

# Educator Preparation Program Accountability in Selected States

## Context

Education agency staff in several states asked SREB to conduct research on how other states created performance accountability systems for teacher education programs. This document describes state efforts to develop performance measures and create public report cards. SREB collected state-specific information by reviewing state statutes, administrative regulations, and state agency websites. The Appendix includes program accountability profiles for all SREB states and nine additional states.

## Accountability Measures

This section features performance metrics created by 10 states — Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Idaho, Illinois, Maryland, North Carolina, Ohio, Texas and Virginia.

### Florida

The State Department of Education generates annual reports that summarize outcome data across six measures:

1. Placement rates	4. Performance of students by subgroup
2. Retention rates	5. Annual educator evaluation
3. Performance of all students as measured by Florida's student growth formula	6. Program completers in statewide critical teacher shortage areas

State officials rate the first five measures on a four-point scale. Programs may earn bonus points if they have increased the number of completers entering critical shortage areas.

Source: [Rule 6A-5.066 Approval of Teacher Preparation Programs](#)

### Georgia

The state's Professional Standards Commission developed Teacher Preparation Program Effectiveness Measures. Programs submit data on five measures across two domains:

<i>Outcome Measures (50%)</i>	<i>Program Measures (50%)</i>
1. Perception of first-year teachers (10%)	4. Passage rates on pedagogy assessment (30%)
2. Perception of supervisors (10%)	5. Passage rates on content assessment(s) (20%)
3. Teacher observation data (30%)	

Citation: [PSC Rule 505-3-.02](#)

## Accountability Measures (continued)

### Kentucky

State regulations require state and program report cards to include five performance measures:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. Pass rates on required licensure exams                                 | 3. Student teacher satisfaction   |
| 2. Pass rates for the Kentucky Teacher and Principal Internship programs* | 4. Teacher intern satisfaction  |
|   | 5. New teacher ( $\leq 3$ years) and supervisor satisfaction with program |

\* State law requires districts to deliver first-year induction programming. Lack of state funding led the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board to suspend the program until June 30, 2020.

Source: [16 KAR 5:010](#)

### Idaho

The state board of education approved an accountability framework including 11 performance metrics.

<i>Domains</i>	<i>Weighting</i>	<i>Metrics</i>
Impact on Student Learning	15%	Student Growth (10 points) Classroom Observation Results (5 points)
Employment Outcomes	8%	Teacher Placement Teacher Placement in High-Need Schools Teacher Retention Teacher Retention in High-Need Schools
Survey Outcomes	25%	Completer Feedback (15 points) Employer Feedback (10 points)
Program Characteristics	52%	Content and Pedagogical Knowledge (26 points) Rigorous Exit Qualifications (26 points) Quality Clinical Preparation <sup>‡</sup>

<sup>‡</sup> The state assesses clinical experiences every third or fourth year, depending on the accreditation review cycle.

## Accountability Measures (continued)

### Idaho

Several indicators contribute to Content and Pedagogical Knowledge metrics. The state may use syllabi review, clinical observations, candidate assessment scores, GPA, program artifacts and interviews with various stakeholders as evidence to score this measure.

The state uses the results of the Common Summative Assessment of Teaching and Individualized Professional Learning Plans to rate the Rigorous Exit Qualifications metric.

The state board approved the use of the performance framework to determine whether programs are effective, at-risk or low performing on or before October 2019.

Sources: [State Board Minutes for December 2016 Meeting](#) and [EPP Performance Measures Rubric](#)

### Illinois

In 2016 the state board created the Partnership for Educator Preparation; its steering committee provides recommendations related to collecting and sharing program data. The Partnership has led a statewide pilot for preparation programs to collect performance accountability data. At a November 2018 meeting, the steering committee shared 18 proposed accountability indicators across four domains:

<i>Domain</i>	<i>Selected Indicators</i>
Candidate Selection Profile	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Academic Strength</li><li>• Teaching Promise</li><li>• Candidate/Completer Diversity</li></ul>
Knowledge and Skills for Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Mastery of Content and Pedagogy</li><li>• Program Ratings by Completers, Novice Teachers and Supervisors</li></ul>
Performance as Classroom Teachers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Impact on K-12 Students</li><li>• K-12 Student Perspectives of Teachers</li></ul>
Contribution to State Needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Placement/Persistence in High-Need Schools</li><li>• Minority Completion</li></ul>

Starting in Fall 2019 the state board will implement the new performance accountability system, and in Spring 2020 it will release the data publicly.

