

Peering Around the Corner:

Analyzing State Efforts to Link Teachers to the Programs That Prepared Them

Ashley LiBetti Mitchel and Chad Aldeman



BELLWETHER
EDUCATION PARTNERS
IDEAS | PEOPLE | RESULTS



Table of Contents

Introduction	2
State Challenges and Trade-offs	4
Colorado	11
Delaware	13
Florida	16
Georgia	19
Louisiana	22
Massachusetts	26
New Jersey	29
North Carolina	31
Ohio	33
Rhode Island	36
Tennessee	39
Endnotes	42
Acknowledgments	44

Introduction

Schools increasingly rely on new teachers to staff their classrooms. A generation ago, the modal teacher had 15 years' teaching experience, meaning that if you asked teachers how many years they had taught, the most common answer would be 15. Today, the most common answer is five years.¹ And the proportion of teachers who are new to the field will only increase as the baby boomer generation retires. Some forecasts estimate that half of the nation's teachers could retire in the next 10 years.²

This demand for new teachers creates obvious challenges for the education field, but it also means that states have a unique opportunity to leverage their authority over teacher preparation and certification to raise the overall level of teacher quality and effectiveness.

States, programs, and schools have long focused on the inputs of teacher preparation — the rules for candidates and the preparation programs they attend — because inputs were thought to predict teacher effectiveness, and because they were often the best option available. But in the early 2000s, policymakers began trying to evaluate preparation programs on the basis of graduate outcomes.³ No longer would policymakers have to impose rules that were essentially best guesses about what would make an effective teacher; they could measure which teachers were effective and then use information about the teachers' training to shape policy decisions.

Louisiana and Tennessee were the first states to try out this idea. In 2000, Louisiana started looking at preparation programs through their outcomes data. Between 2003 and 2006, the state began linking preparation programs to the student-learning data of their recent completers, and made the data available to the public in 2007. Louisiana's work suggested that it was possible to discern program quality from completer outcomes. Tennessee began a similar initiative in

2007, when the state passed legislation that required an annual report on preparation program outcomes. Louisiana's and Tennessee's efforts laid the foundation for national interest in linking outcomes to preparation programs. U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan pushed to expand these models nationwide. The \$4.35 billion Race to the Top program prompted a number of states to begin linking programs to outcomes. Not all of the winning states promised teacher preparation reforms along the lines of Louisiana and Tennessee, but many of them did, including Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, Massachusetts, Ohio, and Rhode Island.

In 2011, the U.S. Department of Education took another step to encourage states to link preparation programs to outcomes. The department announced that it would begin the process of regulating Title II and Title IV of the Higher Education Act⁴ to address teacher-preparation accountability and reporting. Title II affects how states and institutions report on the quality of preparation programs and requires states to identify their low-performing programs. Title IV includes student-aid programs like TEACH Grants, a loan-forgiveness program for teachers attending “high-quality” preparation programs. During the rulemaking process, the department pushed to include completer outcomes in states’ definitions of program quality, and to use those definitions to determine which programs were “high-quality” in the context of TEACH Grants.

The regulation, which is still making its way toward a final rule, would require states to assess preparation programs on three performance outcomes: student learning (measured by student-growth or teacher-evaluation results); employment (placement and retention rates, especially in high-need schools); and survey outcomes (of completers and employers). Although the rule is pending, if the final rule looks like the proposed version, all states will be required to link completer outcomes to preparation programs, beginning in April 2019, and to report the data publicly.

Researchers are still debating how to define a successful preparation program, but preparation programs will never be able to improve unless states begin tracking results.

Researchers are still debating how to track results and define a successful preparation program, but preparation programs will never be able to improve unless states track their results. Measuring and publishing completer-outcomes data bolsters programs’ continuous improvement efforts, giving them deeper insights into the information they already have. Working with the data also builds technical capacity and allows researchers to study the policies of teacher-preparation programs and gauge their effectiveness over time. And in the absence of rigorous state accountability systems, public completer outcomes data give potential candidates and employers useful information that they can use to choose programs and hire teachers.

State policymakers considering this work would be wise to learn from early implementation efforts. This report reviews the challenges and trade-offs that states face in their efforts to link completer outcomes to preparation programs. After reviewing the challenges and trade-offs, the report looks at seven important questions for 11 states that have attempted to link outcomes to programs, based on the most recent information we could find.⁵ What follows is our distillation of those lessons and what policymakers can learn from these early adopters.

State Challenges and Trade-offs

States linking outcomes to programs use the outcomes in different ways: Few states differentiate programs by performance levels or use completer outcomes in their program-approval processes. Other states plan to use outcomes for program accountability. And every state we profile publicly reports completer data for transparency and continuous improvement purposes.

States that take on this work in the future should consider previous states' efforts and start by defining how they intend to use completer outcomes. This critical decision should inform how each state addresses the many challenges and trade-offs that will follow. Once states decide on their goals, they will face logistical, conceptual, and political challenges in linking outcomes to preparation programs. Logistical challenges include determining the minimum n-size, or sample size, that institutions must meet before their performance data are publicly reported. Conceptual challenges include figuring out if, and how, to use outcomes to differentiate programs by performance levels. And states are likely to encounter substantial political challenges for any outcomes they plan to use for program approval or transparency purposes.

Once states decide on their goals, they will face logistical, conceptual, and political challenges in linking outcomes to preparation programs.

Determining Program-Quality Measures

Early in this process, states must determine which measures of program quality they value. States will select different measures depending on what they're trying to achieve, but they generally choose to measure outcomes in four areas: teacher effectiveness, employment (such as placement and retention rates), certification and licensure, and employer

and completer satisfaction. States tracking outcomes for continuous improvement or transparency purposes will likely include a wide range of data to give programs and consumers as much information as possible. States using outcomes as part of the program-approval process have to carefully consider which outcomes they want to hold programs accountable for and may focus on fewer measures.

States determining which completer outcomes to measure must consider these trade-offs:

- Reporting a wide range of measures for transparency and continuous improvement purposes gives programs, consumers, and the state low-stakes information about completer performance.
- Tracking fewer measures, for any purpose, is less expensive and requires less capacity—from states to collect data and from programs to report data.
- Holding programs accountable for fewer measures sends the message that those measures are the most important. This can encourage programs to focus on only those measure while ignoring others, or to attempt to “game” the subset of selected measures.
- Holding programs accountable for many measures allows states to create a more rigorous accountability system, but this may become overly complicated or difficult for programs to navigate.

Defining the Sample of Completers

When measuring the percentage of completers, states must determine which completers to link back to programs and for what time period. Some completers follow a linear path: They start teaching soon after completing a preparation program and remain in the classroom for several years. In this scenario, it makes sense to link the completer’s outcomes to the preparation program that trained her.

Other scenarios are less clear. Some completers graduate from an undergraduate teaching program but then go on to earn a master’s degree before teaching. Others complete a preparation program but don’t immediately begin teaching. In some cases, completers don’t go directly from the program to teaching but do eventually teach. Which of these completers should be linked back to the preparation program, and how much responsibility does the program bear?

In each of these scenarios, states must also determine for how long after completion to track the graduates and hold programs accountable for completer outcomes.

States determining the sample of completers must consider these trade-offs:

- Excluding nonlinear completers may severely reduce the sample size of completers included in analyses or public reports.
- Including nonlinear completers may increase the sample size, but it adds a layer of complexity.
- Outcomes for linear completers link most directly to program quality and are easiest to justify to providers.
- Tracking completers for multiple years increases the number of observed completer outcomes and indicates how, or if, the completer improves over time. But research suggests that preparation effects fade over time, and it's unclear what outcomes can be reasonably attributed to a program after several years.

Minimum N-Size

States must determine the minimum n-size that can be reported or analyzed. In the context of teacher preparation, the n-size is the minimum number of program completers that can be included in a statistical analysis of program effectiveness. The larger the n-size, the more confident states can be that the results truly reflect the program and are not just random noise. Matt Kraft, an assistant professor of education at Brown University, estimates that an n-size of between 100 and 375 completers per program is the minimum number necessary to discern nonrandom differences among preparation programs.⁶

So a larger n-size is better from a statistical perspective, but working with a larger n-size is not always possible. As of November 2015, there were 26,589 teacher-preparation programs at 2,171 colleges, universities, and other providers across the country, meaning that the average institution offers about 12 distinct programs, many of which prepare very few educators each year.⁷ Certain types of outcomes may further limit the sample of completers. For example, only a small percentage of completers find and keep education jobs. And most states are limited to collecting data on completers who work at public schools within the state. Completers who teach at in-state private schools or at schools outside the state are excluded from the preparation program's observations, though efforts are underway to expand states' access to out-of-state data.

