

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
AUGUST 23, 2023

SUBJECT

Educator Preparation Programs Performance Measures and Definition – Low Performing

REFERENCE

October 2016	Board was updated on progress made toward developing educator preparation program effectiveness/performance measures.
December 2016	Board approved the proposed measures for determining Educator Preparation Program Provider effectiveness.
February 2022	Board directed staff to bring back recommendations for new performance measures that were more meaningful.
December 2022	Board adopted EPP Performance Measure Report and Title II effectiveness designations and moved that new performance measures referenced in December would come back to the Board for consideration no later than the April 2023 Board meeting.
May 18, 2023	A work group was brought together to create new Annual Performance Measures.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Higher Education Act of 1965, §207 (2008)
IDAPA 08.02.02.100

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Annually, the Office of the State Board of Education (Board) certifies and submits Idaho's Title II report to the U.S. Department of Education (USDOE). The report includes data from public and private teacher preparation programs authorized by the State Board of Education to prepare individuals for certification in Idaho. On October 16, 2016, the USDOE released revised Title II requirements. The rule imposed new reporting measures—beyond the basics required for annual reports under the Higher Education Act—which identify levels of program effectiveness to drive continuous improvement.

The intent of the rule is to promote transparency about the effectiveness of all educator preparation providers (traditional, alternative routes, and distance) by requiring states to report annually—at the program level—on the following measures:

- Feedback from graduates and their employers on the effectiveness of program preparation; and
- Student learning outcomes measured by novice teachers' student growth, teacher evaluation results, and/or another state-determined measure that is

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
AUGUST 23, 2023

- relevant to students' outcomes, including academic performance, and meaningfully differentiates amongst teachers; and
- Placement and retention rates of graduates in their first three years of teaching, including placement and retention in high-need schools; and
 - Other program characteristics, including assurances that the program has specialized accreditation or graduate candidates with content and pedagogical knowledge, and quality clinical preparation, who have met rigorous exit requirements.

States are allowed flexibility in determining how to weigh all outcome measures but are required to categorize program effectiveness using at least three levels of performance (effective, at-risk, and low performing) annually. These federal requirements are designed to facilitate ongoing feedback amongst programs, prospective teachers, schools and districts, states and the public.

In early 2013, while the proposed Title II (Higher Education Act) rule was moving through the process of negotiated rulemaking at the federal level, representatives from Idaho's educator preparation programs met with Board staff to develop common assessments and create consistency in measuring program outcomes. The Idaho measures were shaped in alignment with the proposed federal rule and, as a result, the rubric developed by Board staff with feedback from the educator preparation programs was approved by the Board at the December 2016 regular Board meeting. Since that time, the Board-approved educator preparation programs have struggled to provide the data necessary to complete the annual report. As a result, Board staff have worked with all of the Board-approved educator preparation programs, both traditional and non-traditional to develop a new rubric that can be used to fairly rate all programs in compliance with the Title II requirements.

Work on the performance measures was resumed as the Board office returned to full staffing in the summer of 2021. Significant issues with the performance measures were revealed in the process of preparing the report that was presented at the February 2021 Regular Board meeting. These included a lack of data uniformity among Educator Preparation Programs, substantial unavailable/missing data, concerns about the validity of certain measures, and major changes to relevant standards and statute since the original development and adoption of the rubric.

In December 2022, Board staff started working with a group composed of a representative from each Educator Preparation Program. The group was tasked with providing feedback on the proposed performance measures in the hope that consensus could be reached. These representatives were from public, non-public, and non-traditional Educator Preparation Programs. The group met four times: 12/5/2022, 12/19/2022, 1/9/2023, 3/10/2023.

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
AUGUST 23, 2023

On May 18, 2023, a work group that consisted of the State Board President, Superintendent Critchfield, Division of Career Technical Education staff, practitioners from the K-12 field in Idaho, and faculty from the Educator Preparation Programs were brought together to create new Annual Performance Measures. The previous Annual Performance Measures work was reviewed. Seven Educator Preparation Providers worked together to bring forward four Annual Performance Measures for the work group to review and discuss. With some minor changes, the work group came to consensus. The results will be reported for the October 2023 Title II reporting requirements, and it will be noted that this is a pilot year in the narrative.

IMPACT

If the Board approves the performance measures recommended, as outlined in Attachment 1, the new performance measures will be used for the Annual Performance Measures Report that will be completed every October along with Title II reporting that is completed every October.

