

MEETING CAEP ASSESSMENT EXPECTATIONS:

OACTE CONFERENCE 2016



TODAY'S PRESENTATION

- **CAEP annual reporting – data available from state**
- **Portfolios – best practices**
- **Dispositions – best practices**
- **EPP Mutual support:?**
 - **intern assessment**
 - **advanced programs**

CAEP ANNUAL REPORT: WHAT INFORMATION IS AVAILABLE FROM STATE PARTNERS?

TERESA K. DEBACKER

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

COMPLETER & EMPLOYER SURVEYS



OEQA SURVEY OF EARLY CAREER TEACHERS AND EMPLOYERS – NEW IN 2015-16

- InTASC-based items
 - Learner and Learning (#1-6)
 - Content Knowledge (#7-10)
 - Instructional Practice (#11-15)
 - Technology Integration (#16)
 - Professional Responsibility (#17-21)

OEQA SURVEY OF EARLY CAREER TEACHERS AND EMPLOYERS – NEW IN 2015-16

- Completer version:
 - For 1st, 2nd and 3rd year teachers
 - “My teacher preparation program prepared me to...” understand how learners grow and develop.
- Employer version:
 - For administrators of 1st, 2nd and 3rd year teachers
 - “The teacher...” understands how learners grow and develop.

COMPLETER VERSION ALSO INCLUDES:

- **Open Ended Questions:**

22. What courses or experiences in your teacher education program stand out as particularly important or meaningful? Explain.
23. Given the challenges you have faced as a classroom teacher, in what area could you have used more preparation?
24. Please note awards or honors received, degrees or certificates earned, and other recognitions from the current school year.

COMPLETER VERSION ALSO INCLUDES:

- **Other Questions:**

25. How many years have you been teaching?

- less than 1 year / 1 year / 2 years / 3 year / more than 3 years

26. Through which route did you receive your teaching license?

- traditional teacher certification / alternative teacher certification / emergency certification / other

27. From which institution did you receive recommendation for teacher certification? (If you hold alternative or emergency certification please select the Oklahoma State Department of Education)

- List of EPPs will be provided
- 

COMPLETER VERSION ALSO INCLUDES:

- **Other Questions (cont.):**

28. Were you assigned a mentor from your school districts? [YES/NO]

- If yes, please indicate the number of contact hours.
 - 1 hour or more per week / 1-3 hours per month / 4-7 hours per month
- If yes, is your mentor in your same teaching area?
 - YES / NO
- If yes, how satisfied are you with your mentoring relationship?
 - very unsatisfied --- very satisfied
- How can we improve the mentoring experience? (Comment box)

COMPLETER VERSION ALSO INCLUDES:

- **Other Questions (cont.):**

- 29. In what area(s) were you initially certified? [check all that apply – supply list]
- 30. In what additional areas are you certified? [check all that apply – supply list]
- 31. What is your current primary teaching assignment? [check all that apply – provide lists for grade level and subject]
- 32. In which other roles do you currently participate? [provide lists – e.g., team leader, instructional coach, mentor, student organization sponsor]

Individual EPPs can add unique items here



VALIDITY OF THE SURVEYS

- **Construct validity:** the degree to which an instrument measures what it claims to be measuring – effective teaching as represented in the InTASC standards.
 - Items reflect the actual language of the InTASC standards
- **Content validity:** the extent to which a measure represents all facets of a given construct.
 - All standards are included in the survey

RELIABILITY: INTERNAL CONSISTENCY

To assess the internal consistency of items measuring the four categories of the InTASC standards, Cronbach's alpha coefficients were calculated for each category

- Beginning Teachers, n=1576
- Employers, n=501

	Learner/ Learning	Content Knowledge	Instructional Practice	Professional Responsibility
Teachers	.94	.94	.96	.95
Employers	.95	.94	.97	.96

CALCULATING SCALE SCORES

- Learner and Learning (mean of items 1-6)
- Content Knowledge (mean of items 7-10)
- Instructional Practice (mean of items 11-15)
- Technology Integration (#16)
- Professional Responsibility (mean of items 17-21)

CAEP'S 8 ANNUAL REPORT MEASURES

(...when we started this process)

CAEP'S 8 ANNUAL REPORT MEASURES

- 5.1: Impact on P-12 learning and development
- 5.2: Results of completer surveys
- 5.3: Graduation rates
- 5.4: The ability of completers to meet licensing and any additional state requirements
- 5.5: Indicators of teaching effectiveness
- 5.6: Results of employer surveys, including retention and employment milestones
- 5.7: Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared
- 5.8: Student loan default rates and other consumer information

5.1: IMPACT ON P-12 LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT

◆ 5.1.2: TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS DATA

- WHAT DATA ARE AVAILABLE ON **PROGRAM COMPLETERS**?
 - Value Added Modeling (VAM): currently off the table
 - Quantitative Multiple Measures: currently off the table
 - TLE – Qualitative data
 - Observation data from TLE (Marzano, Tulsa model)
 - Surveys of P-12 learners: currently off the table

5.2: RESULTS OF COMPLETER SURVEYS

◆ COMPLETER SURVEY – CONTENT (5.2.2)

