
2D

Information/Action

Educator Preparation Committee

Accreditation: Update on the Development of Data Dashboards and Next Steps in Establishing a Program Sponsor Data System

Executive Summary: This agenda item provides a demonstration of the most recent set of data dashboards developed which focus on approved institutions and the educator preparation programs they offer as well as continuing the discussion on the types of data the Commission should include in a pilot of a program level data system.

Policy Questions: What potential program-level data elements are appropriate to include in the Commission's data system?

Recommended Action: For the Commission to provide direction as to the type of data that will be included in a data system and to direct staff to establish and work with a technical advisory group in 2016-2017 on a pilot to begin work on a program level data system.

Presenters: Cheryl Hickey, Administrator, Lynette Roby and Nancy Tseng, Consultants, Professional Services Division

Strategic Plan Goal:

I. Educator Quality

- b) Develop, maintain, and promote high quality authentic, consistent educator assessments and examinations that support development and certification of educators who have demonstrated the capacity to be effective practitioners.

Accreditation: Update on the Development of Data Dashboards and Next Steps in Establishing a Program Sponsor Data System

Introduction

The Commission has engaged in an effort to strengthen and streamline the accreditation system over the past year and has adopted new standards, policies, and procedures to support that objective. The development of a data warehouse and data dashboards for the Commission is one part of this multifaceted project. The primary purposes of developing a data warehouse and data dashboards is to establish a single repository for credential and educator preparation data in order to streamline the submission of some program information necessary for accreditation, to increase its usability in the accreditation system, and to increase public access to information about educator preparation, educator assignment and supply, candidate and program outcomes.

This agenda item provides an update on current work related to the development of the data warehouse and data dashboards including a demonstration of the most recent set of data dashboards which focus on approved institutions and the educator preparation programs offered by those institutions. It also continues the discussion about the types of program-level data the Commission should include in a data system for purposes of accreditation and, where appropriate, for inclusion on the appropriate dashboard.

During the 2015-2016 year, staff has been working with a contractor to develop data dashboards that provide visualizations of data and enable users to filter and drill down to obtain a more detailed level of information. The first dashboards developed were focused on the data already available to the Commission either through its reporting requirements or through its previously established databases. These were presented at the [February 2016 Commission Meeting](#) and the [April 2016 Commission Meeting](#) and include the following:

- **Assignment Monitoring and Teacher Vacancies Dashboard** - These dashboards provide a visual display of both assignment monitoring and teacher vacancy data that previously were only available in Commission agenda items with hundreds of pages of detailed data tables attached in appendices.
- **Educator Supply and Demand Dashboard** - This set of dashboards provide visualizations of the statewide data presented in the Teacher Supply Report as well as other data sources that inform teacher supply and demand data. Dashboards include an Educator Supply and Demand Landing Page with trend data, Initial Teacher Credential Issuance Data by Segment and Type, a Teaching Credential Detail Data Search Page, Intern/Permits/Waivers Data, Other Credentials (nonteaching), and Teacher Demand Data by County and Subject informed by California Department of Education's Projected Teacher Hire Data.

- **Commission at a Glance Dashboard** - This dashboard provides a broad, state-wide perspective of educators and preparation programs in California.

Demonstration of Institutional Profile Data Dashboards

During a demonstration, the Commission will view the newly developed institution profile dashboard, the education preparation dashboard and the subject matter dashboard which focus on approved institutions and the specific educator preparation programs offered by the institution. The goal of these dashboards is to provide information about Commission-approved institutions at different grain sizes, including statewide summary data as well as institutional and program level data. For example, one dashboard identifies the number of institutions accredited by the Commission and the number and types of programs operating statewide; other dashboards focus primarily on educator preparation program features and candidate demographics, and program outcomes. More specifically, these dashboards focus on the following purposes and data needs:

- ***Institution and Program Context:*** The purpose of this set of data is to provide information about each institution accredited by the Commission to offer educator preparation, including the kinds of programs and delivery models the institution offers, and other contextual data.
- ***Candidate Demographics:*** The purpose of this set of data is to provide information about how many candidates, and the demographics of the candidates, enroll in and complete each educator preparation program.
- ***Preparation Program Characteristics and Outcomes:*** The purpose of this set of data is to provide indicators of the quality of the preparation received by candidates, including summaries of survey data from program completers, employers, and master teachers as well as aggregated performance assessment data specific to the type of credential preparation programs within which candidates must take a performance assessment.

