**CAEP Standard Four Working Group Gaps Analysis**

Group Members: Jeffrey M. Kenton (Chair), Raymond L. Martens, Deitra Wengert, Christine C. Roland, Robert Rook, Patricia M. Rice Doran, Marie K. Heath, Gail M. Bailey, Qing Li, James V. Foran, Charles Conrad Meyer

Standard 4 provides the mechanisms necessary to measure program impact upon K-12 students. Towson’s Educator Preparation Program will demonstrate the impact of its completers on P-12 student learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools, and the satisfaction of its completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.

**Impact on P-12 Student Learning and Development: (4.1) Towson will document, using multiple measures that program completers contribute to an expected level of student-learning growth.**

*(Multiple measures shall include all available growth measures (including value-added measures, student-growth percentiles, and student learning and development objectives) required by the state for its teachers and available to educator preparation providers, other state-supported P-12 impact measures, and any other measures employed by the provider.)*

At present, the Towson EPP does not have access to these measures. They will need to be negotiated with either (a) all respective school systems, or (b) the MSDE and/or State employee data management systems to provide these data. Within the state of Maryland, there is a working group of interested IHE representatives pursuing a common measurement tool that would be satisfactory to the state agencies that can coordinate the data collection necessary for this requirement. The consensus among the working group members is that there are certain types of data that – though they exactly satisfy this request – would not be able to be released to IHE for use or analysis. This data includes individualized inservice teacher effectiveness data. Instead, the IHE may need to lobby for a singular data collection mechanism with aggregated data reported back to IHE and LEA for respective uses, probably measured in cohorts. That is, all new teachers hired in 2015-16 would be one cohort, all from 2014-15 would be another (i.e. 2nd year) cohort.

Next Steps: To accomplish this expectation, it is likely that all Maryland IHE will need to collaborate to identify: a singular survey instrument that can be distributed to ALL teachers within the first three years of their inservice practice; a singular short survey instrument for ALL principals who have pre-tenure period teachers in their schools (one survey per teacher). This survey would need to identify the “preparation path” for each teacher, including initial certification and any subsequent professional development from other institutions. There is a state-wide working group organizing for this effort.

The State of Maryland also has a longitudinal data system (MLDS) that was – in part – created to be able to track teacher effectiveness. Another attempt to extract data to satisfy 4.1 will be made to the group that manages the MLDS, enabling ALL MD-based EPP to receive aggregated data about their respective graduates. This meeting is in the pre-scheduling phase.

**Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness: (4.2) The provider demonstrates, through structured and/or validated observation instruments and student surveys, that completers effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve.**

At present, Towson collects analogous data using its 1st and 3rd year alumni surveys of graduates. The depth of the questions is limited to answering questions on the preparation experience and preparation for the InTASC Standards. Future work will need to address the creation of an observation instrument and a student survey. Given the size of Towson’s annual preparation cohort (~700 initial certification graduates), and the proportion of these graduates hired within Maryland (~30% of the total cohort; ~210 teachers), and the geographic disbursement of these graduates across the state, direct observations of each graduate will be extremely difficult. In addition, the collection of data across the entire grade band range of program completers (PreK-12), would necessitate several surveys used by the PreK-12 students to account for their relative ability to rate their teachers. That is, the survey for k-3 grades would have less text, those for grades 1-6 would focus on total content pedagogy, and those for 7-12 would focus more on content knowledge. Recent CAEP guidance on this topic suggests that a structured *sample* of the entire cohort could be observed and would represent the entire cohort.

Next Steps: Towson, perhaps in consultation with the IHE working group, will need to create an evaluation instrument, and a sampling technique to identify which new teachers to evaluate. Towson will also need to devise three instruments for use in PreK-12 classrooms.

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

At present, the Towson EPP collects analogous data using its employer survey. This survey is distributed during the first year of teaching for teachers hired within specific schools. This employer survey accompanies the first year alumni survey for each newly hired teacher that we can identify as a Towson graduate. The survey asks questions about the principal’s rating of a new teacher’s capacity to teach using the InTASC standards as benchmark. To address the standard, Towson’s EPP will need to identify measures that will enable multiple year evaluations/surveys to establish baselines and trends for each newly hired teacher. Some of this work overlaps the needs identified in element 4.1.

Next steps: This measure will likely only be successful if Towson’s effort is matched/mated with the similar efforts being expended by the other IHE. Current COMAR, teachers unions, MSDE, and LEA HR departments are very unlikely to voluntarily share this data with each institution that requests it. If instead, this was a single request, reported out to the IHE and other stakeholders, the request may be more palatable.

**Satisfaction of Completers: (4.4) The provider demonstrates, using measures that result in valid and reliable data, that program completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job, and that the preparation was effective.**

At present, the Towson EPP collects some amount of this data from its alumni surveys. Responders to those surveys identify their respective abilities to meet each of the InTASC standards, and help identify strengths and weaknesses in preparation experiences. To fully meet the standard, the Towson EPP will need to expand its survey to more specifically identify strengths and weaknesses in the preparation experiences. For example, instead of identifying generic aspects of preparation, the completers could be asked specific questions about relative strengths and weaknesses of each of the InTASC standards and the MSDE-specific questions related to diverse learners (Diverse, inclusive, ELL, G&T, work with other school personnel).

Next steps: The Towson EPP will need to reframe its present request to be more specific on the inservice measures it collects. The current survey is generic and does not provide actionable data on all of the identified category titles.