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment 1 – Idaho’s Annual Educator Preparation Program Performance Measures
- Attachment 2 – Annual Performance Measures Work Group Reference Sheet

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

At minimum, states must use the 2016-17 academic year to design their reporting system in consultation with stakeholders. They could choose to use 2017-18 as a pilot year and were required to fully implement the system in 2018-19. For programs not performing at an “effective” level, federal consequences outline that such programs will become ineligible for the Teacher Education Assistance for College and Higher Education (TEACH) grants. The first year for which any program could lose TEACH grant eligibility was 2021-22. The TEACH grant program is a federal program that provides grants of up to \$4,000 per year to students who agree to teach for four years in an elementary or secondary school, or educational service agency that serves students from low-income families.

In addition to the Title II reporting and rating requirements, comprehensive educator preparation program performance measures will allow the Board to evaluate the effectiveness of all of the programs approved by the Board; public, non-public, traditional and non-traditional programs. This information will help to inform the Board and other state policy makers on the effectiveness of approved programs along with standard and alternate routes to educator preparation.

In fall 2022 and spring 2023, Board staff met with representatives of the existing Board-approved educator preparation programs four times to discuss potential performance measures. The group could only come to consensus on one measure:

- Indicator: Pedagogical Knowledge

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
AUGUST 23, 2023

- Performance Measure: The percentage of candidates who passed the Common Summative Assessment (Teaching Framework) at a basic or better in all 22 components
 - Source of Data: Educator Preparation Program Reported Data

Board staff have been attempting to work with stakeholders to establish meaningful measures of performance and effectiveness since the original performance measures were approved by the Board in 2016. At that time, there was loose consensus with the measures developed by the group of representatives from the EPP programs. However, when it was time to pull the data for the report it became clear that the measures or the data available would not provide the information necessary to annually rate the programs as required. At the May 18, 2023, the work group came to consensus regarding the Annual Performance Measures.

Staff recommends approval of the performance measures as presented, with the understanding that as the data is pulled and compiled additional amendments may need to be brought back to the Board for approval.

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the proposed performance measures for determining Educator Preparation Provider program effectiveness, as submitted in Attachment 1.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

AUGUST 23, 2023

ATTACHMENT 1

**Annual Performance Measures for
Reporting on Educator Preparation Program Performance**

Indicator	Performance Measure	Benchmark	Indicator Points	Data Source
Pedagogical Knowledge	The percentage of candidates who, at exit of program, passed the Common Summative Assessment (Idaho Framework for Teaching Evaluation) at a basic or better in all 22 components.	90%	> 90% = 25 points 80% - 89.9% = 15 points < 70% = 0 points	State and EPP Provided
Content Knowledge	The percentage of overall completer pass rate of Idaho State Board Approved content assessment for which the EPP has at least ten candidates complete the assessment during the academic year.	80%	>80% = 25 points 79% = 24 points 78% = 23 points ... < 64% = 0 points	State and EPP provided
Completer Effectiveness on Professional Practice	The percentage of teachers of record and completers who signed an Idaho teaching contract in their first year after completion were eligible for and obtained the Idaho Professional Endorsement.	95%	> 95% = 25 points 94% = 24 points 93% = 23 points ... < 69% = 0 points	State provided
Persistence in an Idaho Local Education Agency	The percentage of teachers of record and completers who signed an Idaho teaching contract in their first year after completion working full-time in an Idaho Local Education Agency who persist for three years.	80%	> 80% = 25 points 75% = 20 points 70% = 15 points 65% = 10 points < 50% = 0 points	State provided

Scoring:

80-100 Points = Effective EPP

70-79 Points = At-risk EPP

0-69 Points = Ineffective EPP



**Annual Performance Measures Work Group
Reference Sheet
May 18, 2023 (9a.m.-12p.m. Mountain Time)**

Agenda:

- Welcome and Introductions
- Annual Performance Measures Overview
- Create New Annual Performance Measures for Reporting on Educator Preparation Program Effectiveness and Classification per Title II HEA
- Concluding Discussion

Why do we need Annual Performance Measures?

