

Discussion of Annual Data Submission

March 2016

Overview

As a result of the Commission's work to strengthen and streamline the accreditation system, the activities of the accreditation cycle have been revised, including adding the requirement for annual data submission. This agenda item provides the opportunity for COA discussion and input regarding the types of data that should be required to be submitted by Commission approved programs.

Staff Recommendation

This item is for information and discussion only.

Background

Over the course of the past 18 months work has been undertaken by the Commission to strengthen and streamline the accreditation system. The Accreditation Process Task Group was charged with revising the activities of the accreditation cycle to better focus on program and candidate outcomes while also diminishing the need for lengthy narrative responses.

The task group discussed ways to strengthen the use of data to not only inform program modifications, but to play a greater role in understanding program quality. The group agreed that annually all institutions and programs should be, at minimum, collecting, analyzing, and considering program modifications as a matter of good practice and that this expectation should be maintained in the revised system.

Concurrently, work has begun on developing a data warehouse and dashboards, which would allow for the efficient uploading and examination of data, as well as providing access to both the institution and Commission staff. Initial progress in the development of the data warehouse will be shared and discussed in Item 13 of this COA agenda. The Commission is still having policy discussions on the types of data that should be included in the data warehouse and dashboards and the COA's discussion will inform the next agenda item for the Commission.

Over the past 5-10 years, the Commission's accreditation system has focused much attention on ensuring that institutions collect, analyze and use data for program improvement. Biennial Reports were due in the fall of years two, four, and six of the accreditation cycle and required both candidate competency and program effectiveness data. The 2015 Biennial Report template is attached in Appendix A for your reference.

Some data have been identified as important to collect, analyze, and include in the data warehouse/dashboard system and are noted below.

- Enrollment and Completion Rates
- Demographics
- Commission-sponsored survey data
- TPA, APA, RICA pass rates

Provided here is text from the February 2016 Commission agenda item (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2016-02/2016-02-3A.pdf>) on the Data Warehouse and Dashboards:

Further Discussion of California’s Data Dashboards and Related Policy Questions for the Commission’s Consideration

In thinking about the potential data elements to include in the Program Quality dashboards, staff has reviewed the work of an organization known as “Teacher Preparation Analytics” (<http://teacherpreparationanalytics.org/>). This organization has been working with a number of states as well as national organizations to develop a list of key effectiveness indicators for educator preparation programs. As part of the ongoing work being done with the Network for Transforming Education Preparation (NTEP) in conjunction with the Council for Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), staff has had conversations both with other states developing dashboards and with Teacher Preparation Analytics. The Teacher Preparation Analytics indicators are being considered in other states as they build educator preparation program dashboards, and are provided here as an efficient means of organizing the discussion of program dashboards. Including information from Teacher Preparation Analytics, however, does not imply agreement with any of the specific indicators identified by this organization and/or used by other states.

The indicators identified by Teacher Preparation Analytics relative to program quality dashboards are organized into four categories:

- Candidate Selection Profile
- Knowledge and Skills for Teaching
- Performance as Classroom Teachers
- Contribution to State Needs

Within each category, Teacher Preparation Analytics identified 2-4 key indicators (Appendix D). This list of key indicators provides a starting point for organizing the following discussion and policy questions for the Commission’s input and consideration.

Within the **Candidate Selection Profile** category, Teacher Preparation Analytics’ indicators include academic strength, teaching promise and diversity information. These indicators focus on the candidate at the point of entry. In California, the Basic Skills Requirement and the subject matter requirement are also indicators that could be considered at the point of entry to a program. Some of this data is collected for the Title II report (enrollment, average GPA, demographics of candidates) but the data collected are only for initial teacher preparation—multiple subject, single subject and education specialist. No data is collected for other types of credential program participants in the Title II reporting process.

Staff suggests that certain contextual information, such as enrollment and number of completers, should be required to be submitted by each educator preparation program annually. Staff also suggests that other data, such as number of clinical practice hours, total units in the program, and required course title and summaries could be required to be submitted initially and subsequently updated if or when changes are made in the program design or coursework. The institutional access-only dashboards described above will allow institutions to submit data electronically to the Commission for inclusion in the data warehouse.

Policy Question Regarding Data Elements for the Candidate Selection Profile: Should candidate selection data be collected and published as part of a program dashboard? If yes, what types of data should be included?

Possible *Candidate Selection* data elements for the Commission's consideration:

- Mean GPA of applicants, mean GPA of enrollees
- Length of program—units and months to complete
- Number of applications received
- Number/percentage of individuals accepted
- Number/percentage of individuals completing the program 'on time'
- Number/percentage of those who leave the program (voluntarily and counseled out)
- % of admitted candidates who have satisfied basic skills at admission
- % of admitted candidates who have satisfied subject matter at admission
- Additional data elements?