States can increase n-sizes by "rolling up" observations for multiple years of outcomes data and completers. A state looking at completer effectiveness, for example, could include multiple years of cohorts (for example, the graduates of 2012, 2013, and 2014) in its analysis and then collect its results over multiple years (2013, 2014, and 2015). In this way, a program would be responsible for the performance of its 2012 graduates in 2013, 2014, and 2015.

Another way to increase n-size is to roll up observations of “equivalent programs.” For example, instead of looking separately at the data for Spanish-, French-, German-, and Latin-language completers, a state might decide that the completers’ outcomes combined reflect the quality of an institution’s world languages programs. Several states have taken this further and not even looked at individual programs. Instead they focused on overall *institution-level* results.

States making n-size decisions must consider these trade-offs:

- A low minimum n-size may be inadequate for analysis and jeopardize completers’ privacy.
- A high minimum n-size may limit the state’s ability to share the data, and it may encourage providers to offer smaller programs with fewer completers so that it can avoid public reporting.
- Rolling up different data across years or programs may undermine any conclusions and reduce transparency for potential employers or candidates.

Programs vs. Institutions

States must decide whether they will report or analyze data at the program or at the institution level. Candidates enroll in an institution, for example, the College of Education at a public university, and complete one or more programs, such as a biology, physical education, or English program, that prepare them for subject-area certification.

States making program and institution decisions must consider these trade-offs:

- Linking outcomes to institutions produces a larger sample size of completers, making it more likely that the institution will surpass the minimum n-size requirements for accountability and public reporting.
- Institutions have authority over individual programs and may be better equipped to make structural changes on the basis of state feedback.
- Linking outcomes to programs allows for more precise reporting and more targeted feedback.
- The performance of specific programs can’t be masked by overall institution performance.

States must determine whether they will give programs summative ratings or place institutions into performance bands.

Program Differentiation

States must determine whether they will give programs summative ratings or place institutions into performance bands. If so, they must determine how they will set thresholds to differentiate among performance levels. Federal regulations require states to differentiate programs by at least four performance levels, but they allow states discretion in setting the thresholds for the performance bands.

States making program-differentiation decisions must consider these trade-offs:

- Most research on completer outcomes has found little meaningful variation between the quality of different preparation programs or institutions.
- Some research suggests that there are nonrandom differences in the tails of the distribution (the highest- and lowest-performing programs). Lessons from value-added teacher-evaluation efforts also suggest that there may be limited variability in the programs that are not the highest or lowest performing.
- If performance thresholds are too broad, programs will be lumped together; the thresholds will fail to distinguish the mid-level programs from the highest- and lowest-performing programs. This prevents state policymakers from rewarding top programs and supporting low performers, reduces incentives to improve, prevents other providers from identifying best practices, and limits information about program quality to potential employers or prospective students.
- States that decide to differentiate programs should be careful not to arbitrarily set inflexible performance thresholds and then force program performance to fit those thresholds.

Challenges with Specific Outcomes

States will also encounter issues when linking specific outcomes to preparation programs. Below, we outline some of the issues with measuring completer effectiveness, placement, and retention and with measuring completer and employer satisfaction.

Completer Effectiveness

Completer effectiveness measures how effective a completer is as the lead teacher of a classroom. States can measure completer effectiveness with three types of outcomes data: student learning, observations, or overall evaluation ratings. Student learning scores are generally measured using completers' value-added scores, which are based on student performance on standardized assessments. Observations are part of most districts' teacher-evaluation models. In most cases, a school administrator observes a teacher several times throughout the school year and rates her performance against a rubric. Evaluation ratings are completers' summative ratings on their district's teacher-evaluation models, which may include student learning; observations; and other elements, like levels of professionalism or family engagement.

States using completer-effectiveness data must consider these trade-offs:

- States that link student learning to programs, particularly for accountability purposes, are likely to experience the strongest pushback from providers. Opponents are critical of the heavy reliance on standardized assessments, and they question the quality of those assessments.
- Classroom-observation results are more politically palatable, but are often conducted inconsistently across school districts. Historically, the vast majority of teachers have received inflated evaluation ratings in systems that rely heavily on observation outcomes.
- Using overall effectiveness scores presents both sets of challenges mentioned above.
- States should also consider whether it's appropriate to link back to the preparation program other factors that may be included in a teacher's overall evaluation ratings, like levels of professionalism and family engagement.
- Most states can access effectiveness data only for completers who are employed in state.

Completer Placement and Retention

Completer placement measures the completer's employment outcomes. Placement outcomes can include three types of measures: employment, subject-area employment, and school employment. Employment measures whether the completer is employed in a school, signaling the employment prospects of completers. States can include only teaching positions or other school-based positions in this measure. States measure subject-area employment in response to concerns about an undersupply of teachers in certain subject areas, such as science, technology, engineering, and math. This measure tells providers that they should prepare candidates to address unmet needs in the state. Similarly, states measure school employment to assess whether completers are teaching in certain types of schools, such as high-poverty schools, and to communicate to providers that placing candidates in higher-need schools should be a priority.

States measure retention by looking at a completer's year-to-year persistence, often in her initial placement. States must determine how many years of retention, if any, they want to attribute to the preparation program.

States using completer placement and retention data must consider these trade-offs:

- All in-school positions are not the same. When collecting data, the state must decide whether it values all positions — for example, in-field teacher, out-of-field teacher, and substitute teacher — equally.
- To publish strong placement outcomes, providers may overcompensate. They may push a candidate to an undersupplied subject area or to a high-need school, even if it's not a good fit.

- States must determine what constitutes “persisting.” How will the state count a completer who is still teaching, but not in her original school or district?
- States must also determine whether it’s appropriate to link a completer’s employment choices to her preparation program.
- Most states can access placement and retention data only for in-state public school employers.

Completer and Employer Satisfaction

States can measure satisfaction by using completer and employer surveys. Surveys include questions about factors that are not measured by effectiveness, placement, and retention data – such as whether the completer believes the program prepared her well for teaching or whether the employer will again hire from a program. States must determine which entity – the state agency or the providers – will design, deliver, and analyze completer and employer surveys.

States using satisfaction data must consider these trade-offs:

- Providers administering the surveys may – unintentionally or intentionally – affect the quality and accuracy of responses. For example, this may happen because of the way they write the survey questions or collect responses.
- States must take into account the likelihood of a low response rate and the nonresponse bias that may result.

Colorado

What completer outcomes does the state track?

Colorado statute⁸ requires that the state annually report the outcomes of preparation-program completers in six performance areas:

- Student academic growth
- Placement
- Mobility
- Retention
- Performance evaluation

The state is finalizing how it will measure, track, and report completer outcomes in these performance areas.

Does the state track those outcomes at the program or at the institution level?

Colorado plans to track outcomes for each performance measure at the institution level.

How does the state measure each type of outcome?

The state plans to track and report outcomes for all novice teachers, defined as teachers who have completed an educator-preparation program in the previous three years. The outcomes for all novice teachers will be disaggregated and reported in comparison with the outcomes for three other categories of teachers:

- **Experienced teachers:** teachers who completed an in-state or out-of-state preparation program more than three years before
- **In-state novice teachers:** teachers who completed an in-state educator-preparation program in the previous three years
- **Out-of-state novice teachers:** teachers who completed an out-of-state educator-preparation program in the previous three years

Colorado is finalizing its business rules for measuring each performance area. As of October 2015, the state plans to use these definitions to track and report completer outcomes:

- **Student growth:** median growth percentile for novice completers from the program
- **Student achievement:** percentage of novice completers' students who are meeting state benchmarks
- **Teacher effectiveness:** percentage of novice completers who fall into each effectiveness rating on the state's evaluation system
- **Placement:** percentage of novice completers who are employed in a full-time instructional role in a Colorado public school
- **Retention:** percentage of novice completers who have continued in a full-time instructional role in a Colorado public school
- **Mobility:** percentage of novice completers who have stayed in their initial placement in a Colorado public school

What n-size does the state use in tracking and reporting outcomes?

