CCSSO
Council of Chief State School Officers

MEASURING WHAT MATTERS:

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM STATES IN THE NETWORK FOR TRANSFORMING EDUCATOR PREPARATION (NTEP)

THE COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS

The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) is a nonpartisan, nationwide, nonprofit organization of public officials who head departments of elementary and secondary education in the states, the District of Columbia, the Department of Defense Education Activity, and five U.S. extra-state jurisdictions. CCSSO provides leadership, advocacy, and technical assistance on major educational issues. The Council seeks member consensus on major educational issues and expresses their views to civic and professional organizations, federal agencies, Congress, and the public.

Measuring What Matters: Recommendations from NTEP States

COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS
Carey Wright (Mississippi), President
Carissa Moffat Miller, Interim Executive Director

This resource was developed by members of CCSSO's [Network for Transforming Educator Preparation (NTEP).](#)

Project Leads:
Saroja Warner, CCSSO
The New Teacher Project

Council of Chief State School Officers
One Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Suite 700 • Washington, DC 20001-1431
Phone (202) 336-7000 • Fax (202) 408-8072 • www.ccsso.org

Measuring What Matters was developed by members of CCSSO's [Network for Transforming Educator Preparation (NTEP)](#) and is one report in a three-part series on *Next Steps from NTEP States*. The network, launched in 2012, consists of 15 states working to transform educator preparation through the state levers of program approval, licensure, and data systems. In 2017, the Network formed three action groups to focus on providing states with additional support in specific areas: Improving Data Systems, Strengthening Partnerships, and Creating Competencies for the "Learner-Ready" Teacher. These action groups created the three-part series on *Next Steps from NTEP States* to inform future state work.

Measuring What Matters Group Members:
Michael Allen, Co-Founder, *Teacher Preparation Analytics*
Teri Clark, Director of Professional Services Division, *California Commission on Teacher Credentialing*
Michael Deurlein, Director of Policy & Operations, *Tennessee Department of Education*
Katie Diggins, Project Director, *The New Teacher Project*
Cheryl Hickey, Administrator of Accreditation, *California Commission on Teacher Credentialing*
Shannon Holston, Director of Educator Effectiveness, *Delaware Department of Education*
Paul Katnik, Assistant Commissioner, Office of Educator Quality, *Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education*
Jim Larson, Project Director, *The New Teacher Project*
Elizabeth Losee, Director of Educator Preparation and Educator Assessment, *Massachusetts Department of Elementary & Secondary Education*
Danielle Mitchell, Instruction Specialist, *East Baton Rouge Parish*
Hollie Sheller, Assistant Director of Educator Data Analysis & Reporting, *Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education*
David Stewart, Founder/CEO, *Tembo Inc.*
Marjorie Suckow, Consultant, *California Commission on Teacher Credentialing*
Sarah Strickland, Director of Education Policy, *Louisiana Department of Education*
Amy Wooten, Executive Director of Educator Licensure & Preparation, *Tennessee Department of Education*
Eric Waters, Policy Analyst, *The New Teacher Project*
Saroja Warner, Director of Educator Preparation Initiatives, *CCSSO*

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This resource was developed by members of CCSSO's Network for Transforming Educator Preparation (NTEP). The network, launched in 2012, consists of 15 states working to transform educator preparation. Anchored in CCSSO's taskforce report Our Responsibility, Our Promise, states in NTEP focused on ensuring all new teachers prepared in their states are "learner-ready" on day one by leveraging the authority they have over educator preparation program approval; licensure systems; and data collection, analysis, and reporting. In 2017, network members organized into three action groups to focus on developing tools and resources for states in specific areas to continue this work past the life of NTEP, One action group focused on developing and building outcomes-oriented data systems for their educator preparation programs (EPPs) designed to:

- Report program performance back to EPPs to promote continuous improvement

- Publicly report on EPPs to increase transparency of EPP performance

- Review EPP performance for accountability purposes (e.g., to make program approval or renewal decisions)

The indicators states collect to determine teacher preparation program performance draw from a variety of measures that examine both the inputs and outputs of EPPs in order to ascertain the quality of EPPs and to support their continued improvement. In sum, the work to create, maintain, and scale data systems for EPPs, while providing essential data to drive efforts to improve educator preparation within states, can be cumbersome.

To provide guidance to the field as well as to strengthen their own approaches to EPP review and/or reporting, a group of six states (California, Delaware, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Missouri, and Tennessee—collectively, known as the "participating states" in this report) formed the NTEP Data Systems Action Group in the spring of 2017. Together, they produced this guidance document to provide a synthesis of why and how leading states include specific indicators and measures in their models for EPP review and/or reporting. Further, the report is designed to help states strategically define which measure they will use as well as how they will use them to review and/or report on EPPs, identify where and how their systems align with other states, and help validate their selected measures as well as how they are using those measures.

By providing this level of detail, states now have a clear, in-depth description of the common practices, challenges, and the underlying rationales used by leading states for incorporating specific measures in their respective approaches for EPP review and/or reporting. Overall, the diversity of participating states' models for EPP review and/or reporting is illustrative of the fact that states must develop their data systems in line with a clear set of goals for what they will accomplish. With those state-specific goals as guideposts, each state can meaningfully engage with stakeholders and learn from others in the field to determine the indicators and measures that will enable them to track their progress toward their state's aspirational vision for the educator workforce.

Since 2013, CCSSO's NTEP has provided states with structured opportunities to share challenges and learn from each other, as well as experts in the field, to enhance their systems for EPP review and/or reporting. As NTEP neared its conclusion in the fall of 2017, CCSSO organized targeted action groups in the spring of 2017, including one focused on data systems, to ensure states had meaningful opportunities to continue to share thoughts and challenges about data systems related to EPP review and/or reporting.

Once formed, the NTEP Data Systems Action Group worked closely throughout the spring and summer of 2017. To help facilitate this collaboration, CCSSO engaged a group of external advisors from TNTP, Teacher Preparation Analytics, and Tembo.

The action group organized its work around the Key Effectiveness Indicators (KEI) framework developed by Teacher Preparation Analytics.[1] Published in 2014, the KEI framework is built around four categories of program assessment data, with 12 indicators of EPP performance embedded within these four categories. Additionally, the KEI framework offers 20 suggested measures for these indicators. Ultimately, this framework is designed to provide comparable measures of EPP performance within and across states for both program improvement and accountability purposes. In practice, this action group used the KEI framework as the organizing agent to more readily identify and discuss themes across participating states' approaches to EPP review and/or reporting.

The participating states in the NTEP Data Systems Action Group are leaders in the development and use of teacher preparation data systems and practices to support effective teacher preparation at scale. Each participating state has a goals-aligned, outcomes-based data system for their EPPs that helps them understand the performance of their respective educator preparation system and to collect information to support the improvement of individual providers in the system. Given the strength and diversity of the participating states' models for EPP review and/or reporting, this report provides a detailed description of each state's data system in **Appendix B**, including the indicators, measures, and methods of calculation used to assess EPP performance and impact. Additionally, the report also provides a few crosswalks in **Appendix A** that illustrate how the indicators and measures in the participating states' data systems align to the KEI.

Through the action group, participating states gained insights from their peers and external advisors, which helped them enhance their models for EPP review and/or reporting by focusing on a specific set of questions that states identified as areas of particular interest. Because of the prevalence of the KEI in the states' systems, the action group examined the measures used by participating states in a manner that is aligned to the KEI framework. The participating states specifically chose to focus on four specific KEIs as well as one instrument for measuring multiple indicators of EPP quality:

---

1   For more information about the Key Effectiveness Indicators framework, please visit http://teacherpreparationanalytics.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/KEI-Guide-12-15-16.pdf.

- candidate and completer profile;

- completer teaching skill;

- impact on student learning;

- placement and persistence in high-need schools or subject areas; and

- stakeholder surveys.

For these specific indicators and instrument, this report illustrates (1) the measures states are commonly using in their educator preparation data systems, (2) their rationale for using such measures, (3) the primary implementation challenges associated with these measures, and (4) the questions for further examination to enhance the use of these measures.

PART 1: THE GENESIS OF THE NTEP DATA SYSTEMS ACTION GROUP

By the time CCSSO formed the NTEP Data Systems Action Group in the spring of 2017, CCSSO had been working for many years to prepare and position states to improve educator preparation. In 2012, CCSSO published *Our Responsibility, Our Promise*, a call to action to states that encouraged them to implement 10 recommended action steps organized around three state-specific policy levers: (1) licensure, (2) program approval, and (3) data collection, analysis, and reporting.[2] In part due to states' overwhelmingly positive response to this call to action, CCSSO launched NTEP in 2013. Initially, NTEP focused on providing its first cohort of seven states with high-quality technical assistance to support their planning and implementation efforts to fulfill the task force's recommended action steps. Based on the strides states in the first cohort made toward improving educator preparation, CCSSO added a second cohort of seven states in 2015. Through NTEP, state teams made up of leaders from state education agencies, educator preparation programs, or other state agencies participated in multiple convenings each year to access resources, expertise, and communities of practice to support their implementation of the task force's 10 action steps.

The final full NTEP convening occurred in the spring of 2017. To ensure that states receive ongoing technical assistance aligned to their respective needs, CCSSO launched a set of action groups to focus on the states' agreed-upon priorities. One of those areas of focus was the development of teacher preparation data systems, particularly the data systems that support states' efforts to understand the performance of their educator preparation system by collecting information that can be used to support the improvement of individual providers within their system. In sum, the NTEP Data Systems Action Group is a purposefully focused extension of the original broader NTEP action network, and it is designed to achieve four core objectives:

1. To surface the indicators and measures on EPPs, aligned to a research-based framework, that the participating states are collecting evidence on.

---

2   For more information about the task force's recommended action steps, please visit https://www.ccsso.org/resource-library/our-responsibility-our-promise.

2. To identify the key themes underlying states' rationale for their measures, including their reasoning for not using certain measures, as well as their calculation methods.

3. To develop guidance to help other states strategically define which measures they will use as well as how they will use them to review and/or report on EPPs.

4. To offer recommendations to support other states with implementation and further study of measures that states frequently use to review and/or report on EPPs.

The NTEP Data Systems Action Group, like the broader NTEP action network that predated it, served as a key vehicle for facilitating state-driven leadership to strengthen our nation's educator workforce and improve educational outcomes.

These recommendations from the action group build on previously published work on data systems for EPP review and/or reporting. A working paper focuses on the efforts of six states, some of which also participated in NTEP, that were engaged in additional convenings supported by the Charles and Lynn Schusterman Family Foundation to collaboratively develop and enhance their approaches to EPP review and/or reporting. As an outgrowth of lessons learned from these six states through their involvement in these convenings as well as those associated with NTEP, TNTP published the working paper [Getting to Better Prep](#) in April 2017, which provides an actionable checklist of essential best practices for designing robust, vision-aligned systems for EPP review and/or reporting to help guide other state leaders who are in the early stages of such work. This report builds on previous publications to offer guidance on specific indicators and measures for enhanced data systems, focused in particular on those indicators and measures that most, if not all, of the participating states called out as areas they are working to improve upon.

PART 2: THE WORK OF THE NTEP DATA SYSTEMS ACTION GROUP

The NTEP Data Systems Action Group formally launched in April 2017. Working with members of CCSSO, Teacher Preparation Analytics (TPA), and TNTP, participating states first aligned on the following core research questions for the action group to address.

- What indicators and measures on EPPs are states collecting evidence on?

- Why are states collecting data on these indicators and measures?

- What measures of EPP effectiveness or impact are *not* being collected by states?

- Why are states not collecting data on these indicators and measures?

- What measures are commonly being collected across states?

- How do these measures align with the KEIs developed by TPA?

- How are states calculating measures of EPP effectiveness or impact?

- What barriers are making it challenging for certain measures to be collected across states?

DEVELOPING AND ANALYZING STATE-SPECIFIC SUMMARIES OF EPP REVIEW AND/OR REPORTING MODELS

To answer these questions, TNTP first mapped out each participating state's approach to EPP review and/or reporting in a template organized around the KEIs. After crafting these profiles of states' systems, TNTP then reviewed them individually with participating states to gain their feedback as well as to gain their insights on the implementation challenges associated with indicators and measures in their EPP review and/or reporting model. Through this review process, the participating states explained their rationales for the measures they selected and identified key implementation challenges. These insights formed the basis of our agenda for the convening.

Once the states finalized the summaries of their respective models for EPP review and/or reporting, TNTP then analyzed them for themes across states' systems and in alignment to the KEI. In general, while participating states have different goals for and approaches to EPP review and/or reporting, they all share two critical design features. First, each participating state has developed a multiple measure system that collects evidence across numerous indicators of EPP effectiveness and impact. Second, each participating state has developed its systems through ongoing, operationalized systems for collecting and acting on stakeholder feedback. The fact that there is real variation in the participating states' models for EPP review and/or reporting highlights how stakeholder feedback has resulted in locally shaped approaches.

TNTP also looked for themes across states in terms of the KEIs that are included in their models. **Figure 1** below illustrates a crosswalk between the measures reflected in state-specific models for EPP review and/or reporting to the KEIs. Specifically, **Figure 1** shows whether a state includes any measure that provides evidence of each specific KEI, regardless of what the measure is, how it is used, or if it is one of the specific measures contemplated in the KEI framework. For more detailed crosswalks of the specific measures states used to collect evidence on each of these indicators, please see **Appendix A**.

Figure 1: Key Effectiveness Indicators Measured by States[3]

KEI Domains	Indicators	States					
		DE	TN	LA	MA	CA	MO
Candidate Selection and Completion	Academic Strength	✔	✔	✔		✔	
	Teaching Promise						
	Candidate and Completer Diversity	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	
Knowledge and Skills for Teaching	Mastery of Teaching Subject	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
	Subject-Specific Pedagogical Knowledge		✔	✔		✔	
	Completer Teaching Skill	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
	Completer Rating of Program	✔	✔		✔	✔	✔
Performance as Classroom Teachers	Impact on K-12 Student Learning	✔	✔	✔	✔		
	Demonstrated Teaching Skill	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
	K-12 Student Perceptions						
Contribution to State Needs	Placement / Persistence in High-Need Subjects / Schools	✔	✔	✔			
	Entry and Persistence in Teaching	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	
Additional Domain(s)	Additional Indicator(s)	✔	✔	✔	✔		

It is important to note that these indicators and measures do not exist in a vacuum separate from each state's unique policy environment. Thus, despite the commonalities in states' systems, in many cases the state contexts are very different. In some states, the inclusion of these indicators and measures in their model for EPP review and/or reporting is explicitly endorsed and, in some instances, required under state statute or rule. In other states, the use of these indicators and measures is supported by new or emerging policy or policymakers but not mandated. The individuals from each of the participating states have deftly navigated their state's unique contexts to achieve a system that serves their state's specific goals.

To that end, the indictors states identified as being measured in **Figure 1** are inclusive of those that participating states are using for EPP review and/or reporting purposes. In other words, while the identified states collect evidence using at least one measure for the aforementioned indicators, some do so in a manner that is solely for reporting purposes, others do so for program review, and some states do so for both reasons. Such variation is indicative of the fact that each state's model is inextricably linked to their respective goals for EPP review and/or reporting. Some states' current goals center around public transparency and continuous improvement. As such, those states focus on reporting out publicly on certain measures of EPP quality in the spirit of transparency as well as reporting out to EPPs on other measures to promote their continuous improvement efforts. Other states' goals include using data to make informed, standards-aligned program renewal decisions. As

3   In some cases, states use additional measures that do not align to a specific Key Effectiveness Indicator (e.g., measures used as a part of on-site reviews). For more information, see the state-specific summaries to learn more about their respective approaches to EPP review and reporting.

such, these states use data from measures of EPP quality in part for accountability purposes. Regardless of how participating states use these measures, they are identified in **Figure 1** because they are a meaningful component of their respective approaches to EPP review and/or reporting.

CONVENING FOR PARTICIPATING STATES TO DISCUSS SHARED CHALLENGES AND QUESTIONS

A core set of shared challenges and questions emerged through interviews with state team members as well as the resulting state-specific summaries and crosswalks of measures to the KEI framework that states use. These challenges and questions centered around four KEIs as well as a specific instrument for measuring multiple indicators. As such, an in-person convening of the NTEP Data Systems Action Group focused on using surveys as an instrument for measuring multiple indicators as well as specific measures:

- candidate and completer profile;

- completer teaching skill;

- impact on student learning; and

- placement and persistence in high-need schools or subject areas.

Over a two-day convening, leaders from the participating states thoughtfully unpacked the challenges and questions associated with these indicators and instrument using a problem of practice protocol. First, participating states discussed and aligned on *why* their states include these indicators and use this instrument in their respective models for EPP review and/or reporting. Then, participating states fleshed out how they measured these indicators and used this instrument, getting as detailed as methods of calculation, to identify the most reliable measures for these indicators. Finally, participating states highlighted the most critical implementation challenges and open questions for other states to bear in mind for these specific indicators and instrument. Ultimately, these discussions resulted in guidance from the participating states that is designed to help inform other states' approaches to the data systems underlying their EPP review and/or reporting models.

