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THE BIG IDEA: When students, parents, educators, and partners have the right information to make decisions, students excel.

What does it mean to use data in service of student learning?
Data is one of the most powerful tools to inform good decisions and create opportunities for students along their education journey—and it’s much more than test scores. Data helps us make connections that lead to insights and improvements. Everyone has an important role to play in helping all students succeed in their own individualized ways. Here’s what it will look like when data is working for all students:

**STUDENTS**
“I know my strengths and where I need to grow. I can shape my own education journey.”

**TEACHERS**
“I know where my students are succeeding and struggling right now.”
“Can help them grow.”

**SCHOOL LEADERS**
“I know what’s working and what isn’t in my school.”
“I can make timely decisions and make sure resources support great teaching and improve student learning.”

**PARENTS**
“I know what actions to take to help my child on her path to success.”
“Can be a better champion for her.”

**AFTERSCHOOL PARTNERS**
“I know what’s happening with those kids before 3:00 p.m.”
“I can help families and communities create more opportunities for students to succeed.”

Many educators and policymakers are already taking steps in the right direction. See DQC’s Four Policy Priorities to Make Data Work for Students for more on making this vision a reality for all students.
Teachers need to be learner ready, day one.
Use Data to Continuously Improve EPP Quality

• Currently, programs don’t have the data they need:
  • Only 10 states include educator preparation program (EPP) graduates’ observed performance as teachers of record as an indicator in their program.
  • Only 22 states report sharing teachers’ classroom performance annually with in-state EPPs.
  • Only 6 out of 23 surveyed program leaders have access to data on teacher performance as measured by students’ academic performance.
Challenges Persist

SEA data on teacher performance is not uniformly shared with EPPs.

Data that EPPs are currently required to collect do not answer questions or inform action.

Publically available reports are not clear about how well EPPs prepare teachers for the classroom.
By **eliminating data silos**, states, educator preparation programs, and K-12 leaders can **work together** to drive improvement and provide each other with the necessary information to fully prepare and support teachers.
State Actions to Use Data to Improve EPP Quality

✓ Collecting data that are most useful for transparency and the continuous improvement of EPPs.

✓ Ensuring that data about K-12 outcomes used to improve EPPs are high quality and secure.

✓ Developing a feedback loop between local education agencies, states, and EPPs with the information EPPs most need for continuous improvement.

✓ Helping EPPs grow their existing culture and capacity to continuously improve.
Massachusetts: Incentivizes and supports continuous improvement

- Updated state approval standards
- Updated MA’s data collections process
- Facilitates meaningful partnerships
Missouri: Collaborates to address future teacher shortages

- Leverages data to better understand teacher workforce
- Developed a shortage predictor model
- Supports districts with recruitment and targeted EPP training
Tennessee: Promotes Transparency of EPP Quality

- Produces yearly report cards for all EPPs
- Invests time and resources in high-quality and accurate data
- Emphasizes transparency and meeting the public’s needs
“A primary obstacle to investigating...many...important aspects of teacher preparation is the lack of systemic data collection, at both the national and state levels.”

National Research Council Report, 2010
“We now have a historic opportunity to do what the Flexner Report did for medical education in 1910. That report called on American medical schools . . . adhere strictly to robust scientific knowledge in teaching and research. Flexner transformed medical education making it the clinical model it is today and spurred the transformation of North American medicine into a profession.

. . . unique opportunity to do the same, ultimately improving the outcomes for our nation’s students . . .”
CAEP Standards

**Standard 1:** Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

**Standard 2:** Clinical Partnerships and Practice

**Standard 3:** Candidate, Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

**Standard 4:** Program Impact

**Standard 5:** Provider Quality, Continuous Improvement, and Capacity

5.3 The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes.
The Importance of Backward Design

If I’d known they wanted me to use all this info— I would never have asked for it!
How do you know you have evidence of meeting the CAEP Standards?

How do you know your quality assurance system is working?

How do you know you are preparing excellent educators to serve P-12 students?
“If we rephrase accountability as “doing right by our students,” it gets at the heart of our profession.”

