

**FEEDBACK NEEDED FOR  
POTENTIAL MEASURES TO BE PROVIDED BY THE STATE  
THAT MEET NEW CAEP REQUIREMENTS (10.19.15)**

*Directions: For teacher preparation programs to be nationally accredited by the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation in the future, they will need to provide additional types of evidence and show how they are using the evidence to improve the quality of their programs and the effectiveness of their completers. Recently seven higher education representatives from Louisiana participated in CAEP Site Visitor Training over a two-month time period and met on October 6, 2015 to identify types of measures that could be collected at the State level in Louisiana to help ALL teacher preparation programs possess important data to address the CAEP Standards. The data could be reported to the public on an annual basis, and individual programs could then focus their campus attention on working with districts to implement their programs and collect other relevant evidence that are specific to their partnerships. Additional information about the standards and types of evidence can be found at the following URL on pages 88-114 in the CAEP Accreditation Manual.*

<http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/caep-accreditation-resources>

*Please examine the following information and use page 10 of this document to provide feedback about whether the types of evidence identified on pages 1-2 or other types of evidence should be collected at the State level for all institutions and reported in A Teacher Preparation Data Dashboard or other document (e.g., Teacher Preparation Quality Report).*

CAEP STANDARDS	EVIDENCE
<p><b>Standard 1. Content and Pedagogical Knowledge (Candidates)</b> The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Observation Scores</b> (University selects one of the following: Compass Professional Practice Assessment; Danielson; TAP)</li> <li>• <b>Praxis Content Assessment Passage Rates</b></li> <li>• <b>Praxis Professional Knowledge Assessment Passage Rates</b></li> <li>• <b>Candidate Completer Survey Ratings</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>Standard 2. Clinical Partnerships and Practice</b> The provider ensures that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to demonstrate positive impact on all P-12 students' learning and development.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Clinical Educator Survey Ratings of Preparation Program</b></li> <li>• <b>Candidates Survey of Clinical Educators</b></li> <li>• <b>Clinical Experiences in High Need Schools</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>Standard 3. Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity (Candidate)</b> The provider demonstrates that the quality of candidates is a continuing and purposeful part of its responsibility from recruitment, at admission, through the progression of courses and clinical experiences, and to decisions that completers are prepared to teach effectively and are recommended for certification. The provider demonstrates that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation in all phases of the program. This process is ultimately determined by a program's meeting of Standard 4.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Praxis Skills Assessment Passage Rate</b></li> <li>• <b>ACT/SAT</b> (Mean and % in top 50%/40%/33%)</li> <li>• <b>GPA of candidates entering the program</b> (Mean, median, range, and % below 3.0)</li> <li>• <b>GPA of candidates completing the program</b> (Mean, median, range, and % below 3.0)</li> <li>• <b>Candidate completers in high-need subject areas</b></li> <li>• <b>Completer rate of candidates starting and completing the program</b></li> <li>• <b>Minority candidate completers</b></li> </ul>

**FEEDBACK NEEDED FOR  
POTENTIAL MEASURES TO BE PROVIDED BY THE STATE  
THAT MEET NEW CAEP REQUIREMENTS (CONT'D.)**

<b>CAEP STANDARDS</b>	<b>MEASURES</b>
<p><b>Standard 4. Program Impact (Completer &amp; Employer)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Compass Professional Practice</b> (Mean and % in 4 performance levels)</li> <li>• <b>Compass Student Outcome</b> (Mean and % within 4 effectiveness levels)</li> <li>• <b>Compass Final Evaluation</b> (Mean and % within 4 effectiveness levels)</li> <li>• <b>Value-Added Scores (Grades 4-8 Only New Teachers)</b> (Mean and % within 4 effectiveness levels for Composite and each content area for math, language arts, science, and social studies)</li> <li>• <b>First Year Teacher Survey Ratings</b></li> <li>• <b>Employer Survey Ratings</b></li> <li>• <b>Attainment of State Licensure Requirements</b></li> <li>• <b>Attainment of Level 1 License of Cohort Completers</b></li> <li>• <b>Attainment of Level 2 License of Completers</b></li> <li>• <b>Cohort Employment of Cohort Completers Within One Year After Program Completion</b></li> <li>• <b>Retention of Cohort Completers After One to Five Years of Teaching</b></li> <li>• <b>Cohort Completers Who Teach in High-Need Subject Areas During First Year of Teaching</b></li> <li>• <b>Student Loan Default Rate</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>Standard 5. Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement (All)</b> The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.</p>	<p><b>All of the above dashboard data plus additional campus data</b></p>