PART 3: OVERVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE NTEP DATA SYSTEMS ACTION GROUP

The next five sections of this report highlight the key takeaways surfaced by the participating states during the NTEP Data System Action Group meeting. These insights are presented for each of the four KEIs as well as the instrument for measuring various KEIs that states focused their discussions on during this meeting. To reemphasize a point raised earlier in this report, the examples of best practices highlighted in this report are *not* intended to be adopted uniformly by other states. Instead, this report should serve as a resource to states and is designed to (1) illustrate how six leading states are incorporating certain KEIs into their respective approaches to EPP review and/or reporting as well as to (2) forecast important considerations for states to make when exploring the use of these KEIs.

The examples and guidance presented in the next five sections are each organized in the same manner, aligned to how state team members explored these topics during the meeting:

- An overview of the KEI or instrument for measuring EPP quality.

- An explanation of why these leading states believe it is important to include this indicator or instrument in their respective models for EPP review and/or reporting.

- A presentation of the themes that emerged regarding how these states use this indicator or instrument in their respective models for EPP review and/or reporting.

- A description by participating states of the nuances of their current or forthcoming approach for these indicators or instrument, including why they use and do not use certain measures in certain ways and for specific purposes (for a state-by-state breakdown of how indicators and measures are calculated and incorporated into models for EPP review and/or reporting, please see **Appendix B**).

- An explanation of what participating states believe to be essential implementation considerations as well as questions for further examination to strengthen the use of this specific indicator or instrument in an EPP review and/or reporting model.

GUIDANCE ON MEASURING CANDIDATE SELECTION AND COMPLETION

Overview

The first assessment category in the KEI framework is "Candidate Selection and Completion." This category consists of three distinct indicators, each of which is designed to illustrate the profile of candidates and completers within EPPs:

1. academic strength;

2. teaching promise; and

3. candidate/completer diversity.

States value these indicators because they are interested in identifying measures that are predictive of candidate or completer teaching skill. At the same time, states recognize the methodological challenges associated with determining such predictive measures. As such, the participating states are making a concerted effort to use data on the profile of candidates and completers in EPP review and/or reporting in a research-based, goals-aligned manner to strengthen their teaching workforce. To do so, state team members are working with their stakeholders to arrive at the appropriately balanced, multi-measure approach for measuring candidate and completer profiles for their respective state.

Academic Strength

This indicator can include evidence of academic school performance, beginning with candidates' performance before entering their EPP and/or completers' performance in their major upon finishing their program. The KEI framework offers a few suggested measures for this indicator, including those

that examine candidates' prior proficiency (e.g., average GPA of candidates in most recent coursework prior to program entry) as well as completers' proficiency (e.g., GPA of completers in their subject major compared to all university students in the same major).

Teaching Promise

This indicator is meant to assess candidates' attitudes, values, and behaviors to gauge their "fitness for teaching." The KEI framework suggests that one way to measure this indicator is to use a rigorous and validated dispositional survey to determine the attitudes, values, and behaviors of accepted program candidates.

Candidate/Completer Diversity

This indicator is intended to gather reliable data on the race/ethnicity, age, and gender of candidates and completers at the EPP level as well as for specific programs. The KEI framework encourages EPPs and state agencies to track, disaggregate, and analyze this data longitudinally, including to compare the number and percentage of completers in a graduating cohort with the number and percentage of candidates admitted to that same cohort.

Summary

Together, these three indicators make up the first assessment category within the KEI framework. The "KEI Guide" encourages EPPs and state agencies to collect candidate-level data on these indicators because it will enable them to look for significant correlations between specific candidate characteristics and their experiences in educator preparation programs as well as in their professional teaching careers.[4] EPPs and state agencies could use the resulting correlation data to identify opportunities to strengthen certain features of preparation programs to better serve candidates and, by proxy, the students they will teach upon program completion. Additionally, where there is evidence that certain profile characteristics are predictive of performance in the educator workforce, states could use this data to inform which candidates to retain in an EPP as well as which completers to certify. Thus, reliably collecting descriptive data about the profiles of candidates and completers in a longitudinal manner is only the first step. EPPs and state agencies must also thoughtfully analyze this data in conjunction with outcome data from candidates' experiences in their EPPs and completers' experiences in their professional teaching careers to ascertain ways to better support candidates in a manner that strengthens the readiness and impact of completers as well as the diversity of our educator workforce.

---

4   Key Effectiveness Indicators Guide, pp. 5–6.

Looking across the three indicators addressed in the candidate and completer profile domain, states are aligned on the purpose for certain indicators more so than for others. For instance, participating states resoundingly agreed that it is critical to collect data on the profiles of candidates and completers to clearly illustrate the diversity of the educator candidate pool and workforce in their respective states. Emerging research demonstrates that having a teacher of color benefits students, particularly those of color. Having such information allows EPPs and state agencies to use data to drive conversations about and initiatives to address the disparity between the racial/ethnic diversity of students and their teachers. In sum, state team members concurred that the primary "why" for collecting data on candidate and completer diversity as a means of measuring candidate and completer profiles is to have relevant data to drive and assess the progress of initiatives designed to increase the diversity of the educator workforce.

On a related note, state team members also expressed a great deal of interest in being able to determine the extent to which candidates have the necessary mindset for equitably serving all students. Participating states see potential in using instruments such as surveys to collect data on dispositional measures and to identify the personality traits and beliefs that are common among successful teachers. Given that instruments for gathering dispositional measures are emerging, state team members indicated that they will continue to closely monitor action research on the use of dispositional measures for EPP review and/or reporting as well as emerging instruments for collecting such data.

Finally, states that participated in the NTEP Data Systems Action Group incorporate measures of academic strength for candidates and completers into their respective models for EPP review and/or reporting in various ways. In some states, measures of academic strength are included in their EPP review and/or reporting model as an indicator to promote rigorous candidate selection. Other states emphasize indicators and measures that focus on candidate and completer performance during and after their program, as opposed to measures of academic strength that can be used to raise the bar for candidate selection. As such, state team members did not arrive at a consensus "why" for using measures of academic strength in their respective model for EPP review and/or reporting. Regardless of their approach, each participating state has developed a clear "why" for their incorporation of candidate and completer profile measures into their respective model for EPP review and/or reporting, each grounded in their vision for teacher preparation in their states, informed by themes from local stakeholder feedback, and anchored in a firm belief in the importance of candidate and completer diversity.

⊕

THE "HOW"

After highlighting why they collect and use specific data on the profiles of candidates and completers for the review of and reporting on EPPs, state team members then discussed how their respective states measure candidate and completer profiles. Just as participating states varied the most in their perspectives on why or why not to incorporate measures of academic strength into their respective approach for EPP review and/ reporting, states also greatly differed on how measures of academic strength are incorporated in their model. Similarly, participating states aligned in how they use measures of candidate and completer diversity as well as their interest in the use of dispositional measures for their EPP review and/or reporting models.

Academic Strength	
WHAT ARE THE COMMONLY USED MEASURES?[5]	• grade point average • Praxis Core • ACT • SAT
HOW ARE THESE MEASURES USED BY STATES?	Four states in the NTEP Data Systems Action Group include one or more measures of academic strength in their EPP review and/or reporting models. In practice, these states collect data on candidates' grade point average (GPA), ACT, SAT, or GRE scores as well as completers' Praxis Core scores. Two of these states publicly report on one or more of these measures (e.g., average GPA of candidates prior to program entry, percentage of completers who pass the Praxis Core) but do not include these measures in their approaches to EPP review. In Delaware and Tennessee, measures of academic strength are used both for EPP reporting and review purposes. In the past, Delaware has used candidates' Praxis Core scores as one measure in the "recruitment" domain of their EPP review model. However, the state recently passed legislation to eliminate Praxis Core as a requirement for licensure, and the Delaware Department of Education is currently working with its stakeholder working group to review this particular feature of its model and to determine the most appropriate measure of candidates' academic strength going forward. Tennessee sets a minimum threshold for each of these measures of academic strength—GPA, Praxis Core, ACT, SAT, and GRE. EPPs then select at least two of these measures to serve as the specific markers of academic strength that they include in their program review.

---

5   These are measures that are used by half or more of the states in the NTEP Data Systems Action Group. Additionally, these measures are used in a variety of ways by states, sometimes solely for reporting on EPPs and in other cases for reporting on and review of EPPs.

WHAT DOES MY STATE NEED TO KEEP IN MIND TO SUPPORT IMPLEMENTATION?	• Given concerns about the extent to which academic strength measures are seen as barriers, states need to provide a clear, research-supported rationale for incorporating measures of academic strength into a state's approach to EPP review and/or reporting. • To do so, states are encouraged to meaningfully engage stakeholders in the process of determining how academic strength measures will be used, possibly for reporting purposes only until additional research on the predictive value of these measures is available.
WHAT IS THE KEY QUESTION FOR FURTHER STUDY?	• How do we learn more about which measures of academic strength are predictive of teacher quality?

Teaching Promise

WHAT ARE THE COMMONLY USED MEASURES?	• For the states in the NTEP Data Systems Action Group, the decisions on which measures to include in their respective model for EPP review and/or reporting is an emerging area of interest. As such, there are no commonly used measures to report.
HOW ARE THESE MEASURES USED BY STATES?	As previously mentioned, state team members expressed a great deal of interest in dispositional measures. However, given the emerging nature of instruments designed to collect such data, participating states are in the early stages of including one or more dispositional measure in their approach to EPP review and/or reporting. For example, all EPPs in Missouri use an attitudinal survey developed by Pearson, but this survey is not included as a measure in Missouri's Annual Performance Review for EPP review or reporting. These EPPs determine how best to use the resulting data from this survey in the spirit of continuous improvement. In the future, Missouri plans to provide guidance to EPPs on strategies for analyzing and acting on this survey data, learning from the best practices developed by local EPPs. Overall, participating states expressed an interest in using dispositional measures not for accountability purposes but rather for program improvement purposes. For instance, participating states expressed interest in improving the cultural competence of their educator workforce. As such, they explored how a dispositional measure could be used as one method for measuring cultural competence at multiple milestones in a candidate's program experience (e.g., program entry, completion of field experience) with the goal of ensuring that all candidates demonstrate a specific level of cultural competence by the time they complete the program.
WHAT DOES MY STATE NEED TO KEEP IN MIND TO SUPPORT IMPLEMENTATION?	• As reliable measures of candidate and completer disposition are identified, the primary implementation consideration will become how best to support EPPs' analysis and use of this data for continuous improvement.

WHAT ARE THE KEY QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY?	• How do we ensure our dispositional measures are assessed by validated instruments? • Do these dispositional measures need to be the same instrument(s) across all EPPs? • How do we best support EPPs to use data from dispositional measures to improve program quality?

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2" align="center">Candidate/Completer Diversity</td></tr>
<tr><td>WHAT ARE THE COMMONLY USED MEASURES?</td><td>• Percentage of candidates and completers by race and ethnicity

• Percentage of candidates and completers by gender</td></tr>
<tr><td>HOW ARE THESE MEASURES USED BY STATES?</td><td>Each of the participating states collect data on the diversity of their candidates and completers. Specifically, states collect data on the race/ethnicity and gender of their EPPs' candidates and completers. In some states, such as California, this data collection happens solely through Title II reporting processes. In other states, the diversity of candidates and completers is included in their approaches to EPP review and reporting. For example, in Louisiana, data about candidate and completer diversity is publicly available on the data dashboards published by the state's Board of Regents. Additionally, the Louisiana Department of Education is also working toward including the diversity of the state's teacher workforce on future state report cards. Finally, as a part of Louisiana's on-site review of EPPs, the state will be comparing the diversity of candidates and completers to the diversity of teachers in districts that an EPP's completers frequently work in. By doing so, Louisiana hopes to be able to call attention to the extent to which EPPs are enriching the diversity of teachers in their district partners.</td></tr>
<tr><td>WHAT DOES MY STATE NEED TO KEEP IN MIND TO SUPPORT IMPLEMENTATION?</td><td>• Ideally, data on candidate and completer diversity would be collected at numerous points along the trajectory of a candidate and completer, such as program entry, matriculation through the program, completion of the program, and entry into and persistence in the teaching workforce.

• States are then encouraged to use this longitudinal data to closely examine how candidate and completer diversity is impacted by and relates to other measures. For example, a state could examine the completion rate of candidates who entered their respective programs in a certain year across all sub-groups to determine if any differences by race/ethnicity exist.</td></tr>
<tr><td>WHAT IS THE KEY QUESTION FOR FURTHER STUDY?</td><td>• Other than self-reporting, how can we collect data on candidate and completer diversity at multiple program gateways and milestones to increase the validity of the data?</td></tr>
</table>

GUIDANCE ON MEASURING KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS FOR TEACHING

Overview

The second assessment category in the KEI framework is "Knowledge and Skills for Teaching." This category is designed to capture whether completers have the requisite knowledge and skills to succeed as classroom teachers by measuring four distinct indicators:

1. knowledge of the subject(s) the completers are being licensed to teach;

2. pedagogical knowledge;

3. teaching skill; and

4. candid assessments from the completers of their preparation programs.

At least half of the participating states in the NTEP Data Systems Action Group use various measures for each of the indicators in this category as a part of their approach to EPP review and/or reporting, but states expressed a particular interest in discussing the third indicator, Completer Teaching Skill, because this indicator hones in on teaching ability.

In terms of measuring completer teaching skill, the KEI framework suggests using a nationally normed performance test and including program-specific mean scores, percentile distributions, and pass rates.

?

THE "WHY"

Participants in the action group agreed that this indicator captures a core purpose of educator preparation—to prepare teachers who know how to teach. The states shared a belief that teaching skill is a primary responsibility of EPPs. While some states in the action group license 50 percent or more of their teachers in post-baccalaureate programs (i.e., the candidates already possess the requisite content knowledge), and all states understand that teachers may be hired to teach subjects beyond their initial training and endorsement(s), all EPPs must produce completers who possess the skills needed to teach students, regardless of content. Therefore, being able to measure the extent to which program completers possess these teaching skills will help ensure EPPs have the data they need to continuously improve.

⊕ THE "HOW"

All six states in the action group currently assess completer teaching skill, and five include, or plan to include, a measure in their EPP review and/or reporting systems. Their approaches to assessing completer teaching skill vary in large part by whether or not the state uses a national versus a locally developed assessment as their measure.

WHAT IS THE COMMONLY USED MEASURE?	• Teacher performance assessments, national or locally developed
HOW IS THIS MEASURE USED BY STATES?	Five states in the NTEP Data Systems Action Group include results from a teacher performance assessment in their EPP review and/or reporting systems. Three of these states use a national assessment, such as edTPA or the ETS PPAT, while three states administer their own. Some states allow candidates to select from multiple assessments, such as California, which offers both national and local assessments. Locally developed teacher performance assessments, like Massachusetts' Candidate Assessment of Performance and the Missouri Teacher Performance Assessment, are aligned to the same state standards that are used to evaluate fully licensed teachers. These assessments give programs the ability to make direct comparisons between teacher performance assessment results and eventual candidate performance at in-state public schools. On the other hand, national assessments provide norm-referenced scores that reflect a larger pool of teachers and do not demand the additional costs associated with development. These assessments can also be aligned to state evaluation frameworks by developing a crosswalk between the two instruments, such as what Tennessee is doing with edTPA.

Although each of these five states currently requires or will require candidates to pass a teacher performance assessment as a condition of either program completion or licensure, none of the states use pass rates to measure or report completer teaching skill because they have found most candidates and completers are able to pass the teacher performance assessments. Therefore, pass rates do not reveal meaningful differences between programs' effectiveness in preparing teachers. Three states use domain/task-specific scores and a fourth provides this data to EPPs. Two states report or plan to report scores and distributions against statewide averages.

Participating states are also exploring other methods for measuring completer teaching skill. For example, in Missouri, student teachers are evaluated using a rubric that is modeled after the one used to evaluate fully certified teachers. A single mean score is averaged with those from all other candidates, and this value is used to assign points to each EPP. Some of the participating states also survey supervising practitioners, which provides additional feedback from a critical stakeholder group and gives partners an opportunity to contribute to an EPP's continuous improvement efforts. This highlights the need to clearly define the roles of mentor and clinical supervisor as well as to provide differentiated training to each group. Two of the participating states are considering credentialing mentor teachers to formalize this process. |

WHAT DOES MY STATE NEED TO KEEP IN MIND TO SUPPORT IMPLEMENTATION?	• The relative advantages and disadvantages of using a national assessment compared to developing your own, such as the ability to tailor the assessment to state standards, the comparability of the data, and the associated costs.
	• The most meaningful method for incorporating scores into your reporting framework. For example, will you report overall scores or task-specific averages? What is most useful for the public may be different than what is most useful for EPPs. The participating states suggested that performance data on each task or standard has been very important to supporting the continuous improvement process, but the public may not benefit from that level of detail. Instead, distributions against state averages may be more appropriate for public reporting and accountability purposes because they provide a benchmarked snapshot of how completers in a specific EPP perform against an average of their peers statewide.
	• If you offer candidates a choice of teacher performance assessments, you will need to identify the most effective way to standardize scores.
	• If you develop your own teacher performance assessment, you will need to pay special attention to training evaluators and calibrating scoring.
WHAT ARE THE KEY QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY?	• How predictive are teacher performance assessments of future teaching success?
	• Are there other ways to effectively measure completer teaching skill?
	o As mentioned above, participating states are considering other ways to measure completer teaching skill, such as through a student teacher evaluation rubric akin to the state's rubric for educators in the workforce.