Federal Classification

[Title II of the Higher Education Act Section 207](#) requires each state to establish criteria for identifying Educator Preparation Programs and Providers that are “low performing” or “at risk” of being low performing. Institutions are to implement activities to meet the following assurances listed in [Section 206b, HEA](#). The results in the Annual Performance Measures Report are used to comply with Title II of the HEA requirements. Federal Title II state reporting is completed in October on an annual basis.

Idaho’s State Board Approved Educator Preparation Programs

- [Educator Preparation Programs | Idaho State Board of Education](#)

<p>Public and Non-Public Traditional Educator Preparation Programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Boise State University, Dr. Sherry Dismuke, (208) 426-1991. Accreditation: CAEP • Brigham Young University – Idaho, Dr. Melissa Green, (208) 496-4137. Accreditation: AAQEP • College of Idaho, Dr. Kevin Talbert, (208) 459-5232 • Idaho State University, Dr. Emma Wood, (208) 282-5443. Accreditation: CAEP • Lewis-Clark State College, Dr. Mark Haynal, (208) 792-2237. Accreditation: CAEP • Northwest Nazarene University, Dr. LoriAnn Sanchez, (208) 467-8457. Accreditation: CAEP • University of Idaho, Dr. Taylor Raney, (208) 885-1027. Accreditation: CAEP
<p>Non-Traditional Educator Preparation Programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • American Board (ABCTE), Isabelle Welch, (877) 669-2228 • College of Southern Idaho, Christina Linder, (208) 732-6385. Accreditation In Progress: AAQEP • Lewis-Clark State College, Dr. Mark Haynal, (208) 792-2237. Accreditation: CAEP • Teach for America, Tony Ashton, (208) 991-0455

Idaho’s Federal Teacher Shortage Area Report

- [TSA \(ed.gov\)](#)

School Year	State	Subject Matter	Discipline	Grades
2023-2024	Idaho	Art and Music Education	Visual and Performing Arts	Pre-K, K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12
2023-2024	Idaho	Career and Tech. Education	Agricultural Science and Tech.	6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12
2023-2024	Idaho	Career and Tech. Education	Family and Consumer Science	6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12
2023-2024	Idaho	Core Subjects	Elementary Education	Pre-K, K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
2023-2024	Idaho	Health and Physical Fitness	Physical Education	Pre-K, K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12
2023-2024	Idaho	Mathematics	Basic and Adv. Mathematics	6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12
2023-2024	Idaho	Science	General Science	6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12
2023-2024	Idaho	Special Education	All Exceptionalities	Pre-K, K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12

**PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
AUGUST 23, 2023**

ATTACHMENT 2

2023-2024	Idaho	Support Staff	Counseling	Pre-K, K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12
2023-2024	Idaho	Support Staff	Psychologist	Pre-K, K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12

Performance Measures Report from October 2022

- [Educator Preparation Program Performance Measures | Idaho State Board of Education](#)

Performance Measures Work

Current Annual Performance Measures	Commonly Used Performance Measures in Other States
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Student Growth 2. Teacher Evaluation Measures 3. Placement Rate 4. High Need Placement Rate 5. Retention Rate 6. High Need Retention Rate 7. Alumni Feedback 8. Employer Feedback 9. Content and Pedagogical Knowledge 10. Quality Clinical Preparation and Rigorous Exit Qualifications 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Entrance requirements 2. Number of Applicants/Number of Admitted Applicants 3. Number of Completers 4. Candidates being prepared in high-need subjects 5. Curricular requirements 6. Faculty Qualifications 7. Fieldwork Requirements (Clinical Practice) 8. Retention 9. Candidate Competency 10. Satisfaction of Completers 11. Satisfaction of Employers 12. Content Knowledge Assessment Pass Rate