**XXXXXXX UNIVERSITY**  
**DRAFT TEACHER PREPARATION QUALITY REPORT**

*Directions: The public currently has no way to know if information provided in the current Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Dashboard reflects effectiveness. The college of education deans/heads are currently in discussions with the Board of Regents about creating a Teacher Preparation Quality Report for public universities that would help to better define effectiveness levels. The following draft document has been developed to obtain input from faculty, district personnel, and other stakeholders regarding relevant types of evidence that are aligned to national CAEP Standards and State expectations. Please examine the information on pages 3-9 and use the document on page 10 to provide feedback by November 6, 2015. In particular, please examine the levels of effectiveness and provide feedback if the levels are appropriate or should be different. All feedback will be reviewed by a small committee and discussed by the college of education deans/heads.*

**A. PURPOSE**

The primary purpose of the Teacher Preparation Quality Report is to provide evidence to verify that public universities in Louisiana are meeting expectations as they prepare and support teacher candidates and new teachers who demonstrate knowledge and skills to successfully teach PK-12 students who are college- and career-ready.

**B. ASPECTS OF TEACHER PREPARATION THAT MATTER THE MOST**

The five aspects of teacher preparation that have been identified as being the most important are the following:

- Program Innovation
- Candidate Selection
- Knowledge and Skills for Teaching
- Performance as Classroom Teachers
- Program Productivity and Alignment to State Needs

**C. TEACHER PREPARATION QUALITY REPORT**

**1. OVERALL PERFORMANCE:**

\_\_\_% of the performance indicators were at or above expectations for teacher preparation programs.

**2. PERFORMANCE SUMMARY**

<i>Important Aspects of Teacher Preparation</i>	<i>Attainment of Expectations</i>		
	<i>Further Development Needed</i>	<i>Meets Expectations</i>	<i>Above Expectations</i>
<i>PROGRAM INNOVATION</i>			
<i>CANDIDATE SELECTION</i>			
<i>ACADEMIC STRENGTH</i>			
<i>PERFORMANCE AS CLASSROOM TEACHERS</i>			
<i>PROGRAM PRODUCTIVITY AND ALIGNMENT TO STATE NEEDS</i>			

**XXX UNIVERSITY**  
**TEACHER PREPARATION QUALITY REPORT (CONT'D.)**

**3. RANGES OF PERFORMANCE FOR ATTAINMENT OF EXPECTATIONS**

<i>Important Aspects of Teacher Preparation</i>		<i>Performance Indicators</i>	<i>Ranges of Performance</i>	<i>Attainment of Expectations</i>
<b>1<sup>st</sup> PROGRAM INNOVATION</b>	<i>University/District Partnerships External Grant Funds</i>	<i>Innovative new programs being implemented (N)</i>	3 or More	Above Expectations
			1-2	Meets Expectations
			None	Further Development Needed
		<i>External grant funds (N)</i>	3 or More	Above Expectations
			1-2	Meets Expectations
			None	Further Development Needed
		<i>Endowed Chairs and/or Professorships for Education (N)</i>	3 or More	Above Expectations
			1-2	Meets Expectations
			None	Further Development Needed