PERFORMANCE AS CLASSROOM TEACHERS

Overview

The third assessment category in the KEI framework is "Performance as Classroom Teachers." This category is designed to identify how well program completers perform as teachers in their own classrooms by measuring one or more of three distinct indicators:

- teachers' impact on student learning;
- teachers' demonstrated ability to teach; and
- student perceptions of their teachers.

The participating states focused their discussion on the first of these indicators, which is based on actual student academic outcomes. Recognizing that the use of student data is a hot-button issue nationally and particularly contentious in some states, the participants were thoughtful and candid in their discussion of the importance of this indicator, its role as one part of a multiple-measure system of EPP review, and potential opportunities to get at the same information in a less controversial way.

In terms of measuring impact, the KEI framework suggests using statewide student data, such as value-added or student growth scores. To reduce the impact of potential outliers and anomalies, the KEI encourages states to aggregate data for second- and third-year teachers, respectively. Finally, the KEI suggests comparing cohort and program averages as well as identifying the percentage of completers in the top and bottom 33 percent of all novice teachers and of all teachers, respectively.

? THE "WHY"

The participating states in the NTEP Data Systems Action Group agreed that student learning is the central purpose for the work they do. One state suggested that although state agencies and EPPs work directly with teachers, their real clients are the students of their state. As mentioned, the participants engaged in a rich discussion of the pros, cons, and potential limitations of using student assessment data and the importance of considering it as one part of a multifactor system for understanding teacher and program quality. However, the participating states agreed that, whether or not they include standardized test score data, student learning is the most important outcome for a teacher preparation data system to track.

🔍 THE "HOW"

Four of the six states in the action group include or plan to include measures of student learning in their EPP review and/or reporting systems. Of the two states that do not, one uses student growth data in all teacher evaluations and is working on a way to apply it to EPPs, and the other is exploring options for assessing program impact without using standardized assessment data.

WHAT IS THE COMMONLY USED MEASURE?	• Value-added and student growth scores
HOW IS THIS MEASURE USED BY STATES?	Three states in the NTEP Action Group use value-added data, and one state uses student growth data. All three states that use value-added data incorporate it into their program review processes and report it publicly. However, they calculate and incorporate the data differently. For example, Tennessee uses the percentage of completers who earn a value-added score of 3 or higher (out of 5) and the distribution of value-added scores, while Delaware uses average completer performance against a projected value-added score that takes into account several school and demographic factors.
	With respect to student growth, Massachusetts currently reports the percentage of an EPP's math and English language arts teachers whose median student growth score places the teacher in the "low," "medium," or "high" range among all state teachers. These data are not currently reported publicly and is in the process of being incorporated into the state's comprehensive EPP review process.

	Participating states are also exploring additional mechanisms for measuring a completer's impact on student learning. For example, Delaware includes the student growth component of its teacher evaluations in its EPP review system and reports this data publicly. Specifically, this measure includes the percentage of completers who earn a score of "exceeds" on the student improvement component of their teacher evaluations. The student improvement component is based on multiple measures of student growth, including statewide assessment data and alternate assessments and student growth goals, and is adjusted for various factors, including school demographics, differences in educator experience, and grade-level taught. Additionally, Missouri has added a question to its survey for principals that asks them to indicate whether their first-year teachers are getting adequate growth. Finally, participating states discussed the possibility of using student surveys to help measure impact on student learning. One study has found a correlation between value-added scores, observations using the Danielson rubric, and surveys of K–12 student perceptions.[6] None of the participating states currently incorporate student perceptions into their EPP review and/or reporting systems, though Massachusetts does include this data as a portion of its student teacher evaluations.
WHAT DOES MY STATE NEED TO KEEP IN MIND TO SUPPORT IMPLEMENTATION?	• In most states, value-added data are presently limited to math and English language arts teachers, and states do not have data for private or out-of-state completers. Is there data that could serve as a proxy for non-tested grades and subjects? • Consider which cohorts of completers you will include given that it is not clear for how many years you can reasonably attribute student outcomes to the prep program. • How should states handle data from teachers who are hired to teach in a content area other than the one the EPP prepared them for? • How will you be able to access and use student and teacher data while protecting the privacy of those involved?
WHAT ARE THE KEY QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY?	• Can you standardize scores in subjects that are not tested annually? • Given the importance of student learning outcomes but the lingering questions about the use of this data in general as well as for accountability decisions, how should this measure be emphasized in a broader approach to EPP review and/or reporting?[7] • Are there other ways to measure impact on student learning without using standardized assessment data?[8]

---

6   Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. (2013 January). *Ensuring Fair and Reliable Measures of Effective Teaching: Culminating Findings from the MET Project's Three-Year Study.* Seattle, WA: Author.

7   For more information on the calculation and weighting that participating states apply to this and other measures, see the state-specific summaries in **Appendix B.**

8   As mentioned previously, participating states are already exploring the use of additional measures of student learning, including by examining the student growth component on a statewide teacher evaluation model as well as by adding questions to a principal survey related to an educator's impact on student growth.

GUIDANCE ON CONTRIBUTION TO STATE WORKFORCE NEEDS

Overview

The fourth and final assessment category in the KEI framework is "Contribution to State Needs." This category consists of two indicators that are designed to illustrate how well EPPs are addressing the needs of their state:

1. entry and persistence in teaching; and

2. placement/persistence in high-need subjects/schools.

In general, measures of these indicators are used by fewer states than measures that align to the three other categories of the KEI framework. Although states differed on the justifications for collecting evidence on one or both of these indicators and the role they should play in EPP review and/or reporting, all states are concerned with ensuring great teachers are in every classroom and view data on these indicators as a means to understanding the extent to which EPPs are meeting their state's workforce needs.

Entry and Persistence in Teaching

This indicator is designed to provide information for stakeholders on the proportion of teachers who are hired to teach and who remain in education. The KEI framework suggests tracking the percentage of completers who are employed as teachers within two years of program completion (including by gender and race/ethnicity), and the percentage of completers from the fourth most recent cohort who remain in teaching or education for one, two, and three years. The framework also suggests that states with multiple tiers of licenses should track the percentage of completers who attain second-stage teaching licenses.

Placement/Persistence in High-Need Subjects/Schools

This indicator is designed to illustrate how often an EPP's completers are being hired to teach in high-need subjects and schools, and how long they remain in those placements. The measures suggested in the KEI framework for measuring placement and persistence in high-need schools are similar to the ones for entry and persistence in teaching, with the exception that qualifying employment is restricted to high-need schools. The KEI framework suggests tracking the number and percentage of completers who become certified in high-need subjects.

❓ THE "WHY"

The states participating in the action group acknowledged the complex implications of collecting this data. Some states identified that EPPs do not exert control over who districts hire. Likewise, participants also acknowledged that some EPPs serve different types of students, such as national universities whose student populations are comprised of out-of-state candidates who are thus more likely to return to their home states to teach.

Ultimately, the majority of participating states believe it is appropriate for the state to understand and report out on the workforce trends, including the in-state EPPs' contributions to the workforce. Additionally, given the investment states make in public universities and in educator preparation, most states believe that it is reasonable to expect a return on that investment by understanding and incentivizing EPPs to help address and meet state and local workforce needs. In addition, despite the limitations of EPPs' influence on district hiring, the workforce data—if presented at the right grain size—can help both prospective EPP candidates and local education agencies (LEAs). Prospective candidates will have visibility into programs' ability to produce candidates who are in demand and persist in the state's public schools. LEAs will have information about a program's candidates and their likelihood to remain in state when forging partnerships with EPPs.

Measuring the indicators in this KEI assessment category ensures that states are able to provide this valuable information to each stakeholder group.

🔍 THE "HOW"

Entry and Persistence in Teaching	
WHAT ARE THE COMMONLY USED MEASURES?	• Percentage of completers employed by an in-state K–12 public school • Retention of completers by an in-state K–12 public school beyond their first year of teaching
HOW ARE THESE MEASURES USED BY STATES?	Four of the states in the NTEP Data Systems Action Group include measures of both completer employment and retention, and three of these states include at least one measure of each in their EPP review systems. All four states measure the percentage of completers employed in their first year, and two states also measure completers who were not employed during their first year after completion but were employed during their second. "Employment" is generally limited to in-state public schools, though Delaware allows EPPs to self-report the out-of-state placement of their candidates.

	In terms of retention, all states that track initial placements also measure the percentage of new teachers who remain employed for a second year. In addition, Delaware measures completers employed beyond year three and Louisiana and Massachusetts report on the candidates from a single cohort who were retained for each of five consecutive years. Because of the vital role that retaining highly effective educators plays in improving the overall educator workforce, each of the participating states that collect evidence on completers' employment also measure the persistence of said completers to determine which EPPs prepare teachers who tend to remain as public school teachers in state.
WHAT DOES MY STATE NEED TO KEEP IN MIND TO SUPPORT IMPLEMENTATION?	• How do you establish a benchmark for placement rate given differences in the location of your EPPs and in their likelihood to place teachers in non-public schools or in other states? o If your state wants to track out-of-state placements, are there more reliable ways to obtain this data without relying on EPPs to self-report? • Do you have access to the data needed to measure these indicators? For example, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing is an independent agency and does not currently have access to employment data. The commission is, however, in the second year of a strategic data project and working on creative ways to track employment and persistence.
WHAT IS THE KEY QUESTION FOR FURTHER STUDY?	• How can measures of completer employment and retention be adapted during economic downturns to ensure they are fair and reliable reflections of EPP performance and impact?
Placement/Persistence in High-Need Subjects/Schools	
WHAT ARE THE COMMONLY USED MEASURES?	• Number of completers who earn an endorsement in state-identified high-need subject areas • Placement of teachers/residents in high-need schools

HOW ARE THESE MEASURES USED BY STATES?	Two states in the action group measure, or are planning to measure, high-need subject endorsements and two states measure, or are planning to measure, placement in high-need schools, respectively. None of the participating states currently include a separate measure for tracking or reporting persistence in these schools, though the states that measure retention for all teachers should have this information. Delaware (placement rates in high-need schools) and Tennessee (percentage of endorsements that are in high-need subjects) report this data publicly and include it in their EPP review system. Participating states take various approaches to defining high-need subject endorsements and high-need schools. In Louisiana, the subject endorsements that are high-need are determined annually based on an analysis of certification and workforce data. These high-need subject endorsements serve as one of Louisiana's publicly reported statewide goals for strengthening its educator workforce. In Massachusetts, EPPs are required to conduct a needs assessment for their partner districts at the beginning of the program approval and review cycles. EPP and state leaders then discuss the findings from and implications of this needs assessment as a part of the on-site review process.
	In a new and unique approach, Louisiana is planning to measure and score programs on the placement of residents in high-need subjects and schools. The state argues that EPPs have more control over the placement of residents than the hiring of teachers and believes that residency placement has a strong correlation to eventual employment.
WHAT DOES MY STATE NEED TO KEEP IN MIND TO SUPPORT IMPLEMENTATION?	• Measuring entry and persistence in the educator workforce can be particularly complex given the lack of reliable data on out-of-state hires and retention in full-time K–12 educator roles. Thus, it is especially important for states to bear in mind the percentage of their completers who enter the educator workforce in-state versus out-of-state. Such perspective will help state leaders incorporate entry and persistence measures into their respective approaches to EPP review and/or reporting in a manner that reflects the reliability of their data on entry and persistence.
WHAT IS THE KEY QUESTION FOR FURTHER STUDY?	• Given that hiring completers does not equate to hiring completers who will effectively meet the needs of students in high-need schools, are there better ways to measure how well programs are preparing teachers to work in high-need schools?

GUIDANCE ON STAKEHOLDER SURVEYS

Overview

Two of the previous four sections took a holistic look at a KEI assessment category, while the other two focused on a significant indicator within a specific assessment category. Instead of focusing on a specific indicator or KEI assessment category, this last section highlights an instrument frequently used by participating states to measure multiple indicators across the KEI—stakeholder surveys. The KEI framework recommends surveying recent completers, first-year teachers, and K–12 students

to measure completer rating of program and K–12 student perceptions, respectively. In addition to those stakeholder groups, various participating states in the NTEP Data Systems Action Group also administer surveys to:

- supervising practitioners

- program supervisors

- district and school partners

- EPP candidates

- supervisors of new teachers

- hiring principals

To focus the discussion of this instrument, the participating states chose to zero in on surveys of program completers and first-year teachers, as the greatest number of participating states administer these surveys. These surveys align to the KEI indicator "Completer Rating of Program," which falls within the "Knowledge and Skills for Teaching" assessment category. The Completer Rating of Program indicator is designed to gather clear and candid information from completers about their experiences in and perspectives on their EPP. The KEI framework recommends surveying individuals upon program completion and at the end of their first year of teaching.

?
THE "WHY"

Participating states highlighted several reasons for using surveys to gather information about completers' perceptions of program quality. First, completer surveys give teachers a voice to influence educator preparation in their state. Second, as long as a state has the capacity and resources to develop a reliable survey and to disseminate it to teachers, surveys can be a low-cost way to gather insights on EPP quality from a critical stakeholder group—the customer. Third, surveys are often more widely embraced by stakeholders, including teachers, than many of the other measures included in states' EPP data systems. As such, surveys, particularly those that represent the experiences of program completers, can provide an accessible and actionable data set from which EPPs can draw on to support their own continuous improvement efforts.

THE "HOW"

To increase the reliability of their surveys, such as those that gather feedback from completers on their educator preparation program, participating states use a variety of strategies including, but not limited to, setting minimum n-sizes as thresholds that must be met in order for the survey data to be used for EPP review and/or reporting. Additionally, participating states also make a concerted effort to produce survey data for EPPs that can help drive their continuous improvement in a manner that aligns to state standards for educator effectiveness.

HOW IS THIS INSTRUMENT USED BY THE STATES TO MEASURE THE KEI OF COMPLETER RATING OF PROGRAM?	Five of the six states in the action group administer a survey to completers and/or first-year teachers. All five states incorporate this data into their program review processes and three of the states make it available to the public. Most states acknowledged challenges with ensuring the information resulting from the surveys is reliable. States mitigate this concern in a few ways. First, every state sets minimum n-sizes, which range from 6 to 10 for public reporting. Additionally, some states include minimum-response thresholds that must be met before the data will be included or shared. For example, Delaware requires a 30 percent response rate on its survey of first-year teachers and an n-size of 10 before it will calculate a score in its program review process. As another way to improve the reliability of results, two states administer the same survey to multiple stakeholders. One of these states, Missouri, surveys first-year teachers and their supervisors using questions that are aligned to the state's teaching standards. The standards used were identified, in part, by district feedback on the skills that teachers most need to know. The scores used in the EPP review process are combined averages of the responses of teachers and principals. The participating states agreed that aligning survey questions to a set of standards is a best practice that makes this data more focused and actionable for providers.

WHAT DOES MY STATE NEED TO KEEP IN MIND TO SUPPORT IMPLEMENTATION?	• What strategies will you use to promote a high enough response rate to ensure the resulting survey data are reliable enough to inform continuous improvement efforts?
	
	   o For example, California requires completers to click through the survey on the state's website before accessing the license application.
	
	• How will you address the validity concerns with self-reported data?
	
	   o For instance, Missouri administers the same survey to multiple stakeholder groups. In addition, states could consider using a vetted observation rubric to compare to survey results.
	
	• When is the best time to administer surveys to produce the most useful information?
	
	• What can you do to build the capacity of the field to interpret and use the survey data for continuous program improvement?

WHAT IS THE KEY QUESTION FOR FURTHER STUDY?	• When a response rate for a program completer survey does not meet or exceed the minimum n-size threshold, participating states often fold this survey data in with that from other programs' completer surveys to ensure that the n-size threshold is cleared and the data can be shared. How can states help EPPs use this aggregated survey data from completers across two or more programs to drive continuous improvement?

CLOSING

The participating states in this action group are on the leading edge of designing and implementing outcomes-oriented educator preparation data systems. We are incredibly grateful to them for their participation in the NTEP Data Systems Action Group and for their generous contributions to the field. The insights and guidance outlined above came to fruition because these leading states allowed us to thoroughly document their current approaches to EPP review and/or reporting, existing implementation challenges, and measures they aspire to include in their respective models. The goal was to provide states with in-depth descriptions of common practices, challenges, and the underlying rationales used by leading states for incorporating specific measures in their respective approaches for EPP review and/or reporting. The diversity of models for EPP review and/or reporting is illustrative of the fact that states must develop their data systems in line with a clear set of goals for what it will accomplish. With state-specific goals as guideposts, states can meaningfully engage with stakeholders and learn from others in the field to determine the indicators and measures that will enable them to track their progress toward their aspirational vision for the educator workforce in their state.

APPENDIX A: CROSSWALKS OF MEASURES REFLECTED IN STATE-SPECIFIC MODELS FOR EPP REVIEW AND/OR REPORTING, ALIGNED TO THE KEY EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS

HOW DO THE MEASURES REFLECTED IN STATE-SPECIFIC MODELS ALIGN TO THE KEY EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS?

Table 1 below illustrates a crosswalk between the measures reflected in state-specific models for EPP review and/or reporting to the Key Effectiveness Indicators (KEI). Specifically, Table 1 shows *whether* a state includes any measure that provides evidence of each specific KEI, regardless of what the measure is, how it is used, or if it is one of the specific measures contemplated in the KEI framework.