- Areas of preparation (survey must include at least one area):
 - ✓ Content knowledge
 - ✓ Instruction and pedagogical content knowledge
 - ✓ Teaching diverse P-12 students
 - ✓ Teaching P-12 students with diverse needs
 - Classroom management
 - ✓ Alignment and teaching the state standards
 - Family and community engagement
 - ✓ Assessment of P-12 student learning

5.2: RESULTS OF COMPLETER SURVEYS

◆ COMPLETER SURVEY – PROCEDURES (5.2.3)

- Survey administered by Office of Educational Quality and Accountability (OEQA) in spring of each academic year.
- Survey of teachers in their first three years of teaching
 - Statewide standard survey
 - Option for additional IHE items at end of teacher survey
- Response rate info available from OEQA for each EPP

5.2: RESULTS OF COMPLETER SURVEYS

◆ COMPLETER SURVEY – VALIDITY (5.2.5)

- Noted previously:
 - Construct validity
 - Content validity
 - Internal consistency reliability

5.5: INDICATORS OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

◆ TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS DATA (5.5)

- TLE – Qualitative data
 - Observation data from Marzano, Tulsa model

5.6: RESULTS OF EMPLOYER SURVEYS

◆ EMPLOYER SURVEY – CONTENT (5.6.2)

- Areas of preparation (survey must include at least one area):

Collaboration with school-based colleagues and staff

- ✓ Alignment of teaching with state standards

Family and community engagement

- ✓ Content/subject matter
- ✓ Instructional and pedagogical content knowledge
- ✓ Development of a safe learning environment
- ✓ Assessment of P-12 student learning
- ✓ Teaching P-12 students with diverse needs
- ✓ Teaching diverse P-12 students

5.6: RESULTS OF EMPLOYER SURVEYS

◆ EMPLOYER SURVEY – PROCEDURES (5.6.3)

- Survey administered by Office of Educational Quality and Accountability (OEQA) in spring of each academic year.
- Survey of administrators employing teachers in their first three years of teaching.
 - Statewide standard survey
 - Request: Individual IHEs not use additional surveys of administrators
- Response rate info available from OEQA for each EPP

5.6: RESULTS OF EMPLOYER SURVEYS

◆ EMPLOYER SURVEY – VALIDITY (5.6.4)

- Noted previously:
 - Construct validity
 - Content validity
 - Internal consistency reliability

EMPLOYMENT DATA FOR COMPLETERS (5.7)

◆ AVAILABLE DATA

- Completer surveys (OEQA)
- Employer surveys (OEQA)
- Employment data (OSDE):
 - Employed in a position for which they were prepared
 - Employed in an education position outside of their preparation (maybe)
 - Enrolled in higher education
 - Employed outside of the education field
 - Not employed
 - Employment status unknown
- Note. We will only have data on completers employed in Oklahoma public schools.

OSDE:TEACHER INFORMATION

- Teacher number
- Last Name
- First Name
- Race Code
- Race Description
- Gender
- Degree Code
- Degree Description
- Certification Code
- Certificate Description
- Certification Area Code
- Certification Area Description
- Grade Code
- Short Description
- Recommending Institution
- Recommendation Date
- Expiration Date

OSDE: POSITION INFORMATION

- County Name
- District Name
- County Code
- District Code
- School Code
- School Elite Name
- Site Level
- Job Code
- Job Description
- Subject Code
- Subject Description
- FTE
- Reason For Leaving

Each EPP will need to:

- match area of initial recommendation to teaching assignment each year.
- track graduates' employment from year to year.

TIMELINE FOR DATA SHARING

- OSDE collects personnel data in October
- OSDE send data to OSRHE for certification by Nov 1
- OEQA disaggregate data by EPP and sends on to EPPs

**OKLAHOMA TEACHER
PREPARATION
DATA GOVERNANCE COUNCIL**



MISSION

- To ensure that data collected through OSDE and OEQA on Educator Preparation Programs are used primarily for continuous improvement of EPPs in the state of Oklahoma, through responsible stewardship that emphasizes ease of use for the EPPs while ensuring strong privacy controls to prevent misuse of data.

COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP

- **Chair:** Jennifer Job, OK State Univ.
- Renée Laundey-Rodolf, OEQA
- Darin Martin, Oklahoma Christian Univ.
- Bryan Duke, Univ. of Central Oklahoma
- Brenda Sherbourne, East Central Univ
- Terri DeBacker, Univ of Oklahoma
- Lisa Huffman, Cameron University
- Goldie Thompson, Board of Regents
- Robyn Miller, SDE
- Ellen Dollarhide, SDE

ACCEPTABLE DATA USE

- **Data may be used** in the aggregate for reporting to external stakeholders (CAEP, OEQA) and for program improvement.
 - e.g., aggregated by program of study, department, institution, cohort year, etc.

