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The REL Program and Work Related to Teacher Preparation
The Regional Educational Laboratory (REL) Program

Three primary goals:

1. Conduct applied research
2. Provide analytical technical assistance
3. Dissemination

* The Pacific Region contains Hawaii pictured on the map and American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia (Chuuk, Kosrae, Pohnpei, & Yap), Guam, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, & the Republic of Palau not pictured on the map.
About REL Central

• Partnership of Three Organizations:
  1) Marzano Research (MR), Prime
  2) RMC Research Corporation (RMC)
  3) Augenblick, Palaich and Associates (APA)

• Serving 7 States (CO, KS, MO, NE, ND, SD, WY)

• Three Priority Areas:
  1) Educator Effectiveness
  2) Closing the Achievement Gap
  3) Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness
REL Central Research Alliances

- Educator Effectiveness
- Native American Education
- Formative Assessment
- College and Career Readiness
- Systems Development and Improvement
- Rural Education
REL Central’s Educator Effectiveness Research Alliance (EERA)

• Educators from seven states, including: state agency representatives, district leaders, university researchers, and others

• Four topics:
  – Teacher Preparation
  – Professional Development
  – Teacher Feedback
  – Teacher Mentoring
Motivation for Focus on Teacher Preparation

- REL Program focused on data use
- Focus of Central region’s SLDS grant efforts
- Changing federal expectations (Race to the Top, Title II, TEACH Grants)
- Evolving state and district models for teacher preparation accountability and reporting
REL Central Teacher Preparation Projects: Technical Assistance

- Validity/reliability study of a teacher candidate performance assessment tool in Missouri
- Development of analytic tool to support valid and reliable scoring of teacher candidate performance in Kansas
- Review of state capacity to report teacher preparation program performance data (with REL-Appalachia)
- Inventory of state data for teacher preparation program evaluation
- Review of research relating teacher preparation to student and teacher outcomes
REL Central Teacher Preparation Projects: Webinar Series

- **Reporting on Teacher Preparation Program Performance: A Look at State Approaches** (October, 2015)
- **Evaluation of Teacher Preparation Programs: Key Considerations and Methodological Issues** (December, 2014)
- **Evaluation of the Boston Teacher Residency Program: An Alternative Path to Preparation** (October, 2014)
- **Using Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems to Evaluate Teacher Preparation Programs** (October, 2014)
- **Clinical Practice in Teacher Preparation: Evaluating Program and Candidate Performance** (August, 2014)
- **Teacher Residency Programs: Alternative Path to Preparation** (April, 2014)
- **Understanding and Promoting Data-Driven Decision Making and Data Literacy in Teacher Preparation Programs** (October, 2013)
- **State Efforts to Develop Teacher Preparation Program Assessment and Reporting Systems** (August, 2013)
- **Issues Regarding Data, Measures, and Interpretation for Studies of Teacher Development and Teacher Effectiveness** (July, 2013)
REL Central Teacher Preparation Projects: Research

Approaches to evaluating teacher preparation programs in seven states

December 2014

Stephen J. Meyer
RMC Research Corporation
R. Anne Anderson
Marzano Research
Matthew A. Linnick
RMC Research Corporation

Key findings
- All seven Regional Educational Laboratory (REL) Central states (Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming) have evaluation procedures for approving and reauthorizing teacher preparation programs. These procedures focus on program design and implementation.
- Six of these states were implementing or planning changes to their evaluation of teacher preparation programs to shift the focus to the performance of program graduates.
- Other changes in focus and process across REL Central states include developing statewide data collection tools, investing in data systems, and exploring new approaches for reporting evaluation findings.


Study of field experiences in traditional teacher preparation programs in Missouri

Coming Soon!
Questions or comments about REL Central and work related to teacher preparation?
Research on Field Experiences in Teacher Preparation
First, Some Definitions

Field experiences: Student teaching as well as various early and ongoing field-based opportunities.

