**STANDARD 4: PROGRAM IMPACT**
The provider demonstrates 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.

**Introduction**
As with most EPPs, impact on P-12 learning has been an ongoing focus of assessment development. Certain programs have been able to assess the impact of students on classroom instruction through observable measures such as student engagement and productivity. The initial preparation programs house assignments and candidate assessments within portfolio requirements, while measuring program impact within other programs, such as principal preparation, are more technically challenging. University faculty are also including more content related to assessment into coursework and expecting that candidates are able to demonstrate that student learning has occurred with methods such as pre- and post-testing, case studies, and projects.

Candidate, mentor teacher, university supervisor, and employer surveys have been administered for years, but not in a systematic way or on a regular basis across the College. While some programs have been able to collect responses and use the data to inform program quality, it is more common that the data are used by a program coordinator or director to make specific placement decisions. The College is determining how to utilize surveys to inform the broader programmatic and College-level decision-making process in a systematic, intentional manner.

Standard 4 artifacts include a summary of Teacher Work Sample results for the Teacher Education and Alternative Licensure Programs; abridged details on the new, externally validated assessments related to candidate impact COE is piloting; and survey results regarding program satisfaction. Data and details are housed in the Electronic Exhibits.

The College has been proactive in addressing program impact. This spring (2014), three of the programs are piloting edTPA. The other two programs (Special Education and the Bachelor of Innovation in Inclusive Early Childhood Education) will analyze the results of this year’s participants before deciding if edTPA will be required for their candidates next year.

The College is working with the Colorado Legacy Foundation, Tripod Project and Gates Foundation in implementing the newly developed Student perception Survey (SPS). That initiative will be piloted during the 2014-2015 academic year.

Finally, the College has held a number of conversations with the Colorado Department of Education on the state’s collection of SB 191 data, including how that information will inform EPPs, timeline, data flow, etc.

**Standard 4: Summary**
A criticism long leveled against teacher education programs is that we resisted external validation and argued for the quality of our own self assessments. That era is gone, and we must now allow our candidates to be held to standards beyond our own conclusions.
As with so many other assessment reforms, the central challenge is often the cultural shift rather than technical requirements. The College is engaged in remarkable discussions about where we need to go to develop assessments and processes that document the impact our candidates have on P-12 learning. In 2013 COE hired an Assessment Operations Specialist and this year created an Office of Assessment and Accreditation, both of which will contribute to the systematic administration of an assessment agenda.

Although there is a shift in the College toward using externally validated assessments, this does not signify COE relinquishment of how candidate quality is determined. The College has over a dozen faculty trained in the use of CLASS and is participating with Teachstone in a “train the trainers” model that will allow further preparation for COE faculty and site supervisors. Programs piloting the instrument have engaged in planning and implementation strategies, including projecting results and determining score interpretation.

For edTPA, faculty have completed the scoring training and will be involved in facilitating the local scoring process. Since edTPA is a relatively new instrument, local scoring will be a valuable exercise for faculty in determining how candidate quality is measured, both qualitatively and quantitatively. Like many other states, Colorado is considering adopting edTPA as a requirement for licensure. Nationally, initial scores are relatively low. Knowing that, and by engaging in the process early, programs can help shape results by adjusting course content, assignments, assessments, and programmatic practices to help subsequent cohorts be increasingly successful.

The collaborative effort to gather exit data and survey program completers one to five years out will also provide the College with comparative data from across institutions. Whether we continue with the Novice Teacher’s Core Competencies or move to another model, faculty already see the value of having an externally validated assessment of their programs.

In summary, the College seeks to emphasize the evolution of the use of data for internal consumption with localized standards of quality to a broader based and more complex system of assessment that provides programs and stakeholders nationally normed, externally evaluated feedback on the quality of our program completers and their programs. This transformation is multifaceted and incorporates technical, procedural, and cultural changes. Notable among them: are expanded technical capabilities on the part of faculty and staff in the use of assessment tools and data reporting; the implementation of multiple measures, replacing siloed program data with multiple, integrated software packages; development of routine data reporting cycles to internal and external users; and increased use of multiple measures of candidate outcomes within programs to form conclusions about candidate quality and program health.