<i>Important Aspects of Teacher Preparation</i>		<i>Performance Indicators</i>	<i>Ranges of Performance</i>	<i>Attainment of Expectations</i>	
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> CANDIDATE SELECTION</b>	<b>Academic Strength</b>	<i>State Licensure Skills Assessment passage rates of cohort candidates (CAEP) (%)</i>	90-100%	Above Expectations	
			80-89%	Meets Expectations	
			Below 80%	Further Development Needed	
		<i>GPA of cohort candidates who started the program (CAEP) (Median)</i>	3.0 & Above	Above Expectations	
			2.5-2.9	Meets Expectations	
			Below 2.5	Further Development Needed	
		<i>GPA of cohort candidates who successfully completed all program requirements (CAEP) (Median)</i>	3.0 & Above	Above Expectations	
			2.5-2.9	Meets Expectations	
			Below 2.5	Further Development Needed	
		<i>Composite ACT score for cohort candidates who started the program (CAEP) (Mean)</i>	Above 25	Above Expectations	
			20-25	Meets Expectations	
			Below 20	Further Development Needed	
		<i>Completion rate of cohort candidates who started and completed the program (CAEP) (%)</i>	90% & Above	Above Expectations	
			80-89%	Meets Expectations	
			Below 80%	Further Development Needed	
		<b>Candidates/Completer Diversity</b>	<i>Increase in number of candidates who completed the program when compared to baseline (%)</i>	15% and above	Above Expectations
				-5% to 14%	Meets Expectations
				Below -5%	Further Development Needed
<i>Minority cohort candidates completing the program compared to white candidates (%)</i>	15% & Above		Above Expectations		
	5-14%		Meets Expectations		
	Below 5%		Further Development Needed		

<i>Important Aspects of Teacher Preparation</i>	<i>Performance Indicators</i>	<i>Ranges of Performance</i>	<i>Attainment of Expectations</i>	
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS FOR TEACHING OF CANDIDATES COMPLETING PROGRAMS</b>	<b>Knowledge</b>	<i>State Licensure Content Assessment</i> passage rates of cohort candidates (CAEP) (%)	90-100%	Above Expectations
			80-89%	Meets Expectations
			Below 80%	Further Development Needed
		<i>State Licensure Professional Knowledge Assessment</i> passage rates of cohort candidates (CAEP) (%)	90-100%	Above Expectations
			80-89%	Meets Expectations
			Below 80%	Further Development Needed
	<b>Clinical Experiences</b>	<i>Observation rating</i> of cohort candidates on scale (e.g., Compass, TAP, Danielson) completed by PK-12 Clinical Educator (CAEP) (Mean)	3.0 and Above	Above Expectations
			2.0 to 2.9	Meets Expectations
			Below 3.0	Further Development Needed
		<i>Clinical Educators' Survey ratings</i> of preparation program (4-Point Scale) (CAEP) (Mean)	3.0 and Above	Above Expectations
			2.0 to 2.9	Meets Expectations
			Below 3.0	Further Development Needed
		<i>Cohort Candidates' Survey of Clinical Educators</i> (4-Point Scale) (CAEP) (Mean)	3.0 and Above	Above Expectations
			2.0 to 2.9	Meets Expectations
			Below 3.0	Further Development Needed
		<i>Participation of candidates in clinical experiences in high need schools</i> (%)	100%	Above Expectations
			80-90%	Meets Expectations
			Below 80%	Further Development Needed
	<b>Licensure Requirements</b>	<i>State licensure requirement attainment</i> of cohort completers (CAEP) (%)	90-100%	Above Expectations
			80-89%	Meets Expectations
			Below 80%	Further Development Needed
<b>Candidate Completer Rating</b>	<i>Cohort Candidate Completer Survey ratings of program</i> (4-Point Scale) (CAEP) (Mean)	3.6-4.0	Above Expectations	
		3.0 – 3.5	Meets Expectations	
		Below 3.5	Further Development Needed	