Table 1: Key Effectiveness Indicators Measured by States

KEI Domains	Indicators	States					
		DE	TN	LA	MA	CA	MO
Candidate Selection and Completion	Academic Strength	✓	✓	✓		✓	
	Teaching Promise						
	Candidate and Completer Diversity	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Knowledge and Skills for Teaching	Mastery of Teaching Subject	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Subject-Specific Pedagogical Knowledge		✓	✓		✓	
	Completer Teaching Skill	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Completer Rating of Program	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Performance as Classroom Teachers	Impact on K-12 Student Learning	✓	✓	✓	✓		
	Demonstrated Teaching Skill	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	K-12 Student Perceptions						
Contribution to State Needs	Placement / Persistence in High-Need Subjects / Schools	✓	✓	✓			
	Entry and Persistence in Teaching	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Additional Domain(s)	*Additional Indicator(s)*	✓	✓	✓	✓		

WHAT MEASURES ARE REFLECTED IN STATE-SPECIFIC MODELS AND HOW DO THEY ALIGN TO THE KEY EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS?

Table 2 lists *what* measures are reflected in state-specific models for EPP review and/or reporting, organized by the Key Effectiveness Indicators. Two Key Effectiveness Indicators (i.e., Teaching Promise and K–12 Student Perceptions) are not included in Table 2 because neither are measured by states participating in the NTEP Data Systems Action Group. Measures used solely for nonconsequential reporting are italicized. For more information about these measures, including how they are calculated by states, see the state-specific summaries.

Table 2: Measures Reflected in Current State-Specific Models for EPP Review and/or Reporting, Aligned to Key Effectiveness Indicators

KEI Domains	Indicators	Measures					
		DE	TN	LA	MA	CA	MO
Candidate Selection and Completion	Academic Strength	• Praxis Core • ACT • SAT • GRE • GPA	• Praxis Core • ACT • SAT • GRE • Undergraduate GPA	• *Praxis Core* • *Candidates and completers GPA*		• *Median GPA of admitted candidates*	
	Candidate and Completer Diversity	• Non-white candidate enrollment	• Completers by race and ethnicity • Completers by identified gender	• *Candidates by race and ethnicity* • *Candidates by identified gender*	• Candidates by race and ethnicity • Candidates by identified gender • Completers by race and ethnicity • Completers by identified gender	• *Candidates by race and ethnicity* • *Candidates by identified gender*	

Knowledge and Skills for Teaching	**Mastery of Teaching Subject**	• Praxis Subject Area Assessments	• Praxis Subject Area Assessments	• *Praxis Subject Area Assessments*	• Massachusetts Test for Educator Licensure	• *California Subject Examinations for Teachers*	• Missouri Content Assessment • Content-area GPA of completers
	Subject-Specific Pedagogical Knowledge		• Principles of Learning and Teaching Assessment • Reading: Elementary Education Assessment • Reading Across the Curriculum: Elementary Assessment	• *Praxis Professional Knowledge Assessment*		• Reading Instruction Competency Assessment	
	Completer Teaching Skill	• Performance assessment, candidate choice of EdTPA or TPAC	• EdTPA	• Candidate evaluations during residency	• Survey of supervising practitioners of EPP candidates • Candidate assessment of performance	• Survey of supervising practitioners of EPP candidates • Performance on standardized performance assessments	• Missouri Educator Evaluation System • Missouri Performance Assessment
	Completer Rating of Program	• Survey of first-year teachers	• Survey of first-year teachers		• Survey of completers when completing a program and one year after completion (if they are teaching in an MA public school)	• *Survey of completers*	• Combined survey of first-year teachers and first-year teacher supervisors

	Impact on K–12 Student Learning	• Student improvement component of state teacher evaluation model • Student growth outcomes	• Value-added scores	• Value-added scores • *Compass Student Outcome scores*	• Student growth percentile data		
Performance as Classroom Teachers	**Demonstrated Teaching Skill**	• Classroom observation scores • Teacher evaluation ratings	• Classroom observation scores, disaggregated by domain and indicator • Teacher evaluation ratings	• *Compass Professional Practice scores* • *Compass Final Evaluation scores*	• Teacher evaluation ratings • Survey of principals who have hired a teacher who completed a prep program in the past year • *Percentage of completers who earn Professional Teacher Status*	• *Survey of employers*	• Combined survey of first-year teachers and first-year teacher supervisors

	Placement/ Persistence in High-Need Subjects/Schools	• Completers from past five years working in a high-needs school	• Completers earning an endorsement in ESL, secondary math, secondary science, Spanish and SPED	• Placement of residents in historically underserved rural schools with a high percentage of economically disadvantaged students • Completers in LA's three highest-need content areas	
Contribution to State Needs	**Entry and Persistence in Teaching**	• Completers employed as an educator within one year of completion • Employment beyond year one • Employment beyond year three	• Completers employed in a TN public school during first and/or second year following completion or enrollment for job-embedded candidates • Employment in TN public school during first year following completion • Employment in TN public school during second year following completion but not first year • Employment in a TN public school for a second consecutive year after completion	• *Completers employed in a LA public school during first school year following completion* • *Completers from a specified cohort who are retained in LA public schools for each of five successive years*	• Completers employed in a MA public school • Employment beyond year one • *Completers hired in their first year after completion* • *Completers hired in their second year after completion* • *Completers hired within their first two years of completion* • Completers employed less than one year • Completers employed fewer than two years • Completers employed between two and five years	• *Completers employed in a CA public school during first year following completion* • Employment beyond year two • Employment beyond year four

SYNTHESIS OF MEASURES USED BY STATES AND ALIGNMENT TO THE KEI FRAMEWORK

Table 3 provides a synthesis of the measures commonly used by states, for review and reporting purposes, organized by the domains and indicators of the KEI framework as well as a description of the indicators in the KEI framework infrequently measured by states.

Table 3: Commonly Used Measures Aligned to the Key Effectiveness Indicators (KEI)

KEI Domain	Indicator	Commonly Used Measures
Candidate Selection and Completion	Academic Strength	• Praxis Core • GPA
	Diversity of Candidates and Completers	• Percentage of candidates and completers by race/ethnicity • Percentage of candidates and completers by gender identification
Knowledge and Skills for Teaching	Mastery of Teaching Subject	• Praxis Subject Area Assessments
	Completer Teaching Skill	• Completer performance on performance assessments (e.g., EdTPA, CAP)
	Completer Rating of Program	• Feedback collected via survey of teachers in their first year of teaching
Performance as Classroom Teachers	Impact on Student Learning	• Student growth data (e.g., value-added data, student growth percentiles)
	Demonstrated Teaching Skill	• Average teacher evaluation scores • Distribution of teacher evaluation scores • Feedback collected via survey of supervisors of teachers in their first year of teaching
Contribution to State Needs	Entry and Persistence in Teaching	• Percentage of completers who are employed in a K–12 public school in the respective state • Retention of completers in a K–12 public school in the respective state after their first year of teaching

Measures Used Only for Nonconsequential Reporting

For each of the Key Effectiveness Indicators other than Teaching Promise, K–12 Student Perceptions, and Completer Teaching Skill, at least one state uses measures solely for nonconsequential reporting purposes. The states with the most nonconsequential reporting measures are California, Massachusetts, and Louisiana. California does not produce a consequential report, and Massachusetts and Louisiana each have systems designed to track some EPP information for transparency or continuous improvement purposes only. Demonstrated Teaching Skill is the only measure for which all three states track information for nonconsequential reporting purposes.

Gaps between These Measures and the Indicators in the KEI Framework

Teaching Promise and K–12 Student Perceptions are the only indicators in the KEI framework that are not currently measured by any of the states participating in the NTEP Data Systems Action Group. Subject-specific pedagogical knowledge and placement/persistence in high-need subjects/schools are measured by half (n=3) of the states participating in the NTEP Data Systems Action Group. Three states (Delaware, Massachusetts, and Tennessee) survey partners and principals regarding the quality of preparation programs, though this measure is not reflected in the KEI framework. For more information about these surveys, see the state-specific summaries.

APPENDIX B: SUMMARIES OF STATES' APPROACHES TO EPP REVIEW AND/OR REPORTING

OVERVIEW

By clicking a link below you will be redirected to a summary of that state's approach to EPP review and/or reporting. The summary of the state's EPP review/reporting is aligned to the Key Effectiveness Indicators (KEI) wherever applicable. If the state has distinct review and reporting processes, its summary describes the measures used for program review and nonconsequential reporting in two separate tables. In addition to identifying each state's measures, the summaries also explain how they are calculated.

- California

- Delaware

- Louisiana

- Massachusetts

- Missouri

- Tennessee

To help the reader better understand how each state's summary of its approach to EPP review and/or reporting is organized, below is a "table key" that describes how the state-specific summaries are laid out.

Example State EPP Review Approach			
In this cell the reader will find a brief summary of the state's approach to EPP review and/or reporting. This description is meant to provide the reader with essential background information on the state's approach to EPP review and/or reporting that will help her/him better understand the context in which this state uses specific measures.			
Example State Domain	**Key Effectiveness Indicator (KEI)**	**Measure**	**Method of Calculation**
In this column, the reader will learn how this state defines the domains that serve as the foundation of its approach to EPP review and/or reporting.	n this column, the reader will learn which KEIs are assessed by the state-specific domains identified in the column to the left. In cases where the indicator is not a specific KEI, the content in this column will be underlined and will reflect how a specific state terms this indicator (e.g., on-site, off-site).	In this column, the reader will learn which measures are used by this state to collect evidence on the KEI identified in the column to the left.	In this column, the reader will learn how this state calculates the measure identified in the column to the left.

CALIFORNIA

EPPs are reviewed by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, both at the EPP level and within EPPs at the program-specific level. These reviews occur on a seven-year cycle and include annual data submission and a site visit in year six. Data are not scored but are used primarily for continuous improvement, informing the work of accreditation teams and focusing their efforts on the areas of greatest need. California is in the process of building a data warehouse that will house all of the data it collects from EPPs.

California EPP Reporting: Institutional Profile Data Dashboards

Institutional Profile Data Dashboards provide information at the EPP level, not the program-specific level. Over time, California plans to build out the data collected in the warehouse to expand it beyond the measures currently in the dashboards and to use that information to inform comprehensive reviews as well. California has also begun collecting data from surveys of completers, student teaching supervisors, and employers. These data are reported to EPPs at the program level and to the public in the statewide aggregate.

California Domain	Key Effectiveness Indicator	Measure	Method of Calculation
Recruitment	Candidate and Completer Diversity	Gender and race/ethnicity of candidates in EPPs	• Based on optional self-reporting by candidates and EPPs.
	Academic Strength	Minimum GPA for EPP admittance[9]	• Based on self-reporting by EPPs of their minimum GPA for program admittance.
		Median GPA of candidates admitted to the EPP	• Based on self-reporting by EPPs of their median GPA for all admitted candidates.
Candidate Achievement	Subject-Specific Pedagogical Knowledge	First-time pass rates on the Reading Instruction Competency Assessment test	• Number of first-time passers divided by the total number of first-time takers during the most recent academic year, and for completers from the past three academic years..
	Completer Teaching Skill	Candidate performance on required, standardized performance assessments for prospective teachers and school leaders (tentative)	• Candidates will be required to take one of three statewide performance assessments. • All three assessments will measure six teaching criteria with a total of 45 elements.
	Mastery of Teaching Subjects	Candidate performance on California Subject Examinations for Teachers (CSET)	• Number of takers and passers of each test by program, as well as state average scores and pass rates.

---

9   GPA data are not used for accreditation or program approval but rather to help prospective candidates understand the program's criteria for admission.

Perceptions	Completer Rating of Program	[EPP completer survey](#)	• Administered for the first time in 2015; data are not currently included in the Institutional Profile Data Dashboards but will be in the future. • Surveys are multiple-choice and all individual question responses are numbered. • Reported data include mean and standard deviation for each question and a comparison to the state mean.
	Completer Teaching Skill	[Master teacher survey](#) of supervisors and mentors of EPP student teachers	• Administered for the first time in 2016; data are not currently included in the Institutional Profile Data Dashboards but will be in the future. • Most questions are scored from 1 (not at all) to 5 (very well). • Reported data include mean and standard deviation for each question and a comparison to the state mean.
	Demonstrated Teaching Skill	[Employer survey](#)	• Administered for the first time in 2016; data are not currently included in the Institutional Profile Data Dashboards but will be in the future. • All questions use a five-point rating scale from 1 (not at all) to 5 (very well). • Reported data include mean and standard deviation for each question and a comparison to the state mean.
Workforce Needs	Entry and Persistence in Teaching/ Contribution to State Needs	Placement and retention of completers (tentative)	• California is currently exploring placement and retention measures, including in-state placement in the first year and retention in year three and year five.
	Candidate and Completer Diversity	Gender and race/ethnicity of EPP completers (tentative)	• The gender and race/ethnicity of EPP completers.

DELAWARE

Delaware uses the EPP progress report to review programs. It publishes the progress reports biennially, and they also serve as the state's public reporting on EPP performance. Delaware also provides all of the raw data it collects on an EPP back to the provider for its own analysis.

Delaware EPP Review and Reporting: EPP Progress Report
Reviewed annually and published biennially, the Delaware Department of Education reviews and reports out on EPPs at the program-specific level. Delaware publishes its teacher preparation provider reports on even years and its school leader preparation reports on the off years. Visit this website to review the 2016 Delaware Educator Preparation Program Reports. For a detailed description of Delaware's technical specifications, review this report.

Delaware Domain	Key Effectiveness Indicator	Measure	Method of Calculation
Recruitment (10 total points out of 100)	Candidate and Completer Diversity	Non-white candidate enrollment (5 total points)	• Proportion of candidates who have entered the program in the past five years who are not white. • 0 points awarded for lower than 10%, 5 points for greater than 40%, with a proportional percentage of 5 points earned between those two numbers.
	Candidate Academic Strength	Praxis I Scores (5 total points)	• The sum of the average of each candidate's best available reading, writing and math Praxis I scores, respectively. • 0 points awarded for average scores lower than 174, 5 points for scores greater than 185, with a proportional percentage of 5 points between those two numbers.

	Admissions Criteria	GPA and SAT/ACT score range of students accepted into program GRE scores (Currently reported but not scored, but Delaware plans to merge these measures with Praxis I scores and to score them [with the possible exception of GPA])	• There are two potential scenarios for how this measure will be calculated:
			  o Standardize ACT and SAT scores on a same scale and average candidate's best available scores.
			  o If standardization is not possible (no conversion table), Delaware will only use SAT scores.

Candidate Performance (10 total points)	Mastery of Teaching Subjects	Standardized Praxis II scores (10 total points)	• Candidates' best available score on the Praxis II test for the content area in which they are/will be certified to teach is standardized (see below) and then divided by the total number of candidates with standardized Praxis II scores on any Praxis II test.
			  o Scores are standardized by:
			    ∞ subtracting the passing score on the Praxis II test from the candidate's score; then
			    ∞ dividing that number by the historical population standard deviation for the Praxis II tests.
			• 0 points awarded for lower than 0.4, 10 points for greater than 1.5, with a proportional percentage of 10 points between those two numbers.

	Completer Teaching Skill	Performance assessment *(to be included in the EPP Review and Progress Report starting in 2018; students will be allowed to choose from two options— EdTPA and PPAT)*	• While the specific method of calculation is to be determined, Delaware knows that it will be using the actual scores on the performance assessment and not pass rates.
Placement (15 total points)	Entry and Persistence in Teaching	Proportion of completers working as an educator within one year of completion (6 total points)	• The total number of completers who began working anywhere as a teacher or specialist within one year of graduation divided by the total number of graduates. • Outside of Delaware, this is currently self-reported. Delaware wants to link into the MELS system to help eliminate self-reported data as much as possible. • 0 points awarded for lower than 30%, 6 points for greater than 85%, with a proportional percentage of 6 points between those two numbers.
		Proportion of completers from past five years working in DE within one year of completion (6 total points)	• The number of graduates who began working as a teacher or specialist in DE public schools within one year of graduation divided by the total number of graduates. • 0 points awarded for lower than 25%, 6 points for greater than 75%, with a proportional percentage of 6 points between those two numbers.
	Placement/ Persistence in High-Need Subjects/Schools	Proportion of completers from past five years working in a high-needs school (3 total points)	• The number of completers placed in a state-identified high-needs DE public school divided by the number of completers placed in any DE public school. • 0 points awarded for lower than 15%, 3 points for greater than 35%, with a proportional percentage of 3 points between those two numbers.
Retention (15 total points)	Entry and Persistence in Teaching	Retention beyond year one (7.5 total points)	• Proportion of graduates placed in DE who continue working in public education in DE beyond their first year of employment. • 0 points awarded for lower than 80%, 7.5 points for greater than 95%, with a proportional percentage of 7.5 points between those two numbers.
		Retention beyond year three (7.5 total points)	• Proportion of graduates placed in DE who continue working in public education in DE beyond third year of employment. • 0 points awarded for lower than 65%, 7.5 points for greater than 85%, with a proportional percentage of 7.5 points between those two numbers.