Student teaching experiences: Practice instruction under the supervision of an experienced teacher.
Background

• National focus on teacher preparation program accountability

• Specific concerns about field experiences
  – “Poorly defined and inadequately supported” and the “most ad hoc part of teacher education in many programs,” leading to great variation in how and where it is delivered and uneven quality (NCATE, 2010, p.4)
  – Programs typically offer experiences of insufficient duration, in inappropriate teaching sites, and with insufficient monitoring of student teacher performance (Levine, 2006)
Field experiences are one of three aspects of teacher preparation with potential for positive effects on student outcomes identified in the NRC (2010) review (others were content knowledge emphasis and quality of teacher candidates recruited)

There are various national and state efforts to better understand and improve field experiences (e.g., CAEP State Alliance for Clinical Educator Preparation and Partnerships, AACTE Clinical Practice Commission)
Weak Evidence Base in Teacher Preparation

- Little research that: (1) relates program design and implementation to student and teacher outcomes, and (2) systematically describes current practice.
- Reviews of research that examine the relationship between teacher preparation and teacher effectiveness provide little conclusive information (Allen, 2003; Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005; National Research Council, 2010).
- Handful of more rigorous studies suggest importance of clinical practice...
Recent Studies Suggest the Importance of Field Experiences

- Mandatory student teaching, oversight of the student teaching experience, and congruence between clinical experiences and eventual teaching position were positively associated with student test score gains (Boyd, Grossman, Lankford, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2009).

- Teachers with more extensive preservice clinical practice experiences felt better prepared and are more likely to stay in teaching (Ingersoll, et al., 2014; Ronfeldt, Schwartz, & Jacob, 2014).

- Teachers with student teaching experiences in suburban schools and in schools with higher teacher turnover were more likely to find a teaching job (Goldhaber, Krieg, & Theobald, 2014) and those in easier-to-staff schools had higher rates of teacher retention and greater student achievement gains (Ronfeldt, 2012).
The REL Central Study of Field Experiences in Traditional Teacher Preparation Programs
Research Questions

1. What are the characteristics of field experiences in traditional teacher preparation programs completed by first-year public school teachers in Missouri?

2. How do field experiences in traditional teacher preparation programs completed by first-year public school teachers in Missouri vary by certificate type?
Study Purposes

• Document current practice, including variation within and across programs

• Provide a data collection tool that: (1) collects data from program graduates about important dimensions of clinical practice; and (2) can be adopted and/or adapted for use in other settings

• Provide a means for teacher preparation providers to assess their own ratings relative to state averages and potentially to monitor change in practice over time

• Provide a data source that can potentially be linked to teacher and student outcome data
Study Design/Analysis Plan

• Survey based on a framework of “elements of field experiences” (potentially important elements identified in research and professional standards)

• Administered to first-year public school teachers in Missouri (who completed traditional programs)

• State- and institution-level descriptive analysis
Missouri EPP Context

• New state standards introduced in 2013
• New certification requirements
• New student teaching requirements including universal evaluation forms and training
• New licensure tests (general education, content)
• New performance assessment (MoPTA aka PPAT)
• Creation of Annual Performance Report for EPPs
Missouri First-Year Teacher Survey

• Since 2007, DESE sent survey to first-year teachers in public MO schools. Data was reported to each institution.
• **New items** for 2015
• Aligned to new MO standards
• Published [technical manual](#) with field test data
• Did not ask specifically about field experiences
Survey Respondents and Institution Reports
Survey Respondents

- 856 survey respondents from 36 institutions
- Response rate: 44%
- Institution response rates: from 13 to 71%
- Institution information missing for:
  - 30% of all teachers who were contacted
  - 6% of all survey respondents
Survey Respondents by RPDC Region

Missouri RPDCs

1. Southeast - Cape Girardeau
2. The Hook Center for Educational Leadership and District Renewal
3. Kansas City
4. Northeast - Kirksville
5. Northwest - Maryville
6. South Central - Rolla
7. Southwest - Springfield
8. St. Louis
9. Central - Warrensburg

Map showing survey respondents by RPDC region with numbers: 75, 31, 72, 160, 131, 78, 214, 7
Institution Reports