Within the ***Knowledge and Skills for Teaching*** category, Teacher Preparation Analytics indicators include a content knowledge assessment, a pedagogical content knowledge assessment, a teaching skill assessment and program completer rating of the program. For California, a content knowledge assessment would not be a valid measure of teacher preparation program quality because teacher preparation programs do not provide the subject matter preparation and therefore the preparation programs should not be held responsible for candidate outcomes on that component. California does not require both a pedagogical content knowledge examination and a teaching skill performance assessment; instead, California combines the assessment of both types of knowledge and skills within a single teaching performance assessment for general education candidates. The final key indicator in this category identified by Teacher Preparation Analytics is program completer surveys, a data source which California is already implementing. Performance assessment data for preliminary teaching and administrative services programs will be available once the teaching performance assessments have been redesigned to meet the revised Assessment Design standards and the administrator performance assessment for program candidates has been developed and implemented.

Policy Question Regarding Data Elements for Knowledge and Skills for Teaching: What kinds of knowledge and skills for teaching data should be collected and displayed as part of a Commission-developed program quality dashboard?

Possible *Knowledge and Skills for Teaching* data elements for the Commission's consideration:

- Aggregate performance assessment data for each approved program that incorporates a performance assessment
- Aggregate RICA scores for Multiple Subject and Education Specialist candidates, by program
- Aggregate survey data: completers, employers, master teachers
- Additional data elements?

Within the ***Performance as Classroom Teachers*** category, Teacher Preparation Analytics indicates that impact on K-12 student learning, demonstrated teaching skill and K-12 student perceptions are three indicators that could be used as part of program quality data dashboards. In California there are currently no statewide systems in place to collect impact on K-12 student learning, teacher evaluation information, or K-12 student survey data. These are local matters addressed by employers, and staff does not recommend that the Commission's system be adapted to include these kinds of data. Rather, staff recommends that the Commission focus on program impact, and see what kinds of quality metrics emerge as the preparation community works to implement the new Common Standards.

Within the ***Contribution to State Needs*** category, Teacher Preparation Analytics suggests that employment and persistence as a teacher as well as employment and persistence in high-need subjects and schools are key indicators that could be used. In California, there are currently no statewide systems that collect and analyze employment and persistence data in the schools, including in high-need subjects and schools. The California Department of Education (CDE) annually collects information about each educator employed in the public schools and the teaching assignment for those who are teachers. The Commission has data on each educator who earns a credential, but the legal authority to share these data and examine patterns of credentialing, employment, mobility, attrition and re-entry into the profession is not clear. Moreover, neither the CDE nor the Commission currently has a clear mandate or staff resources to engage in this type of data analysis and reporting.

Policy Question Regarding Data Elements for Contribution to State Needs: Should contribution to state needs data be collected and published as part of a Commission dashboard? If yes, what types of data should be included?

To move forward in this area would require further analysis of the Education Code to determine what kinds of data can be collected and by what state agency. Absent appropriate legal authority, the Commission might consider sponsoring legislation that would enable the agency to collect and report on the following kinds of data:

- The numbers of individuals initially credentialed who are currently employed in a position requiring their credential
- Where program completers are employed
- Retention of educators, including in hard to staff schools and content areas

Staff requests input from the COA regarding additional appropriate candidate competency and program effectiveness data, expectations for analysis, and requirements for reporting resulting program modifications.

Discussion Questions

1. Are there data that all programs should submit
2. Are there program-specific data that should be required (TPA is one example)

Next Steps

Staff will bring additional items to the COA regarding annual data submission, including potential revisions to appropriate Accreditation Handbook chapters.

Appendix A

Commission on Teacher Credentialing Biennial Report Fall 2015 Academic Years 2013-2014 and 2014-2015

Institution	
Cohort	
Date report is submitted Blue due on September 15, 2015 Orange due November 15, 2015	
Program documented in this report	
Please identify all pathways through which this program is offered (Traditional, Intern, Blended)	
Credential awarded	
Is this program offered at more than one site and/or online delivery model ?	
If yes, list all sites/delivery models at which the program is offered	
Program Contact	
Title	
Phone #	
E-Mail	
If the preparer of this report is different than the Program Contact, please note contact information for that person below:	
Name	
Title	
Phone #	
E-mail	