Colorado plans to use a minimum n-size of five for public reporting of institution-level data for each performance area. Completers must have a minimum number of tested students in order to be included in the n-size for the student-achievement and student-growth performance areas. A completer must have at least 16 tested students for the student-achievement performance area and at least 20 tested students for the student-growth performance area.

Does the state use outcomes data to differentiate providers by performance?

Colorado does not plan to use the outcomes data to differentiate providers by performance.

Does the state use outcomes data to make consequential decisions, such as whether to approve programs?

Colorado does not plan to use the outcomes data to make consequential decisions, such as decisions about program approval.

How does the state make the information meaningful to the public?

Colorado statute requires that the annual report be made public. The state is collecting data and preparing them for public release.



Delaware

What completer outcomes does the state track?

Delaware passed legislation in 2013⁹ that requires the state to collect and publicly report completer outcomes in five domains:

- Recruitment
- Candidate performance
- Placement
- Retention
- Graduate performance

Each domain comprises two to four metrics. The state first published these outcomes in 2015.¹⁰ Eventually, the state will also collect and report data on one additional domain, perceptions.

Does the state track those outcomes at the program or at the institution level?

Delaware tracks and reports completer outcomes at the program level. The state plans to produce institution-level reports in 2016.

How does the state measure each type of outcome?

Recruitment

- **Nonwhite candidate enrollment:** proportion of nonwhite completers from among program graduates from the previous five years who worked in public education in Delaware.
- **SAT score:** average cumulative SAT score (on a scale of 2400) for the most recent incoming class of the program. This also includes ACT scores converted to their SAT equivalents.

Candidate performance

- **General Knowledge Test Scores:** average General Knowledge Test scores (Praxis I scores in math, reading, and writing) for all completers from the previous five years who worked in public education in Delaware.
- **Performance-assessment score:** average performance-assessment scores for all completers who worked in public education in Delaware. As of 2015, this metric has not yet been calculated or reported.

Placement

- **Placement in Delaware:** proportion of completers who began working in public education in Delaware within one year of completing the program. On the 2015 scorecard, this metric evaluates 2013 completers.
- **Placement in High-Need Schools:** proportion of completers from the previous five years who began working in a public school in Delaware that the state has identified as high need.

Retention

- **Beyond-year-one retention rate:** proportion of completers from the previous five years who continued working in public education in Delaware for any length of time beyond their first year.
- **Beyond-year-three retention rate:** proportion of completers from the previous five years who continued working in public education in Delaware for more than three consecutive years.

Graduate performance

- **Student Improvement Component ratings:** proportion of completers from the previous five years who were rated “Exceeds” on the Student Improvement Component of the state evaluation system, the Delaware Performance Appraisal System (DPAS II).¹¹
- **Observation scores:** average observation score for completers who worked in public education in Delaware over the previous five years.
- **Student-growth outcomes:** student-achievement results for program completers over the previous five years who taught English, math, or social studies in public education in Delaware. Student-achievement results are measured using the Delaware Comprehensive Assessment System.
- **Overall performance-evaluation ratings:** proportion of completers over the previous five years who received “Highly Effective” as their summative rating on the DPAS II.

Perceptions

- **Candidate survey:** results from a completer survey administered within one year of completers starting work in the Delaware school system. This metric was not calculated for 2015. The Delaware Department of Education will administer this survey for the first time in spring 2016.

- **LEA 360:** results from a survey that asks a district representative (e.g., the completer's first-year mentor) to assess completer readiness in several key performance factors in the completer's first year. This metric was not calculated for 2015. The Delaware Department of Education will administer this survey for the first time in spring 2016.

Delaware is building its capacity to track outcomes for all completers, including those who are employed out of state, for the Recruitment, Candidate Performance, and Placement domains.

What n-size does the state use in tracking and reporting outcomes?

Programs receive a scorecard if they have 10 or more completers who have been working in Delaware over the previous five years.

Does the state use outcomes data to differentiate providers by performance?

Delaware differentiates programs by four performance tiers on the basis of completer outcomes. Tier 1 is the highest rating and Tier 4 is the lowest. Programs receive an overall tier rating and a tier rating for each performance domain.

Does the state use outcomes data to make consequential decisions, such as whether to approve programs?

The state did not use outcomes as part of any formal regulatory processes in 2015. For 2016, the reports are scheduled to be reproduced with formal consequences. These consequences will include, at minimum, a probationary period for programs rated in the lowest tier of performance.¹² These biennial reports are intended to be the main proxy for ongoing program review.

How does the state make the information meaningful to the public?

The Delaware scorecards are easy to read and interpret. The state publishes a state-level summary scorecard, with high-level information about the programs. The state-level summary links to program-level scorecards, which lay out specific information about the program's performance in each domain, such as the final tier, earned points, possible points, and actual performance compared with the minimum state standard and the state target.

Florida

What completer outcomes does the state track?

Florida statute¹³ requires the state to collect data on six performance measures:

- Placement rate of program completers
- Retention rate of program completers
- Results of district evaluations of program completers
- Achievement of pre-k through 12th-grade students of completers
- Achievement of students of completers by subgroups
- Production of teachers in critical shortage areas

Does the state track those outcomes at the program or at the institution level?

Florida tracks outcomes for each performance measure at the program level, for each certification subject area.

How does the state measure each type of outcome?

- Placement rate of program completers: percentage of program completers who are employed full-time or part-time in instructional positions in a Florida public school in the first or second academic year after program completion. Completers employed in a private or out-of-state school may also be included if their employment is verified.
- Retention rate of program completers: average number of years that program completers are employed in full-time or part-time instructional positions in a Florida public school. The employment must occur during a five-year period that begins with initial employment in the first or second academic year after program completion. Completers employed in a private or out-of-state school may also be included if their employment is verified.
- Results of district evaluations of program completers: annual summative evaluation ratings for the most recent academic year for program completers from the previous three academic years.
- Achievement of pre-k through 12th-grade students of completers: the performance of pre-k through 12th-grade students who are assigned to in-field program completers from the previous three-years and who received a student-learning growth score from the most recent academic year for which results are available. Student-learning growth scores are based on the performance of students in grades 4 through 10 on statewide standardized assessments in math and English language arts.
- Achievement of pre-k through 12th-grade students of completers by subgroups: the performance, aggregated by student subgroup, of pre-k through 12th-grade students who are assigned to in-field program completers. The definition of “student subgroup” is taken from the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This score is based on in-field program completers from the previous three years who received a student-learning growth score in the most recent academic year for which results are available. Student-learning growth scores are based on the performance of students in grades 4 through 10 on statewide standardized assessments in math and English language arts.
- Production of teachers in critical shortage areas: specific certification in high-need content areas and high-priority locations that the State Board of Education annually defines.

What n-size does the state use in tracking and reporting outcomes?

Florida legislation¹⁴ requires programs to meet minimum n-size requirements to receive an Annual Program Performance Report (APPR). Programs must have three or more completers in the selected cohort time period for the Placement or Retention performance metric, and two or more completers who received an annual evaluation for the Annual Evaluation performance metric.

Does the state use outcomes data to differentiate providers by performance?

Florida recently released program outcomes data for the first time, through the APPR. The APPR outlines four performance levels (1 through 4) for each metric using the program's outcomes. For example, this is how a program's Placement Rate performance is defined:

Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
Placement rate is at or above the 68th percentile of all equivalent programs across the state.	Placement rate is at or above the 34th percentile and below the 68th percentile of all equivalent programs across the state.	Placement rate is at or above the 5th percentile and below the 34th percentile of all equivalent programs across the state.	Placement rate is below the 5th percentile of all equivalent programs across the state.

Level 4 is the highest rating for all performance metrics except Critical Teacher Shortage. Critical Teacher Shortage, a bonus metric, is defined below:

Bonus Performance Metric
The critical teacher shortage program increased the number of program completers compared to the year before with a minimum of 2 completers in each year.

Does the state use outcomes data to make consequential decisions, such as whether to approve programs?

Florida statute¹⁵ requires the state to incorporate completer outcomes into the continuing program-approval process. Programs must be reapproved every five years. During the approval process, programs receive a summative score of between 1.0 and 4.0. Half of a program's summative score is based on on-site visits and the program's average APPR scores over the previous five years.

