EF 46-Impact and Effectiveness Report

CAEP STANDARDS: R.4.1

UNIVERSITY OF
RICHMOND
®

Impact on Student Learning & Teaching Effectiveness Report | R4.1

CAEP R.4.1. addresses how EPPs measure completer impact on P-12 student learning and teaching effectiveness. This report includes descriptions of the InTASC/VUPS-aligned data collection instruments used by the EPP to measure the impact and effectiveness of completers; a summary of the EPPs data collection methods implemented to this end, including the terms during which specific evidence was collected; results by instrument and semester; and program improvement based on faculty analysis of available completer data triangulated with other program measures similarly mapped to InTASC and VUPS standards.

It is important to note that the Commonwealth of Virginia does not provide completer effectiveness data to EPPs, and regional divisions have remained largely unresponsive to EPP faculty requests for completer aggregate impact data. Therefore, the EPP has historically relied on the willingness of completers to respond to a survey, share administrator evaluations, and allow faculty to observe lessons to collect impact and effectiveness data.

In response to the dearth of available completer impact data and the labor-intensive nature of collecting such data, the University of Richmond Assessment and Accreditation Specialist partnered with faculty from three other Virginia EPPs to establish the Virginia Education Assessment Collaborative (VEAC). In the Spring of 2020 VEAC leadership developed, piloted, and disseminated data from their Completer Satisfaction and Employer Satisfaction surveys.   All Virginia EPPs were able to opt into VEAC data collection and reporting for 2020-2021. The VEAC data is included in this report along with data from other sources noted in Table 1 to help determine completer impact on student learning and teaching effectiveness.

Table 1: Completer Effectiveness/Impact Data Matrix

Instrument	Instrument organized by InTASC/VUPS?	Description of Data Collection	Term Collected					
			Sp19	*F19*	*Sp20*	*F20*	*Sp21*	*F21*
VEAC Employer Satisfaction Survey	**YES**	Site administrator shares aggregate information about the effectiveness of completers employed at the site		X		X		
Division Evaluation Rubric (varies by division)	**YES**	Completer shares their summative evaluation of the effectiveness by site administrator	X					X
Division Observation Template (varies by division)	**NO**	Completer shares division created formative observation notes on the effectiveness of the site administrator		X		X	X	X
EPP Completer Observation Evaluation Rubric	**YES**	Completer welcomes EPP faculty members to evaluate the effectiveness of a lesson	X	X		X	X	
EPP Initial Licensure Completer Survey	**YES**	Completer self-reports on instructional effectiveness	X					

Description of Data Collection by Term

Spring 2019:
- Adjunct faculty observed and evaluated one Elementary Education program completer and one Secondary Education program completer using the **EPP Completer Observation Rubric**. The two completers observed also agreed to share their **Division Evaluation Rubrics**.
- In the **EPP Initial Licensure Completer Survey**, 10 completers self-reported on the VUPS, and of the ten, one uploaded their **Division Evaluation Rubric.**

Fall 2019:
- The Director of Clinical Practice collected **Division Observation Templates** during a completer panel event. Completers at this time did not have **Division Summative Evaluations** from their administrators, only observation notes. These pieces of evidence will be utilized in our case in later drafts
- Adjunct faculty observed and evaluated 4 the University of Richmond Teacher Preparation Program graduates using the **EPP Completer Observation Rubric.**

Spring 2020:
- Adjunct faculty observations were scheduled, but unable to be completed due to COVID and school closures.
- Data from pilot VEAC surveys were reported to EPP. --On the 2019-2020 VEAC Employer, employers were asked to rate the completer's ability to "immediately impact student learning as the Overall item. This item matches an item in the Deans for Impact Survey.

Fall 2020:
- Adjunct faculty observed one Secondary program completer using the **EPP Completer Observation Rubric.**

Spring 2021:
- Full-time Faculty observed one Elementary Education program completer and two Secondary Education program completers using the **EPP Completer Observation Rubric**. The Elementary Education program completer and one of the two Secondary Education program completers observed also agreed to share their completed **Division Observation Templates** with administrator notes.
- VEAC is currently collecting data on the **VEAC Employer Satisfaction Survey** and will provide data in response to the FFR.

Fall 2021:
- Two program completers shared division-specific evaluations. One division evaluation was explicitly aligned to the VUPS. The second was aligned to the division-specific standards. Data were reviewed by the EPP faculty.
- Faculty are currently scheduling structured observations in Spring 2021. We specifically are looking to observe an elementary and comprehensive program completer. The faculty will evaluate the completers using the Final Evaluation tool during the observation and post-observation meetings.

Division Evaluation Rubric & EPP Completer Observation Rubric Results
Across all Terms, Spring 2019- Spring 2021

Table 2 is a summary of data collected by the University of Richmond Teacher Education Program from the **Division Summative Evaluation Rubrics** and the **EPP Completer Observation Rubric**. Both division administration and university faculty used the same seven rubric indicators (VUPS Standards 1-7) and similar ratings, see Table 2, to score completers. The outline below summarizes the ratings assigned to EPP completers by VUPS Standard across all terms, Spring 2019 to Fall 2021.