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

PART I – Contextual Information

¹ Enrollment 2014-15		Traditional:	Intern:	Other:
² Prior Enrollment 2013-14		Traditional:	Intern:	Other:
³ Expected Length of Program		__ __ Months Fulltime; __ __ Months Part time		
⁴ Completer Rates:				
^a On time (Expected Length of Program)	^b Within One Year beyond Expected Length of Program	^c More than One Year beyond Expected Length of Program	^d Non-Completers	
			ⁱ Counseled Out	ⁱⁱ Other
⁵ Analysis of Completer Rate Data:				
⁶ Program Description				
Briefly describe program. Pay specific attention to providing program details that will assist the reviewer in understanding the context of the data and analysis provided in Part II. <i>(limit 300 words)</i>				
⁷ Program Changes Since Last Accreditation Activity			^{7a} Implementation Date	

PART II –Candidate Assessment and Program Effectiveness Analysis and Discussion of Data

REQUIRED Data Table #1

⁹ Briefly describe Key Assessment #1 (Candidate Competency):								^a Scoring Scale:		
								^b Passing Score:		
¹⁰ CTC Competencies/Standards Assessed:										
¹¹ Site/ Delivery Model	2013-14					2014-15				
	¹² Pathway (N)	¹³ Distribution of Results			¹⁴ Candidates Not Assessed	¹² Pathway (N)	¹³ Distribution of Results			¹⁴ Candidates Not Assessed
		Range of Scores	^a Mean Score	SD			Range of Scores	^a Mean Score	SD	
Campus X	Traditional ()					Traditional ()				
	Intern ()					Intern ()				
Campus Y	Traditional ()					Traditional ()				
	Intern ()					Intern ()				
Online	Traditional ()					Traditional ()				
	Intern ()					Intern ()				
¹⁵ Summary of Findings and Data Analysis:										
¹⁶ Resulting Program Modifications								Related Program Standard(s)		

REQUIRED Data Table #2

⁹ Briefly describe Key Assessment #2 (Candidate Competency):									^a Scoring Scale:	
									^b Passing Score:	
¹⁰ CTC Competencies/Standards Assessed:										
¹¹ Site/ Delivery Model	2013-14					2014-15				
	¹² Pathway (N)	¹³ Distribution of Results			¹⁴ Candidates Not Assessed	¹² Pathway (N)	¹³ Distribution of Results			¹⁴ Candidates Not Assessed
		Range of Scores	^a Mean Score	SD			Range of Scores	^a Mean Score	SD	
Campus X	Traditional ()					Traditional ()				
	Intern ()					Intern ()				
Campus Y	Traditional ()					Traditional ()				
	Intern ()					Intern ()				
Online	Traditional ()					Traditional ()				
	Intern ()					Intern ()				
¹⁵ Summary of Findings and Data Analysis:										
¹⁶ Resulting Program Modifications									Related Program Standard(s)	

REQUIRED Data Table #3

¹⁷ Briefly describe Key Assessment #3 (Candidate Competency in Fieldwork/Clinical Practice):										^a Scoring Scale:																											
										^b Passing Score:																											
¹⁸ CTC Competencies/Standards Assessed:																																					
²¹ Results (Disaggregated by ¹⁹ Pathway):																																					
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <th colspan="6" style="text-align: center;">2013-14</th> <th colspan="6" style="text-align: center;">2014-15</th> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Intern (N)</th> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Traditional (N)</th> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Total (N)</th> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Intern (N)</th> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Traditional (N)</th> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Total (N)</th> </tr> </table>														2013-14						2014-15						Intern (N)		Traditional (N)		Total (N)		Intern (N)		Traditional (N)		Total (N)	
2013-14						2014-15																															
Intern (N)		Traditional (N)		Total (N)		Intern (N)		Traditional (N)		Total (N)																											
²⁰ Key Indicators:	^a R	^b M	^a R	^b M	^c M	^d SD	^a R	^b M	^a R	^b M	^c M	^d SD																									
Indicator 1																																					
Indicator 2																																					
Indicator 3																																					
Indicator 4																																					
Indicator 5																																					
Indicator 6																																					
Indicator 7																																					
Indicator 8																																					
Indicator 9																																					
Indicator 10																																					
Indicator 11																																					
Indicator 12																																					
Total Overall																																					
²² Summary of Findings and Data Analysis:																																					
²³ Resulting Program Modifications										Related Program Standard(s)																											