Programs may receive one of three approval ratings, on the basis of their summative score:

- Summative score below 2.4: approval denied
- Summative score between 2.4 and 3.5: full approval
- Summative score above 3.5: approval with distinction

How does the state make the information meaningful to the public?

The first APPRs are publicly available. Users can access certification-subject-area reports one at a time. There is no way to compare program results without downloading multiple files and manually comparing them.

Georgia

What completer outcomes does the state track?

Georgia collects data on its nine Teacher Preparation Program Effectiveness Measures (TPPEMs). These indicators include completer and program performance. Three of the indicators measure completer performance pre-service, or while still enrolled in the preparation program. The state will begin collecting data on the TPPEMs in the 2015-16 academic year. The full set of measures will be available for the first time in 2018. These are the nine TPPEMs:

- Teacher effectiveness measures of program completers
- Success rates of induction certificate teachers
- Candidate performance on state-approved content assessments
- Candidate performance on edTPA
- Completion rates
- Retention rates
- Employment yield rate
- Survey of employed completers
- Employer survey

Does the state track those outcomes at the program or at the institution level?

Georgia tracks these outcomes at the program level.

How does the state measure each type of outcome?

- **Teacher effectiveness measures of program completers:** program-completer performance on the state's teacher-effectiveness system, which includes three components: Teacher Assessment on Performance Standards (TAPS), the growth and academic achievement of the completer's students, and surveys of instructional practice.
 - > TAPS: evaluator observations of teacher practice¹⁶
 - > Student growth and academic achievement: student-growth percentile and value-added measure for teachers of state-tested subjects, or approved student-learning objectives, using district achievement growth measures for teachers of nontested subjects
 - > Surveys of instructional practice: student surveys, administered in grade bands 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12¹⁷
- **Success rates of induction certificate teachers:** As of 2014, beginning teachers in Georgia work as "Induction Teachers" for the first three years. After completing the induction period, teachers can earn a professional certificate. This measure tracks the rate at which a program's completers successfully pass the induction phase.
- **Candidate performance on state-approved content assessments:** Completers must attempt all tests in the state-approved assessment before August 31 of the completion year. The better of two attempts for each program completer will be used to calculate the content-assessment pass rate for the program.
- **Candidate performance on edTPA:** Programs must require candidates to take the edTPA at some point before program completion. Completer scores are used to calculate the program's content-assessment measure.
- **Completion rates:** annual completion rates, measured by comparing the number of enrolled candidates enrolled in a program with the number of candidates who successfully completed the program.
- **Retention rates:** program completers and nontraditional candidates who, during the reporting year, continued their employment as a teacher beyond their first year teaching in a Georgia public or public charter school.
- **Employment yield rate:** used in conjunction with annual employment data, the yield rate represents the number of program completers, or in the case of nontraditional programs, candidates who earn the Induction Certificate, are employed by a Georgia pre-k through 12 public school or public charter school, and are placed in in-field teaching positions.
- **Survey of employed completers:** an annual statewide survey of program completers who are employed in a Georgia public school or public charter school. The goal of the survey is to assess whether completers are adequately prepared to translate theory into practice and whether the program gave them the essential knowledge, skills, and dispositions they need to be effective in the classroom.
- **Employer survey:** an annual statewide survey of employers of those completers who are working in a Georgia public school or public charter school. The goal of the survey is to gauge employer satisfaction; identify what qualities are most desirable in a teacher when making a hiring decision; and determine what knowledge, skills, and dispositions are essential in a teacher.

What n-size does the state use in tracking and reporting outcomes?

The minimum n-size for reporting and tracking outcomes is 10. Georgia tracks and reports outcomes for aggregated cohorts. An aggregated cohort is a group of candidates completing a defined, state-approved program between September 1 and August 31. If the number of candidates in an aggregated cohort is below 10, multiple years (up to three years) will be combined to create a cohort of at least 10 candidates.

Does the state use outcomes data to differentiate providers by performance?

Georgia is still deciding how it will differentiate programs by performance, though it expects to use four performance levels: exemplary, effective, at risk of low performing, low performing.¹⁸

Does the state use outcomes data to make consequential decisions, such as whether to approve programs?

Georgia will use its TPPEM data to complement the state's program-approval process, which takes place every seven years, though the consequences for low performance and accolades for high performance have not been determined. The state will likely use the data to make inferences and encourage program adjustments between full program-approval reviews.

How does the state make the information meaningful to the public?

The TPPEM data are not yet publicly available, but the state plans to publish the data online. This will most likely happen 2018, when all TPPEM measures are collected.



Louisiana

What completer outcomes does the state track?

Louisiana is examining new types of outcomes as it tracks and reports them on its online Teacher Preparation Data Dashboards. The state is collecting information on indicators in four categories: Candidate Selection Profile, Knowledge and Skills for Teaching of Completers, Program Productivity and Alignment to State Needs of Completers, and Performance as Classroom Teachers. These indicators are modeled on 2020 Effectiveness Indicators, a framework that proposes a set of annual, publicly reported indicators for alternative and traditional educator-preparation programs to ensure transparency for stakeholders and facilitate continual-improvement efforts.¹⁹

Louisiana is also revamping its preparation-accountability process. It currently reports on licensure pass rates only for public universities, for accountability purposes. The data dashboards were voluntarily developed by the state's providers in collaboration with the Board of Regents and with support from the Louisiana Department of Education. The providers decided together which data they would voluntarily publish. So while the format of the data dashboard follows the 2020 Effectiveness Indicators, only some data are available, and some indicators are not published in the suggested format.²⁰

Below are the indicators on the 2014 data dashboards. In this section and the next, indicators for which data are not available are marked with an asterisk.

Candidate Selection Profile

- Academic strength*
- Teaching promise*
- Candidate/completer diversity

Knowledge and Skills for Teaching of Completers

- Content and pedagogical knowledge
- Teaching skill*
- Completer rating of program*

Program Productivity and Alignment to State Needs of Completers

- Entry and persistence in teaching*
- Placement and persistence in high-need subjects and schools*

Performance as Classroom Teachers

- Impact on K-12 students
- Demonstrated teaching skill
- Overall impact and demonstrated teaching skill
- State value-added and overall evaluation scores
- K-12 student perceptions*

Does the state track those outcomes at the program or at the institution level?

The state tracks outcomes at the institution level.

How does the state measure each type of outcome?

Candidate Selection Profile

- **Academic strength***: percentage of completers who pass the Praxis skills assessment; median GPA of candidates at admission and completion of the program; and the number of completers who started but did not complete the program within six years
- **Teaching promise***: percentage of accepted program candidates whose score on a rigorous and validated “fitness for teaching” assessment demonstrates a strong promise for teaching
- **Candidate/completer diversity**: number of candidates who enrolled and completed the program; number of candidates enrolled in the program, by gender and racial/ethnic subgroup

Knowledge and Skills for Teaching of Completers

- **Content and pedagogical knowledge**: percentages of completers who passed the Praxis content assessments, the Praxis professional knowledge assessment, and all assessments
- **Teaching skill***: number of hours of clinical experience prior to and during student teaching, and the percentage of completers who meet state licensing requirements
- **Completer rating of program***: state- or nationally developed program-completer survey of teaching preparedness and program quality, by cohort, upon program completion and at end of the first year of full-time teaching

Program Productivity and Alignment to State Needs of Completers

- **Entry and persistence in teaching***: percentage and number of completers who began teaching in the year following program completion; percentage and number of completers who obtained a teaching license; and percentage and number of completers from five years ago who have persisted in teaching each year since then.
- **Placement and persistence in high-need subjects and schools***: number and percentage of completers, by cohort, who are employed and persisting in teaching in low-performing, low-income, or remote rural schools or in high-need subjects one to five years after program completion, including in-state and out-of-state placements

Performance as Classroom Teachers

- **Impact on K-12 students**: mean student-outcome score and number of scores for all new teachers with less than two years of teaching in the previous academic year; percentage and number of student-outcome scores for new teachers in the previous academic year, by teacher-effectiveness levels
- **Demonstrated teaching skill**: mean professional practice score and number of scores for all new teachers with less than two years of teaching in the previous academic year; percentage and number of professional practice scores for new teachers in the previous academic year, by teacher-effectiveness levels
- **Overall impact and demonstrated teaching skill**: mean overall evaluation score and number of scores for all new teachers with less than two years of teaching in the previous academic year; percentage and number of overall evaluation scores for new teachers in the previous academic year, by teacher-effectiveness levels

- **State value-added and overall evaluation scores**: mean value-added score and number of scores for new teachers in grades 4-8 with less than two years of teaching, by content area (mathematics, science, social studies, and language arts/reading); percentage and number of value-added scores by content areas and teacher-effectiveness levels
- **K-12 student perceptions***: K-12 student surveys about completers' teaching practice during first three years of full-time teaching, using valid and reliable statewide instruments

What n-size does the state use in tracking and reporting outcomes?