Sources: [PEP Website](#) & [PEP November 2018 Presentation](#)

## Accountability Measures (continued)

### Maryland

The state performance framework emphasizes the importance of clinical experiences and partnerships with cooperating districts. The five [Institutional Performance Criteria](#) are:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. Qualifications of program entrants   | 4. Linkage with PreK-12 priorities        |
| 2. Extensive internships                | 5. State or national accreditation status |
| 3. Performance on licensure assessments |   |

The criteria prioritize improvement in several areas, including candidate recruitment, clinical experiences, and performance on licensure assessments. Under each criterion, the state department provided performance indicators and detailed guidance on how to report on them.

### North Carolina

State law requires Annual Performance Reports to include at least three performance measures:

<i>Completer Measures</i>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Performance on annual personnel evaluations</li> <li>2. Teacher impact on student performance, using value-added data when available</li> <li>3. Results of first-year satisfaction survey</li> </ol>

Source: [SBOE Rule TCED-013](#)

### Ohio

State law requires the Ohio Board of Regents and Ohio Department of Education to produce annual performance reports. Indicators fall into three categories:

<i>Program Efforts</i>	<i>Candidate Outcomes &amp; Perceptions</i>	<i>Completer Outcomes &amp; Perceptions</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Admissions Standards</li> <li>• Field/Clinical Experiences</li> <li>• Excellence &amp; Innovation Initiatives</li> <li>• National Accreditation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Licensure Pass Rates</li> <li>• Teacher &amp; Principal Candidate Survey Results</li> <li>• Principal Mentor Survey Results</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation Results</li> <li>• Impact on Student Growth</li> <li>• Resident Educator Survey</li> <li>• Resident Retention</li> <li>• Employer/Principal Survey</li> </ul>

Source: [Ohio Rev. Code Ann. § 3333.048](#)

## Accountability Measures (continued)

### Texas

The state approves preparation programs based on five performance measures:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. Passage on certification exams               | 4. Compliance with state clinical practice requirements |
| 2. Supervisor appraisals of first-year teachers | 5. Completer satisfaction survey                        |
| 3. Performance of students                      |   |

The Texas State Board for Educator Certification prioritized improvement on the first two measures, increasing the required minimum performance benchmarks annually through 2020-2021.

Source: [19 TAC 229.4](#)

### Virginia

The State Board of Education approves preparation programs biennially based on seven standards:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. Performance on licensure exams           | 5. Contribution to student achievement                   |
| 2. Performance on basic skills assessments  | 6. Employer job satisfaction                             |
| 3. Structured, integrated field experiences | 7. Partnerships and collaborations with PreK-12 partners |
| 4. Diverse clinical experiences             |  |

Source: [8 VAC 20-543-40](#)

### Synthesis

Generally, state performance measures fall into one of six categories:

- |  |                                      |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Recruitment and enrollment            | 4. Completer performance             |
| 2. Candidate performance                 | 5. Surveys of completer satisfaction |
| 3. Performance on licensure examinations | 6. Surveys of employers or peers     |

The [Appendix](#) summarizes the performance measures adopted by each selected state.

## Report Cards and Dashboards

Six SREB states developed or will develop Educator Preparation Program report cards: Alabama, Delaware, Kentucky, Louisiana, North Carolina and Tennessee. This section features report card efforts in Connecticut, Delaware, Louisiana, New Mexico and Tennessee.

### Connecticut

In December 2016, the state board adopted the Educator Preparation Advisory Council's recommendation to implement an educator preparation data dashboard. After September 2018, the state department will use the data dashboard to report to the General Assembly on program quality.

<i>Data Categories</i>	<i>Indicators</i>
Program Selectivity, Entry and Completion	Program admission selectivity and graduation rates
Candidate Pre-Service Performance	Pass rates on licensure assessments (e.g., Praxis II, edTPA)
Candidate Employment, Persistence, and In-Service Performance	Initial employment rates across state and in hard-to-staff schools Persistence rates for first and third years after program completion Surveys of completers and employers Teacher-level summative evaluation ratings
District Partnership Leadership	Surveys of district superintendents and program deans related to quality of district partnerships

Source: [Adoption of the Recommendations of the Educator Preparation Advisory Council](#)

## Report Cards and Dashboards (continued)

### Delaware

The [Delaware Educator Preparation Scorecards](#) assess program performance across six domains on a biennial basis.