‘Accountability’: Reclaiming the Worst Word in Education – By Justin Minkel
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuum Area Addressed by Data Relevant to CAEP Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recruitment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Components 3.1 and 3.2 if at entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards 1 and 3, Component 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Licensure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Induction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 4 (results from Standard 1 and 3, Component 2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retention</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Components 4.3 and 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Renewal/Recognition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Components 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard 2

Standard 5
Balancing Assessment Limitations and Decisions About Programs

• “No single methodology is perfect.”
• “This is not to say these limitations mean the instruments should not be used.”
• “The use of multiple measures generally assures the ability to make stronger inferences.”

“Despite this concern, decisions about program effectiveness need to be made consistently and fairly. Using the most trustworthy data and methods currently available at any given decision point is the optimal way to proceed.”

» (Worrell et al., 2014, p. 7)  

Are you too busy to improve?

No thanks! We are too busy

Håkan Forss @hakanforss http://hakanforss.wordpress.com

This illustration is inspired by and in part derived from the work by Scott Zimmermann, “The Square Wheels Guy” http://www.performancemanagementcompany.com/
## Distinguishing three uses of measurement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Accountability</th>
<th>Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>Determining whether change is an improvement.</td>
<td>Identifying exemplary or problematic, teachers, programs, schools, or districts.</td>
<td>Test or develop a theory regarding the relations among two or more conceptual variables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What do you measure?</strong></td>
<td>SPECIFIC work processes that are the object of change.</td>
<td>GENERAL end of the line outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How often?</strong></td>
<td>Frequently as practice occurs</td>
<td>Usually collected once a year after it may happen</td>
<td>Typically once or twice per study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data collection is easily embedded in everyday work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Size</strong></td>
<td>“Just enough” data</td>
<td>Any relevant data</td>
<td>“Just in case” data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of data</strong></td>
<td>Shared in a low-stakes, safe environment</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Confidential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <a href="#">Table developed by Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Break the cycle

“A bad system will beat a good person every time.”

W. Edwards Deming
Resources - Reports

Building State Data for continuous improvement of educator preparation providers and across the continuum

- Using Data to Improve Teacher Effectiveness: A Primer for State Policymakers (The Data Quality Campaign)
- Roadmap for a Teacher-Student Data Link (The Data Quality Campaign)
- From Chaos to Coherence: A Policy Agenda for Accessing and Using Outcomes Data in Educator Preparation (Deans for Impact)
- Peering Around the Corner: Analyzing State Efforts to Link Teachers to the Programs that Prepared Them (Bellwether Education Partners)
- Building an Evidence-Based System for Teacher Preparation (Teacher Preparation Analytics, commissioned by CAEP)
- Accountability in Teacher Preparation: Policies and Data in the 50 States & DC (Council of Chief State School Officers & Teacher Preparation Analytics)
- Approaches to Evaluating Teacher Preparation Programs in Seven States (Regional Education Laboratory Central)
Resources – Initiatives & Websites

- **Multistate Educator Lookup System (MELS)** – consider joining this NASDTEC initiative where benefits include tracking completers across states

- **Evidence for ESSA**
  - **High-Reliability Organizations** Robert Slavin article on putting reading research to use to solve one of our greatest problems

- **FERPA|Sherpa**, the Education Privacy Resource website

- **PSEL 2015 and Promoting Principal Leadership for the Success of Students with Disabilities** (CCSSO and CEEDAR)

- **Coming Attraction**: *Using Data to Transform Educator Preparation* (DQC)
Resources - CAEP

- Accreditation Resources page on our website
  - CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Designed Assessments
  - 2017 Spring CAEP Conference presentations
    - Strategies for Addressing Challenging CAEP Standard Components 3.2, 4.1, and 5.2 for Initial Licensure Programs
- Family Engagement Mini Course for candidates and accompanying resources for faculty
- SK-12 student perception research project lessons learned
Participate

- CAEP State Clinic – join us in DC in September before CAEPCon and send us ideas for topics you want covered: Matt.Vanover@caepnet.org
- Volunteer and/or tap volunteers for positions critical to accreditation such as site visitors – call will be released in early 2018
- Contact for research collaborations: Jennifer.Carinci@caepnet.org

- Call for Book Chapter Proposals:
  - Linking Teacher Preparation Program Design and Implementation to Outcomes for Teachers and Students
360° approach to leveraging data for P-12 student learning

- Relevant actionable data about P-12 students help the P-12 enterprise understand...
  - What works?
  - What doesn’t?
  - Under what circumstances?