Stakeholder Input on New Annual Performance Measures	Previous Work Group Input on Performance Measures with prior Ed. Effectiveness Program Manager
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evaluation Ratings 2. Completer Survey, Employer Survey, Parent Perception Survey of Completers 3. Demographics/Diversity of Completers 4. Assessment, 1st Attempt Pass Rates, Assessment of Dispositions 5. Self-Assessment of Completers 6. State Program Review Results 7. Academic Growth of Completers 8. Entry Requirements 9. Placement Rates, Placement in Low-Income/Hard to Staff Schools/Critical Shortage Areas 10. Retention of Completers 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Average rating for completers from the previous 3 years on the summative evaluation score in last year's evaluation 2. % of completers from the previous 3 years who had at least 1 component marked unsatisfactory in last year's evaluation. 3. % of completers from the previous 3 years who had at least 50% of their students meet Measurable Student Achievement or Student Success Indicator targets in last year's evaluation 4. # of completers from the last 3 years who had action taken against their certificate by the PSC last year. 5. Average rating that completers from this program receive on Employer perception survey 6. This survey would be distributed to the employing administrators of the program's completers. 7. Average rating that completers of this program give themselves on Completer perception survey 8. This survey would be given to program completers upon application for initial certification 9. Average rating that completers of this program give themselves on New Teacher perception survey 10. This survey would be distributed to new teachers in the latter half of their first year of teaching. 11. % of completers from the last 3 years who had accepted a certificated position in any Idaho public school as of last year (i.e., placement rate) 12. % of completers from the last 3 years who had accepted a certificated position in any RURAL Idaho public school as of last year (i.e., rural placement rate) 13. % of completers who returned to ANY Idaho public school last year following their first year (i.e., 2nd year state-level retention rate) 14. % of completers assigned to a RURAL Idaho public school who returned to any RURAL Idaho public school last year following their first year (i.e., 2nd year rural retention rate) 15. % of completers who returned to ANY Idaho public school last year following their fourth year (i.e., 4th year state-level retention rate) 16. % of completers assigned to a RURAL Idaho public school who returned to any Rural Idaho public school last year following their first year (i.e., 4th year rural retention rate)

Current Work Group Recommendation:

Indicator	Performance Measure
-----------	---------------------

**PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
AUGUST 23, 2023**

ATTACHMENT 2

Pedagogical Knowledge	The percentage of candidates who passed the Common Summative Assessment (Teaching Framework) at a basic or better in all 22 components
-----------------------	--

Accountability Measures Used for CAEP’s Annual Report

CAEP Accountability Measures:

- (1) Completer impact and effectiveness
 - *Completer impact in contributing to P-12 student learning and growth and completer effectiveness in applying professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions*
 - Data Options May Include: Student Performance Measures, Portfolios, Case Study, Teacher Evaluation Data, Interviews, Observations of Completers, Surveys, Other
- (2) Employer satisfaction and stakeholder involvement
 - *Data provided should be collected on employers’ satisfaction with program completers*
 - Data Options May Include: Surveys, Case Studies, Interviews, Stakeholder feedback, input, other
- (3) Candidate competency at the time of program completion
 - *Data provided should relate to measures the EPP is using to determine if candidates are meeting program expectations and ready to be recommended for licensures. (Title II Report, Data that reflect the ability of EPP candidates to meet licensing and state requirements or other measures the EPP uses to determine candidate competency at completion*
 - Data Options May Include: Threshold/criteria for success at completion, EPP created measures, content exams, licensure measures, student-teaching evaluation instrument, dispositions, other
- (4) Ability of completers to be hired in positions for which they were prepared
 - *Ability to be hired in position that the completer was prepared in*
 - Data Options May Include: State EPP collected data related to completers’ employment in teaching positions for which they are prepared

EPPs are reporting the following based on the CAEP Annual Report – Accountability Measures:

** Note: The type of data can change year to year as long as it addresses the CAEP Accountability Measure.*

<p>BSU</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of 1st year completers that met student achievement/student success indicator target • % of 1st year completers that met satisfactory on all 22 components of the Danielson’s Framework for Teaching • Employer and alumni survey data • Graduation rates • Pass rates on content exams • 1st year completer placement rates • # of Completers by Title II Subject Area • Three-year student loan default rate at BSU 	<p>UI</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completer and Alumni Satisfaction Survey data • Professional Endorsement Awarded • UITPA aligned with the Danielson Framework for Teaching • % of program level degrees awarded by primary licensure area • % of recommendations for certification by primary licensure area and program level • % of Title II Completer Pass Rates on Content Exam • % of Completers with employment contracts in Idaho by program level
<p>LCSC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completer mentor program outcomes and Tripod Survey data • Employer and Alumni Survey data • Advisory Board Minutes • Graduation Rates • Licensing Rates of Completers • Hiring Rates of Completers 	<p>ISU</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case Study on Impact on P-12 Growth • Employer and Alumni Survey data • Employer Feedback Protocol • Common Summative Assessment – Aligned to Danielson Framework for Teaching Framework • Title II pass rates on content exam • Number of Completers