



**REVISED
LOUISIANA TEACHER PREPARATION
ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM**

SEPTEMBER 23, 2013

LOUISIANA TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM OVERVIEW

In compliance with the Higher Education Act, Louisiana created a Teacher Preparation Accountability System to assess the performance of teacher preparation programs within the state. During the first phase (2001-2002) of the accountability system, the performance of the regular and alternate certification students on the state teachers' licensure examination (PRAXIS) was assessed. During subsequent phases (2002-2003, 2003-04, and 2004-05), a Quantity Index (e.g., quantity of program completers at each institution; quantity of program completers in teacher shortage areas) and an Institutional Index (e.g., performance of regular and alternate certification students on the state teachers' Praxis examinations; satisfaction ratings by regular program completers during their first year of teaching) were used to calculate a Teacher Preparation Performance Score for each institution. Programs were labeled as Exemplary, High Performing, Satisfactory, At-Risk, or Low Performing based upon their Teacher Preparation Performance Scores. A third index was identified for future implementation that would be based upon growth of achievement of students taught by new teachers who completed teacher preparation programs. The purpose of this accountability system was to clearly demonstrate to the public that all teacher preparation programs in Louisiana were working diligently to produce quality teachers who worked effectively with PK-12 students. During 2005-06, it was not possible to implement the Teacher Preparation Accountability System due to the closure of programs and schools in Louisiana and the inability to collect data from displaced teachers and mentors due to Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita. A decision was made for the Blue Ribbon Commission for Educational Excellence to use the time to revise the Teacher Preparation Accountability System. The Blue Ribbon Commission met during 2006-07 and 2008-09 to identify revisions for the accountability system and to discuss ways to integrate growth of student achievement into the system.

During the same time period, the Louisiana Board of Regents provided funding for Dr. George Noell (Louisiana State University and A&M College) to develop a Value-Added Teacher Preparation Assessment Model for future integration into the Teacher Preparation Accountability System. The model was piloted during 2003-04, 2004-05, and 2005-06. The value-added results and names of programs were released for the first time during fall 2007 for all redesigned teacher preparation programs that had 25 or more teachers with scores in specific content areas. Value-added results were released for an increasing number of teacher preparation programs during 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10. Dr. George Noell then worked within the Louisiana Department of Education to help develop a value-added teacher evaluation model that was piloted during 2009-10 and 2010-11. The State made a decision to adopt the Louisiana Department of Education's new value-added teacher evaluation model to evaluate teacher preparation programs during fall 2011. Value-added scores for teacher preparation programs based upon the new value-added model were released to the public for 2009-10 and 2010-11 new teachers. The new value-added model was used in tested grades as one of multiple measures to calculate overall teacher and leader evaluation scores as part of the Compass teacher and leader evaluation system during 2012-13.

As a result of changes occurring to teacher evaluation in Louisiana, a decision was made to report data about teacher preparation programs to the public but to delay final decisions about a Teacher Preparation Accountability System until the new teacher evaluation system was implemented. The Louisiana Department of Education, Louisiana Board of Regents, and stakeholders will now work together during 2013-2015 to develop a comprehensive teacher preparation evaluation system that will address recommendations identified in a new report that has been disseminated by the Council of Chief State School Officers. To comply with requirements of the Higher Education Act, a decision has been made to only use state licensure assessment performance as a measure to identify "At-Risk" and "Low Performing" teacher preparation programs until the new system is developed. Once the new multi-tiered system is developed, the Louisiana Board of Regents and Louisiana Board of Elementary and Secondary Education will be asked to adopt policies that will impact all teacher preparation programs in Louisiana.

TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

QUESTIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS								
<p>Indicators</p> <p>1. What indicators should be used to determine if teacher preparation programs have demonstrated growth?</p>	<p>The following indicators should be used to determine if teacher preparation programs have demonstrated growth.</p> <p>Institutional Performance:</p> <p>P1 Percentage of program completers who took PRAXIS subtests and passed the subtests.</p> <p>Teacher Quantity:</p> <p><i>Note: New indicators being identified</i></p> <p>Growth in Student Achievement:</p> <p><i>Note: New indicators being identified.</i></p>								
<p>Phase-in Schedule of Indicators</p> <p>2. When will the indicators be integrated into the formula to calculate Teacher Preparation Performance Scores?</p>	<p>2012-13 Percentage of program completers who took PRAXIS subtests and passed the subtests. (2011-12 traditional and alternative program completers and into the future)</p> <p>2013-15 Identification of new indicators and integration of the indicators into a system that is approved by the Louisiana Board of Regents and Louisiana Board of Elementary and Secondary Education</p>								
<p>Institutional Performance Labels</p> <p>3. How will the Institutional Performance labels be determined?</p>	<p>At-Risk and Low-Performing labels to address requirements for the Higher Education Act will be assigned to institutions based upon the overall percentage of program completers who passed the PRAXIS examinations. The percentages and corresponding labels are the following:</p> <table style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;"><i>Percentages</i></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><i>Labels</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">87-100%</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><i>No label</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">80-86%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">At-Risk</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">0%-79%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Low Performing</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<i>Percentages</i>	<i>Labels</i>	87-100%	<i>No label</i>	80-86%	At-Risk	0%-79%	Low Performing
<i>Percentages</i>	<i>Labels</i>								
87-100%	<i>No label</i>								
80-86%	At-Risk								
0%-79%	Low Performing								
<p>Less Than 10 Program Completers</p> <p>4. Will data be used if there are less than 10 program completers?</p>	<p>If data are available for less than 10 program completers at an institution during a given year, two or more consecutive years of data will be used to determine an average score.</p>								

TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM (CONT' D)

QUESTIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<p>Corrective Actions</p> <p>5. What will happen when a university obtains an "At-risk Teacher Preparation Program" label or a "Low Performing Teacher Preparation Program" label?</p> <p>(NOTE: Movement to a lower level will be based upon cumulative years. Thus, if a university labeled as "At-risk" spends one year in Level 1, moves to "Satisfactory" the next year, moves back to "At-risk" the next, and does not reach "Satisfactory" the next year, the university will move to Level 2 corrective action due to the fact that it had an "At-risk" label for a total of two years.)</p> <p>* Board of Regents will compile a list of experts to work with the programs. The programs may select from the list or hire another expert with similar expertise.</p>	<p>Programs should receive corrective actions if they attain Teacher Preparation Performance Scores that result in labels of "At-risk" or "Low Performing". Types of corrective actions are the following.</p> <p><i>For At-risk Teacher Preparation Programs Only</i></p> <p><i>Level 1:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Programs receive an "At-risk" label for the U.S. Department of Education. b. Programs obtain an external expert to work with the PK-16+ Councils to conduct a rigorous program review and identify actions to improve the teacher preparation program.* c. Programs report recommended actions to improve the teacher preparation program to the public. d. Programs report progress in improving the teacher preparation program to the public on an annual basis. e. Programs have two years to reach a "Satisfactory" level. Programs that fail to demonstrate growth will move to Level 2 corrective actions. <p><i>Level 2:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Programs receive an "At-risk" label for the U.S. Department of Education. b. Board of Regents refuse to approve new university programs in colleges that offer general education and major courses to teacher education majors. c. Board of Elementary and Secondary Education assign private programs a "probationary status" as part of the state approval process. d. Programs have one year to move to "Satisfactory" level. Programs that fail to demonstrate growth will move to Level 3 corrective actions. <p><i>For Low Performing Teacher Preparation Programs or At-Risk Teacher Preparation Programs that Fail to Demonstrate Growth During Level 2 Corrective Actions</i></p> <p><i>Level 3:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Programs receive a "Low Performing" label for the U.S. Department of Education. b. Programs are assigned an external team (funded by programs) to assist the program. c. Programs contact students to inform them of the status and plans to improve the teacher preparation program. d. Programs have two years to move to a "Satisfactory" level. (Note: Programs that have had an "At-risk" label for three years will have only one year to move to a "Satisfactory" level before moving to Level 4.) <p><i>Level 4:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Programs lose state approval of teacher preparation programs.

TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM (CONT'D)

QUESTIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<p><i>Non-approval</i></p> <p>6. What will happen once a university moves into Level 4 corrective action?</p>	<p>Once a university reaches Level 4 of the corrective actions, the program will no longer be approved by the state. If the university wishes to reconstitute the program, it may not submit a plan for a new program until a minimum of one year is spent planning the reconstituted program.</p> <p>Once a university loses its program approval, it may accept no new students into the teacher preparation program. Students already enrolled in the non-approved teacher preparation program may complete their program at the university and be employed in the state. A non-approved institution is expected to work with approved institutions and help students transfer credits to approved programs providing the students meet admission requirements at the approved programs.</p> <p>The performance of students from non-approved institutions who enter approved institutions during their final 30 hours will not be calculated into the Teacher Preparation Performance Score of the approved institutions.</p>
<p><i>Corrective Action - New Accountability Cycle</i></p> <p>7. Can institutions be given a second label of “At-Risk or “Low Performing” based upon new indicators if they are already in Corrective Action?</p>	<p>Institutions that enter into Corrective Action will have two years to address the accountability indicators and reach a Satisfactory level. These institutions will not be assigned an additional label and will not be required to address new accountability indicators until they have exited Corrective Action at the end of the two year time period.</p>
<p><i>Corrective Action - Exit in One Year</i></p> <p>8. What happens if institutions enter into Corrective Action and reach a “Satisfactory” or higher level in less than two years?</p>	<p>If a campus enters into Corrective Action and exits within a one year time period, the campus will have the “At-Risk” or “Low-Performing” label removed and exit Corrective Action. The campus will be given a one year grace period and assigned a label of “Transitional Teacher Preparation Program” for one year. Data for new indicators will be reported; however, the institution will not be held accountable for new indicators until the end of the second year.</p>