<i>Program Measures</i>	<i>Outcome Measures</i>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Recruitment (10 points)</li><li>2. Candidate Performance (10 points)</li></ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>3. Placement (15 points)</li><li>4. Retention (15 points)</li><li>5. Graduate Performance (35 points)</li><li>6. Perceptions (15 points)</li></ol>

Based on a review of the data, state officials score two to four metrics under each domain. Programs receive a domain rating based on a four-tier scale. Per the state's [Educator Preparation Program Guide](#), officials tabulate domain scores to generate an overall performance rating.

Source: [14 DEL 290](#)

### Louisiana

State Board regulations require the Louisiana Department of Education to produce Educator Preparation Program performance profiles starting in Winter 2019. The profiles will include a Quality Rating with three weighted domains:

- Preparation Program Experience: 50%
- Meeting Workforce Needs: 25%
- Teacher (Completer) Quality: 25%

The educator workforce domain encourages programs to place teacher residents in high-needs schools and graduate more teachers in high-need certification areas. State officials award points based on the degree to which programs meet or exceed state needs on the residency and certification measures.

The State Department collaborated with the Louisiana Board of Regents and education experts to adopt measures for the Teacher Quality domain. State regulation requires the use of a value-added measure to assess the impact of completers on student achievement. The State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education has the authority to adopt new licensure assessments and a process for scoring the Teacher Quality domain. The State Department will submit biennial reports to recommend changes in ratings.

The performance profiles will also include informational metrics, which may include (but are not limited to) the placement and retention of completers in Louisiana schools.

Source: [LAC 28: XLV](#)

## Report Cards and Dashboards (continued)

### *New Mexico*

The Public Education Department produces Educator Preparation Program Scorecards. Programs receive A to F grades in four domains:

- Admissions (27 points)
- Candidate Promise (18 points)
- Hiring and Retention (27 points)
- Graduate Performance (108 points)

Programs may receive up to 180 points across the four domains. The state department assigns a summative performance score based on the percentage of points earned. The scorecard prioritizes post-completion outcomes, with the third and fourth domains counting for 75 percent of the overall performance score. Like Tennessee, New Mexico's scorecard awards points based on where the program sits in relation to its peers. The scorecard also aligns with state priorities. For instance, the scorecard rewards programs that graduate more educators prepared to teach STEM subjects, students with disabilities and low-income students. While impact on student growth is one of 15 scorecard indicators, the metric accounts for 24 percent of the total possible points.

Source: [Educator Preparation Program Scorecards](#)

### *Tennessee*

The State Board of Education produces an annual [Teacher Preparation Report Card](#). The report cards include four domains: candidate profile, employment, satisfaction, and provider impact.

The report card shows Educator Preparation Program performance on each domain over the last two years. For each indicator, the report provides a possible scoring range based on statewide data. Programs exceeding the state score on an indicator receive at least half of the possible points. Programs outpacing their peers on given indicators will receive a higher percentage of the total possible points.

The report cards feature an unscored data profile that includes demographic and performance data for teacher candidates and program completers. Leaders describe program efforts or innovations in the report card's highlights tab.

The State Board of Education has adopted eight program metrics to generate annual reports. Significant overlap exists between the Report Card indicators and these metrics.

The domains, indicators and weights appear in the table on the next page.

## Report Cards and Dashboards (continued)

### Tennessee (Continued)

<i>Domain</i>	<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Points</i>
Candidate Profile (20 Points)	Percentage of Completers with Certain ACT/SAT Score	3
	Percentage of High-Demand Endorsements	10
	Percentage of Racially Diverse Completers	7
Employment (15 Points)	First-Year Placement	6
	Three-Year Placement	Unscored
	Beyond Year One Retention Rate	9
Satisfaction (25 Points)	Data Not Yet Available	25
Provider Impact (40 Points)	Percent Completers with Observation Scores Level 3 or Above	6
	Percent Completers with Observation Scores Level 4 or 5	9
	Percent Completers with Student Growth Scores Level 3 or Above	10
	Percent Completers with Student Growth Scores Level 4 or 5	15
	TOTAL	100

Source: [Educator Preparation Policy 5.504](#)