The minimum n-size for tracking and reporting outcomes is 25.

Does the state use outcomes data to differentiate providers by performance?

Louisiana does not use outcomes data to differentiate institutions by performance level, but it previously did so. For example, as part of the Programmatic Intervention accountability model, the state determined performance levels on the basis of value-added scores. As part of the new preparation-accountability system, the state is considering using outcomes to differentiate providers by performance level.

Does the state use outcomes data to make consequential decisions, such as whether to approve programs?

Louisiana does not use outcomes data to make consequential decisions about institutions, but it previously did so. As part of the new preparation-accountability system, the state is considering how to integrate outcomes data and use them to make consequential decisions.

How does the state make the information meaningful to the public?

Louisiana publishes the institution-level data dashboards on the Board of Regents website. Institutional reports from previous years are also available. In 2014, the state provided a “fact book” with the data dashboards, which includes historical context, as well as institution-level trend data for many indicators.

Massachusetts

What completer outcomes does the state track?

According to Massachusetts legislation,²¹ the state Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) must publish an annual report with information on each organization that is approved to offer an educator-preparation program in the state. In Preparation Program Profiles, the state publishes data on these areas:

- Candidate enrollment
- Program completers
- Massachusetts Tests for Educator Licensure (MTEL)²² pass rate
- Employment
- Faculty and staff
- Job placement and retention rates

Massachusetts is revising the types of data it collects from sponsoring organizations and programs. When these changes go into effect, the state will collect and report data on two additional types of outcomes:

- In 2016: educator-evaluation ratings
- In 2017: Survey results of program completers' supervising practitioners and their hiring principals

Does the state track those outcomes at the program or at the institution level?

Massachusetts reports outcomes at the sponsoring-organization (institution) level and the program level.

How does the state measure each type of outcome?

Current Profiles

- **Candidate enrollment:** total unduplicated number of candidates enrolled, and number and percentage of candidates enrolled, by gender and racial/ethnic subgroup.
- **Program completers:** total number of candidates meeting all requirements of the preparation program (e.g., instruction/coursework and practicum), whether or not a candidate has taken and passed state tests or assessments for licensure or has been endorsed for licensure by the program. This count includes candidates who complete two or more programs during the same year.
- **Massachusetts Tests for Educator Licensure (MTEL) pass rate** percentage and number of candidates who took the MTEL and achieved a score equal to or higher than the passing score established by the state, by assessment type and candidate status. Candidate status includes all program completers, candidates who have not completed nonclinical coursework, and candidates who have completed the nonclinical coursework but have not completed the clinical component.
- **Employment:** number of program completers each year, for the previous three years and overall, who are employed in a Massachusetts public school. These data are also represented by program type, program level, and program subject area. This measure also includes the five Massachusetts public school districts that employ the highest percentage of program completers.

- **Retention rate:** percentage of employed completers who were employed for a second consecutive year. These data are also represented by program type, program level, and program subject area. This measure also includes the five Massachusetts public school districts that employ the highest percentage of program completers.
- **Faculty and staff:** total number of full-time program faculty and staff, overall and by gender and racial/ethnic subgroup, and the number of candidates per faculty member.
- **Job placement rate:** percentage of completers employed in a Massachusetts public school within one, two, and three years of completing a preparation program.
- **Retention rate:** percentage of employed completers who stayed for two, three, and four years.

Additional Outcomes Data in New Profiles

- **Educator-evaluation ratings:** percentage of completers by summative rating; by ratings on each component of the state's evaluation system, including impact on student growth; and percentage of completers who have earned professional teacher status.²³
- **Surveys of program completers and their principals:** Response rate and response by question to state-administered surveys for enrollees, non-practicum completers, program completers, district personnel, and new educators.

What n-size does the state use in tracking and reporting outcomes?

The minimum n-size for tracking and reporting outcomes is six.

Does the state use outcomes data to differentiate providers by performance?

Massachusetts does not use outcomes data to differentiate providers by performance level.

Does the state use outcomes data to make consequential decisions, such as whether to approve programs?

Massachusetts launched a new program-approval process in the 2014-15 academic year. Through this process, the state includes outcomes data as one piece of evidence in program-approval decisions.²⁴

How does the state make the information meaningful to the public?

Massachusetts publishes complete outcomes data in two places on the DESE website: the statewide profile section, where a range of state-, district-, and school-level information is available, and the section that offers individual educator-preparation profile data reports.

The educator-preparation profiles provide in-depth information about each institution, on the basis of the data mentioned above and other indicators required by legislation. The statewide reports allow stakeholders to compare all institutions by several indicators, including employment and retention by program, program characteristic, and year.

New Jersey

What completer outcomes does the state track?

New Jersey tracks and publicly reports completer outcomes through its Educator Preparation Provider Annual Reports. The state adds new public metrics each year. The 2015 version of the report includes the following outcomes:

- Certification and licensure rates
- Hiring rate
- Persistence rate
- School placement by:
 - > School classification
 - > District factor group
- Classroom assignments by teacher-shortage area
- Compensation
- Praxis II scores

The state expects that future versions of the report will include completer-evaluation data, more robust persistence and hiring data, and teacher-candidate-survey data.²⁵

Does the state track those outcomes at the program or at the institution level?

New Jersey tracks all of these outcomes at the institution level. In addition, the state also reports program-level employment outcomes (i.e., the number of certified and employed completers) for the five largest programs at the institution.

How does the state measure each type of outcome?

- **Certification and licensure rate:** number of completers receiving New Jersey certification or licensure, subject areas of endorsement, number of endorsements, and percentage employed.
- **Hiring rate:** percentage of completers from the previous two years who were employed in a New Jersey public school as of that fall.
- **Persistence rate:** percentage of completers employed in a New Jersey public school in one year who continued employment in the following year.
- **School placement by:**
 - > **School classification:** number and percentage of completers who are employed at a Priority, Focus, or Reward school, as defined by New Jersey's Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) waiver,²⁶ compared with the percentage of teachers employed in each category of school statewide.
 - > **District factor group:** number and percentage of completers who are employed at a school in each of the state's eight district factor groups. The state defines district factor groups by a number of variables that approximate the community's socioeconomic status.²⁷ The percentage of completers employed in a single district factor group is compared with the percentage of completers employed in each district factor group statewide.

- **Classroom assignments by teacher-shortage area:** number of completers who received an endorsement in a teacher-shortage area and who are employed in a teacher-shortage position.
- **Compensation:** the average starting salary of completers employed in a New Jersey public school, by region.
- **Praxis II scores:** the average scaled score on the Praxis II, by content area, compared with the average scaled score for the state.

What n-size does the state use in tracking and reporting outcomes?

The minimum n-size for tracking and reporting outcomes is 10.

Does the state use outcomes data to differentiate providers by performance?

New Jersey does not differentiate programs or institutions by performance level on the basis of outcomes data.

Does the state use outcomes data to make consequential decisions, such as whether to approve programs?

New Jersey does not yet use outcomes data to make consequential decisions, but it expects to eventually use outcomes data to inform parts of the approval process.

How does the state make the information meaningful to the public?

The state improves each iteration of the Educator Preparation Provider Annual Report. Currently, the reports are available only as PDF files and cannot be easily compared across institutions or programs. The state plans to make these documents more accessible to different stakeholder groups, such as program deans and potential employers.

North Carolina

What completer outcomes does the state track?

North Carolina legislation²⁸ requires educator-preparation programs to submit annual performance reports on the criteria below. The state compiles much of this information on an online dashboard available to the public.