---

10   In the next iteration of Delaware's progress reports, it will split 10 points with performance assessment equally.

Graduate Performance (35 total points)	Impact on K–12 Student Learning	Proportion of completers from previous five years who earn "exceeds" on student improvement component on state evaluation (14 total points)	• Out of all program completers, proportion of graduates that receive the highest possible rating on the Student Improvement Component of their evaluation, which is based on multiple measures of student growth in DE. • This is also adjusted for various demographics. • First, each educator's performance level is identified using the Student Improvement Component of all available DPAS-II evaluations. • Then, the marginal effect of each program on educators' odds of being rated "exceeds" on this component is modeled in a multilevel, mixed-effects logistic regression. • This model adjusts for differences in educator experience, grade-level taught, DPAS-II educator group, and school demographics. • The model also includes a school effect to mitigate systematic differences in ratings across schools. • Results are reported as predicted probabilities for educators in each program with 0–2 years of experience; in educator group 220; in middle grades; and in classrooms with average levels of poverty, students with disabilities, English language learners, and white students. • 0 points awarded for lower than 20%, 14 points for greater than 70%, with a proportional percentage of 14 points between those two numbers.
		Student Growth Outcomes of math and ELA teachers in DE (5.25 total points)	• Delaware's model for measuring the student growth outcomes of its math and English language arts (ELA) teachers adjusts for teacher pathway and student outcomes, for relevant factors at various levels, prior student achievement, teachers' years of experience, school composition, and student characteristics such as race, ethnicity, and special education status. • Math and ELA teachers' student value-added scores are averaged within their subject. • Then a teacher-specific value-added composite score is calculated for each teacher by weighting the value-added score by its variance among DE teachers of the same subject. • The "value-added" measures of teacher effectiveness in these reports were computed using longitudinal student assessment data linked to individual classroom teachers through administrative data linked to individual classroom teachers provided by the Delaware Department of Education. • These analyses took two forms, a multilevel model and a value-added calculation. Teachers' effects on student achievement were estimated using a multilevel-mixed model, also known as hierarchical linear model (HLM). This approach examined the relationship between teacher pathway and student outcomes, adjusting for relevant factors at various levels, prior student achievement, teachers' years of experience, school composition, and student characteristics such as race, ethnicity, and special education status. • Importantly, this estimation strategy mitigates nested or clustered data, such as when students are clustered within teachers and observations are not independent. • The program score is the average of all composite scores. • 0 points awarded for lower than -0.2, 5.25 points for greater than 0.2, with a proportional percentage of 5.25 points between those two numbers.

(continued) **Graduate Performance** (35 total points)	Demonstrated Teaching Skill	Average observation score for previous five years, adjusted for school demographics and other factors (14 possible points)	• The average of all available completers' raw observation scores is modeled in a multilevel, mixed-effects regression to adjust for differences in the percentage of students in poverty and with disabilities, as well as the percentage of English language learner and white students, the teacher's years of experience, grade level taught, and educator evaluation group, to produce a conditional average score. • 0 points awarded for lower than 2.7, 14 points for greater than 3.3, with a proportional percentage of 14 points between those two numbers.
		Proportion of Graduates Who Earn the Highest Overall Performance Evaluation Rating (1.75 total points)	• Each completers' available summative observation ratings are identified. • The marginal effect of each program on a completers' odds of being rated "highly effective" overall is modeled in a multilevel, mixed-effects logistic regression to adjust for differences in the percentage of students in poverty and with disabilities, as well as the percentage who are English language learners and white, and the teacher's years of experience, grade level taught, and DPAS II educator group. • The proportion of completer observations estimated to be "highly effective" out of all completers is based on the predicted probabilities for completers with 0–2 years of experience; in educator group 2; in middle grades; and in classrooms with average levels of poverty, students with disabilities, English language learners, and white students. • 0 points awarded for lower than 20%, 14 points for greater than 70%, with a proportional percentage of 1.75 points between those two numbers.
Perceptions (15 total points)	Completer Rating of Program	Graduate survey (7.5 total points)	• Completers' responses on a scale 1–4 (4 being the highest) on a survey of how well their prep program prepared them are averaged. • The median of all completer average scores is used for this measure. • 0 points awarded for lower than 2.8, 7.5 points for greater than 3.8, with a proportional percentage of 7.5 points between those two numbers.
	Supervisor Perception of Preparedness	Supervisor survey (7.5 total points)	• Supervisors' responses on a scale 1–4 (4 being the highest) on a survey of their perceptions of the preparedness level of the recent graduates they hired are averaged. • The median of all average supervisor scores is used for this measure. • 0 points awarded for lower than 2.8, 7.5 points for greater than 3.9, with a proportional percentage of 7.5 points between those two numbers.

LOUISIANA

Louisiana is in the process of testing and implementing a new program review process. The Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) recently adopted regulations outlining a quality rating system for EPPs. Initially, all EPPs will be reviewed every two years. Those that are rated at Level 3 or higher (on a scale of 1–4) will have their renewal cycle extended to four years. Separately, Louisiana publishes a data dashboard with provider-level details for informational purposes only, and it will begin publishing annual Performance Profiles in winter 2019 with information relating to the quality rating system. The two tables below summarize the state's approach to EPP review and EPP reporting, respectively.

Louisiana EPP Review: Teacher Preparation Quality Rating System			
BESE recently approved a new system for program accountability and reporting. Programs will be evaluated biennially at the pathway level (undergraduate or graduate) using a new quality rating system. It will consist of the three domains identified below, but the measures identified will be tested and researched over the next two years, as the details of this new system are finalized.			
Louisiana Domain	**Key Effectiveness Indicator**	**Measure**	**Method of Calculation**

Preparation Program Experience
 	
 (50%)
	On-site Review	On-site program review	• Reviewers will gather evidence across four domains:
			    o Quality of selection.
			    o Quality of content knowledge and teaching methods.
			    o Quality of clinical placement, feedback, and candidate performance.
			    o Quality of program performance management.
			 • Evidence from these domains will be used to calculate one holistic rating (on a scale of 1–4) for each pathway.

Meeting Workforce Needs (25%)	Placement/ Persistence in High-Need Subjects/Schools	Placement of residents in historically underserved rural schools or schools with a high percentage of economically disadvantaged students	• **High-need certification areas** and a list of **high-needs schools** will be established every four years, beginning on September 1, 2017, and every four years thereafter by September 1.
			o **High-need certification areas** are the groups of certification areas that align with the highest percentage of classes being taught by out-of-field or uncertified teachers across the state.
		Percentage of completers graduating from programs in LA's three highest-need content areas	o **High-need schools** may be defined as schools with a high percentage of minority or economically disadvantaged students or schools that are less geographically proximate to teacher preparation providers or schools underserved by current teacher preparation providers.
			• The percentage of positions that are high-need certification areas and in high-needs schools shall also be established every four years. These percentages will form the basis for the state need.
			• Providers will receive a rating from 1–4 based upon the extent to which they are meeting the state need in one or both areas.

Percentage of Program Completers in a High-Need Area/Residents in a High-Need School	Points
Below Need—below need for both measures	2.0
Meets Need—at need or up to 20 percentage points above need for at least one measure	2.5
Exceeds Need—more than 20 percentage points above need for one measure	3.0
Exceeds Need—more than 20 percentage points above need for both measures	3.5
Exceptional—more than 40 percentage points above need for one or both measures	4.0

Teacher Quality (25%)	Impact on K–12 Learning	Value-added scores Other measures of teacher quality (as recommended by an advisory committee)	• These measures will be studied in the 2017–2018 academic year. The Louisiana BESE will consider updates to the system in 2018.

Louisiana Domain	Key Effectiveness Indicator	Measure	Method of Calculation
Basic Program Information	Program Details and Accreditation	Is the program state-approved/ accredited by the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education?	• Whether the program is approved/accredited by the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education.
		Is the program state-approved/ accredited by the Board of Regents?	• Whether the program is approved/accredited by the Board of Regents.
		Is the program regionally approved/accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC)?	• Whether the program is regionally approved/accredited by SACSCOC.
		Is the program nationally approved/accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC), or Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)?	• Whether the program is nationally approved/accredited by NCATE, TEAC, or CAEP.
		Type of EPP	• Whether the program is undergraduate or alternate.

Candidate Selection Profile	Academic Strength	Completer passage rate on Praxis Skill Assessment in a specific year defined in the data dashboard	• Completer passage rate is calculated based on all attempts. However, it does not include candidates who were not required to take the test because they had a qualifying ACT/SAT score.
		Median GPA of candidates entering the program in a specific year defined in the data dashboard	• Median GPA of entering candidates.
		Median GPA of candidates completing the program in a specific year defined in the data dashboard	• Median GPA of completers.
		Number of candidates who started but did not complete the program within six years	• Number of candidates who started a program six years prior to the record year and have not completed the program.
	Teaching Promise	*This is a possible indicator that is currently listed as a category on the data dashboard, but a measure or measures are not identified and no data were available in 2015.*	• TBD.
	Candidate and Completer Diversity	Number of candidates—enrolled, completers, and total (sum of enrolled and completers) for a specific year defined in the data dashboard	• Number of enrolled candidates and completers, individually and combined.
		Number of enrolled candidates by gender (male and female)	• Number of enrolled candidates during a specific year defined in the dashboard that reported being male and female, respectively.
		Number of enrolled candidates by race (Hispanic, Indian, Asian, black, Pacific Islander, white, multi-racial)	• Number of enrolled candidates during a specific year defined in the dashboard that identified with each of seven identified races.

Knowledge of Skills for Teaching of Completers	Mastery of Teaching Subjects	Completer passage rate on Praxis Content Assessments for a specific year defined in the data dashboard	• Completer passage rate is calculated based on all attempts.
	Subject-Specific Pedagogical Knowledge	Completer passage rate on Praxis Professional Knowledge Assessments for a specific year defined in the data dashboard	
	<u>Content Knowledge and Pedagogical Knowledge</u>	Combined completer passage rate on all (Praxis Content Assessments and Praxis Professional Knowledge Assessments) assessments for a specific year defined in the data dashboard	
	<u>Clinical Experiences (clock hours of clinical experiences prior to, and during, student teaching)</u>	Number of weeks of clinical experiences during student teaching	• Each number is based on the minimum number of hours required by the prep program.
		Number of clock hours per week	
		Total number of clock hours	
	Licenses	Percentage of completers from a specific year defined in the data dashboard that meet state licensing requirements	• Percentage who meet LA licensing requirements.
	Completer Rating of Program	*This is a possible indicator that is currently listed as a category for first-year teacher rating of the prep program. Although this measure category was identified in the data dashboard, no data was included on the 2015 Data Dashboard.*	• TBD.

Program Productivity and Alignment to State Needs of Completers	Entry and Persistence in Teaching	Number and percentage of completers from a specific year defined in the data dashboard that began teaching in a LA public school in the school year following completion of their program	• Number and percentage of completers from a specific year defined in the data dashboard that began teaching in a LA public school in the year following program completion.
		Number and percentage of completers from a specific year defined in the data dashboard as well as the number and percentage of completers from that same specific year who were retained in LA public schools in each of the five years after their completion	• The number of completers from a year identified in the data dashboard and the number and percentage of those completers who were teaching in a LA public school in each of the next five years.
		Number and percentage of completers that obtained a Level 1 license to teach in LA within one year after completing program	• Number and percentage of completers from a specific year defined in the data dashboard that obtained a LA teaching license in the year following program completion.
	Placement/ Persistence in High-Need Subjects/Schools	*This is a possible indicator that is currently listed as a category to determine the percentage of completers with degrees in high-need subjects who taught in high-need subjects during their first year of teaching.* *Although the measure category was identified in the data dashboard, no data were included on the 2015 Data Dashboard.*	• TBD.
Performance as Classroom Teachers	Impact on K–12 Student Learning	Mean Compass student outcome score for all completers from the two most recent cohorts who taught in a LA public school	• Compass student outcome scores range from 1.00 to 4.00 and correspond to a four-tiered rating—highly effective, effective proficient, effective emerging, and ineffective.
		Number of scores for all completers from the two most recent cohorts who taught in a LA public school	
		Percentage and number of "ineffective" Compass student outcome scores for all completers from the two most recent cohorts who taught in a LA public school	• Scores are based on a four-tiered rating—highly effective, effective proficient, effective emerging, and ineffective.
		Percentage and number of "effective emerging" Compass student outcome scores for all completers from the two most recent cohorts who taught in a LA public school	• Scores are based on a four-tiered rating—highly effective, effective proficient, effective emerging, and ineffective.

(continued) **Performance as Classroom Teachers**	(continued) Impact on K–12 Student Learning	Percentage and number of "effective proficient" Compass student outcome scores for all completers from the two most recent cohorts who taught in a LA public school	• Scores are based on a four-tiered rating—highly effective, effective proficient, effective emerging, and ineffective.
		Percentage and number of "highly effective" Compass student outcome scores for all completers from the two most recent cohorts who taught in a LA public school	• Scores are based on a four-tiered rating—highly effective, effective proficient, effective emerging, and ineffective.

		Mean state value-added scores for all completers from the two most recent cohorts who taught math, science, social studies, or ELA/reading in grades 4–10 in LA public schools	• Value-added scores are calculated using a linear model based on a comparison of students' actual scores with predicted scores that consider past performance and other factors outside the control of the teacher, including attendance, discipline, and SPED status.
			• They are calculated only for teachers of:
			  o mathematics in grades 4–10.
			  o science in grades 4–8.
			  o social studies in grades 4–8.
			  o English language arts in grades 4–8.

		Percentage of completers from the two most recent cohorts who taught math, science, social studies, or ELA/reading in grades 4–10 whose state value-added scores place them in each of four effectiveness levels	• The four effectiveness levels are highly effective, effective proficient, effective emerging, and ineffective.
	Demonstrated Teaching Skill	Mean Compass professional practice score for all completers from the two most recent cohorts who taught in LA public schools	• Compass professional practice scores range from 1.00 to 4.00 and correspond to a four-tiered rating—highly effective, effective proficient, effective emerging, and ineffective.
		Number of Compass professional practice scores for all completers from the two most recent cohorts who taught in LA public schools	
		Percentage of completers from the two most recent cohorts who taught in LA public schools who were rated "highly effective" based on their Compass professional practice scores	• Scores are based on a four-tiered rating—highly effective, effective proficient, effective emerging, and ineffective.
		Percentage of completers from the two most recent cohorts who taught in LA public schools who were rated "effective proficient" based on their Compass professional practice scores	• Scores are based on a four-tiered rating—highly effective, effective proficient, effective emerging, and ineffective.

		Percentage of completers from the two most recent cohorts who taught in LA public schools who were rated "effective emerging" based on their Compass professional practice scores	• Scores are based on a four-tiered rating—highly effective, effective proficient, effective emerging, and ineffective.
		Percentage of completers from the two most recent cohorts who taught in LA public schools who were rated "ineffective" based on their Compass professional practice scores	• Scores are based on a four-tiered rating—highly effective, effective proficient, effective emerging, and ineffective.
(continued) **Performance as Classroom Teachers**	(continued) Demonstrated Teaching Skill	Mean Compass final evaluation score for all completers from the two most recent cohorts who taught in LA public schools	• Compass final evaluation scores range from 1.00 to 4.00 and correspond to a four-tiered rating—highly effective, effective proficient, effective emerging, and ineffective. • Half of the score is based on the Compass student outcome score and half is based on Compass professional practice scores.
		Number of Compass final evaluation scores for all completers from the two most recent cohorts who taught in LA public schools	
		Percentage of completers from the two most recent cohorts who taught in LA public schools who were rated "highly effective" based on their Compass final evaluation scores	• Scores are based on a four-tiered rating—highly effective, effective proficient, effective emerging, and ineffective.
		Percentage of completers from the two most recent cohorts who taught in LA public schools who were rated "effective proficient" based on their Compass final evaluation scores	• Scores are based on a four-tiered rating—highly effective, effective proficient, effective emerging, and ineffective.
		Percentage of completers from the two most recent cohorts who taught in LA public schools who were rated "effective emerging" based on their Compass final evaluation scores	• Scores are based on a four-tiered rating—highly effective, effective proficient, effective emerging, and ineffective.
		Percentage of completers from the two most recent cohorts who taught in LA public schools who were rated "ineffective" based on their Compass final evaluation scores	• Scores are based on a four-tiered rating—highly effective, effective proficient, effective emerging, and ineffective.

MASSACHUSETTS

Massachusetts conducts comprehensive program reviews every seven years with interim reviews occurring as needed. In addition to this accountability function, Massachusetts also publishes no-consequential data on EPP performance via several platforms: Edwin analytics (private to providers only), annual EPP profiles (available to the public), and (still in process) Educator Provider Annual Snapshot. The two tables below summarize the state's EPP review and no-consequential reports, respectively.

Massachusetts EPP Review

The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) conducts comprehensive program reviews every seven years. All program approval domains, with the exception of the Instruction domain, are evaluated at the organizational level. For the Instruction domain, sponsoring organizations submit evidence for each program grouping (e.g., undergraduate teacher programs, administrative leadership programs). The EPP review process triangulates evidence from three different sources: the off-site review, the on-site review, and output measures. More information about this review process can be found here.

Programs that fail to comply with regulatory requirements, submit insufficient evidence of meeting state program standards, or are designated "low performing" on a previous formal review may also be subject to interim reviews on an as-needed basis.

