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Standard 4: Completer 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.
General Rules for Standard 4

• At least **three (3) cycles of data** are required. If a revised assessment is submitted with less than three (3) cycles of data, the data from the original assessment should be submitted.

• Cycles of data must be **sequential** and be the **latest available**.

• EPP created assessments should be **scored at the minimal level of sufficiency** using the CAEP Assessment Rubric

• **All components for Standard 4 must be met.**

• All phase-in requirements are met.
Component 4.1: The provider documents, using multiple measures, that program completers contribute to an expected level of student-learning growth. Multiple measures should 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.

FOR EPPs THAT HAVE ACCESS TO OR LOCATED IN STATES THAT PROVIDE STUDENT-LEARNING GROWTH DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Evidence</th>
<th>Minimal Level of Sufficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value-added modeling</td>
<td>• One or more measures of state-provided impact data are provided for completers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-growth percentiles</td>
<td>• Analysis &amp; interpretation of evidence are aligned to component &amp; conclusions are supported with data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student learning</td>
<td>• Context &amp; description of the source of P-12 learning data are provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State supported measures linked with teacher data</td>
<td>• Description &amp; explanation are provided on the representativeness of the data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Familiarity with State Provided Data (if the EPP has state data)

• Consider the following -
  ▪ Proportion of the provider’s completers for whom P-12 student growth measures are available
  ▪ Level of state disaggregation of data for specific preparation fields
  ▪ Number of years associated completer’s performance
  ▪ State criteria used to establish the minimum number of completers for whom data are provided
  ▪ Level of context provided by states for completer data (degree of attrition, high-need schools, etc.)
Component 4.1: The provider documents, using multiple measures, that program completers contribute to an **expected level of student-learning growth**. Multiple measures should 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.

---

### FOR EPPs THAT DO NOT HAVE ACCESS TO STUDENT-LEARNING GROWTH DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Evidence</th>
<th>Minimal Level of Sufficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provider-conducted case studies of completers</td>
<td>• At least one measure of impact data, utilizing research-based methodology, from a purposive sample of candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completer-conducted action research</td>
<td>• Analysis &amp; interpretation of evidence are aligned to component &amp; conclusions are supported with data (qualitative and/or quantitative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships with individual school districts</td>
<td>• Context &amp; description of the source of P-12 learning data are provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of focus groups, in-depth interviews, learning communities, blogs, electronic journals, videos, and others</td>
<td>• Description &amp; explanation are provided on the representativeness of data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Component 4.1
No State Data Available

• Standard 4 requires impact data, but does not require statewide data
  ▪ Learning objectives to measure student growth (individual completers)
    • May vary from school to school or district to district
    • Use of multiple and varied measures provides a rich picture of completers’ teaching effectiveness
    • EPPs with differing measures can contextualize results across completers and licensure areas

• CAEP is aware that evidence from EPPs in states not providing student impact will have limitations. The focus needs to be on what EPPs will learn from completers they follow into the field.
Component 4.1
No State Data Available

• Other options available
  ▪ Teacher-linked P-12 student learning data from selected school districts or individual schools
    • Purposive sample of completers (group of completers representing various licensure areas)
    • Need to be explicit about the sample being used
  ▪ Case study or action research study
    • Student impact data could be aligned with teacher goals
    • Pre and post assessments could be used in lieu of state data
    • Multiple sources of impact data could be used (quantitative and qualitative)
    • Narrative data analyzed using a research-based methodology
Component 4.1
No State Data Available

- EPPs could form coalitions
  - Work with selected schools/districts to gather student growth data for multiple EPPs
  - Data are share across members of the coalition
  - Could include such things as observations, interviews, blogs, hosting focus groups, student surveys, etc.

- **Examples from the field** –
  - One EPP is working with a district as part of the new teacher induction process
    - Will follow all new teachers in the district
    - Will allow the EPP to make comparisons with other new teachers as well as their completers
Component 4.1
No State Data Available

- **Examples from the field** -
  - EPP completed a case study specific to teaching strategies taught by the EPP to examine how effective candidates are implementing these teaching strategies
    - Pilot with two completers
    - Focus was on “Question Chains in Classroom Discourse”
    - Plan is to increase the number of completers in the study
    - Add other teaching strategies
    - Will collect impact data in addition to narrative
    - As the EPP noted:
      “This experience has really served to open our eyes to the possibilities that exist in the absence of state generated data.” Nancy Wellenzohn at Canisius College
Component 4.1
No State Data Available

• **More examples from the field –**
  - Several EPPs are completing case studies with a small sample of completers
    - Collecting data from teacher created assessments
    - Using other measures of teacher effectiveness including observations (virtual and live)
    - Interviews both virtual and face to face
  - Several EPPs are using virtual environments for case study approach
    - Reflective journals/blogs
    - Virtual meetings via Skype or GOTO meetings
    - Learning communities with other first year completers
Component 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.