Together these changes are designed to ensure excellent preparation of educators and continuous improvement of program elements well into the future. The increased scrutiny of EPPs both on the state and national level, in addition to dynamic changes in the
teacher labor market will require the College to remain vigilant in assessing the quality of its programs in order to achieve its goal of recognized completer quality.

**STANDARD 4: PROGRAM IMPACT**

1. Summary of preliminary findings

a. Narrative summary of preliminary findings

In its Self Study Report (SSR) and evidence document, the EPP references progress that it has made in the assessment process. It has, for instance, hired an Assessment Operations Specialist and created an Office of Assessment and Accreditation. These are positive and necessary steps.

As is occurring across the nation, UCCS is including or plans to include in its assessments measures that seek to confirm program impact. These measures include the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS), the Teacher Work Sample (TWS), Teacher Performance Assessment (EdTPA), and the Student Perception Survey (SPS). The EPP also references internally-created assessments such as the Candidate Survey of Preparation Adequacy. Each of these measures could conceivably provide evidence of the programs’ impact on candidate preparation and student achievement.

Unfortunately, the data presented from the Teacher Work Sample and the Candidate Survey of Preparation Adequacy do not directly measure impact on P-12 Student Learning and Development (CAEP Standard 4.1), Teacher Effectiveness (CAEP Standard 4.2), or Satisfaction of Employers (CAEP Standard 4.3). No other data from other assessments are presented in the SSR or the evidence for Standard 4. It was difficult to assess the EPP’s progress in meeting CAEP Standard 4. In the list of onsite tasks below, specific additional data needed by the visiting team are noted.

The change to edTPA from TWS was implemented so that we could determine how our candidates were performing compared to students across the nation. Both the TWS and the edTPA have components that require that teacher candidates not only assess student learning, but also address how they will change their instruction to meet the needs of all students. For example, in the TWS, section VII, Analysis of Student Learning, teacher candidates use pre- and post-test data to discuss and reflect on how well their students learned the materials. They also do subgroup analysis for edTPA. Based on assessment results, teacher candidates select students to focus on in the Elementary Task 4. They then reteach content/skills to this subgroup that previously they struggled to grasp.

Preliminary edTPA data is available here. CLASS data is available here for UCCS Teach and here for SPED. The reason for creating an Office of Assessment and Accreditation is to have an individual whose primary responsibility is to help programs create, administer and analyze various assessments, including surveys related to candidate and employer satisfaction. Finally, the College’s involvement with the Colorado Education Initiative
(formerly the Legacy Foundation, mentioned in SSR) will be a critical piece in collecting data on P-12 student perception of learning.

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

In Table 4A of Standard 4, reporting summary data on the Teacher Work Sample (TWS), multiple items could be construed as showing that the EPP is attending to program impact on student learning during the teacher preparation process. For example, candidates are scored on “pre- and post-assessments,” “Adaptations based on the individual needs of students,” “Evidence and data,” and “Impact on learning and student academic growth.” However, no direct student learning data are presented. It is possible that components found in the Teacher Work Sample could be analyzed to contribute to making the case regarding program impact.

Completer surveys, noted in the most recent annual report to be valid and reliable, indicate that completers “perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job, and that the preparation was effective” (CAEP standard 4.4). Item 4c.1 from the EPP demonstrates that candidates are generally well satisfied with their preparation. Additional measure that speak to candidate satisfaction would strengthen the case. The SSR mentions “Candidate, mentor teacher, university supervisor, and employer surveys have been administered for years, but not in a systematic way or on a regular basis across the College.” Perhaps samples of these surveys could be included as evidence and would, in aggregate, add to the emerging picture.

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

As noted above, TWS data do not directly show evidence of P-12 student learning. Rather, the data show that whomever scores the TWS (university supervisors) which is not clear from the narrative), notes whether or not candidates are attending to P-12 student learning in their work. That’s an indirect measure that does not show evidence of program impact. Additionally, no other data regarding P-12 student learning is presented; CAEP Standard 4 calls for multiple measures. The SSR references the previously-mentioned CLASS and EdTPA, but no data are presented from these assessments. CAEP’s phase-in schedule indicates that a plan to include data is sufficient for institutions seeking re-accreditation this year. UCCS’ annual reports and SSR do include references to measures that will become available. More information in the narrative sections regarding how the institution will use this data for continuous improvement would be welcomed. While the CAEP phase-in document does not require data in this area, it does require a solid plan showing what data will become available, when, and how that data will be integrated into the EPP’s operations and used for program assessment and continuous improvement.