<b>Important Aspects of Teacher Preparation</b>		<b>Performance Indicators</b>	<b>Ranges of Performance</b>	<b>Attainment of Expectations</b>
<b>4<sup>th</sup> PERFORMANCE AS CLASSROOM TEACHERS</b>	<b>Overall Evaluation</b>	<i>Compass Final Evaluation scores of first and second year teachers (CAEP) (Mean)</i>	3.0 and Above	Above Expectations
			2.0 to 2.9	Meets Expectations
			Below 2.0	Further Development Needed
		<i>Effective Proficient and Highly Effective Compass Final Evaluation ratings of first and second year teachers (CAEP) (%)</i>	60-100%	Above Expectations
			30-59%	Meets Expectations
			Below 30%	Further Development Needed
	<b>Impact on K-12 Students</b>	<i>Compass Outcome Score (CAEP) Scores of First and Second Year Teachers (CAEP) (Mean)</i>	3.0 and Above	Above Expectations
			2.0 to 2.9	Meets Expectations
			Below 2.0	Further Development Needed
		<i>Effective Proficient and Highly Effective Compass Outcome ratings of first and second year teachers (CAEP) (%)</i>	60-100%	Above Expectations
			30-59%	Meets Expectations
			Below 30%	Further Development Needed
		<i>Composite Value-Added Scores of new teachers (CAEP) (Means)</i>	Above 1.0	Above Expectations
			-5.0 to 1.0	Meets Expectations
			Below -5.0	Further Development Needed
		<i>Effective Proficient and Highly Effective Composite Value-Added Score ratings of first and second year teachers (CAEP) (%)</i>	60-100%	Above Expectations
			30-59%	Meets Expectations
			Below 30%	Further Development Needed
		<i>Mathematics Value-Added Scores of new teachers (CAEP) (Means)</i>	Above 1.0	Above Expectations
			-5.0 to 1.0	Meets Expectations
Below -5.0			Further Development Needed	
<i>Effective Proficient and Highly Effective Mathematics Value-Added Score ratings of first and second year teachers (CAEP) (%)</i>		60-100%	Above Expectations	
		30-59%	Meets Expectations	
		Below 30%	Further Development Needed	
<i>Science Value-Added Scores of new teachers (CAEP) (Means)</i>		Above 1.0	Above Expectations	
		-5.0 to 1.0	Meets Expectations	
		Below -5.0	Further Development Needed	
<i>Effective Proficient and Highly Effective Science Value-Added Score ratings of first and second year teachers (CAEP) (%)</i>		60-100%	Above Expectations	
		30-59%	Meets Expectations	
		Below 30%	Further Development Needed	
<i>Social Studies Value-Added Scores of new teachers (CAEP) (Means)</i>	Above 1.0	Above Expectations		
	-5.0 to 1.0	Meets Expectations		
	Below -5.0	Further Development Needed		

<b>Important Aspects of Teacher Preparation</b>		<b>Performance Indicators</b>	<b>Ranges of Performance</b>	<b>Attainment of Expectations</b>
<b>4<sup>th</sup> PERFORMANCE AS CLASSROOM TEACHERS (CONT'D.)</b>	<b>Impact on K-12 Students (Cont'd.)</b>	<i>Effective Proficient and Highly Effective Social Studies Value-Added Score ratings of first and second year teachers (CAEP) (%)</i>	60-100%	Above Expectations
			30-59%	Meets Expectations
			Below 30%	Further Development Needed
		<i>Language Arts Value-Added Scores of new teachers (CAEP) (Means)</i>	Above 1.0	Above Expectations
			-5.0 to 1.0	Meets Expectations
			Below -5.0	Further Development Needed
		<i>Effective Proficient and Highly Effective Language Arts Value-Added Score ratings of first and second year teachers (CAEP) (%)</i>	60-100%	Above Expectations
			30-59%	Meets Expectations
			Below 30%	Further Development Needed
	<b>Demonstrated Teaching Skills</b>	<i>Compass Professional Practices score of first and second year teachers (CAEP) (Mean)</i>	3.0 and Above	Above Expectations
			2.0 to 2.9	Meets Expectations
			Below 2.0	Further Development Needed
		<i>Effective Proficient and Highly Effective Compass Professional Practices ratings of first and second year teachers (CAEP) (%)</i>	60-100%	Above Expectations
			30-59%	Meets Expectations
			Below 30%	Further Development Needed
	<b>New Teacher/ Employer Rating</b>	<i>New Teacher Survey ratings of teacher preparation programs (4 Point Scale) (CAEP) (Mean)</i>	3.6 – 4.0	Above Expectations
			3.0 – 3.5	Meets Expectations
			Below 3.5	Further Development Needed
<i>Employer Survey of first year teachers' preparation programs (4 Point Scale) (CAEP) (Mean)</i>		3.6-4.0	Above Expectations	
		3.0 – 3.5	Meets Expectations	
		Below 3.5	Further Development Needed	