- Demographics and academic profile of entering candidates
- Graduation rate
- Time-to-graduation rate
- Licensure assessment scores and pass rate
- Licensure rate
- Employment rate
- Retention rate
- Completer satisfaction
- Employer satisfaction
- Completer effectiveness

Does the state track those outcomes at the program or at the institution level?

North Carolina tracks outcomes at the institution level.

How does the state measure each type of outcome?

- **Demographics and academic profile of entering candidates:** number of full-time and part-time enrolled candidates, by gender and racial/ethnic subgroup, and mean scores from several academic criteria, including SAT, ACT, and GPA.
- **Graduation rate** percentage of candidates who completed the program.
- **Time-to-graduation rate:** number of completers, by full- or part-time status and by the number of semesters it took for them to complete the program (range: three or fewer semesters through eight semesters).
- **Licensure assessment scores and pass rate:** average completer scores on professional and content-area examinations for the purpose of licensure.
- **Licensure rate:** percentage of completers receiving initial licenses.
- **Employment rate:** percentage of completers hired as teachers.
- **Retention rate:** percentage of completers remaining in teaching for four years.
- **Completer satisfaction:** results from a common survey of completer satisfaction.
- **Employer satisfaction:** results from a common survey of employer satisfaction.
- **Completer effectiveness:** summary of evaluation data for beginning teachers (teachers with less than three years of experience and a Standard Professional 1 license) by each component in the state's evaluation system. This measure includes sample size and percentage of completers in each performance level.

What n-size does the state use in tracking and reporting outcomes?

The minimum n-size for tracking and reporting outcomes is five.

Does the state use outcomes data to differentiate providers by performance?

The state does not use outcomes data to differentiate providers by performance level.

Does the state use outcomes data to make consequential decisions, such as whether to approve programs?

The state does not use outcomes data to make consequential decisions, including program-approval decisions.

How does the state make the information meaningful to the public?

Although North Carolina requires preparation providers to submit information on the outcomes listed above, the information is not published in one place. The state provides some of the information, such as the completer-effectiveness ratings, on an online dashboard,²⁹ but other information on completer time-to-graduation rates is available in a separate IHE Performance Report.³⁰ Potential candidates or employers who are interested in the outcomes data for a specific institution would have to look through two separate reports to get most of the information. Some of the required information, such as completer-retention data, is missing from the dashboards.

Ohio

What completer outcomes does the state track?

Ohio tracks and publicly reports completer outcomes in annual Educator Performance reports. The reports include data on these outcomes:

- Licensure test scores or pass rate
- Evaluation results of program completers
- edTPA assessment results
- Value-added data
- Candidate academic measures
- Field and clinical experiences
- Pre-service teacher survey results
- Resident educator survey results
- Resident educator persistence
- Excellence and innovation initiatives
- National accreditation

Does the state track those outcomes at the program or at the institution level?

Ohio tracks outcomes at the institution and program levels. Different outcomes are tracked at different levels:

- At the **program level**, Ohio reports licensure test scores, candidate academic measures, field and clinical experiences, pre-service teacher survey results, and resident educator survey results.
- At the **institution level**, Ohio reports evaluation results of program completers, edTPA assessment results, licensure pass rate, value-added data, candidate academic measures, field and clinical experiences, pre-service teacher survey results, resident educator survey results, national accreditation, resident educator persistence, and excellence and innovation initiatives.

How does the state measure each type of outcome?

- **Licensure test scores or pass rate**
 - > Program-level report: cut score for passing the required assessment, number of completers tested, average scaled score (the average of completers' best scores and the number and percentage of completers who passed).
 - > Institution-level report: number of completers tested and the pass-rate percentage of completers from the previous year.
- **Evaluation results of program completers:** number of completers in each evaluation performance level, for each year over the previous four years.
- **edTPA assessment results:** institutional average score.
- **Value-added data:** number of completers with effective licensure dates over the previous four years; number of those completers who were

employed as teachers and who had value-added data. Number and percentage of those completers in each value-added performance classification. Number and percentage of those completers by school characteristic (grade span, school type, overall grade level of building, minority enrollment, poverty enrollment).

- **Candidate academic measures:** Both the program- and institution-level reports include nearly two dozen academic criteria, such as SAT writing subscore, Praxis II score, GRE composite score, and GPA. The number and average score are reported for admitted candidates, enrolled candidates, and completers by their degree level (undergraduate, postbaccalaureate, or graduate).
- **Field and clinical experiences:** Both the program- and institution-level reports provide the minimum and maximum number of clinical hours required, the average number of weeks required to teach full time as a student teacher, and the percentage of candidates who complete student teaching.
- **Pre-service teacher survey results:** Both the program- and institution-level reports provide the results of a completer survey. The survey was developed by the Ohio Board of Regents and a committee of representatives from Ohio institutions. The survey is given to all teacher candidates. Number of and response rate for respondents, question language, and the average number of institution responses are reported.
- **Resident educator survey results:** The survey was developed by the Ohio Board of Regents and a committee of representatives from Ohio institutions. The survey is given only to completers who participate in the state's Resident Educator program.³¹ Number of and response rate for respondents, question language, and average number of institution responses are reported.

- **Resident educator persistence:** number of newly hired teachers who entered the Resident Educator program each year for the previous four years. Number and percentage of Resident Educators who are persisting to the next year.
- **Excellence and innovation initiatives:** narrative descriptions of up to three initiatives that are “geared to increase excellence and support innovation in the preparation of Ohio educators.” Each initiative includes the purpose, goal, number of participants, strategy, a demonstration of impact, and information about any external recognition.
- **National accreditation:** accrediting agency, date of last accreditation, and accreditation status.

What n-size does the state use in tracking and reporting outcomes?

The minimum n-size for reporting outcomes is 10.

Does the state use outcomes data to differentiate providers by performance?

The state does not use outcomes data to differentiate programs or institutions by performance level. The state notes when any program’s or institution’s performance on a measure is below the normal distribution, but that information is not shared publicly; it is available only to preparation programs.

Does the state use outcomes data to make consequential decisions, such as whether to approve programs?

Per Ohio legislation, the state can make consequential decisions only on the basis of licensure pass rates. Until the state sets thresholds for other metrics, the outcomes are purely informational.

How does the state make the information meaningful to the public?

Each program and institution report is available publicly on the state website. All materials are available in individual PDF reports that are not easily compared across institutions or programs. The state hopes to develop an online, interactive dashboard where stakeholders can look at data across a number of programs or sort institutions by specific variables.

Rhode Island

What completer outcomes does the state track?

Through its Educator Preparation Indices, Rhode Island publicly reports completer outcomes in three categories: Educating Rhode Island, Entering the Profession in Rhode Island, and Admission and Progression. The state also publishes a summary with provider information in these three categories.

Educating Rhode Island

- Employed completers
- Completer employment details
- Educator effectiveness
- Educator-effectiveness details

Entering the Profession in Rhode Island

- Certified completers
- Certification details

Admission and Progression

- Professional test data
- GPA at admission
- GPA at completion

Does the state track those outcomes at the program or at the institution level?

Rhode Island publicly reports outcomes at the program, institution, and degree (undergraduate or postgraduate) level. Different outcomes are collected at different levels.

- Employed completers, employment details, educator effectiveness, educator-effectiveness details, certified completers, and certification details are tracked at the **institution level**.
- Professional test data are collected at the **program level**.
- GPA at admission and GPA at completion are collected at the **degree level**.

How does the state measure each type of outcome?

Educating Rhode Island

- **Employed completers:** number of completers from the previous two years who were employed as regular or substitute teachers in Rhode Island public schools, and the total number of newly hired regular and substitute teachers in the state in the previous two years.
- **Completer employment details:** employment completers by certification area and by school accountability level, district or local education name name, and grade span (elementary, middle, or high school). Completers and newly hired educators from the previous two years are included. This report card denotes critical certification areas or areas where the Rhode Island Department of Education has historically issued emergency credentials at the request of LEAs struggling to fill open positions.