Discussion of Priorities for Program-Level Data Collection

Since the last revision of the Commission's accreditation system in 2008, the system has focused attention on ensuring that institutions collect, analyze, and use candidate assessment and program effectiveness data for program improvement. Much of these data have been provided by institutions and the programs they offer during various aspects of the accreditation cycle. For instance, information about program delivery models, pathways, number of courses required, and estimated hours of fieldwork are embedded in the voluminous program assessment documents that were previously required. In addition, information about enrollment and data from key assessments, including performance assessments, have been included in biennial reporting. Institutions that offer initial teacher preparation programs (Multiple Subject/Single Subject/Education Specialist) are also subject to Title II reporting which is an annual federal data requirement.

While much information exists about Commission-approved preparation programs operating in California, little of it is readily accessible in a manner that is useful to understanding the larger

context of preparation programs, pathways, enrollment and quality indicators. It is evident that a more systematic and timely method of collection would not only be useful to accreditation, but would be valuable to policymakers, researchers, and interested members of the public.

Additionally, there are significant limitations inherent in some of the data that is collected currently. For instance, Title II data is only collected from 90 of the 260 approved program sponsors, is approximately two years old at the time of reporting, and is aggregated for preliminary Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist candidates together without the ability to extract information for any one of those programs individually. Biennial report data, which was required to be submitted in the fall of years two, four and six of the past accreditation cycle was not collected in a manner that allowed for aggregation/disaggregation or examination across all programs.

At the same time, there is a need to collect additional data elements not currently collected in any systemic manner. For example, as discussed at the [April Commission meeting](#) the Commission does not currently track which institutions offer an undergraduate/integrated pathway as part of the preliminary teacher preparation program or how many candidates complete teacher preparation through this delivery model. The Commission frequently gets requests for information of this sort from policymakers or other constituents. While that information is contained in individual program documents, much greater efficiencies and transparency can be gained by reforms in the manner in which some data is reported to the Commission.

Keeping in mind the strengths and limitations of data currently being collected, staff proposes piloting a data system in 2016-17, with interested institutions, designed to enhance the usability of data. In February 2016, the Commission discussed an agenda item that presented for consideration the types of data the Commission should collect in a more systematic way through a data collection process for inclusion in the data warehouse, and as appropriate, on the data dashboard.

It is important to note that the data system envisioned is not the only source of information for accreditation, but rather it would be designed to 1) capture major aspects of programs that the Commission deems appropriate for easy access and usability of the data, and 2) work in concert with other components of a larger accreditation system in which additional information about programs exist. For instance, the new program review process will include the submission of course and fieldwork requirements and course sequence information for all programs. This information will also be linked to syllabi and candidate assessments. Together, these components will inform the accreditation work.

Another major objective is to ensure that where possible, data collection efforts and duplicative submissions of data are minimized. Where possible and appropriate, the same data may be used for multiple purposes or may be pulled from other sources to populate the data system. This effort will require some discussions with the field and staff.

Below is a table that identifies types of data that the Commission may find useful to collect in a more systematic manner to better inform the Commission’s understanding of educator preparation programs, to enhance efficiency in obtaining the data, or to allow for greater access by the public through a data dashboard. In addition, the table contains information about whether the data is currently being collected, the current source of the data collected, and comments, particularly noting limitations of any of the data currently collected to guide and inform further discussion by the Commission.

What?	Does the Commission currently collect this? If yes, how?	Comment
<i>What should the Commission know about candidate demographics?</i>		
Total Enrollment in Program	Yes, for some programs– Title II	Title II Data is submitted only for MS/SS and Ed Specialist credential programs and is not current year data. Data is aggregated across all Preliminary Multiple Subject, Single Subject and Education Specialist programs and is not available by individual credential programs.
Gender	Yes, for some programs– Title II	
Ethnicity	Yes, for some programs– Title II	
Percentage of full time/part time students	No	
<i>What should the Commission know about candidate selectivity/admissions requirements?</i>		
Required minimum GPA for admission, if specified	Yes, for some programs– Title II	Title II data is submitted only for MS/SS/and Ed Specialist credential programs and is not current year data. Data is aggregated across Preliminary Multiple Subject, Single Subject and Education Specialist programs and is not available by individual credential program.
Mean GPA of admitted applicants	Yes, for some programs– Title II	
Does the program require demonstration of Basic Skills for admission? (Yes/No)	Not required	This data is often provided in program document, but is limited in its usefulness due to the manner in which it is collected.
Percentage of candidates who have satisfied basic skills at admission.	No	