- Who cares? Who makes up the 360°?
  - States and USED
  - P-12 districts, schools, and teachers
  - Higher education, which prepares P-12 teachers AND receives P-12 graduates
  - Parents, the general public, communities, businesses
  - Professional associations and policy/advocacy groups
  - Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation
    - How can we pursue that vision without data? Help us help you!
360° approach to leveraging data for P-12 student learning

- I have been in most of these roles in one way or another, so to some degree I understand the **benefits** and **burdens** of generating and using data.
  - Teacher—classroom teacher and district specialist
  - Educator Preparation Provider faculty member and program director
  - Director of Educator Preparation at Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board
  - Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)
    - Chair, Accreditation Council
    - Member, Board of Directors and Board Executive Committee
- In each of these roles I rely/relied on others to generate and share relevant actionable data to help me do my job better.
  - Teachers can be more effective if we have relevant actionable data.
  - EPPs can prepare more effective teachers if they have relevant actionable data.
  - CAEP can apply standards more effectively if we & EPPs have relevant actionable data.
How could you benefit from EPP Accountability?

• It’s generally accepted—I think—that multiple entities share accountability for much of what happens in P-12 schools.
  - No single entity controls all the variables, so shared accountability makes sense.
  - We don’t even know what “all” the variables are in education, but we know some keys.
  - Sharing accountability is scary, but it can foster necessary urgency and cooperation.
  - Explicit shared accountability is common in aspects of law, medicine, and other fields.

• CAEP’s definition of shared accountability promotes P-12 learning
  - A policy for holding Educator Preparation Providers (EPPs), P-12 schools and teachers mutually responsible for students’ and candidates’ learning and academic progress.
  - Need interoperability that protects privacy and makes all data more useful.
  - Can maximize utility while minimizing costs and time wasted on duplication.
  - Ideally, we need portable data across time and places, because people move around.
Is the benefit worth the burden?

• Simply put, in a 360° system, it’s a “help us help you” situation.
  ▪ In this case, “us” = CAEP and “you” = any other P-12 role. #HelpUsHelpYou
  ▪ You can help CAEP hold EPPs to our standards, which were developed by stakeholder groups like those represented here to raise the bar for educator preparation.
  ▪ Stronger EPPs produce stronger teachers, so it’s a win-win-win-win-win.

• ESSA is a great opportunity for states to develop/enhance systems and expertise to generate high quality data that inform our understanding of student learning and how teachers and their EPPs contribute to it.
  ▪ Our focus today is on CAEP Standard 4, but we are interested in broader issues, too.
    • How much of a teacher’s teaching effectiveness is the result of his/her ed prep program?
    • What variables account for the rest of it? Are they variables we can influence?
  ▪ Our email addresses are included in this presentation, so if you really want to go deep on this or get involved, contact us. Please.
CAEP Standard 4, Program Impact

- The provider demonstrates the impact of its completers on P-12 student learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools, and the satisfaction of its completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.
CAEP Standard 4, Program Impact

• Impact on P-12 Student Learning and Development:
   4.1 The provider documents, using multiple measures, that program completers contribute to an expected level of student-learning growth. Multiple measures shall include all available growth measures (including value-added measures, student-growth percentiles, and student learning and development objectives) required by the state for its teachers and available to educator preparation providers, other state-supported P-12 impact measures, and any other measures employed by the provider.

• Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness:
   4.2 The provider demonstrates, through structured validated observation instruments and/or student surveys, that completers effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve.
CAEP Standard 4, Program Impact

• Satisfaction of Employers:
  ▪ 4.3. The provider demonstrates, using measures that result in valid and reliable data and including employment milestones such as promotion and retention, that employers are satisfied with the completers’ preparation for their assigned responsibilities in working with P-12 students.