- **Educator effectiveness:** percentage of completers over the previous two years who were rated for each performance level of the state's evaluation system. These data are compared with data for all Rhode Island program completers and all Rhode Island educators from the same time period.
- **Educator-effectiveness details:** percentage of completers over the previous two years who performed at each performance level on both components of the Rhode Island educator-effectiveness evaluation. The two components are Professional Practice and Personal Foundation and Student Learning. On the Professional Practice component, completers can earn a score of 1 through 4, with 1 being the lowest and 4 the highest. On the Student Learning component, completers can earn Minimal Attainment, Partial Attainment, Full Attainment, or Exceptional Attainment. Student Learning is measured using the completer's Student Learning Objectives. These data are compared with data for all Rhode Island program completers and all Rhode Island educators from the same time period.

Entering the Profession in Rhode Island

- **Certified completers:** total number of completers over the previous three years, and the total number of those completers who achieved Rhode Island certification.
- **Certification details:** demographics of certified completers over the previous two years compared with demographics of all certified completers in Rhode Island from the same time period. This measure also includes institution-level data for program completers by certificate area from the previous two years.

Admission and Progression

- **Professional test data:** number of completers who took and passed each content-area assessment. Also includes the average score of all institution completers in that content area. These data are compared with the statewide average score and the statewide pass rate. All data are for the previous two years.
- **GPA at admission:** minimum GPA required at admission and median GPA of accepted individuals, by undergraduate and postgraduate degree level, from the previous two years.
- **GPA at completion:** minimum GPA required for completion and median GPA of completers, by undergraduate and postgraduate degree level, from the previous two years.

What n-size does the state use in tracking and reporting outcomes?

The minimum n-size for reporting and tracking outcomes is 10.

Does the state use outcomes data to differentiate providers by performance?

Rhode Island does not differentiate programs or institutions by performance levels on the Educator Preparation Indices. The state does, however, plan to eventually include certain outcomes in its performance-review process.³²

Completer performance data and placement data will, as of the 2016-17 academic year, be used to inform a program's rating on Standards 4.1 (Evaluation Outcomes) and 4.2 (Employment Outcomes) in the Rhode Island performance-review process.

For Standard 4.1, program performance is determined by comparing the performance data of completers on the different elements of the educator evaluation (overall effectiveness rating, professional practice,

student learning, professional responsibility scores) with the aggregate performance distribution for all recent completers on those same elements. A program's rating is determined by its recent completers' performance relative to other recent program completers in the state.

For Standard 4.2, the state will set cutoff points for aggregate placement rates but has not yet done so.

Does the state use outcomes data to make consequential decisions, such as whether to approve programs?

The state plans to use completer-evaluation data and placement data to inform the program rating on Standards 4.1 and 4.2 of the performance-review process. It is unclear how much weight these outcomes will have on a program's or institution's overall performance review. The state plans to use outcomes at different levels to inform the program-approval process.

How does the state make the information meaningful to the public?

The outcomes data are available on the state Department of Education's website. The website encourages future educators to explore the information in the indices. Any stakeholder can easily search for data by institution, and an FAQ section accompanies each set of data points.

The content of the indices, however, is not as clear as it could be. For example, placement rate could be represented as a percentage as well as a discrete number, and the indices could pair percentage numbers with the stacked bar charts that depict educator-effectiveness outcomes.

Tennessee

What completer outcomes does the state track?

Since 2007, Tennessee legislation has required the state to track and publicly report data for four outcomes as part of the state's Teacher Preparation Report Cards. The outcomes are:

- Placement rate
- Retention rate
- Assessment average score and pass rate
- Teacher effect data

In October 2014, Tennessee's State Board of Education passed Educator Preparation Policy 5.504, which changed the way the state approves educator-preparation providers. As part of that policy, the state will collect information from all educator-preparation programs for an annual report that is separate from, but includes much of the same data as, the Teacher Preparation Report Cards.³⁹ The metrics required for the annual report are:

- Recruitment and selection
- Placement
- Retention
- Completer satisfaction
- Employer satisfaction
- Completer outcomes
- Completer impact

Does the state track those outcomes at the program or at the provider³⁴ level?

Tennessee publicly reports outcomes at the provider level as part of the Teacher Preparation Report Cards. The annual reports will attempt to track outcomes at the program level, but the state expects to encounter challenges with meeting the minimum n-size and may have to aggregate programs by type to review.

How does the state measure each type of outcome?

Report Card Outcomes

- **Placement rate:** percentage of completers from the previous four years who teach in a Tennessee public school and who started their job within one or two years of program completion.
- **Retention rate:** percentage of completers from the previous four years who teach in a Tennessee public school have been at their job for three consecutive years. This measure also includes the percentage of completers who have been teaching in a Tennessee public school for three out of the previous four years.
- **Assessment average score and pass rate:** candidates' average scores on Praxis II core reading, core math, and core writing assessments, as well as on the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching assessment. Also includes the overall pass rate for these assessments.
- **Teacher effect data:** value-added data for all completers with one to three years of experience (also known as beginning teachers), according to the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System, as compared with all teachers statewide and other beginning teachers during the same time period. For the 2014 report card, teacher effect data are based

on one-year t-value estimates of teacher effects for the 2013-14 school year. The performance of the institution's beginning teachers is noted as either positive or negative, as compared with the other groups for each subject. The results are provided for apprentice- and transitional-license teachers separately and together. The state also provides a statewide distribution of apprentice and transitional teachers (again separately and together). The statewide distribution denotes the percentage of beginning teachers who are in the top and bottom performance quintiles statewide and whether there is a statistically significant difference between those teachers and other teachers statewide.

Annual Report Outcomes³⁵

- **Recruitment and selection:** performance against identified recruitment goals.
- **Placement:** number and percentage of candidates placed in Tennessee public schools in the three years immediately following program completion.
- **Retention:** number and percentage of placed completers who remain working in Tennessee public schools in the third and fifth years following placement.
- **Completer satisfaction:** results from a completer satisfaction survey, delivered within 12 months of program completion and again after the third year of teaching. The Tennessee Department of Education administers the survey to program completers.
- **Employer satisfaction:** results from an employer satisfaction survey. All primary partner LEAs and LEAs employing more than 25 percent of the completer cohort will be surveyed. The Tennessee Department of Education will administer the survey to employers.

- **Completer outcomes:** includes outcomes on components such as graduation rate, first-time pass rate on required content assessments, and the ability of completers to meet licensing requirements.
- **Completer impact:** completer performance as measured by evaluation results, including overall evaluation scores, observation scores, and student-growth scores.
The state is determining the number of completer cohorts to include in this indicator.

What n-size does the state use in tracking and reporting outcomes?

For the state Teacher Preparation Report Cards, the minimum n-size for tracking and reporting placement rate, retention rate, and assessment pass rate is five. The minimum n-size for tracking and reporting teacher effect outcomes data is 10. The state is determining the minimum n-size for annual reports.

Does the state use outcomes data to differentiate providers by performance?

Tennessee does not differentiate providers by performance levels on the basis of outcomes data, but the Teacher Preparation Report Cards provide some comparative information. The value-added data for each provider's completers are compared with the data for completers of other programs in the state and with teachers statewide.

Does the state use outcomes data to make consequential decisions, such as whether to approve programs?

Tennessee does not use outcomes data to make consequential decisions, including provider- and program-approval decisions. According to Educator Preparation Policy 5.504, however, the state will begin using the data from annual reports in the approval process in the 2017-18 academic year.³⁶

How does the state use transparency to shape the teacher pipeline?

The Teacher Preparation Report Cards from 2010 through 2014 are publicly available on the Tennessee Higher Education Commission website. The state has made each iteration of the Report Card more user friendly than the last. The 2014 version, for example, is the first to provide institution reports, the state profile, and the executive summary in separate documents. The 2014 institution reports also provide teacher effect data as the percentage of completers in the highest and lowest performance quintiles and statistical significance, rather than as estimates of the completers' average value-added scores, as previous versions had done. (The 2014 estimates are available in a technical appendix.) The state hopes to eventually create a public, interactive system.

Annual reports will be produced only for program use.