Table 2: Division Evaluation Rubric & EPP Completer Rubric Results Spring 2019-Spring 2021

Division Summative Evaluation Rating Scale (n=14) EPP Completer Observation Rubric Rating Scale (n=9)	Exemplary Exceeds Proficiency	Proficient Meets Proficiency	Needs Improvement Begins to Meet Proficiency	Unacceptable Does not Meet Proficiency
VUPS Standard 1	8	15	0	0
VUPS Standard 2	6	14	0	0
VUPS Standard 3	7	13	0	0
VUPS Standard 4	5	15	0	0
VUPS Standard 5	5	15	0	0
VUPS Standard 6	7	13	0	0
VUPS Standard 7 Division Summative Evaluation Rubric only (n=13)	**2**	**12**	**0**	**0**

Division Summative Evaluation (n=13) Rating Scale

EPP Completer Observation Rubric Rating Scale: .

Standard 1 Professional Knowledge:
- Division Evaluation Rubric data (n=14)
  - 3 Exemplary, 11 Proficient
- EPP Completer Observation Rubric data combined (n=9)
  - 5 Exceeds Proficiency, 4 Meets Proficiency

Standard 2 Instructional Planning:
- Division Evaluation Rubric data combined
  - Two Exemplary Ratings, 12 Proficient Ratings
- EPP Completer Observation Rubric data combined
  - Four Exceeds the proficiency expected Ratings, Two Meets the proficiency expected Ratings

Standard 3 Instructional Delivery:
- Division Evaluation Rubric data combined
  - Two Exemplary Ratings, 11 Proficient Ratings
- EPP Completer Observation Rubric data combined
  - Five Exceeds the proficiency expected Ratings, One Meets the proficiency expected Ratings

Standard 4 Assessment of and for Student Learning:
- Division Evaluation Rubric data combined
  - Two Exemplary Ratings, 12 Proficient Ratings
- EPP Completer Observation Rubric data combined
  - Three Exceeds the proficiency expected Ratings, Three Meets the proficiency expected Ratings

Standard 5 Learning Environment:
- Division Evaluation Rubric data combined
  - Two Exemplary Ratings, 12 Proficient Ratings
- EPP Completer Observation Rubric data combined
  - Three Exceeds the proficiency expected Ratings, Three Meets the proficiency expected Ratings

Standard 6 Professionalism:
- Division Evaluation Rubric data combined
  - Four Exemplary Ratings, 10 Proficient Ratings
- EPP Completer Observation Rubric data combined
  - Three Exceeds the proficiency expected Ratings, Three Meets the proficiency expected Ratings

Standard 7 Student Academic Progress: (Impact on Student Learning)
- Division Evaluation Rubric data combined
  - Two Exemplary Ratings, 12 Proficient Ratings
- Collected Mid-term SMART Goal Data
  - Measures defined for Spring 2021

Collected-VUPS Evaluations Spring 2019
In Spring 2019, the EPP collected and recorded three signed/dated Virginia Uniform Performance Summative Evaluations. These data are presented in Table 1. Note that the three completers all were employed in public schools, and were rated in the top two categories of the VUPS (Proficient and Exemplary). VUPS 1-6 measure teacher effectiveness, and VUPS 7 measures impact on student learning. Original files have been scrubbed of identifying information. Two of the completers have secondary licenses and 1 completer has an elementary license.

Table 2: Spring 2019 VUPS Evaluation Data

Student	VUPS 1	VUPS 2	VUPS 3	VUPS 4	VUPS 5	VUPS 6	VUPS 7
Completer X	Exemplary	Proficient	Proficient	Proficient	Proficient	Exemplary	Proficient
Completer Y	Proficient	Proficient	Proficient	Proficient	Proficient	Proficient	Proficient
Completer Z	Proficient	Proficient	Proficient	Proficient	Proficient	Exemplary	Proficient

Self-Reported VUPS Evaluations Spring 2019 (From Completer Survey)
In the Spring 2019 Teacher Education Program Completer Survey, the EPP asked completers to self-report their most recent VUPS Summative Evaluation data in the Qualtrics survey. Table 2 presents evidence collected on VUPS 1-7 from the Spring 2019 survey. VUPS 1-6 measure teacher effectiveness, and VUPS 7 measures impact on student learning. When joining VEAC, we removed this item from the common survey.

Table 3: Spring 2019 Self-Reported Evaluation Data

VUPS	Unacceptable (1)	Needs Improvement / Developing (2)	Proficient (3)	Exemplary (4)	N	Mean
VUPS 1 - Professional Knowledge	0	0	8	2	10	3.2
VUPS 2 - Instructional Planning	0	0	8	2	10	3.2
VUPS 3 - Instructional Delivery	0	0	8	2	10	3.2
VUPS 4 - Assessment of and for Student Learning	0	0	8	2	10	3.2
VUPS 5 - Learning Environment	0	0	8	2	10	3.2
VUPS 6 - Professionalism	0	0	7	3	10	3.3
VUPS 7 - Student Academic Progress	0	0	8	2	10	3.2

Observation Data (Utilizing University of Richmond Final Evaluation Tool)
To supplement summative evaluation data, the EPP has assigned University Supervisors the task of observing and working with program completers. As such, the EPP collects data on program completers utilizing the Final Evaluation tool as a method of assessing teaching effectiveness. The Final Evaluation tool is identical to the one utilized in the Teaching Internship. The instrument was evaluated for validity using the Lawshe Method during the Spring 2019 Advisory Board meeting. Additionally, the Accreditation and Assessment Specialist works with the Director of Clinical Practice to improve the sample (licensure type and program track) of completers observed in the field. This helps ensure that the EPP's sample of responses addresses variation in internal EPP tracks.