Many of the same examples to be found for component 4.1 would apply to component 4.2 when state data are not available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Evidence</th>
<th>Minimal Level of Sufficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student surveys completed for sample of completers</td>
<td>• Observations and/or student survey assessments measure the application of professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions with teaching effectiveness and/or P-12 student learning (state data or sample of completers by EPP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completer observations by EPPs or induction mentor (face to face or virtual)</td>
<td>• Student survey return rates were at an acceptable level and inclusive of most licensure areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School based observations</td>
<td>• Validity descriptions were appropriate and specific types of validity identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations completed by coalition members and shared</td>
<td>• Interpretation of data were valid and supported by results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Component 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 completers’ preparation for their assigned responsibilities in working with P-12 students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Evidence</th>
<th>Minimal Level of Sufficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Employer satisfaction surveys (include instrument sampling, response rates, timing)</td>
<td>• Evidence employers perceive completers’ preparation was sufficient for their job responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employer satisfaction interviews (include population represented, response rates, instrument content, timing)</td>
<td>• Appropriate provider analysis and interpretation of results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employer satisfaction focus groups (include population represented, response rates, instrument content, timing)</td>
<td>• A system for the analysis, evaluation, and interpretation of data was described and conclusions were supported by the data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employer satisfaction case studies (include description of methodology)</td>
<td>• Documentation is provided that the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• System was identified for gathering data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Adequate response rates (20% or more) were achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Description was provided on the representativeness of the sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Data specific to high need schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Data specific to licensure areas were provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Comparison points for data were provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Employment milestones including promotion, employment trajectory, and retention were provided for at least some completers and were analyzed appropriately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• For all narrative evidence, a research-based methodology was used for analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Component 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Evidence</th>
<th>Minimal Level of Sufficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Completer satisfaction surveys (include instrument, sampling, response rates, timing)</td>
<td>• Evidence completers perceive their preparation was sufficient for their job responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Completer satisfaction interviews (include population represented, response rates, instrument content, timing)</td>
<td>• Appropriate provider analysis and interpretation of results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provider focus groups of employers (include population represented, response rates, instrument content, timing)</td>
<td>• Adequate and representative sample reflected in response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Completer satisfaction case studies (include methodology)</td>
<td>• Adequate response rates (20% or more) were achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Analysis and interpretation of data are aligned with the intent of the standard/component and conclusions are supported by the data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes to Phase-In for Standard 4

The EPP develops an evidence plan to guide their accumulation of data documenting all components of Standard 4, drawing on state or district sources and their own:

- **Evidence plans** from 2016 or 2017 – EPP develops an evidence plan for components of the Standard
  - Plans indicate successive movement toward relevant evidence that will document all components by 2018
  - There must be at least one data point by 2018
  - Plans indicate how content validity of the measures will be determined (“content validity” refers to the alignment of the assessment content with the Standard)

- **Self study** – plans with data are incorporated into self-study in 2017 and 2018
  - EPPs provide analyses, interpretations and documentation on how results are used for program improvement

- **Site visitors** – review evidence plans as well as data collected by the time of the visit. Areas for improvement and stipulations will be noted.
Changes to Phase-In for Standard 4 (cont.)

- **Follow up –**
  - After the final accreditation decision, EPPs will report data specific to Standard 4 in the next three annual reports.
  - CAEP would phase-in the requirement in CAEP Standard 4 that “all components” must be met.
    - There will be at least some evidence for each component of the Standard. Some evidence is defined as at least one data point.
    - The evidence must be relevant to the component – evidence is aligned with the standard.
    - The Accreditation Council could rule that Standard 4 as a whole is met even though there are AFIs for one or more components.
Classifying States/Using State Data

• CAEP will work with states to describe their practices specific to Standard 4 and CAEP will:
  ▪ Classify states based on their practices
  ▪ Reviewers will have copies of the state specific practices to guide the review process
  ▪ Classifications will ensure that all EPPs in the state are subject to the same CAEP transition guidelines

• When relevant state or district data are shared with EPP –
  ▪ Shared state data will be accepted by CAEP that the component is met (even if state data is limited or incomplete)
  ▪ EPP must present state or district data together with the analysis, interpretation and documentation of use of results