TWS is being phased out and CLASS and edTPA (and next year, the Student Perception Survey) are replacing it. Data for CLASS and edTPA are provided for the pilot year (AY2013-2014). Preliminary edTPA data is available here. CLASS data is
available [here for UCCS Teach] and [here for SPED]. Results of data will be collected and tracked by the Office of Assessment and Accreditation and reported to programs, the Assessment and Accreditation Committee, the Dean, and the College Advisory Board. Results will inform decisions about programmatic changes that may need to occur to address shortcomings, if any, or enhance desired outcomes.

The unit is working with the Colorado Departments of Education and Higher Education to determine indicators the state should be collecting to assist EPPs as evidence of post-program completer impact on P-12 learning, and UCCS will follow their recommendations. This process is in its nascent stage.

2. **List of onsite tasks to be completed.** Use the following three prompts for each task. Add additional tasks as needed.

*Standard 4 Task 1* Examine teacher work sample and eportfolio data for evidence of program impact

a. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

The Teacher Work Sample data table uses a four point scale with four being high. It would be helpful to see the rubric used to generate the scores, as well as representative samples of student work. Perhaps a randomly-selected 10 percent of TWS could be generated in the [TaskStream Virtual Exhibit Room](#). Also, more information on who scores the TWS and how the information is systematically used would strengthen the case in Standard 4. In addition to access to the data and an analysis of what the data tells the EPP about program impact, the team would like to interview those who score and otherwise have responsibility for the TWS.

This is the handbook for our previous TWS. Included in it are all rubrics. All TWS and edTPA work is scored by two raters who work directly with the candidates in the schools (faculty and university supervisors). Please see the [TaskStream Virtual Exhibit Room](#) for examples of student TWS work.

b. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

“Teacher Work Sample has been used for five years with the TELP and ALP programs, and its use provides tangible evidence of P-12 learning. E-portfolios all contain multiple means of demonstrating impact.” See question below. In addition, do the multiple means referenced refer to multiple items that are included in the portfolio or do they refer to scoring the same item from multiple perspectives? For instance, a single lesson plan could be considered evidence of consideration of diversity as well as evidence of content learning.

If the one lesson plan clearly addresses a standard regarding diversity as well as a standard regarding content then yes, one artifact could be used multiple times in the portfolio. This does not occur with great frequency, however.
c. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews, including follow up on response to 1.c).

In the evidence document, there is reference to both the Teacher Work Sample and the e-portfolio. Do these references refer to the same piece of evidence? How were the scores reported in the evidence document generated?

These are 2 separate pieces of evidence. EdTPA will provide a third data point.

TWS scores were generated on a 4 point scale: 1-basic, 2-partially proficient, 3-proficient, 4-advanced. University supervisors scored the TWS for their own 5-6 teacher candidates. Two raters score each TWS or edTPA.

*Standard 4 Task 2 Clarify the use of the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS)*

a. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

The SSR references a pilot project in which faculty were trained in the use of the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS). In the evidence document, there is a general description of CLASS, but no presentation of data. Are data from the pilot available and if so, do the data support program impact? The team would like to have access to the data and to interview those involved with CLASS.

CLASS data is available [here](#) for UCCS Teach and [here](#) for SPED.

b. Excerpt from SSR (Self Study Report) to be clarified or confirmed

From p. 2 of the evidence document: “The Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) is an observational tool (see Standard 2) being piloted by Special Education and UCCSTeach this year (2013-14).”

UCCSTeach piloted CLASS S and there is one year of [data available here](#). SPED piloted CLASS in the spring of 2014, and that data is [available here](#).

c. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews, including follow up on response to 1.c).

How many teacher candidates have been assessed using CLASS? What are the preliminary results of those assessments?

CLASS data is available [here](#) for UCCS Teach and [here](#) for SPED.