<b>Important Aspects of Teacher Preparation</b>		<b>Performance Indicators</b>	<b>Ranges of Performance</b>	<b>Attainment of Expectations</b>
<b>5<sup>th</sup> PROGRAM PRODUCTIVITY AND ALIGNMENT TO STATE NEEDS</b>	<b>Entry and Persistence in Teaching</b>	<i>[Insert Year] Cohort completers that obtained a <b>Level 1 License</b> to teach in Louisiana within a year after completing their program (CAEP) (%)</i>	70-100%	Above Expectations
			50-69%	Meets Expectations
			Below 50%	Further Development Needed
		<i>[Insert Year] Cohort completers that <b>began teaching</b> in public schools in Louisiana within a year after completing their program (CAEP) (%)</i>	70-100%	Above Expectations
			50-69%	Meets Expectations
			Below 50%	Further Development Needed
		<i>[Insert Year] Cohort completers who taught in Louisiana and obtained a <b>Level 2 License</b> by the end of their third year of teaching (CAEP) (%)</i>	90-100%	Above Expectations
			80-90%	Meets Expectations
			Below 80%	Further Development Needed
	<i>[Insert Year] Cohort completers that were <b>retained after five years</b> of teaching in public schools in Louisiana (CAEP)</i>	60-100%	Above Expectations	
		40-59%	Meets Expectations	
		Below 40%	Further Development Needed	
	<b>Placement and Persistence in High Need Schools</b>	<i>[Insert Year] Cohort completers with degrees in High-Need Subjects who <b>taught in High Need Subjects</b> during the first year of teaching (%)</i>	75-100%	Above Expectations
			50 -74%	Meets Expectations
			Below 50%	Further Development Needed
<b>Student Loan Default Rate</b>	<i>[Insert Year] Student Loan Default Rate(CAEP)</i>	0-5%	Above Expectations	
		6-10%	Meets Expectations	
		Above 10%	Further Development Needed	

**D. AT-RISK AND LOW PERFORMING RATINGS FOR TITLE II REPORTING FOR USDE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT**

All states must assign labels of “At-Risk” and “Low Performing” to comply with the USDE for the Higher Education Act. The BoR has adopted the use of licensure rates to identify “At-Risk” and “Low Performing” public universities. Until the Louisiana Department of Education develops accountability requirements for all teacher preparation programs in the State, the following labels would be assigned to public universities based upon multiple measures instead of just one measure for reporting to the USDE for the Higher Education Act.

**1. At-Risk Rating**

Criteria: The following percentage of indicators are rated as “Further Development Needed:” [To be determined] %

**2. Low Performing**

Criteria: After two years of being classified as “At-Risk,” the following percentage of indicators are listed as “Further Development Needed:” [To be determined] %

**3. Closure or Reconstitution of Program**

Criteria: After two years of being classified as “Low Performing,” improvements have not been demonstrated in the following percentage of the areas classified as “Further Development Needed” for the original “At-Risk” rating: [To be determined] %

**E. OTHER PERFORMANCE LEVELS**

Discussions need to occur regarding other performance levels with the awareness that the USDE may be requiring the identification of additional performance levels in the near future.

DRAFT

**FEEDBACK FORM  
FOR POTENTIAL MEASURES TO BE PROVIDED BY THE STATE  
AND TEACHER PREPARATION QUALITY REPORT**

**Directions:** Please review the information on pages 1-9 and provide responses to the following questions. Please submit all feedback by November 6, 2015 to [Jeanne.burns@la.gov](mailto:Jeanne.burns@la.gov).

<b>Name of Person:</b>	
<b>Institution/District/Organization:</b>	

- 1. Please indicate if the types of evidence listed on pages 1-2 to address the CAEP standards would assist your institution if collected by the State and reported on an annual basis to the public. If the evidence is not appropriate, please identify what you would revise, add, or delete.**
  
- 2. Please indicate if the types of evidence listed on pages 4-9 to address national CAEP and state expectations would assist your institution if collected by the State and reported on an annual basis to the public. If the evidence is not appropriate, please identify what you would revise, add, or delete. Also, please examine the “Ranges of Performance” and identify any changes that you would recommend.**
  
- 3. Please examine Section “D” of the document on page 9 that addresses “At-Risk” and “Low-Performing” classifications that must be reported to the USDE each year to comply with the Higher Education Act. Please indicate if it would be appropriate to use a transparent process that identifies percentage of Performance that fall within the “Further Development Needed” to identify “At-Risk” and “Low-Performing” programs. If yes, what would be appropriate percentages? If not, what would be a more appropriate way to identify “At-Risk” and “Low Performing” programs that the public would clearly understand? (Note: This will no longer be needed for public universities once the State identifies a process that is used for all teacher preparation programs in Louisiana.)**