• Satisfaction of Completers:
  ▪ 4.4 The provider demonstrates, using measures that result in valid and reliable data, that program completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job, and that the preparation was effective.
CAEP Standard 4, Program Impact

• Who has what data, and will they share it?
   Some schools, districts, and states have very little usable data to share.
   Some schools, districts, and states have usable data but cannot share it.
   Some have only a little usable data but they share with they have.
   Some have a lot of usable data and share it effectively.

• To help us help you, we need more “have a lot of usable data and share it.”
   Legal barriers, resource issues, and capacity issues present challenges, but the benefits of a more effective teaching force outweigh the burdens.
   We believe you can help us break down some of those barriers.

• This is not uncharted water: we can learn from entities, e.g., states, who have already navigated these waters (mostly) successfully.
Ky Educator Preparation Accountability System: KEPAS

- Collection of measures facilitates evaluation of EPSB-accredited EPPs’ performance. Looks at both provider- and program-level data.
- Uses data from EPSB certification, admissions & exit, and educator assignment systems, and data from KDE system to produce aggregated data views.
  - Tells us who teaches what to whom where. We get only de-identified aggregate data.
  - Unique identifiers make a lot of this possible. Ky has been at this for quite a few years.
- Data are stored on the Ky Center for Education and Workforce Statistics system, then used by various software systems to generate charts, tables, etc.
  - Display products are available on the KCEWS system. kcews.ky.gov
- Used by EPSB Division of Educator Preparation & EPPs to make judgments about program performance & to recommend program improvements.
KEPAS

- Only Kentucky EPP data at this time
- Beginning with initial certification programs
- Start with what you have. Current KEPAS reports include:
  - Labor Market Share
    - Total # teachers employed in district by provider and by academic year
    - Proportionate share of teachers employed in each district by provider
  - Cohort Distribution (How many admitted candidates in which fields, etc.)
  - Admissions and Exits
  - Program Completers (not same as exits)
  - Average Admission GPA (Kentucky has a minimum 2.75 or 3.0 on most recent 30 hrs.)
  - Long-term Praxis pass rates
  - First-time Praxis pass rates
## New Teacher Survey: Implementation of State Standards

### Total Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Items Answered</th>
<th>3,690</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>199,253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Response

- **Excellent**: 42%
- **Good**: 48%
- **Fair**: 1%
- **Poor**: 9%

### Standard 1: The Teacher Demonstrates Applied Content Knowledge

- **Student/Intern teacher communicates concepts, processes, and knowledge.**
  - Respondent: 39%
  - Program: 57%

- **Student/Intern teacher connects content to life experiences of students.**
  - Respondent: 42%
  - Program: 51%

- **Student/Intern teacher demonstrates instructional strategies that are appropriate for content and context.**
  - Respondent: 39%
  - Program: 55%

- **Student/Intern teacher guides students to understand content from various perspectives.**
  - Respondent: 44%
  - Program: 48%

- **Student/Intern teacher identifies and addresses students' misconceptions of content.**
  - Respondent: 46%
  - Program: 45%

### Standard 2: The Teacher Designs and Plans Instruction

- **Student/Intern teacher develops significant objectives aligned with standards.**
  - Respondent: 37%
  - Program: 57%

- **Student/Intern teacher plans assessments to guide instruction and measure learning objectives.**
  - Respondent: 42%
  - Program: 47%

- **Student/Intern teacher plans instructional strategies and activities that address learning objectives.**
  - Respondent: 40%
  - Program: 60%
If you can’t come up with all that, where to start?

• Based on experience, the easiest place to start is probably with something like Kentucky’s New Teacher Survey.

• Sent to student teachers, cooperating teachers, first-year teachers (1st year = Ky Teacher Internship Program), resource teachers (work with interns), principals.
  - Same or similar questions across groups and over time.
  - Easy to spot trends and go to the source.

• Aggregate data is publicly available at epsb.ky.gov under Data and Research; newest version is housed at KCEWS.
  - Kentucky’s questions aren’t copyrighted, so….
  - Other states have similar surveys; data availability varies.
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