Table 4: Observation Data

Completer	Endorsement	VUPS 1 Professional Knowledge	VUPS 2 Instructional Planning	VUPS 3 Instructional Delivery	VUPS 4 Assessment of and for Student Learning	VUPS 5 Learning Environment	VUPS 6 Professionalism
Completer A Observed in S19	Secondary	Meets the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected
Completer B Observed in S19	Elementary	Meets the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected
Completer C Observed in F19	Secondary	Exceeds the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected
Completer D Observed in F19	Secondary	Meets the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected
Completer E Observed in F19	Comprehensive	Exceeds the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected
Completer F Observed in F19	Comprehensive	Exceeds the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected
Complete G Observed in F20	Secondary	Exceeds the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected
Completer H Observed in S21	Elementary	Meets the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected	Begins to meet the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected
Completer I Observed in S21	Secondary	Exceeds the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected

VEAC Survey Data (2019-2021)

On the 2019-2020 VEAC Employer, employers were asked to respond to the following question per each completer. "Based on your experiences with this teacher, what best describes the extent to which they were ready to meet the needs of students in your school?" Respondent employers could respond "Fully ready (able to have an <u>immediate impact</u> on student learning), Mostly ready (able to successfully meet the needs of most students," "Moderately ready (in order to be successful, needed additional training, support, and coaching beyond what is typically provided to beginning teachers)," "Minimally ready (limited success meeting the needs of students and improving outcomes even with additional supports)" or "Not ready (unable to meet the needs of students even with additional supports)."

To find the average overall satisfaction, responses are coded, from 1 to 5. Higher values indicate more readiness, and lower values indicate less readiness. Table 1 provides descriptive statistics on this scaled version of the overall satisfaction item. The University of Richmond EPP's mean is above the average rating for the 17 VEAC partner EPPs. Of EPP completers surveyed,

Overall Preparation Scaled Descriptive:

2019-20

Group	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	Lower 95% CI from Mean	Upper 95% CI from Mean	N
University of Richmond	4.73	0.467	0.141	4.45	5.00	11
ALL VEAC	4.49	.798	.037	4.42	4.53	457

*Values range from 1 to 5

2020-21

Group	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	Lower 95% CI from Mean	Upper 95% CI from Mean	N
University of Richmond	4.69	.55	0.11	4.48	4.90	26
All VEAC	4.52	.72	0.02	4.48	4.55	1,338

*Values range from 1 to 5

Spring 2021-Fall 2021 Impact on Student Learning Data

The EPP collected Talent ED data from 4 completers (one year out) in early Spring 2021-Fall 2021 working in local divisions. All (Mix of A&S, BALA, and TLP) completers were licensed in elementary education. These data were from the mid-point in the term. Included in these reports are the SMART goals for each completer to document their impact on student learning. In both cases, completers are utilizing growth measures between Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 in reading and math. The EPP will provide documentation of this information at the CAEP Site Visit.

Notes from Observation Debrief

Spring 21

JH, DN, BS, LK

- LK – Noted how COVID has impacted teaching. It was LK's first virtual birds-eye view in the classroom. LK noted how good it was to see how completers adapted to COVID. Was impressed and felt confident with their abilities.
- BS – note that this was the first time observing virtually. Noted that the completers sent lots of warnings in communicating before the observation, however, the lesson was wonderful. BS noted the completer's enthusiasm for teaching.
  - Completers utilized strategies highlighted in our program
    - Probing questions for engagement
  - Noted how difficult engagement is during COVID
    - Many tactics were utilized, but there were many "black screens."
    - Suggested that data from schools this year will poor in terms of "impact."
  - Food for thought to take back to methods - the importance of engagement
    - Added content in class – the reality of seeing the COVID world via zoom.
      - Stress to current candidate - Focus on engaging – avoiding even the "hint of boredom"
- DN- Focused on differentiation and assessment – what are you doing with it?
    - Talked afterwards – Noted how the divisions are not providing good models. Completers know it, but don't always practice. They are "getting by" during the pandemic.
  - Noted how this experience is being used to guide the Professional Growth Plan
    - Tying in Guest Speakers in Capstone Seminar
      - Reflective discussions on differentiation
    - Engagement moving forward
    - Tie Planning and Engagement

- Discussed other 4.1 data. Noted that mid-term includes impact evidence. I will re-review in late Spring.
- Need to find a better time to collect Summative Data (observations and mid-terms great, but not 7 measures).
- I will attempt to reach out to divisions (Henrico and Chesterfield)