*Standard 4 Task 3 Review data from the EdTPA pilot, and plan to use the data.*
a. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

Preliminary edTPA data is available here.

It is unclear from the SSR whether or not pilot data from the EdTPA exist and/or have been analyzed. At minimum, the team needs to understand the plan for using EdTPA data.

b. Excerpt from SSR (Self Study Report) to be clarified or confirmed

“For edTPA, faculty have completed the scoring training and will be involved in facilitating the local scoring process.” (p. 56).

A table comparing local and national scores is available here. The results have been shared with methods instructors, at the Site Supervisor meeting, and with our College Advisory Board.

c. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews, including follow up on response to 1.c).

How many teacher candidates have been assessed using EdTPA? What are the preliminary results of those assessments?

All TELP, ALP, and UCCSTeach students that completed their student teaching Spring 2014 participated in edTPA. Preliminary edTPA data is available here.

Standard 4 Task 4 Review data from other college assessments

a. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

The Standard 4 evidence document references internally generated assessments. If these assessments can help to show program impact, it would be helpful for data from the assessments to be included.

We are aware of this concern and it is one of the factors that has led the College to move toward other measures. TWS is being phased out and CLASS and edTPA (and next year, the Student Perception Survey) are being introduced as additional ways of measuring candidate impact. Data for CLASS and edTPA are provided for the pilot year (AY2013-2014). Preliminary edTPA results are available here and CLASS data is available here for UCCS Teach and here for SPED. Results of data will be collected and tracked by the Office of Assessment and Accreditation and reported to programs, the Assessment and Accreditation Committee, the Dean, and the College Advisory Board. Results will inform decisions about programmatic changes that may need to occur to address shortcomings, if any, or enhance desired outcomes. Already we have made programmatic changes based on the pilot of edTPA. Methods instructors and site supervisors have revised their assignments and seminars to address analysis of student learning and feedback to students based on performance.
b. Excerpt from SSR (Self Study Report) to be clarified or confirmed

From the Standard 4 Evidence PDF: “While the assessments generally used by the College are acceptable and frequently exceptional,…” (p. 2)

The Assessment and Accreditation Committee is working to tighten up the development of an assessment model that works, to whatever level possible, across the College. That means surveys will have a common format and when reasonable, a common stem; that dispositions measures will have an agreed-upon purpose, and when logical, common indicators; and that similar observation tools will be used across teacher education programs. Commonalities in admissions standards, interview processes, etc. have already been developed and that work of creating a college-wide system will continue. Here is an example of what the Assessment and Accreditation Committee has been considering for college-wide implementation.

The use of externally-validated instruments across teacher education programs will also pull disparate program requirements into better alignment and provide a platform for stronger cross-programmatic and external comparisons.

From the SSR: “…impact on P-12 learning has been an ongoing focus of assessment development. Certain programs have been able to assess the impact of students on classroom instruction through observable measures such as student engagement and productivity” (p. 55).

As mentioned earlier, the COE is moving toward more externally-validated assessments. In addition, the EPP is working with the State in developing measures for post program-completer impact.

c. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews, including follow up on response to 1.c).

What is the nature of the assessments referenced above?

edTPA, TWS, and portfolios are performance assessments designed to show levels of mastery of planning, instruction, and assessment.

What do they demonstrate regarding program impact?

At the candidate level, the three instruments demonstrate proficiency in planning, instruction, and assessment. Aggregate results are a measure of program efficacy. When analyzed, the results from these measures guide us in programmatic changes to better prepare our educators.
Are data from such assessments shared among faculty and/or used to guide program development?

Data are shared with faculty on both the aggregate and individual levels. Initial scores from edTPA indicated teacher candidates—both elementary and secondary—struggled with analysis of student learning. This led the faculty to re-examine methods courses and field experiences relative to assessment. The faculty also reviewed findings and adjusted syllabi and assignments to address concerns. edTPA results will be shared with the Assessment and Accreditation Committee and has already been shared with the College Advisory Board this fall (2014).