## Appendix

Table 1. SREB State Educator Preparation Program Accountability Information

<i>State</i>	<i>Policy Citation</i>	<i>Public Data Reported?</i>	<i>Report Cards Produced?</i>
AL	<a href="#">Rule 290-3-3</a>	Yes	Yes ( <a href="#">Link</a> )
AR	None	Yes ( <a href="#">Link</a> )	No
DE	<a href="#">14 DE Admin 290</a>	Yes	Yes ( <a href="#">Link</a> )
FL	<a href="#">Rule 6A-5.066</a>	Yes ( <a href="#">Link</a> )	No
GA	<a href="#">PSC Rule 505-3-.02</a>	Yes	No
KY	<a href="#">16 KAR 5:010</a>	Yes	Yes ( <a href="#">Link</a> )
LA	<a href="#">28 LAC XLV</a>	Yes ( <a href="#">Link</a> )	In Process <sup>1</sup>
MD	None	No	No
MS	<a href="#">Miss. Code Ann. § 37-101-29</a>	Yes	No
NC	<a href="#">N.C. Gen. Stat. § 115C-269.1</a>	Yes ( <a href="#">Link</a> )	In Process <sup>2</sup>
OK	OAC 218:10-5-4	No <sup>3</sup>	No
SC	<a href="#">Regulation 43-90</a>	No	No
TN	<a href="#">SBE Policy 5.504</a>	Yes	Yes ( <a href="#">Link</a> )
TX	<a href="#">19 TAC § 229.4</a>	Yes ( <a href="#">Link</a> )	No
VA	<a href="#">8 VAC 20-543-40</a>	Yes ( <a href="#">Link</a> )	No
WV	<a href="#">WVBE Policy 5100</a>	No	No

<sup>1</sup> The Louisiana Department of Education will produce EPP Performance Profiles in 2019-2020.

<sup>2</sup> The North Carolina Department of Public Instruction will produce EPP report cards by December 2019.

<sup>3</sup> Data collected but not publicly available

## Appendix

Table 2. Educator Preparation Program Accountability Information for Selected Non-SREB States

<i>State</i>	<i>Policy Citation</i>	<i>Public Data Reported?</i>	<i>Report Cards Produced?</i>
CT	<a href="#">Public Act 15-243</a>	Yes	In Process ( <a href="#">Link</a> )
ID	<a href="#">EPP Performance Measures Rubric<sup>4</sup></a>	Yes	No
IL	<a href="#">23 Ill. Adm. Code § 25.127</a>	Yes	In Process ( <a href="#">Link</a> )
IN	<a href="#">511 IAC 21</a>	Yes ( <a href="#">Link</a> )	No
MA	<a href="#">603 CMR 7.03</a>	Yes ( <a href="#">Link</a> )	No
MO	<a href="#">5 CSR 20-400.440</a>	Yes ( <a href="#">Link</a> & <a href="#">Link</a> )	No
NJ	N.J.A.C. 6A:9A-3.2	Yes	Yes ( <a href="#">Link</a> )
NM	<a href="#">NMSA § 22-10A-19.2</a>	Yes	Yes ( <a href="#">Link</a> )
OH	<a href="#">Ohio Rev. Code Ann. § 3333.048</a>	Yes ( <a href="#">Link</a> )	No

---

<sup>4</sup> Approved by Idaho State Board of Education in December 2016.

## Appendix

Table 3. Educator Preparation Program Performance Measures in SREB States

<i>State</i>	<i>Recruitment</i>	<i>Candidate Performance</i>	<i>Licensure Performance</i>	<i>Completer Performance</i>	<i>Completer Perceptions</i>	<i>Employer Perceptions</i>
AL	--	--	✓	--	✓	✓
AR	✓	✓	✓	--	✓	✓
DE	✓	✓	✓	✓	--	✓
FL	--	--	--	✓	--	--
GA	--	--	✓	✓	✓	✓
KY	✓	--	✓	✓	✓	✓
LA	--	--	--	✓	--	--
MD	--	✓	✓	--	--	--
MS	✓	--	✓	--	✓	✓
NC	✓	--	--	✓	✓	--
OK	--	--	✓	--	✓	✓
SC	--	--	✓	--	--	--
TN	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
TX	--	--	✓	✓	✓	✓
VA	✓	--	✓	✓	--	✓
WV	--	✓	✓	--	✓	✓
TOTAL	7	5	13	9	10	11

## Appendix

Table 4. Educator Preparation Program Performance Measures for Selected Non-SREB States

<i>State</i>	<i>Recruitment</i>	<i>Candidate Performance</i>	<i>Licensure Performance</i>	<i>Completer Performance</i>	<i>Completer Perceptions</i>	<i>Employer Perceptions</i>
CT	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
ID	--	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
IL	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
IN	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
MA	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
MO	--	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
NJ	✓	--	✓	✓	✓	✓
NM	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
OH	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
TOTAL	7	8	9	9	9	9

### For More Information

If you have research questions related to educator preparation and development, please contact Megan Boren at [Megan.Boren@SREB.org](mailto:Megan.Boren@SREB.org).