MA Program Approval Domain	Key Effectiveness Indicator	Measure	Method of Calculation
The Organization *Is the organization set up to support and sustain effective preparation?*	Completer Rating of Program	Candidate and completer surveys (administered first at the point of program completion and later to individuals employed in MA public schools one year after completion)	• All survey questions use a five-point rating scale from 0 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). • Reviewers are asked to provide a rating on a three-part scale (- = contrasts, ? = inconclusive, + = supports) and rationale for this rating based on their assessment of the quality and sufficiency of evidence provided in support the MA Program Approval domain criteria to which it is applicable (see page 8 of this document for the specific criteria).
	Demonstrated Teaching Skill	Survey of principals who have hired a teacher who completed a prep program in the past year *(these data are not yet used in reviews)*	
	Completer Teaching Skill	Survey of supervising practitioners of EPP candidates *(these data are not yet used in reviews)*	
	Off-site Submissions	Organization worksheet	• Reviewers are asked to provide a rating on a four-point scale (1=insufficient, 2=limited, 3=sufficient, 4=compelling) and rationale for this rating, based on their assessment of the quality and sufficiency of evidence provided in support of the MA Program Approval domain criteria to which it is applicable (see page 8 of this document for the specific criteria).
	On-site Review	Leadership interview	
		Candidate/completer focus group(s)	
		Faculty focus group(s)	

Field-Based Experiences *Do candidates have the necessary experiences in the field to be ready for the licensure role?*	Completer Rating of Program	Candidate and completer surveys (administered first at the point of program completion and later to individuals employed in MA public schools one year after completion)	• All survey questions use a five-point rating scale from 0 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). • Reviewers are asked to provide a rating on a three-part scale (- = contrasts, ? = inconclusive, + = supports) and rationale for this rating, based on their assessment of the quality and sufficiency of evidence provided in support of the MA Program Approval domain criteria to which it is applicable (see pages 14 and 15 of this document for the specific criteria).
	Demonstrated Teaching Skill	Survey of principals who have hired a teacher who completed a prep program in the past year *(these data are not yet used in reviews)*	
	Completer Teaching Skill	Survey of supervising practitioners of EPP candidates	
		Partner survey	
	Demonstrated Teaching Skill	Teacher evaluation ratings	• Percentage of completers receiving each evaluation score. • Reviewers are asked to provide a rating on a three-part scale (- = contrasts, ? = inconclusive, + = supports) and rationale for this rating, based on their assessment of the quality and sufficiency of evidence provided in support of the MA Program Approval domain criteria to which it is applicable (see pages 14 and 15 of this document for the specific criteria).
	Off-site Submissions	Practicum handbook	• Reviewers are asked to provide a rating on a four-point scale (1=insufficient, 2=limited, 3=sufficient, 4=compelling) and rationale for this rating, based on their assessment of the quality and sufficiency of evidence provided in support of the MA Program Approval domain criteria to which it is applicable (see pages 14 and 15 of this document for the specific criteria). *Only ESE staff rate the practicum handbook and field-based experience chart.*
		Field-based experience chart	
		Field-based experiences worksheet	
	On-site Review	Candidate artifact review	• Reviewers are asked to provide a rating on a four-point scale (1=insufficient, 2=limited, 3=sufficient, 4=compelling) and rationale for this rating, based on their assessment of the quality and sufficiency of evidence provided through artifact review, staff interview, and focus groups, in support of the MA Program Approval domain criteria to which it is applicable (see pages 14 and 15 of this document for the specific criteria).
		Field-based experience staff interview	
		Partner focus group	
		Supervising practitioner focus group	
		Program supervisor focus group	
		Faculty focus group(s)	
		Candidate/completer focus group(s)	

The Candidate *Is the candidate's experience in the program contributing to effective preparation?*	Candidate and Completer Diversity	Candidate enrollment by race and gender	• Number and percentage of EPP candidates and completers by gender and race (African American, Asian, Hispanic, white, Native American, Pacific Islander, multi-race).
		Number of completers by program, including by race and gender	
	Mastery of Teaching Subjects	Massachusetts Test for Educator Licensure (MTEL) pass rates *(these data are not yet used in reviews)*	• Number of people who take an assessment and percentage of test takers who pass the assessment.
	Entry and Persistence in Teaching	Percentage of completers employed in a MA public K–12 school	• Completers employed in a MA public K–12 school any time between their program completion year and before the reporting year. • Reviewers are asked to provide a rating on a three-part scale (- = contrasts, ? = inconclusive, + = supports) and rationale for this rating, based on their assessment of the quality and sufficiency of evidence provided in support of the MA Program Approval domain criteria to which it is applicable (see page 7 of this document for the specific criteria).
	Completer Rating of Program	Candidate and completer surveys (administered first at the point of program completion and later to individuals employed in MA public schools one year after completion)	• Reviewers are asked to provide a rating on a three-part scale (- = contrasts, ? = inconclusive, + = supports) and rationale for this rating, based on their assessment of the quality and sufficiency of evidence provided in support of the MA Program Approval domain criteria to which it is applicable (see page 7 of this document for the specific criteria). • All survey questions use a five-point rating scale from 0 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree).
	Demonstrated Teaching Skill	Survey of principals who have hired a teacher who completed a prep program in the past year *(these data are not yet used in reviews)*	
	Completer Teaching Skill	Survey of supervising practitioners of EPP candidates	
	Demonstrated Teaching Skill	Administrator evaluation ratings	• Percentage of completers receiving each evaluation score.
	Off-site Submissions	Candidate worksheet	• Reviewers are asked to provide a rating on a four-point scale (1=insufficient, 2=limited, 3=sufficient, 4=compelling) and rationale for this rating, based on their assessment of the quality and sufficiency of evidence provided in support of the MA Program Approval domain criteria to which it is applicable (see page 7 of this document for the specific criteria).
		Admission policy	
		Advising policy	
		Waiver policy	
	On-site Review	Candidate artifacts	• Reviewers are asked to provide a rating on a four-point scale (1=insufficient, 2=limited, 3=sufficient, 4=compelling) and rationale for this rating, based on their assessment of the quality and sufficiency of evidence provided through artifact review, interviews, and focus groups, in support of the MA Program Approval domain criteria to which it is applicable (see page 7 of this document for the specific criteria).
		Leadership interview	
		Advisors interview	
		Field-based experiences staff interview	
		Candidate/completer focus group(s)	
		Faculty focus group(s)	
		Program supervisor focus group	
		Supervising practitioner focus group	

Continuous Improvement *Is the organization engaging in continuous improvement efforts that result in better prepared educators?*	Completer Rating of Program	Candidate and completer surveys (administered first at the point of program completion and later to individuals employed in MA public schools one year after completion)	• All survey questions use a five-point rating scale from 0 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). • Reviewers are asked to provide a rating on a three-part scale (- = contrasts, ? = inconclusive, + = supports) and rationale for this rating, based on their assessment of the quality and sufficiency of evidence provided in support of the MA Program Approval domain criteria to which it is applicable (see page 6 of this document for the specific criteria).
	Demonstrated Teaching Skill	Survey of principals who have hired a teacher who completed a prep program in the past year *(these data are not yet used in reviews)*	
	Completer Teaching Skill	Survey of supervising practitioners of EPP candidates	
		Partner survey	
	Off-site Submissions	Annual goals	• Reviewers are asked to provide a rating on a four-point scale (1=insufficient, 2=limited, 3=sufficient, 4=compelling) and rationale for this rating, based on their assessment of the quality and sufficiency of evidence provided in support of the MA Program Approval domain criteria to which it is applicable (see page 6 of this document for the specific criteria).
		Continuous improvement worksheet	
	On-site Review	Leadership interview	• Reviewers are asked to provide a rating on a four-point scale (1=insufficient, 2=limited, 3=sufficient, 4=compelling) and rationale for this rating, based on their assessment of the quality and sufficiency of evidence provided through interviews and focus groups, in support of the MA Program Approval domain criteria to which it is applicable (see page 6 of this document for the specific criteria).
		Faculty focus group(s)	
		Program supervisors focus group	
		Supervising practitioner focus group	
		Candidate/completer focus group	
Instruction *Do candidates have the necessary knowledge and skills to be effective?* *(Measured at the program level)*	Impact on K–12 Student Learning	TBD	• TBD
	Completer Teaching Skill	Candidate Assessment of Performance (CAP)	• Candidates are rated "unsatisfactory," "needs improvement," "proficient," or "exemplary" in six domains that are aligned to the Massachusetts Educator Evaluation System.
	Mastery of Teaching Subjects	Massachusetts Test for Educator Licensure (MTEL) pass rates	• Number of people who take an assessment and percentage of test takers who pass the assessment.
	Completer Rating of Program	Candidate and completer surveys (administered first at the point of program completion and later to individuals employed in MA public schools one year after completion)	• All survey questions use a five-point rating scale from 0 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). • Reviewers are asked to provide a rating on a three-part scale (- = contrasts, ? = inconclusive, + = supports) and rationale for this rating, based on their assessment of the quality and sufficiency of evidence provided in support of the MA Program Approval domain criteria to which it is applicable (see page 12 of this document for the specific criteria).
	Demonstrated Teaching Skill	Survey of principals who have hired a teacher who completed a prep program in the past year *(these data are not yet used in reviews)*	
	Completer Teaching Skill	Survey of supervising practitioners of EPP candidates	
		Partner survey	
	Demonstrated Teaching Skill	Teacher evaluation ratings *(these data are not yet used in reviews)*	• Percentage of completers receiving each evaluation score, aggregate of all years in the review period.

(continued) **Instruction** *Do candidates have the necessary knowledge and skills to be effective?* *(Measured at the program level)*	Off-site Submissions	Instruction worksheet	• Reviewers are asked to provide a rating on a four-point scale (1=insufficient, 2=limited, 3=sufficient, 4=compelling) and rationale for this rating, based on their assessment of the quality and sufficiency of evidence provided in support of the MA Program Approval domain criteria to which it is applicable (see page 12 of this document for the specific criteria).
	On-site Review	Program supervisor focus group Partner focus group Supervising practitioner focus group Faculty focus group(s) Candidate/completer focus group(s)	• Reviewers are asked to provide a rating on a four-point scale (1=insufficient, 2=limited, 3=sufficient, 4=compelling) and rationale for this rating, based on their assessment of the quality and sufficiency of evidence provided through these focus groups, in support of the MA Program Approval domain criteria to which it is applicable (see page 12 of this document for the specific criteria).
Partnerships *Is the organization meeting the needs of the PK–12 system?*	Entry and Persistence in Teaching	Percentage of completers employed in a MA public K–12 school	• Completers employed in a MA public K–12 school anytime between their program completion year and before the reporting year.
		Retention in a MA public school beyond year one	• The percentage of program completers who were employed for at least one year prior to the reporting year (the "retention cohort") who remained employed for a second, consecutive year.
	Completer Rating of Program	Candidate and completer surveys (administered first at the point of program completion and later to individuals employed in MA public schools one year after completion)	• All survey questions use a five-point rating scale from 0 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). • Reviewers are asked to provide a rating on a three-part scale (- = contrasts, ? = inconclusive, + = supports) and rationale for this rating, based on their assessment of the quality and sufficiency of evidence provided in support of the MA Program Approval domain criteria to which it is applicable (see page 7 of this document for the specific criteria).
	Demonstrated Teaching Skill	Survey of supervising practitioners of EPP candidates	
		Partner survey	
	Impact on K–12 Student Learning	Available K–12 student growth percentile data *(these data are not yet used in reviews)*	• The average SGP of the completers' students.
	Off-site Submissions	Partnerships worksheet	• Reviewers are asked to provide a rating on a four-point scale (1=insufficient, 2=limited, 3=sufficient, 4=compelling) and rationale for this rating, based on their assessment of the quality and sufficiency of evidence provided in support of the MA Program Approval domain criteria to which it is applicable (see page 7 of this document for the specific criteria).
	On-site Review	Field-based experiences staff focus group Leadership interview Partner focus group Faculty focus group(s) Supervising practitioner focus group Program supervisor focus group	• Reviewers are asked to provide a rating on a four-point scale (1=insufficient, 2=limited, 3=sufficient, 4=compelling) and rationale for this rating, based on their assessment of the quality and sufficiency of evidence provided through the survey, interview, and focus groups, in support of the MA Program Approval domain criteria to which it is applicable (see page 7 of this document for the specific criteria).

Massachusetts EPP Reporting: Edwin and Annual Profiles

DESE maintains a database, Edwin Analytics, which providers can access at any time to see information on their performance, candidates, and completers. Edwin is private and only accessible by providers. Additionally, Edwin produces reports on educator prep that users can privately access. Each year DESE also publishes EPP profiles that share some, but not all, of the information available in Edwin with the general public. The information below is all of the educator prep data available within Edwin. Measures that are also made public in annual profiles are noted accordingly. In addition, Massachusetts is in the process of developing an Educator Preparation Annual Snapshot (EPAS) to synthesize available data into a single snapshot that will identify EPP strengths and areas of improvement (the EPAS measures are not reflected here).

MA Annual Profile Domain (Accessible to the public)	Key Effectiveness Indicator	Measure	Method of Calculation
General	Characteristics	Annual Goals	• Qualitative description of annual goals, up to three, as well as a progress report against these goals, provided by the EPP spanning the previous four years.
		Description of the EPP's partnerships	• Listing of partnerships by type.
		Approved programs within the EPP	• Listing of approved programs.
		Admission requirements for the EPP	• Summary of admission requirements.
Ed Prep Students	Candidate and Completer Diversity	Diversity of enrolled candidates	• Number of candidates enrolled by race and gender.
		Quantity of program completers	• Number of program completers in the reporting year.
	Mastery of Teaching Subjects	Massachusetts Test for Educator Licensure (MTEL) pass rates	• MTEL pass rates for program completers, enrolled students who have completed all non-clinical coursework, and all other enrolled students.
	Entry and Persistence in Teaching	Percentage of completers employed in a MA public K–12 school	• Percentage of completers employed in a MA public K–12 school for the EPP and by program in total and for each of the four most recent cohorts of completers.
Faculty	Full-Time Faculty Demographics	Diversity of full-time equivalent staff	• Number of full-time equivalent staff by race and gender.

MA Edwin Report (Accessible to EPPs)	Key Effectiveness Indicator	Measure	Method of Calculation
Educator Preparation Program Cohort Pipeline (Report 701)	Entry and Persistence in Teaching	Number of cohort candidates who left or exited before completing a program	• Total number in a user-selected cohort who were entered in MA's Education and Licensure Renewal portal (ELAR) as having left or exited before completing a program.
		Number of cohort candidates who completed coursework and practicum	• Total number in a user-selected cohort who were enrolled in ELAR and completed coursework and practicum.
		Number of cohort candidates who completed coursework but did not complete a practicum	• Total number in a user-selected cohort who were enrolled in ELAR and completed coursework but did not complete practicum.
		Number of cohort candidates who did not complete coursework or practicum	• Total number in a user-selected cohort who were only enrolled in ELAR and did not complete coursework or practicum.
		Time required for cohort candidates to go from enrolling to completing coursework	• Number of months it took for members of the user-selected cohort to go from being enrolled in ELAR to completing coursework.
		Time required for cohort candidates to go from completing coursework to completing practicum	• Number of months it took for members of the user-selected cohort to go from completing coursework to completing practicum.
		Time required for cohort candidates to go from enrolling to completing coursework and practicum	• Number of months it took for members of the user-selected cohort to go from being enrolled in ELAR to completing coursework and practicum.
		Completers who are licensed within a year in their field	• Percentage of those in the user-selected cohort who completed a program and were licensed within one year in their endorsement field.
		Completers who are licensed within a year in their field and gain an additional license	• Percentage of those in the user-selected cohort who completed a program and were licensed within one year in their endorsement field and gained an additional license.

MA Public Employment Summary (Report 702)	Entry and Persistence in Teaching	Completers employed in a MA public school	• Number and percentage of completers employed in a MA public school.
		Completers hired in their first year after completion	• Total number hired in the first year after completion in a specified year.
		Completers hired in their second year after completion	• Total number hired in the second year after completion in a specified year.
		Completers hired in their first two years after completion	• Total number of completers in the first two years after completion employed in a specified year.
		Completers employed	• Total number of completers employed in a specified year.
		Completers employed fewer than two years	• Total number of completers employed fewer than two years as of a specified year.
		Completers employed between two and five years	• Total number of completers employed between two and five years as of a specified year.
	Demonstrated Teaching Skill	Completers earning professional teacher status	• Percentage of completers who earned professional teacher status in a user-specified year.
	Impact on K–12 Student Learning	Completers' impact on student learning in math	• Total number of completers teaching math to at least 20 students with an MCAS score and the percentage whose median student's score, relative to the academic peer group of students with similar testing histories, places them within the "low," "moderate," or "high" range.
		Completers' impact on student learning in ELA	• Total number of completers teaching ELA to at least 20 students with an MCAS score and the percentage whose median student's score, relative to the academic peer group of students with similar testing histories, places them within the "low," "moderate," or "high" range.
Educator Evaluation Rating Summary (Report 703)	Entry and Persistence in Teaching	Completers employed in an MA public school in a given time frame	• Total number and percentage of completers employed in a MA public school over a user-specified time frame.
	Demonstrated Teaching Skill	Completers receiving specific teacher evaluation ratings in a given time frame	• Percentage of evaluated completers in a user-specified time frame who received an overall evaluation rating of "exemplary," "proficient," "needs improvement," and "unsatisfactory."
		Completers receiving specific teacher evaluation ratings on specific standards in a given time frame	• Percentage of evaluated completers in a user-specified time frame who received an evaluation rating on Standard 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively, of "exemplary," "proficient," "needs improvement," and "unsatisfactory."
		Completers receiving specific impact ratings in a given time frame	• Percentages of evaluated completers in a user-specified time frame who received an Impact Rating of "high," "moderate," "low," or "not applicable."