REQUIRED Data Table #4

²⁴ Briefly describe Key Assessment #4 (Program Effectiveness)										^a Scoring Scale:																																							
²⁵ CTC Program Standards Assessed:																																																	
²⁸ Results (Disaggregated by ¹⁹ Pathway):																																																	
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <th colspan="6" style="text-align: center;">2013-14</th> <th colspan="6" style="text-align: center;">2014-15</th> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Intern (N)</th> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Traditional (N)</th> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Total (N)</th> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Intern (N)</th> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Traditional (N)</th> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Total (N)</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">^aR</th> <th style="text-align: center;">^bM</th> <th style="text-align: center;">^aR</th> <th style="text-align: center;">^bM</th> <th style="text-align: center;">^cM</th> <th style="text-align: center;">^dSD</th> <th style="text-align: center;">^aR</th> <th style="text-align: center;">^bM</th> <th style="text-align: center;">^aR</th> <th style="text-align: center;">^bM</th> <th style="text-align: center;">^cM</th> <th style="text-align: center;">^dSD</th> </tr> </table>														2013-14						2014-15						Intern (N)		Traditional (N)		Total (N)		Intern (N)		Traditional (N)		Total (N)		^a R	^b M	^a R	^b M	^c M	^d SD	^a R	^b M	^a R	^b M	^c M	^d SD
2013-14						2014-15																																											
Intern (N)		Traditional (N)		Total (N)		Intern (N)		Traditional (N)		Total (N)																																							
^a R	^b M	^a R	^b M	^c M	^d SD	^a R	^b M	^a R	^b M	^c M	^d SD																																						
²⁷ Key Indicators:																																																	
Indicator 1																																																	
Indicator 2																																																	
Indicator 3																																																	
Indicator 4																																																	
Indicator 5																																																	
Indicator 6																																																	
Indicator 7																																																	
Indicator 8																																																	
Indicator 9																																																	
Indicator 10																																																	
Indicator 11																																																	
Indicator 12																																																	
Total Overall																																																	
²⁹ Summary of Findings and Data Analysis:																																																	
³⁰ Resulting Program Modifications										Related Program Standard(s)																																							

REQUIRED Intern Data Table 1 (Multiple, Single Subject and Education Specialist Intern Programs only)

Teacher Intern Support and Supervision						
It is not necessary to submit individual candidate data for the Biennial Report*. Using that data, calculate the following :						
³¹ Cohort	³² Total number of candidates	³³ Number of Candidates <u>without</u> prior ELA	³⁴ Average # hours provided by <u>Program</u> for each candidate	³⁵ Average # hours provided by <u>Employer</u> for each candidate	³⁶ Average hours <u>EL Support</u> for each candidate w/o ELA	³⁷ Total

**Important: Individual data should be available upon the request of a site visit team.*

Please Note

Data Tables 1-4 and the Intern Data Table 1 meet the requirement for the Biennial Report data and analysis for 4 key assessments. Tables 5 and 6 are optional. If the program elects to use them, they are on pages 9-10. All programs must provide a response to Part III Conclusion found on page 11.

⁹ Briefly describe Key Assessment (Candidate Competency):	^a Scoring Scale: ^b Passing Score:
---	--

¹⁰CTC Competencies/Standards Assessed:

¹¹ Site/ Delivery Model	2013-14					2014-15				
	¹² Pathway (N)	¹³ Distribution of Results			¹⁴ Candidates Not Assessed	¹² Pathway (N)	¹³ Distribution of Results			¹⁴ Candidates Not Assessed
		Range of Scores	^a Mean Score	SD			Range of Scores	^a Mean Score	SD	
Campus X	Traditional ()					Traditional ()				
	Intern ()					Intern ()				
Campus Y	Traditional ()					Traditional ()				
	Intern ()					Intern ()				
Online	Traditional ()					Traditional ()				
	Intern ()					Intern ()				

¹⁵Summary of Findings and Data Analysis:

¹⁶ Resulting Program Modifications	Related Program Standard(s)
---	-----------------------------

OPTIONAL Data Table #2

⁹ Briefly describe Key Assessment (Candidate Competency):									^a Scoring Scale:	
									^b Passing Score:	
¹⁰ CTC Competencies/Standards Assessed:										
¹¹ Site/ Delivery Model	2013-14					2014-15				
	¹² Pathway (N)	¹³ Distribution of Results			¹⁴ Candidates Not Assessed	¹² Pathway (N)	¹³ Distribution of Results			¹⁴ Candidates Not Assessed
		Range of Scores	^a Mean Score	SD			Range of Scores	^a Mean Score	SD	
Campus X	Traditional ()					Traditional ()				
	Intern ()					Intern ()				
Campus Y	Traditional ()					Traditional ()				
	Intern ()					Intern ()				
Online	Traditional ()					Traditional ()				
	Intern ()					Intern ()				
¹⁵ Summary of Findings and Data Analysis:										
¹⁶ Resulting Program Modifications									Related Program Standard(s)	