Endnotes

- 1 See figure 6 in this report: http://cpre.org/sites/default/files/workingpapers/1506_7trendsapril2014.pdf.
- 2 "Nation's Schools Facing Largest Teacher Retirement Wave in History," National Commission on Teaching & America's Future, last modified June 24, 2011, <http://nctaf.org/announcements/nations-schools-facing-largest-teacher-retirement-wave-in-history/>.
- 3 For a review of the evolution of teacher quality reforms, see http://bellwethereducation.org/sites/default/files/JOYCE_Teacher%20Effectiveness_web.pdf.
- 4 "Department of Education; 34 CFR Chapter VI; Negotiated Rulemaking Committee, Negotiator Nominations and Schedule of Committee Meetings—Teacher Preparation and TEACH Grant Programs," 76 Federal Register 207 (26 October 2011), pp. 66248-66249, <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2011-10-26/pdf/2011-27719.pdf>.
- 5 For each state, we conducted extensive desk research and interviewed at least one person at the state education agency who works in educator preparation. Most interviewees were heavily involved with the preparation-program approval process. We synthesized our research into a template and then sent the state profile back to the interviewees to review for accuracy. Each state profile has been reviewed by at least one person in the state education agency. The information provided here is accurate, to our knowledge, at the time of publishing. These states are continually making progress on these efforts, however; each state will have the most up-to-date information.
- 6 Dr. Matthew Kraft, interview with the authors, July 10, 2015.
- 7 These are the latest numbers, as of November 5, 2015, from <https://title2.ed.gov>.
- 8 Colo. Rev. Stat. § 22-2-112(q)(III) (2013)
- 9 Del. Code tit. 14, § 12-1 (2014); [http://legis.delaware.gov/LIS/lis147.nsf/vwLegislation/SB+51/\\$file/legis.html?open](http://legis.delaware.gov/LIS/lis147.nsf/vwLegislation/SB+51/$file/legis.html?open).
- 10 Delaware Department of Education, 2015 *Delaware Educator Preparation Program Reports*, accessed November 10, 2015, http://www.doe.k12.de.us/cms/lib09/DE01922744/Centricity/Domain/398/ED_PREP_SUMMARY_TABLE_PORT.pdf.
- 11 Delaware Department of Education, *DPAS-II Guide (Revised) for Teachers*, last modified August 2015, http://www.doe.k12.de.us/cms/lib09/DE01922744/Centricity/Domain/375/DPAS_II_Guide_for_Teachers_2015-16.pdf.
- 12 Del. Code tit. 14, § 290-7 (2014). <http://regulations.delaware.gov/AdminCode/title14/200/290.pdf>
- 13 § 1004.04(3)(e), Fla. Stat. (2015).
- 14 Fla. Admin. Code R. 6A-5.066 (2015).
- 15 § 1004.04(3)(e) Fla. Stat. (2015).
- 16 "Teacher Assessment on Performance Standards Reference Sheet Performance Standards and Sample Performance Indicators," Georgia Department of Education, last modified July 16, 2012, [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Documents/IDEAS 2013 Handouts 2/TAPS Standards Indicators.pdf](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Documents/IDEAS%2013%20Handouts%202/TAPS%20Standards%20Indicators.pdf).
- 17 Georgia Department of Education, *Teacher Keys Effectiveness System: Implementation Handbook*, last modified July 1, 2015, <https://www.gadoe.org/School-Improvement/Teacher-and-Leader-Effectiveness/Documents/TKES%20Handbook%20-713.pdf>.
- 18 Representative from Georgia Professional Standards Commission, interview with the author, August 12, 2015.
- 19 Developed by Michael Allen, Edward Crowe, and Charles Coble, from Teacher Preparation Analytics: <http://www.suny.edu/media/suny/content-assets/documents/teachny/2-6-15/TPA-Report-Evidence-Based-System-TeacherPrep.pdf>.
- 20 A complete description of the definitions and intended format of the 2020 *Effectiveness Indicators* is available at <http://www.regents.la.gov/assets/docs/2014/11/Allen-Coble-Crow-KEI-Final-Version-FINAL-6-10.pdf>.
- 21 603 CMR 7.03.

- 22 "About the Test," Massachusetts Tests for Educator Licensure, accessed November 1, 2015, <http://www.mtel.nesinc.com/about.asp>.
- 23 Professional teacher status is awarded to teachers who are rated proficient or exemplary on all four Standards of Effective Teaching Practice and for their summative performance rating during their most recent evaluation. For more information see <http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/resources/implementation/RatingEdPerformance.pdf>.
- 24 Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Guidelines for Program Approval, last modified November 2015, <http://www.doe.mass.edu/edprep/ProgramApproval.pdf>. A guide to sources of evidence is available in appendix B; Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, *Review Evaluation Tool*, accessed October 1, 2015, <http://www.doe.mass.edu/edprep/evaltool/Overview.pdf>.
- 25 New Jersey Department of Education, *2015 Educator Preparation Provider Annual Reports*, last modified August 2015, <http://www.state.nj.us/education/educators/rpr/preparation/providers/2015/overview.pdf>.
- 26 "Priority and Focus Schools," State of New Jersey Department of Education, accessed October 1, 2015, <http://www.state.nj.us/education/rac/schools/>.
- 27 NJ Department of Education, *District Factor Groups: Executive Summary*, accessed August 2, 2015, <http://www.state.nj.us/education/finance/rda/dfg.pdf>.
- 28 N.C. Gen. Stat. § 115C 296 (b) (2014).
- 29 "North Carolina Institution of Higher Education Educator Preparation Program Report Cards," Public Schools of North Carolina, August 1, 2015, <http://apps.schools.nc.gov/pls/apex/f?p=141:5:1457486023468901>.
- 30 "IHE Educator Preparation Program Performance Reports," Public Schools of North Carolina, August 1, 2015, <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/ihe/reports/>.
- 31 "Resident Educator Program," Ohio Department of Education, July 7, 2015, <http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Teaching/Resident-Educator-Program>.
- 32 "PREP -RI: Performance Review for Educator Preparation-Rhode Island," Rhode Island Department of Education, July 10, 2015, <http://www.ride.ri.gov/TeachersAdministrators/EducatorCertification/PerformanceReviewforEducatorPreparation-RI.aspx#32031096-providers-planning-for-a-visit>.
- 33 Tennessee State Board of Education, *Tennessee Educator Preparation Policy*, last modified October 31, 2014, https://www.tn.gov/assets/entities/sbe/attachments/5-504_EducatorPreparationPolicy_10-31-14.pdf. See page 11 for a complete list of the metrics that will be included in the annual reports.
- 34 Tennessee distinguishes between provider and program, rather than using the term "institution." A provider is an organization like Vanderbilt University, the University of Tennessee, or Teach for America, while a program is an area of preparation (e.g., elementary education, middle-grades math).
- 35 These outcomes come directly from Tennessee's educator-preparation policy. The state has convened an implementation working group to develop and refine metrics related to each of these topics. For this reason, these outcomes may change.
- 36 Tennessee State Board of Education, *Tennessee Educator Preparation Policy*. See appendix F for a complete timeline.



Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the Joyce Foundation for providing funding for this paper. The authors would also like to thank the state contacts who shared their time and expertise with us. Any inaccuracies belong to the authors alone.

About the Authors



Ashley LiBetti Mitchel

Ashley LiBetti Mitchel is a senior analyst at Bellwether Education Partners. She can be reached at ashley.mitchel@bellwethereducation.org.



Chad Aldeman

Chad Aldeman is an associate partner at Bellwether Education Partners. He can be reached at chad.aldeman@bellwethereducation.org.



BELLWETHER
EDUCATION PARTNERS
IDEAS | PEOPLE | RESULTS

About Bellwether Education Partners

Bellwether Education Partners is a nonprofit dedicated to helping education organizations in the public, private, and nonprofit sectors become more effective in their work and achieve dramatic results, especially for high-need students. To do so, we provide a unique combination of exceptional thinking, talent, and hands-on strategic support.

© 2016 Bellwether Education Partners



This report carries a Creative Commons license, which permits noncommercial re-use of content when proper attribution is provided. This means you are free to copy, display and distribute this work, or include content from this report in derivative works, under the following conditions:



Attribution. You must clearly attribute the work to Bellwether Education Partners, and provide a link back to the publication at <http://bellwethereducation.org/>.



Noncommercial. You may not use this work for commercial purposes without explicit prior permission from Bellwether Education Partners.



Share Alike. If you alter, transform, or build upon this work, you may distribute the resulting work only under a license identical to this one.

For the full legal code of this Creative Commons license, please visit www.creativecommons.org. If you have any questions about citing or reusing Bellwether Education Partners content, please contact us.