*Standard 4 Task 5* Discuss the plan for using data available from the State of Colorado

a. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

CAEP’s phase-in document allows EPPs to present a plan for using data which is not yet available. In approximately two years, the Colorado Department of Education will make value-added data available to the EPP. It is not clear how the EPP will use these data when it becomes available.

Based on the current iteration of the CDE/CDHE data sharing agreement, EPPs will have student-level data on program graduates for the first three years for those who remain in the state. Assuming this remains the case, the EPP will link various measures collected—such as edTPA, CLASS, dispositional data, and course grades to identify key predictors of graduates’ workforce performance. As these data become available, we plan to review data yearly to determine how well our graduates are impacting student learning. This work will be addressed by the Assessment Operations Specialist and the Assessment & Accreditation Committee along with program coordinators/directors, then included into the report to the Dean, College Advisory Board, and CAEP.

b. Excerpt from SSR (Self Study Report) to be clarified or confirmed

“Another external perspective on program impact will come from the Colorado Department of Education. As a result of SB 191 (mentioned earlier), the state has begun tracking EPP graduates, their employment location and annual contribution to student growth—typically expressed as a value added model. This data will be provided to EPPs to help with multi-year data on employment retention, mobility, added endorsements, and to some degree, impact on P-12 learning.”

State representatives will address progress on data model at joint CAEP-CDE meetings. We currently have this integrated into our Continuous Improvement Plan, but not until 2016-17. If the data is available prior to that time, we’ll adjust our CIP.

c. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews, including follow up on response to 1.c).
What data does the EPP expect to have made available to it through the Colorado Department of Education?
How will that data be used for continuous improvement?

The Assessment Operations Specialist, Assessment and Accreditation Committee, and program coordinators/directors will review them and issue a report that then goes to Dean, CAB, and back to departments.

Who will be responsible for making sure the data are attended to and used?

There are a number of people with distinct roles in the data usage. Among them are:
- The Director of Teacher Education
- Program Coordinators
- The Assessment and Accreditation Committee
- The Office of Assessment and Accreditation
- The Dean and Associate Dean
- Further, as discussed in the CIP, the data is shared with the College Advisory Board.

3. Preliminary Recommendations for New Areas for Improvement and/or Stipulations Including a Rationale for Each

Stipulation: 4.1, Impact on P-12 Student Learning and Development. Data presented by the EPP does not assure that “program completers contribute to an expected level of student-learning growth”

Rationale: Data presented do not directly assess P-12 Student Learning. Summary data presented that indicate that the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) requires students to consider P-12 student learning, but no evidence is presented that such learning takes place.

Section 6 of the TWS supports this, especially the last part: impact on learning and student academic growth. See 4 links below:

TWS Overview (shows crosswalk with the old PB Standards and CTQS)
TELP secondary data 2011-13
TELP elementary data 2011-2013
ALP data 2011-2013

Stipulation: 4.2, Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness. The EPP does not demonstrate “that completers effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve”

Rationale: No data are presented that indicate that completer teaching effectiveness is
considered. Data from CLASS and EdTPA may, in the future, provide evidence of teaching effectiveness, but such evidence is currently absent from the self-study report and furthermore would not provide evidence regarding completers. The CAEP phase-in document may apply in this instance. The EPP references in its SSR measures that will become available; it needs to make much clearer its plans for use of such data, as well as providing other means of assessing completer impact.

The COE has expanded on the original CIP in an attempt to provide more detail. See the updated matrix in the Continuous Improvement Plan.

Stipulation: 4.3, Satisfaction of Employers. The EPP does not present data showing that “employers are satisfied with the completers’ preparation for their assigned responsibilities in working with P-12 students.”

Rationale: No data are presented and no mention is made in the SSR regarding satisfaction of employers, other than a brief statement in the SSR: “Candidate, mentor teacher, university supervisor, and employer surveys have been administered for years, but not in a systematic way or on a regular basis across the College” (p. 55).

We are aware of the issues and are addressing them through the Office of Accreditation and Assessment and the hiring of an Assessment and Operations Specialist. The fact that we have had 5 disparate programs under 5 different directors has prevented the College from collecting consistent, high quality data on a regular and ongoing basis. Currently TELP and Counseling have employer survey results. The Assessment and Accreditation Committee is working to create a unified employer survey.