Candidate List (Report 802)	Licenses, Endorsements, and Employers	License(s) sponsored	• License for which the EPP sponsored the candidate.
		License versus endorsement	• Whether the candidate was licensed in the area for which he or she was endorsed.
		Number of licenses	• Total number of licenses the candidate obtained.
		Additional licenses beyond endorsement license	• Any licenses obtained in addition to the license for which the candidate was endorsed.
		Initial employer and details	• District and school that first hired the candidate, date exited, job classification, hire date, and specific assignment.
		Most recent employer and details	• District and school that most recently hired the candidate, date exited, job classification, hire date, and specific assignment.

MISSOURI

Missouri has been publishing program-level Annual Performance Reports (APR) since 214, and most recently published an updated version 1.5. Missouri is planning to progress to a version 2.0 that, when fully implemented, will be used to review programs annually. Missouri is also planning to integrate on-consequential measures into this reporting process. In addition to the measures that comprise the APR, Missouri administers entrance and disposition assessments to program candidates, though it does not manipulate this data for EPPs or publicly report any results.

Missouri EPP Review and Reporting: Annual Performance Report (APR) 2.0
The APR 2.0, which should be publicly available for the first time in 2019, will be used to review all programs with more than 10 completers over the most recent five years. Providers that do not have any programs that meet the threshold will have the data from all their programs aggregated. The information below reflects the current anticipated design of APR 2.0.

Missouri Teaching Standard	Key Effectiveness Indicator	Measure	Method of Calculation
Content Knowledge (22%)	Mastery of Teaching Subjects	Mean of candidates' best scores on the Missouri Content Assessment (15 points)	• Mean of the best score earned by each candidate in the past five years on the Missouri Content Assessment. • Weighted points will be assigned per the following table: | Mean	Weighted Points
---	---
250	15
245	14.25
240	13.5
235	12.75
230	12
225	11.25
220	10.5[11]	 • The weighted points from this measure will be: o combined with the weighted points assigned to the other measures scored under this teaching standard; then o divided by the points possible for this teaching standard (20); then o multiplied by the whole-number percentage assigned to this teaching standard (22).

---

11   Please note that if a program scores below the lowest level, it earns no points for that measure.

	(continued) Mastery of Teaching Subjects	Mean content-area GPA of completers (5 points)	• Mean GPA of all completers in the courses listed in the "content knowledge area" of their particular program's DESE-approved matrix. • Weighted points will be assigned per the following table:

Mean	Weighted Points
3.6	5
3.5	4.75
3.4	4.5
3.3	4.25
3.2	4
3.1	3.75
3.0	3.5
2.9	3.25
2.8	3

(continued)

Content Knowledge

(22%)

• The weighted points from this measure will be:
  o combined with the weighted points assigned to the other measures scored under this teaching standard; then
  o divided by the points possible for this teaching standard (20); then
  o multiplied by the whole-number percentage assigned to this teaching standard (22).

	Completer Teaching Skill	Mean candidate evaluation scores on items 1.1 and 1.2 of the MO Educator Evaluation System[12] (unscored)	• Mean of candidate evaluation scores from the past five years assigned by cooperating teachers and university supervisors of student teachers on all items aligned to this teaching standard.
	Completer Rating of Program/ Demonstrated Teaching Skill	Combined mean of survey responses by first-year teachers and their supervisors on questions 2–4b (unscored)	• Combined mean of all survey responses to standard-specific questions from the past five years by: o first-year teachers; and o their supervisors. • The scoring scale is the same for all questions on the surveys: 1–5, with 1 being "strongly disagree" and 5 being "strongly agree."

---

12   Missouri is working to form a committee to strengthen this approach, specifically by bolstering its validity and reliability.

Student Learning and Development (17%)	Completer Teaching Skill	Mean candidate evaluation scores on item 2.4 of the [MO Educator Evaluation System](#) (5 points)	• Mean of candidate evaluation scores from the past five years assigned by cooperating teachers and university supervisors on all items aligned to this teaching standard. • Weighted points will be assigned per the following table:

<table>
<tr><th>Mean</th><th>Weighted Points</th></tr>
<tr><td>2.6</td><td>5</td></tr>
<tr><td>2.5</td><td>4.75</td></tr>
<tr><td>2.4</td><td>4.5</td></tr>
<tr><td>2.3</td><td>4.25</td></tr>
<tr><td>2.2</td><td>4</td></tr>
<tr><td>2.1</td><td>3.75</td></tr>
<tr><td>2.0</td><td>3.5</td></tr>
<tr><td>1.9</td><td>3.25</td></tr>
<tr><td>1.8</td><td>3</td></tr>
</table>

• The weighted points from this measure will be:
  o combined with the weighted points assigned to the other measures scored under this teaching standard; then
  o divided by the points possible for this teaching standard (10); then
  o multiplied by the whole-number percentage assigned to this teaching standard (17).

Completer Rating of Program/ Demonstrated Teaching Skill

Combined mean of [survey responses](#) by first-year teachers and their supervisors on questions 6–10 (5 points)

• Combined mean of all survey responses by first-year teachers from the past five years and their supervisors on standard-specific questions.
• Weighted points will be assigned per the following table:

<table>
<tr><th>Mean</th><th>Weighted Points</th></tr>
<tr><td>3.6</td><td>5</td></tr>
<tr><td>3.5</td><td>4.75</td></tr>
<tr><td>3.4</td><td>4.5</td></tr>
<tr><td>3.3</td><td>4.25</td></tr>
<tr><td>3.2</td><td>4</td></tr>
<tr><td>3.1</td><td>3.75</td></tr>
<tr><td>3.0</td><td>3.5</td></tr>
<tr><td>2.9</td><td>3.25</td></tr>
<tr><td>2.8</td><td>3</td></tr>
</table>

• The weighted points from this measure will be:
  o combined with the weighted points assigned to the other measures scored under this teaching standard; then
  o divided by the points possible for this teaching standard (10); then
  o multiplied by the whole-number percentage assigned to this teaching standard (17).
• The scoring scale is the same for all questions on the surveys: 1–5, with 1 being "strongly disagree" and 5 being "strongly agree."

Curriculum Implementation (15%)	Completer Teaching Skill	Mean final score on Task 3 of the Missouri Performance Assessment (MoPTA) (15 points)	• Mean of the final scores earned by candidates from the past five years on [Task 3 of the Missouri Performance Assessment](#). • The Task 3 score is the sum of scores (1–4) earned for each step in the rubric linked above. • Weighted points will be assigned per the following table:

Mean for Task 3	Weighted Points
13	15
12.5	14.25
12	13.5
11.5	12.75
11	12
10.5	11.25
10	10.5
9.5	9.75
9	9

• The weighted points from this measure will be:

    o combined with the weighted points assigned to the other measures scored under this teaching standard; then

    o divided by the points possible for this teaching standard (17.5); then

    o multiplied by the whole-number percentage assigned to this teaching standard (15).

Mean candidate evaluation scores on items 3.1 and 3.2 of the [MO Educator Evaluation System](#) (1.25 points)

• Mean of candidate evaluation scores from the past five years assigned by cooperating teachers and university supervisors on all items aligned to this teaching standard.

• Weighted points will be assigned per the following table:

Mean	Weighted Points
2.6	1.25
2.5	1.1875
2.4	1.125
2.3	1.0625
2.2	1
2.1	0.9375
2.0	0.875
1.9	0.8125
1.8	0.75

• The weighted points from this measure will be:

    o combined with the weighted points assigned to the other measures scored under this teaching standard; then

    o divided by the points possible for this teaching standard (17.5); then

    o multiplied by the whole-number percentage assigned to this teaching standard (15).

			• Combined mean of all survey responses by first-year teachers from the past five years and their supervisors on standard-specific questions.
(continued) **Curriculum Implementation** (15%)	Completer Rating of Program/ Demonstrated Teaching Skill	Combined mean of survey responses by first-year teachers and their supervisors on questions 11–12 (1.25 points)	• Weighted points will be assigned per the following table:

Mean	Weighted Points
3.6	1.25
3.5	1.1875
3.4	1.125
3.3	1.0625
3.2	1
3.1	0.9375
3.0	0.875
2.9	0.8125
2.8	0.75

• The weighted points from this measure will be:

  o combined with the weighted points assigned to the other measures scored under this teaching standard; then

  o divided by the points possible for this teaching standard (17.5); then

  o multiplied by the whole-number percentage assigned to this teaching standard (15).

• The scoring scale is the same for all questions on the surveys: 1–5, with 1 being "strongly disagree" and 5 being "strongly agree."

			• Mean of candidate evaluation scores from the past five years assigned by cooperating teachers and university supervisors on all items aligned to this teaching standard.
Critical Thinking (5%)	Completer Teaching Skill	Mean candidate evaluation scores on item 4.1 of the MO Educator Evaluation System (5 points)	• Weighted points will be assigned per the following table:

Mean	Weighted Points
2.6	5
2.5	4.75
2.4	4.5
2.3	4.25
2.2	4
2.1	3.75
2.0	3.5
1.9	3.25
1.8	3

• The weighted points from this measure will be:

  o combined with the weighted points assigned to the other measures scored under this teaching standard; then

  o divided by the points possible for this teaching standard (10); then

  o multiplied by the whole-number percentage assigned to this teaching standard (5).

(continued) **Critical Thinking** (5%)	Completer Rating of Program/ Demonstrated Teaching Skill	Combined mean of [survey responses](#) by first-year teachers and their supervisors on questions 13–16 (5 points)	• Combined mean of all survey responses by first-year teachers from the past five years and their supervisors on standard-specific questions.

- Combined mean of all survey responses by first-year teachers from the past five years and their supervisors on standard-specific questions.
- Weighted points will be assigned per the following table:

Mean	Weighted Points
3.6	5
3.5	4.75
3.4	4.5
3.3	4.25
3.2	4
3.1	3.75
3.0	3.5
2.9	3.25
2.8	3

- The weighted points from this measure will be:
  - combined with the weighted points assigned to the other measures scored under this teaching standard; then
  - divided by the points possible for this teaching standard (10); then
  - multiplied by the whole-number percentage assigned to this teaching standard (5).
- The scoring scale is the same for all questions on the surveys: 1–5, with 1 being "strongly disagree" and 5 being "strongly agree."

Classroom Environment (15%)	Completer Teaching Skill	Mean candidate evaluation scores on items 5.1, 5.2, and 5.3 of the [MO Educator Evaluation System](#) (5 points)	

- Mean of candidate evaluation scores from the past five years assigned by cooperating teachers and university supervisors on all items aligned to this teaching standard.
- Weighted points will be assigned per the following table:

Mean	Weighted Points
2.6	5
2.5	4.75
2.4	4.5
2.3	4.25
2.2	4
2.1	3.75
2.0	3.5
1.9	3.25
1.8	3

- The weighted points from this measure will be:
  - combined with the weighted points assigned to the other measures scored under this teaching standard; then
  - divided by the points possible for this teaching standard (10); then
  - multiplied by the whole-number percentage assigned to this teaching standard (15).

(continued) **Classroom Environment** (15%)	Completer Rating of Program/ Demonstrated Teaching Skill	Combined mean of [survey responses](#) by first-year teachers and their supervisors on questions 17–23 (5 points)	• Combined mean of all survey responses by first-year teachers from the past five years and their supervisors on standard-specific questions. • Weighted points will be assigned per the following table:

Mean	Weighted Points
3.6	5
3.5	4.75
3.4	4.5
3.3	4.25
3.2	4
3.1	3.75
3.0	3.5
2.9	3.25
2.8	3

• The weighted points from this measure will be:
  o combined with the weighted points assigned to the other measures scored under this teaching standard; then
  o divided by the points possible for this teaching standard (10); then
  o multiplied by the whole-number percentage assigned to this teaching standard (15).
• The scoring scale is the same for all questions on the surveys: 1–5, with 1 being "strongly disagree" and 5 being "strongly agree."

Effective Communication (3%)	Completer Teaching Skill	Mean candidate evaluation scores on item 6.1 of the [MO Educator Evaluation System](#) (5 points)	• Mean of candidate evaluation scores from the past five years assigned by cooperating teachers and university supervisors on all items aligned to this teaching standard. • Weighted points will be assigned per the following table:

Mean	Weighted Points
2.6	5
2.5	4.75
2.4	4.5
2.3	4.25
2.2	4
2.1	3.75
2.0	3.5
1.9	3.25
1.8	3

• The weighted points from this measure will be:
  o combined with the weighted points assigned to the other measures scored under this teaching standard; then
  o divided by the points possible for this teaching standard (10); then
  o multiplied by the whole-number percentage assigned to this teaching standard (15).

			• Combined mean of all survey responses by first-year teachers from the past five years and their supervisors on standard-specific questions.
			• Weighted points will be assigned per the following table:
(continued) **Effective Communication** (3%)	Completer Rating of Program/ Demonstrated Teaching Skill	Combined mean of survey responses by first-year teachers and their supervisors on questions 24–29 (5 points)	

Mean	Weighted Points
3.6	5
3.5	4.75
3.4	4.5
3.3	4.25
3.2	4
3.1	3.75
3.0	3.5
2.9	3.25
2.8	3

• The weighted points from this measure will be:

  o combined with the weighted points assigned to the other measures scored under this teaching standard; then

  o divided by the points possible for this teaching standard (10); then

  o multiplied by the whole-number percentage assigned to this teaching standard (15).

• The scoring scale is the same for all questions on the surveys: 1–5, with 1 being "strongly disagree" and 5 being "strongly agree."

Assessment and Data Analysis (17%) — Completer Teaching Skill — Mean final score on Task 2 of the Missouri Performance Assessment (MoPTA) (15 points)

• Mean of the final scores earned by candidates from the past five years on Task 2 of the Missouri Performance Assessment.

• The Task 2 score is the sum of scores (1–3) earned for each step in the rubric linked above.

• Weighted points will be assigned per the following table:

Mean for Task 2	Weighted Points
10.8	15
10.2	14.25
9.6	13.5
9.2	12.75
8.6	12
8	11.25
7.2	10.5
6.6	9.75
6	9

• The weighted points from this measure will be:

  o combined with the weighted points assigned to the other measures scored under this teaching standard; then

  o divided by the points possible for this teaching standard (17.5); then

  o multiplied by the whole-number percentage assigned to this teaching standard (17).

| | (continued) Completer Teaching Skill | Mean candidate evaluation scores on items 7.1, 7.2, and 7.5 of the MO Educator Evaluation System (1.25 points) | • Mean of candidate evaluation scores from the past five years assigned by cooperating teachers and university supervisors on all items aligned to this teaching standard.

• Weighted points will be assigned per the following table: |

<table>
<tr><th>Mean</th><th>Weighted Points</th></tr>
<tr><td>2.6</td><td>1.25</td></tr>
<tr><td>2.5</td><td>1.1875</td></tr>
<tr><td>2.4</td><td>1.125</td></tr>
<tr><td>2.3</td><td>1.0625</td></tr>
<tr><td>2.2</td><td>1</td></tr>
<tr><td>2.1</td><td>0.9375</td></tr>
<tr><td>2.0</td><td>0.875</td></tr>
<tr><td>1.9</td><td>0.8125</td></tr>
<tr><td>1.8</td><td>0.75</td></tr>
</table>

• The weighted points from this measure will be:

   o combined with the weighted points assigned to the other measures scored under this teaching standard; then

   o divided by the points possible for this teaching standard (17.5); then

   o multiplied by the whole-number percentage assigned to this teaching standard (17).

(continued)

Assessment and Data Analysis

(17%)

Completer Rating of Program/ Demonstrated Teaching Skill

Combined mean of survey responses by first-year teachers and their supervisors on questions 30–34 (1.25 points)

• Combined mean of all survey responses by first-year teachers from the past five years and their supervisors on standard-specific questions.

• Weighted points will be assigned per the following table:

<table>
<tr><th>Mean</th><th>Weighted Points</th></tr>
<tr><td>3.6</td><td>1.25</td></tr>
<tr><td>3.5</td><td>1.1875</td></tr>
<tr><td>3.4</td><td>1.125</td></tr>
<tr><td>3.3</td><td>1.0625</td></tr>
<tr><td>3.2</td><td>1</td></tr>
<tr><td>3.1</td><td>0.9375</td></tr>
<tr><td>3.0</td><td>0.875</td></tr>
<tr><td>2.9</td><td>0.8125</td></tr>
<tr><td>2.8</td><td>0.75</td></tr>
</table>

• The weighted points from this measure will be:

   o combined with the weighted points assigned to the other measures scored under this teaching standard; then

   o divided by the points possible for this teaching standard (17.5); then

   o multiplied by the whole-number percentage assigned to this teaching standard (17).

• The scoring scale is the same for all questions on the surveys: 1–5, with 1 being "strongly disagree" and 5 being "strongly agree."

			• Mean of candidate evaluation scores from the past five years assigned by cooperating teachers and university supervisors on all items aligned to this teaching standard.