- Generated for institutions with at least 5 survey respondents
- Sixteen tables, all percentages (except Table 1)
- Comparison to all other survey respondents
- Differences highlighted in **GREEN** when at least five percent above and **RED** when at least five percent below
Table 7. Characteristics of field experience schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of teachers who selected “Agree” or “Strongly agree”</th>
<th>Your Institution</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate received sufficient support from school administration</td>
<td>91.2%</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate classroom resources and materials were available</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School procedures for student discipline were effective</td>
<td>97.1%</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School principal was an effective leader</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching staff were collegial</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate was able to have intellectually rich discussions about teaching and learning with colleagues</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
<td>-5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/family involvement was strong</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
<td>-18.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15. Teacher preparation program and preK-12 school involvement in field experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of teachers who indicated that the activity was done jointly by teacher preparation program and preK-12 school faculty/staff</th>
<th>Your Institution</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deciding location for field experience</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting cooperating teacher</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing field experiences</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring field experiences</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing teaching performance during field experiences</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

• What are strengths and limitations of a survey like this? Of an institution-level report?
• Are there any other kinds of analyses you wish to see on the institution level report?
• What implications, if any, would this have for your program?
Institution Reports: Lindenwood University

What would you do at your institution if given a similar report?
What We Did At Lindenwood

• Shared excerpts at faculty meeting (full time/adjunct)
• Shared with department leaders
• Used to inform field experience revision task force decisions
• Compared with first-year teacher survey and other data including exit survey
• Revised job description and evaluation of student teaching supervisors
# Strengths and Limitations of the Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparison to other EPPs in individual reports</td>
<td>No disaggregation by certification area or type of program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third party collecting and analyzing data</td>
<td>Not all items applied to our co-teaching model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better response rate than our individual efforts</td>
<td>No out-of-state or private school teachers included, sample bias of only those who obtained jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity and reliability of instrument</td>
<td>Time lag: recollection may not be accurate, courses taken three years ago</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Possible Future Research

• Comparing responses of different models of student teaching
• Comparing different levels of certification (elementary/secondary)
• Adding items about field experience to existing first year teacher survey in MO
Discussion
Learn More about REL Central’s Work

Alliance Newsletter

Join REL Central Email Lists

Educator Effectiveness Research Alliance
1st Quarter 2015 Newsletter

This is the quarterly newsletter for REL Central’s Educator Effectiveness Research Alliance (EREA). The alliance consists of researchers, policy makers, and educators from the REL Central region (Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming) who share an interest in the topic of educator effectiveness. The alliance is comprised of four workgroups, each of which has associated REL Center research, evaluation, and technical assistance projects. The workgroups focus on Teacher Preparation, Teacher Mentoring, Teacher Feedback, and Professional Development. EREA planning committee members help shape REL Central’s research, evaluation, and technical assistance agenda related to educator effectiveness and are a primary audience for associated services and products developed by REL Central.

Teacher Preparation Workgroup Projects and Activities

Each quarter, EREA showcases the work of one of its four workgroups. This newsletter features projects and activities related to teacher preparation.

Study of State Approaches for Evaluating Teacher Preparation Programs Finds that Most REL Central States Are Focusing on the Performance of Program Graduates. This report, released in late 2014, describes how states in the REL Central region (Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming) evaluate teacher preparation programs and planned changes for evaluation. Publicly available documents were reviewed and interviews were conducted with state education agency representatives in late 2013. Findings show that all REL Central states have procedures for approval and reauthorization of teacher preparation programs that focus on program design and implementation through reviews of documentation and on-site visits by review teams. Six of the seven REL Central states are implementing or have planned changes to state evaluation of teacher preparation programs that focus on the performance of program graduates. As part of these changes to evaluation activities, states are also developing statewide data collection tools, investing in data system development, and exploring new approaches for reporting evaluation findings.

More frequent and outcomes-focused approaches to teacher preparation program evaluation have the potential to evaluate a change from the current state focus on program accountability to meaningful and ongoing identification of program strengths and weaknesses that can be used to improve programs. The report is available here. An interview with study authors Stephen Meyer and Marc Brodensen can be found here.
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Learn more about the RELs and IES
http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/