-12 student learning and development”

CAEP’s Standard component 4.1 reads as follows:

*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 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.*

**Key points relevant to evidence:**

- **EPPs are to provide evidence of P-12 student learning associated with their**

**completers who are now employed in teaching situations.**

- **By Board policy, this is required for accreditation.**
- **Multiple measures should be available.**
- **The evidence should directly measure P-12 student learning, not instructional skills or pedagogical knowledge.**
- **Any state-provided measures should be included in the self-study evidence.**
- **But also, “other measures employed by the provider” should be included.**
- **Note, also, that in no case does either an EPP or CAEP need any data that individually identify any P-12 student. The data can be described with averages and upper and lower ranges.**

### DATA FROM STATES:

1. **VAM/ student growth shared with teacher preparation**—This is information available to providers in some states that conduct teacher evaluations which include, as a component, student assessment results linked with teachers. The Data Quality Campaign annual state survey reports that 22 states share data with in-state educator preparation programs at least annually [URL: <http://dataqualitycampaign.org/find-resources/providing-feedback-to-teacher-prep-programs-2014/> ].
  - The CAEP Evidence Guide (section 7) anticipates that providers (a) will acquire and develop significant knowledge about the state data models, data collections, linking, and analysis, and (b) will make their own analyses and interpretations of the results as part of their self-study documentation for Standard 4. [https://caepnet.files.wordpress.com/2014/02/caep\\_evidence\\_guide1.pdf](https://caepnet.files.wordpress.com/2014/02/caep_evidence_guide1.pdf)
2. **VAM/ student growth correlated with teacher observations and student surveys**—This option would be possible in states that have VAM/ student growth data as a portion of their teacher evaluations but that also have structured observations and student surveys available that can be linked with teachers. The design would be a form of replication of the Gates-funded MET (Measuring Effective Teaching) study that found correlations of some observation evaluation instruments and student surveys with P-12 student learning.
3. **VAM/ student growth not currently shared**—The Data Quality Campaign reports that 31 states have capacity to link teacher performance data with teacher preparation programs—12 of them states in which those data are not currently shared with preparation providers [<http://dataqualitycampaign.org/find-resources/providing-feedback-to-teacher-prep-programs-2014/> ]. EPPs could, individually, through their associations, or in periodic meetings with states,

collaborate on effective procedures for sharing the available VAM/ student growth data with providers.

## DATA FROM SCHOOL DISTRICTS

### 4. VAM/ student growth, but at the district level

This option could be appropriate in instances where the state does not administer a teacher evaluation system that incorporates VAM/ student growth measures, local public school districts do include pupil performance measures in their teacher evaluations. Essentially, this is like state VAM/ Student growth models, but at the district level. **Also, OR two or more EPPs could collaborate on this option with one or more school districts in a geographic region for which they supply new teachers**

- An EPP could collaborate with the district(s) that employ significant numbers of its completers to obtain teacher-linked P-12 student learning data.
- The CAEP Evidence Guide (section 7) would pertain to this option. The guidelines anticipate that providers (a) will acquire and develop significant knowledge about the state data models, data collections, linking, and analysis, and (b) will make their own analyses and interpretations of the results as part of their self-study documentation for Standard 4.

[\[https://caepnet.files.wordpress.com/2014/02/caep\\_evidence\\_guide1.pdf\]](https://caepnet.files.wordpress.com/2014/02/caep_evidence_guide1.pdf)

### 5. EPP/ district collaboration on use of state or district student learning measures

Under this option, there are no VAM/ growth data available through formal teacher evaluations. The option includes steps that are to some extent similar to construction of VAM models, but less formal. **Also, two or more EPPs could collaborate on this option with one or more school districts in a geographic region for which they supply new teachers.**

- EPP identifies a cluster of its completers who are employed in neighboring schools each year
- EPP collaborates with the districts to:
  - locate scores on State or district tests at the end of the prior year for all students in each completer's classroom
  - define expectations for end of year student performance (can be very sophisticated, or less so)
  - obtain student scores from the end of each study year
  - arrange for the principal to interpret the results, taking into account what the principal knows about such conditions as:
    - The make up of the class and prior performance of the students
    - The findings of the district for other similar classes
  - analyze results, making comparisons with other classrooms in the district or school, with the same completer teachers over three years
- EPP repeats project annually with a plan to cover different subjects and grades over time

### 6. EPP/ district collaboration on use of school measures

This option would make use of tests already used at the school level and results from a completer's classroom, but not associated with teacher evaluation practices and not using approximations of value-added modeling. **Also, two or more EPPs could collaborate on this option with one or more school districts in a geographic region for which they supply new teachers.**

- EPP identifies a cluster of its completers who are employed in neighboring schools each year
- EPP collaborates with district leaders and/or principals to:

- Draw from school or districts tests that are already used (end of year tests, end of year projects, end of major exams, etc.)
- Create a design to measure individual student progress for all students in each completer's classroom (e.g., comparing end-of-year test results, comparing end-of-course results in particular subjects)
- Report findings, analyze results, develop interpretations
- Continue project annually with different teachers who had completed different preparation programs

## **DATA FROM COMPLETER/TEACHERS**

### **7. Teacher action research**

Under this option, EPPS, in collaboration with the district and/ or school, would ask completer teachers to conduct an action research project on P-12 student learning. They would create a design that they would conduct themselves, built around some major teaching objective and taking place over substantial time (at least a quarter of the school year). The teacher would create appropriate pre- and post- collaboration, works with completer teachers who agree to participate in an action research project. Over time the design could become more sophisticated and more objective. Initially it might be similar to aspects of methods courses or clinical experiences in which a candidate would demonstrate the results of their instruction—except this would be while they are employed.

- EPP identifies a sample of completers in neighboring schools each year
- EPP collaborates with district leadership and principals
- Participating teachers make summary records available (not identifying individual P-12 students) on:
  - Goals of a significant and extended teaching project
  - Their analysis of student background related to the topic
  - Their pre and post measures of P-12 student learning
  - The results and their analysis and interpretations