Professionalism (3%)	Completer Teaching Skill	Mean candidate evaluation scores on item 8.1 of the MO Educator Evaluation System (5 points)	• Weighted points will be assigned per the following table:

Mean	Weighted Points
2.6	5
2.5	4.75
2.4	4.5
2.3	4.25
2.2	4
2.1	3.75
2.0	3.5
1.9	3.25
1.8	3

• The weighted points from this measure will be:

   o combined with the weighted points assigned to the other measures scored under this teaching standard; then

   o divided by the points possible for this teaching standard (10); then

   o multiplied by the whole-number percentage assigned to this teaching standard (3).

Completer Rating of Program/ Demonstrated Teaching Skill	Combined mean of survey responses by first-year teachers and their supervisors on questions 35–36 (5 points)

• Combined mean of all survey responses by first-year teachers from the past five years and their supervisors on standard-specific questions.

• Weighted points will be assigned per the following table:

Mean	Weighted Points
3.6	5
3.5	4.75
3.4	4.5
3.3	4.25
3.2	4
3.1	3.75
3.0	3.5
2.9	3.25
2.8	3

• The weighted points from this measure will be:

   o combined with the weighted points assigned to the other measures scored under this teaching standard; then

   o divided by the points possible for this teaching standard (10); then

   o multiplied by the whole-number percentage assigned to this teaching standard (3).

• The scoring scale is the same for all questions on the surveys: 1–5, with 1 being "strongly disagree" and 5 being "strongly agree."

			• Mean of candidate evaluation scores from the past five years assigned by cooperating teachers and university supervisors on all items aligned to this teaching standard.

Professional Collaboration

(3%)

| | Completer Teaching Skill | Mean candidate evaluation scores on items 9.1 and 9.2 of the MO Educator Evaluation System

(5 points) | • Mean of candidate evaluation scores from the past five years assigned by cooperating teachers and university supervisors on all items aligned to this teaching standard.

• Weighted points will be assigned per the following table: |

Mean	Weighted Points
2.6	5
2.5	4.75
2.4	4.5
2.3	4.25
2.2	4
2.1	3.75
2.0	3.5
1.9	3.25
1.8	3

• The weighted points from this measure will be:

   o combined with the weighted points assigned to the other measures scored under this teaching standard; then

   o divided by the points possible for this teaching standard (10); then

   o multiplied by the whole-number percentage assigned to this teaching standard (15).

	Completer Rating of Program/ Demonstrated Teaching Skill	Combined mean of survey responses by first-year teachers and their supervisors on questions 37–39 (5 points)	• Combined mean of all survey responses by first-year teachers from the past five years and their supervisors on standard-specific questions. • Weighted points will be assigned per the following table:

Mean	Weighted Points
3.6	5
3.5	4.75
3.4	4.5
3.3	4.25
3.2	4
3.1	3.75
3.0	3.5
2.9	3.25
2.8	3

• The weighted points from this measure will be:

   o combined with the weighted points assigned to the other measures scored under this teaching standard; then

   o divided by the points possible for this teaching standard (10); then

   o multiplied by the whole-number percentage assigned to this teaching standard (15).

• The scoring scale is the same for all questions on the surveys: 1–5, with 1 being "strongly disagree" and 5 being "strongly agree."

TENNESSEE

Tennessee conducts comprehensive program reviews every seven years with interim and focused reviews occurring as needed. Tennessee produces Annual Reports, which form a part of its comprehensive and ongoing review of programs, and publishes no-consequential data on EPP performance via Annual Report Cards. The two tables below summarize the state's approach to EPP review and EPP reporting, respectively.

Tennessee EPP Review: Annual Reports

In 2015, Tennessee approved a policy that outlined a requirement for Annual Reports to support EPP efforts to continuously improve and to be used as a formal part of the accountability process. Annual Reports offer data disaggregated by clusters of programs (e.g., middle grades, special populations) and for individual programs. The 2016–17 Annual Report included data from two cohorts: individuals who completed their program between 9/1/13 and 8/31/14 and individuals who completed their program or were enrolled in a job-embedded program between 9/1/14 and 8/31/15.

In April 2017, Tennessee published a report that describes its areas of greatest teacher demand and illustrates the variation in effectiveness in the state's novice teacher workforce—*Preparation through Partnership: Strengthening Tennessee's New Teacher Pipeline.*

Tennessee Domain	Key Effectiveness Indicator	Measure	Method of Calculation
Completer Recruitment and Selection	Academic Strength	Percentage of completers with a reported ACT score of 21 or greater	• This metric is calculated by dividing the total number of individuals with a reported ACT score of 21 or greater by the total number of individuals with a reported ACT score.
		Percentage of completers with a reported SAT score of 1020 or greater	• This metric is calculated by dividing the number of individuals with a reported SAT score of 1020 or greater by the total number of individuals with a reported SAT score.
		Average GRE score of completers	• This metric is calculated by dividing the sum of reported GRE scores by the total number of individuals with a reported GRE score.
		Percentage of completers who passed the Praxis Core exams	• This metric is calculated by dividing the number of passing scores for individual Praxis Core tests by the total number of Praxis Core scores reported.
		Percentage of completers with an undergraduate GPA of 2.75 or greater	• This metric is calculated by dividing the total number of individuals with a 2.75 or higher undergraduate GPA by the total number of individuals with any undergraduate GPA.
		Average undergraduate GPA of completers	• Based on the data reported by EPPs, this metric is calculated by dividing the sum of average program GPAs by the total number of program GPAs reported.
	Candidate and Completer Diversity	Percentage of completers by race and ethnicity	• This metric is calculated by dividing the total number of individuals within each reported racial or ethnic group by the total number of individuals with a reported race or ethnicity.
		Percentage of completers identifying in each gender	• This metric is calculated by dividing the total number of individuals within each reported gender by the total number of individuals with a reported gender.
	Placement/ Persistence in High-Need Subjects/Schools	Percentage of high-needs endorsements	• High-needs endorsement areas are ESL, secondary math, secondary science, Spanish, and SPED. • This metric is calculated by dividing the number of individuals with a high-needs endorsement reported by the total number of individuals with an endorsement reported.

Employment and Retention	Entry and Persistence in Teaching	Percentage employed in a TN public school during either (or both) their first or second year following program completion or following enrollment for job-embedded candidates	• This metric is calculated by dividing: 　o the number of completers who were employed in a Tennessee public school in the first or second year following program completion or, in the case of job-embedded candidates, following program enrollment; by 　o the total number of individuals who obtained a Tennessee teaching license during this time.
		Percentage employed in a TN public school during their first year following program completion	• This metric is calculated by dividing: 　o the number of completers who were employed in a Tennessee public school in the first year following program completion or, in the case of job-embedded candidates, following program enrollment; by 　o the total number of individuals who obtained a Tennessee teaching license during this time.
		Percentage of completers employed in a TN public school during their second year following program completion who were not employed in a TN public school during their first year following program completion	• This metric is calculated by dividing: 　o the number of completers who were employed in a Tennessee public school in the second year following program completion or, in the case of job-embedded candidates, following program enrollment; by 　o the total number of individuals who were not identified as being employed in year one.
		Percentage of completers retained for a second year in a TN public school who were employed in a TN public school during their first year following program completion	• This metric is calculated by dividing: 　o the number of completers who were employed in a Tennessee public school in their second year following program completion or, in the case of job-embedded candidates, following program enrollment; by 　o the total number of individuals who were employed in a Tennessee public school the previous year.
Assessment	Completer Teaching Skill	Average edTPA score of completers	• This metric is calculated by dividing the sum of reported edTPA scores by the total number of individuals with a reported edTPA score.
	Subject-Specific Pedagogical Knowledge	Percentage of completers who passed the Principles of Learning and Teaching assessment	• This metric is calculated by dividing the number of passing scores for each Principles of Learning and Teaching assessment by the total number of Principles of Learning and Teaching scores reported. • If an individual attempted the assessment multiple times, each attempt is included in the calculation.
		Combined percentage of completers who passed the Reading: Elementary Education or Reading Across the Curriculum: Elementary assessments	• This metric is calculated by dividing the number of passing scores for each assessment by the total number of scores reported. • If an individual attempted the assessment multiple times, each attempt is included in the calculation.
	Mastery of Teaching Subjects	Percentage of completers who passed a required specialty area assessment	• This metric is calculated by dividing the number of passing scores for each assessment by the total number of scores reported. • If an individual attempted the assessment multiple times, each attempt is included in the calculation.

Completer, Partner, and Employer Satisfaction	Completer Rating of Program	Percentage of completers who indicated they were "somewhat prepared" or "well-prepared" on the TN Educator Survey	• This measure consists of three questions about completer perceptions of how well each of the following prepared them for their current role:
			  o the quality of the preparation they received overall;
			  o their perceptions based on clinical experiences; and
			  o their perceptions based on coursework.
			• Completers were asked to respond to these questions with "not at all prepared," "somewhat unprepared," "somewhat prepared," or "well prepared."
			• This metric is calculated by dividing the number of completers who selected "somewhat prepared" or "well-prepared" when responding to each item by the number of completers responding to each item.

	Employer's Perceptions of the Completer	Employer Satisfaction	• N/A. This measure was not included in the 2016–17 Annual Reports.
	Partner's Perceptions	District survey responses to questions regarding overall satisfaction and quality of their partnerships on TN District Survey	• At this time, this metric is reported simply as the number of respondents who indicated satisfaction or agreement with the proposed statement out of all respondents who completed the survey.
Completer Effectiveness	Demonstrated Teaching Skill	Percentage of completers with a Level of Effectiveness (LOE) rating of 3 or higher (out of 5) on any evaluation (TVAAS or observation)	• LOE range from 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest). • This metric is calculated by dividing the total number of individuals with an LOE rating of 3 or higher by the total number of individuals who had an LOE in the state evaluation database.
		Distribution of completers' LOE (1–5) on all evaluations (TVAAS or observation)	• This metric is calculated by dividing the number of individuals who earned each LOE rating (1, 2, 3, 4, or 5) by the total number of individuals who had an LOE in the state evaluation database.
	Impact on K–12 Student Learning	Percentage of completers with a TVAAS (value-added) score level 3 or higher	• Tennessee's Value-Added Assessment System scores teachers from 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest). • This metric is calculated by dividing the total number of individuals with a TVAAS rating of 3 or higher by the total number of individuals who had a TVAAS rating in the state evaluation database.
		Distribution of completers' TVAAS ratings (1–5)	• This metric is calculated by dividing the number of individuals who earned each TVAAS rating (1, 2, 3, 4, or 5) by the number of individuals who had a TVAAS rating in the state evaluation database.

(continued) **Completer Effectiveness**	Demonstrated Teaching Skill	Percentage of completers with an observation rating of 3 or higher (out of 5)	• This metric is calculated by dividing the total number of individuals with an observation rating of 3 or higher by the total number of individuals who had an observation rating in the state evaluation database.
		Distribution of completers' observation ratings (1–5)	• This metric is calculated by dividing the number of individuals who earned each observation rating (1, 2, 3, 4, or 5) by the number of individuals who had an observation rating in the state evaluation database.

		Average completer observation scores for each of three domains: Instruction, Environment, and Planning	• Individual domain averages are calculated by:
			  o adding up all indicator scores at the individual educator level within each of three domains and dividing that sum by the total number of indicators scored within each domain; then
			  o converting the average obtained at the educator level for each domain to a whole number; then
			  o dividing the sum of all individual domain scores by the number of individuals with a domain score.

		Average scores of all completers on each observation indicator	• Average indicator score is calculated by:
			  o adding up all indicator scores at the individual educator level and dividing by the total number of times an educator was observed on each indicator; then
			  o converting the average obtained for each indicator at the educator level to a whole number; then
			  o dividing the sum of all indicator scores for each indicator by the number of individuals with a score for that indicator.

Tennessee Domain	Key Effectiveness Indicator	Measure	Method of Calculation
Candidate Profile (20 total points out of 75 possible)	Academic Strength	Percentage of completers with an ACT score of 21+ or an SAT score above 1200 (3 points)	• The total number of individuals with a reported ACT score of 21 or greater or an SAT score above 1200 divided by the total number of individuals with a reported ACT or SAT score. • 0 points awarded for lower than 51.5%, 3 points for greater than 96.3%, with a proportional percentage of 3 points between those two numbers.
	Candidate and Completer Diversity	Percentage of completers by race and ethnicity (7 points)	• The total number of individuals who report a race or ethnic group other than white divided by the total number of individuals with a reported race or ethnicity. • 0 points awarded for lower than 3.1%, 7 points for greater than 27%, with a proportional percentage of 7 points between those two numbers.
	Placement/ Persistence in High-Need Subject/Schools	Percentage of high-needs endorsements (10 points)	• High-needs endorsement areas are ESL, secondary math, secondary science, Spanish, and SPED. • The number of individuals with a high-needs endorsement reported divided by the total number of individuals with an endorsement reported. • 0 points awarded for lower than 5.9%, 10 points for greater than 33.7%, with a proportional percentage of 10 points between those two numbers.

Employment (15 total points out of 75 possible)	Entry and Persistence in Teaching	First-year placement rate in TN public schools (6 points)	• This metric is calculated by dividing:
			  o the number of completers who were employed in a Tennessee public school in the first year following program completion or, in the case of job-embedded candidates, following program enrollment; by
			  o the total number of individuals who obtained a Tennessee teaching license during this time.
			• 0 points awarded for lower than 52.7%, 6 points for greater than 80.7%, with a proportional percentage of 6 points between those two numbers.

		Beyond year one retention rate for teachers placed and remaining in TN public schools (9 points)	• This metric is calculated by dividing:
			  o the number of completers who were employed in a Tennessee public school in their second year following program completion or, in the case of job-embedded candidates, following program enrollment; by
			  o the total number of individuals who were employed in a Tennessee public school the previous year.
			• 0 points awarded for lower than 77.8%, 9 points for greater than 95.5%, with a proportional percentage of 9 points between those two numbers.

Provider Impact (40 total points out of 75 possible)	Demonstrated Teaching Skill	Percentage of completers with an average observation score of 3+ (6 points)	• The total number of individuals with an observation rating of 3 or higher (on a scale of 1–5) divided by the total number of individuals who had an observation rating in the state evaluation database. • 0 points awarded for lower than 82.6%, 6 points for greater than 95.9%, with a proportional percentage of 6 points between those two numbers.
		Percentage of completers with an average observation score of 4–5 (9 points)	• The total number of individuals with an observation rating of 4 or 5 (on a scale of 1–5) divided by the total number of individuals who had an observation rating in the state evaluation database. • 0 points awarded for lower than 32.4%, 9 points for greater than 66.1%, with a proportional percentage of 9 points between those two numbers.
	Impact on K–12 Student Learning	Percentage of completers with a Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS) growth score of 3+ (10 points)	• The total number of individuals with a TVAAS rating of 3 or higher (on a scale of 1–5) divided by the total number of individuals who had a TVAAS rating in the state evaluation database. • 0 points awarded for lower than 45.5%, 6 points for greater than 69.9%, with a proportional percentage of 10 points between those two numbers.
		Percentage of completers with a TVAAS score of 4–5 (15 points)	• The total number of individuals with a TVAAS rating of 4 or 5 divided by the total number of individuals who had a TVAAS rating in the state evaluation database. • 0 points awarded for lower than 9.1%, 15 points for greater than 37.7%, with a proportional percentage of 15 points between those two numbers.
Satisfaction (Currently unscored)	<u>Employer's Perceptions of the Completer</u>	Employer satisfaction survey	• N/A. This measure was not included in the 2016–17 Annual Reports.

	Completer Rating of Program	Completer satisfaction survey	• This measure consists of three questions about completer perceptions of how well each of the following prepared them for their current role:
			  o the quality of the preparation they received overall;
			  o their perceptions based on clinical experiences; and
			  o their perceptions based on coursework.
			• Completers were asked to respond to these questions with "not at all prepared," "somewhat unprepared," "somewhat prepared," or "well-prepared."
			• This metric is calculated by dividing the number of completers who selected "somewhat prepared" or "well-prepared" when responding to each item by the number of completers responding to each item.

Profile Page (unscored)	Completion Rate Details	Number of completers	• This represents the total number of completers at each provider across both years represented in the report card.
		Percentage of total state completers	• The percentage of the state's total EPP program completers that come from each provider.
		Percentage of completers by state of residency (in-state versus out-of-state)	• The percentage of in-state versus out-of-state completers. • All students who are reported as having a Tennessee residence are recorded as in-state, and all other completers, including international completers, are recorded as out-of-state.
		Percentage of completers by type of program	• Types of program are baccalaureate, post-baccalaureate, and licensure-only. • All baccalaureate and post-baccalaureate candidates who completed their licensure and degree requirements during the report card's reporting window are included in those respective categories. • The licensure-only category includes completers who did not receive a degree but completed licensure requirements through an approved preparation provider during the reporting period.
		Percentage of completers by type of clinical practice	• The percentage of enrollees in clinical-based programs participating in each type of clinical practice: student teaching, internship, and job-embedded.
		Percentage of completers admitted by assessment type or waiver	• The number of all completers for whom an assessment (ACT, SAT, GRE, Praxis CORE, Miller Analogies Test) was factored into the admissions process divided by the total number of completers.
	Academic Strength	Passage rate on Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching	• The number of completers who passed a Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) assessment divided by the number of completers who took one of these assessments in either 2014 or 2015.