PROHIBITED DATA USE

- **Data may not be used in the following ways.**
 - Release of data to unauthorized parties
 - Use of data to identify specific teachers/graduates
 - Use of data to contact teachers/graduates
 - Dissemination of data in a way that facilitates identification of specific teachers/graduates
 - Use of data to assess the performance of individuals
- Dissemination of data for any purpose other than program improvement or institutional reports is **prohibited.**

OTHER MATTERS

- Procedures are in place to protect the **confidentiality** of data.
- Each EPP will identify an official **data steward** to receive and manage OSDE data.
- Requesting data for **research purposes**:
 - Contact the Data Governance Council for information and applicable forms
 - **okdatagovcouncil@gmail.com**

PORTFOLIOS

MS. RENÉE LAUNEY-RODOLF

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL QUALITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

EXPECTATIONS FOR PORTFOLIOS

- Tag and Align
- Assignments
- Rubrics: Measurable and Actionable
- Validity and Reliability

ASSESSING DISPOSITIONS

DR. COURTNEY GLAZER

CAMERON UNIVERSITY

CAEP 3.3

CANDIDATE QUALITY, RECRUITMENT AND SELECTIVITY

- EPPs establish and monitor attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability that candidates must demonstrate at admissions and during the program.
- Measures may be related to SPAs or applied to all candidates.
- Examples from CAEP Std 3 rationale include “grit, communications, ability to motivate, focus, leadership, perseverance, writing, dialogue, questioning, self-assessment, and reflection”

CAEP 3.3

CANDIDATE QUALITY, RECRUITMENT AND SELECTIVITY

- Evidence considered sufficient must show that the chosen non-academic factors are
 - Used at admission or during preparation
 - Research-based
 - Monitored for individual candidate mentoring & program improvement
 - Used to predict candidate performance in the program and effective teaching
 - Connection to impact on student learning is best but connection to student engagement may be sufficient

VALIDITY & RELIABILITY “BY THE BOOK”

- Content Validity – easiest & meets CAEP sufficiency
 - Outside SME raters
 - “Is the skill or disposition measured by this item ‘essential,’ ‘useful but non essential,’ or ‘not necessary’ to the performance of the construct?” (Lawshe 1975)
 - Conduct a pilot study using the instrument
- Additional Validity – good to do, but not enough to be CAEP sufficient
 - Face validity (AKA standards alignment)
 - Curricular validity (AKA faculty review & revision)

VALIDITY & RELIABILITY “BY THE BOOK”

- Reliability
 - Training of scorers
 - e.g. Observe & rate videos of instruction, conduct joint observations & compare ratings, discuss differences & explain rationale for ratings
 - Are scorers being trained to recognize bias?
 - Is training required?
 - Do scorers achieve mastery through specified practice?
 - Checks of inter-rater agreement (%)
 - What doesn't work
 - Just recording data, routinely using instrument, providing detailed instructions, monitoring use in instrument

VALIDITY & RELIABILITY – AN ALTERNATIVE APPROACH

- Qualitative means of establishing data quality: Trustworthiness
 - Credibility – participant’s perspective
 - Discuss findings with candidate
 - Conduct candidate self-assessment
 - Confirmability – corroboration by others
 - Audit trail of data across assessors
 - Dependability – account for context
 - Audit trail reviewed by external auditors
 - Transferability – among contexts
 - Specially-designed assessor training focused on different contexts

PRACTICAL SUGGESTIONS

- Not all faculty members may believe that all dispositions can be taught
- Draw from InTASC (the CCSSO document)
- Construct an MOU for candidates re: dispositions as program requirement
 - Consult with legal
- Don't be afraid to have tough conversations
 - An investment in candidates but also faculty & school partners

SAMPLE EPP DISPOSITIONS WITH NCATE COMPARISON

Advocating for the learning of all children

was: exhibits belief that all students can learn
(Social justice/Doing the right thing/ Servant leadership)

Empathy

was: is sensitive student needs
(Kind/Compassionate/Nurturing/Positive view of others)

Open-mindedness

was: uses fair and consistent practices
(Growth mindset-others/Non-judgmental)

Willingness to learn

(Growth mindset-self/Eagerness to learn/Open to feedback/Lifelong learning/Use of technology)

Reflectiveness

was: is a reflective decision maker

Dedication

was: is dedicated to the profession
(Passion/Grit/Goal-orientation)

Integrity

was: uses fair and consistent practices
(Honesty/Consistency of character)

Positive attitude/Confidence* (Self-efficacy)

* undergraduates: to be emphasized through the program
but assessed only at end

INTERN PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT?

DR. BRENDA SHERBOURNE

EAST CENTRAL UNIVERSITY

STANDARDS FOR ADVANCED PROGRAMS – SCOPE/EXCEPTIONS

DR. VANESSA ANTON

NORTHEASTERN STATE UNIVERSITY

Resources:

- Update CAEP Advanced Guidelines/Handbook
- CAEP 2016 Standards for Advanced Programs (Full and One-Pager)
- Scope, Policies, and Rubrics (youtube)
- Board Action/June 2016--Color-coded summary of changes
- Phase-In Policy
- Self-Study
- Updates on Scope
- Petition to Exclude Advanced Programs
- Evidence Sufficiency Document (latest resource)
- Training with Tatiana Rivadeneyra, Director of SI and TI Pathways

THANK YOU

