

Proposal for 2017 Missouri Annual Performance Report for Educator Preparation Programs

The 2015 CAEP-sponsored publication *Building an Evidence-Based System for Teacher Preparation* recognized Missouri as a national leader in educator preparation program evaluation¹. Leadership, however, requires self-reflection and a commitment to continuous improvement. If Missouri is to maintain its place in the vanguard of reform, stakeholders in educator preparation must continue to pool their resources and perspectives in service to the cause. While the current system for reporting the quality of Missouri educator preparation programs is a laudable first step, careful analysis during its introductory period has identified several areas for potential revisions. These, generally, fall into two categories: 1) indicators and 2) structure.

There has been a great deal of discussion regarding the particular indicators that should be included in the APR. The addition and removal of several data points has been suggested, but, unfortunately, very little research exists to validate the inclusion (or removal) of certain types of data. Changes in this area will require substantial time, study, and testing and, so, do not lend themselves to short-term revisions. They are more plausible as the focus of longer-term efforts (e.g. the development of APR 2.0).

Greater potential for short-term change lies in the overall structure of the current APR. As constituted, the system provides a picture of a program's achievement that would benefit from a greater degree of nuance. Programs receive a score of either "Met" or "Not Met" on each indicator, with a 0 counting as much as missing the cut by a single point. Similarly, the system divides entire programs into two large categories, "Met" and "Not Met", with those that have met all indicators placed in one group and those that have failed to meet all indicators placed in another. This situation restricts EPP's ability to share both their strengths and weaknesses, and it does not provide other stakeholders with a particularly detailed picture of programs. It is in this area of general structure that the APR could best be revised in the short term with the potential for significant benefit.

The essential points of the proposal (APR 1.5) are:

1. Use data that is already being collected.
2. Assign a total number of points that could be earned on each indicator based upon a predetermined scale.
3. Reformat the reporting system to provide an overall score based upon points earned on each indicator.²
4. The total points earned by a program would result in assignment to one of four tiers.³

These changes would provide a more nuanced view of EPPs, which would benefit both programs and those evaluating them. Instead of two broad categories, it would be possible to see how EPPs cluster across the state in both overall scores and in individual categories. This revised system would also allow a more holistic perspective on a program because value would be more evenly spread across all indicators instead of being disproportionately allocated to "Not Met" categories. Lastly, these revisions would create a framework that would lend itself to the relatively simple addition, removal, or revision of indicators in the future.

¹ <http://www.caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/caep-accreditation-resources/building-an-evidence-based-system>

² *Building an Evidence-Based System for Teacher Preparation* suggests using some system of weighting.

³ Delaware's system provides an example of this: <http://www.doe.k12.de.us/domain/398>.

Included Data for 2017

<u>Key Indicators</u>	<u>Possible Metrics/Measures</u>	<u>Points</u>
Content Knowledge	Content GPA	20 (10x2)
Content Knowledge	MoCA	20 (10x2)
Teaching Skill	MEES	20 (10x2)
Teaching Skill	MoPTA	20 (10x2)
Completer Rating of Program	1st Year Teacher Survey	10
Principal Rating of 1st Year Teachers	1st Year Principal Survey	10

Assignment of Points

	Content GPA ⁴ (x2)		MoCA ⁵ (x2)		MEES ⁶ (x2)		MoPTA ⁷ (x2)		1st Year Teacher Survey ⁸		1st Year Principal Survey ⁹	
	Score	Weighted Points	Score	Weighted Points	Score	Weighted Points	Score	Weighted Points	Score	Weighted Points	Score	Weighted Points
10	3.6	20	90%	20	90%	20	3.6	20	90%	10	90%	10
9	3.2	18	80%	18	80%	18	3.2	18	80%	9	80%	9
8	2.8	16	70%	16	70%	16	2.8	16	70%	8	70%	8
7	2.4	14	60%	14	60%	14	2.4	14	60%	7	60%	7
6	2.0	12	50%	12	50%	12	2.0	12	50%	6	50%	6
5	1.6	10	40%	10	40%	10	1.6	10	40%	5	40%	5
4	1.2	8	30%	8	30%	8	1.2	8	30%	4	30%	4
3	.8	6	20%	6	20%	6	.8	6	20%	3	20%	3
2	.4	4	10%	4	10%	4	.4	4	10%	2	10%	2

Overall Program Rating

Tier 1	80-100% of total points possible
Tier 2	65-79% of total points possible
Tier 3	55-64% of total points possible
Tier 4	0-54% of the total points possible

⁴ Average completer GPA

⁵ Pass Rate

⁶ Percentage of completers "Meeting the Standard" on the four data points reported

⁷ Mean program score

⁸ Percentage of completers reporting "adequate" or better preparation at the conclusion of their first year teaching

⁹ Percentage of principals reporting that program completers concluding their first year teaching had adequate" or better preparation.

Additional Proposed Changes

1. MoCA Pass Rate: Subtests should be reported separately, with each subtest being assigned a proportional value. Example: For elementary programs, each subtest would be worth 25% of all of the points in the indicator.
2. Missing Indicators: Overall program rating should be determined by dividing the total points earned by the total points possible.
 - a. If a program has a large enough N on at least 3 indicators, then an overall rating would be calculated based upon the points possible and the points earned on those 3 indicators.
 - b. Ratings for programs that do not report content GPA would earn an overall rating based upon 80 possible points.

Example 1:

The Secondary Social Studies Program at Daniel Boone University earned the following points:

	Content GPA	MoCA	MEES	MoPTA	1st Year Teacher Survey	1st Year Principal Survey
Score	3.3	86%	73%	2.67	87%	77%
Points Earned	18 (9x2)	18 (9x2)	164 (8x2)	14 (7x2)	9	8

The program's total score would be 83 out of 100, for an overall percentage of 83% and a Tier 1 rating.

Example 2:

The Elementary Education Program at Daniel Boone University earned the following points:

	Content GPA	MoCA	MEES	MoPTA	1st Year Teacher Survey	1st Year Principal Survey
Score	N/A	79	83	2.3	74	85
Points Earned	N/A	16 ¹⁰	18 (9x2)	12 (6x2)	8	9

The program's total score would be 63 out of 80, for an overall percentage of 79% and a Tier 1 rating.

¹⁰ Earned from combining points converted from pass rates on 4 sub-tests; 5 possible points each.