What?	Does the Commission currently collect this? If yes, how?	Comment
Does the program require demonstration of subject matter for admission? (Yes/No)	Not required	This data is often provided in program document, but is limited in its usefulness due to the manner in which it is collected.
Percentage of candidates who have satisfied subject matter at admission.	No	
Percentage of applicants admitted	No	
<i>What should the Commission know about each program?</i>		
Identify all pathways through which the program is offered (e.g. traditional, intern, undergraduate).	Yes – Biennial Report, Program Narrative, and Title II	Data collected but limited usage in the manner in which it is collected.
How many units required for completion of the program?	No	This data is often provided in program documents but data is limited in its usage in the manner in which it is collected.
Average ratio of supervisors to candidates (or master teachers to candidates)	Yes, for some programs– Title II	
Total hours of fieldwork/clinical practice required	Yes, for some programs– Title II	
Number of observational hours	No	
Number of solo teaching hours	No	
Number of fieldwork hours required for interns	No	
<i>What should the Commission know about program outcomes?</i>		
Expected length of program	Yes–Biennial Report	BR was submitted every two years and completion rates were provided but not collected in a manner that can be averaged or calculated in percentages. This was a more recent addition to the biennial report and has not always been included on the template in the earlier years. Through annual data collection, these data will be collected for each program.
Number of candidates who completed program on time	Yes–Biennial Report	
Number of candidates who completed program within one year of expected length of time	Yes–Biennial Report	
Number of candidates who completed program more than one year beyond expected length of time	Yes–Biennial Report	
What is average length of time your candidates complete the program?	Yes–Biennial Report	

What?	Does the Commission currently collect this? If yes, how?	Comment
Number of candidates who leave the program (voluntarily or counseled out)	Yes–Biennial Report	Non-completers were submitted as part of the Biennial Report recently and included the categories “Counseled Out” and “Other.”
Percentage of candidates who pass the performance assessment on first attempt [preliminary teaching and administrative services only]	Yes – Biennial Reports	TPA data has been submitted as part of the key assessments in the Biennial Report for MS/SS only and has been provided in different formats limiting its usability across programs.
Performance Assessment Data at TPE or CAPE level	No	Not all TPA models previously allowed for data to be presented at the TPE level. New Assessment Design Standards would allow for this possibility.
Percentage of first time pass rate for RICA [MS and Ed Specialists]	Yes-Title II	Currently, this data is aggregated across both MS and Ed. Sp. Programs and is not available by individual credential program.
First time pass rates for any other required standardized test required of credential [e.g. Praxis for SLPs]	No	Often submitted as a key assessment in the Biennial Report, but not required.
Percentage of graduates who are employed as educators?	No	Currently the Commission has access to the PAIF data and will be piloting work to analyze these data for placement and retention information.
Retention rates in the profession	No	
<i>What does survey data say about this program? (program completer, employers, master teachers)</i>		
Completer Survey	Piloted Completer Survey in 2014-15 and 2015-16. Piloting Master Teacher Survey in 2015-16 and Employer Survey in fall 2016.	Plan to aggregate data and provide a summary for each survey.
Master Teacher Survey		
Employer Survey		

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission provide direction on the appropriate data elements to be collected and tested in a pilot data system in 2016-17. A Technical Advisory Group could be formed to work with Commission staff and the Committee on Accreditation (COA) during this time and the role of this group would be to review the piloting of the data system process, as well as provide feedback on the program-level data collected during 2016-17. The advisory group would be comprised of representatives from key organizations and stakeholder groups that prepare educators, employ educators, and represent educators.

Next Steps

If the Commission directs staff to move forward with a pilot, the data system could be developed for testing in 2016-17 and interested institutions would be identified for participation. Work would also begin to identify and select representatives to serve on the Technical Advisory Group.