Part III: Program Summary Conclusion

*Upon reviewing data, analysis, and proposed modifications that were provided for each assessment, briefly describe any conclusions that can be reached for the program as a whole. Are there **trends that are prevalent across data sources**? This section will also inform the unit lead as s/he completes Section B of the Biennial Report. Please try to limit comments to the space in the boxes below. This should suffice for most programs.*

Summary of Overall Program Findings		
³⁹ Program Strengths		
⁴⁰ Areas for Program Improvement	⁴¹ Response/Next Steps	Related Program Standards

Appendix B
Key Effectiveness Indicators developed by Teacher Preparation Analytics

Assessment Categories	Key Indicators	Measures
I Candidate Selection Profile	Academic Strength	PRIOR ACHIEVEMENT – (1) <u>For Undergraduate Programs</u> : Non-education course GPA required for program admission. Mean and range of high school GPA percentile (or class rank) for candidates admitted as freshmen. Mean and tercile distribution of candidates’ SAT/ACT scores. GPA in major and overall required for program completion. Average percentile rank of completers’ GPA in their major at the university, by cohort. – (2) <u>For Post-Baccalaureate Programs</u> : Mean and range of candidates’ college GPA percentile and mean and tercile distribution of GRE scores TEST PERFORMANCE – <u>For All Programs</u> : Mean and tercile distribution of admitted candidate scores on rigorous national test of college sophomore-level general knowledge and reasoning skills
	Teaching Promise	ATTITUDES, VALUES, AND BEHAVIORS SCREEN – Percent of accepted program candidates whose score on a rigorous and validated “fitness for teaching” assessment demonstrates a strong promise for teaching
	Candidate/Completer Diversity	DISAGGREGATED COMPLETIONS COMPARED TO ADMISSIONS – Number & percent of completers in newest graduating cohort AND number and percent of candidates originally admitted in that same cohort: overall and by race/ethnicity, age, and gender
II Knowledge and Skills for Teaching	Content Knowledge	CONTENT KNOWLEDGE TEST – Program completer mean score, tercile distribution, and pass rate on rigorous and validated nationally normed assessment of college-level content knowledge used for initial licensure
	Pedagogical Content Knowledge	PEDAGOGICAL CONTENT KNOWLEDGE TEST – Program completer mean score, tercile distribution, and pass rate on rigorous and validated nationally normed assessment of comprehensive pedagogical content knowledge used for initial licensure
	Teaching Skill	TEACHING SKILL PERFORMANCE TEST – Program completer mean score, tercile distribution, and pass rate on rigorous and validated nationally normed assessment of demonstrated teaching skill used for initial licensure
	Completer Rating of Program	EXIT AND FIRST YEAR COMPLETER SURVEY ON PREPARATION – State- or nationally-developed program completer survey of teaching preparedness and program quality, by cohort, upon program (including alternate route) completion and at end of first year of full-time teaching
III Performance as Classroom Teachers	Impact on K-12 Student Learning	TEACHER ASSESSMENTS BASED ON STUDENT LEARNING – Assessment of program completers or alternate route candidates during their first three years of full-time teaching using valid and rigorous student-learning driven measures, including value-added and other statewide comparative evidence of K-12 student growth overall and in low-income and low-performing schools
	Demonstrated Teaching Skill	ASSESSMENTS OF TEACHING SKILL – Annual assessment based on observations of program completers’ or alternate route candidates’ first three years of full-time classroom teaching, using valid, reliable, and rigorous statewide instruments and protocols
	K-12 Student Perceptions	STUDENT SURVEYS ON TEACHING PRACTICE – K-12 student surveys about completers’ or alternate route candidates’ teaching practice during first three years of full-time teaching, using valid and reliable statewide instruments
IV Contribution to State Needs	Entry and Persistence in Teaching	TEACHING EMPLOYMENT AND PERSISTENCE – (1) Percent of completers or alternate route candidates, by cohort and gender – race-ethnicity, employed and persisting in teaching years 1-5 after program completion or initial alternate route placement, in-state and out-of-state – (2) Percent of completers attaining a second stage teaching license in states with multi-tiered licensure
	Placement/Persistence in High-Needs Subjects/Schools	HIGH-NEED EMPLOYMENT AND PERSISTENCE – Number & percent of completers or alternate route candidates, by cohort, employed and persisting in teaching in low-performing, low-income, or remote rural schools or in high need subjects years 1-5 after program completion or initial alternate route placement, in-state and out-of-state