

Impact & Effectiveness Report

CAEP STANDARDS: R.4.1



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 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.

Table 1: Completer Effectiveness/Impact Data Matrix

Instrument	Description of Data Collection	Term Collected										
		Sp19	F19	Sp20	F20	Sp21	F21	S22	F22	S23	F23	S24
VEAC Employer Satisfaction Survey Impact Indicator	Site administrator shares aggregate information about effectiveness of completers employed at site.		X		X		X		X		X	
EPP Completer Observation Evaluation Rubric	Completer welcomes EPP faculty member to evaluate effectiveness of a lesson.	X	X			X		X		X	X	

Observation Data (Utilizing University of Richmond Final Evaluation Tool)

The EPP has assigned University Supervisors and faculty 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 2: 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
Completer 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
Completer J Observed in S21	Elementary	Meets the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected
Completer K Observed S22	Elementary	Begins to meet the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected
Completer L Observed S22	Elementary	Exceeds the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected
Completer M Observed Spring S23	Elementary	Begins to meet the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected
Completer N Observed Spring S23	Elementary	Meets the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected

Completer O Observed Spring S23	Secondary	Meets the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected
Completer P Observed F24	Elementary	Meets the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected	Exceeds the proficiency expected
Completer Q Observed F24	Elementary	Meets the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected	Begins to meet the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected	Meets the proficiency expected

VEAC Initial Licensure Employer Survey (2019-2023)

On the VEAC Initial Employer Survey, employers of program completers were asked to respond to the following question per each individual completer working in their school. “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 immediate impact 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.

As Virginia does not provide impact data, evidence from principals when evaluating one specific candidate (not a broad question framed – “candidates from UR impact...”) is an effective method of collecting this feedback data. VEAC matched data (N=8) from four partner EPPs collected from both official school-division provided impact scores from Spotsylvania County Public Schools and principal overall evaluation rating from 2020 and found a Pearson correlation coefficient of .82 between the two measures. This is a moderate to high level of positive correlation between the two measures, suggesting that these measures triangulate with impact scores. Note that these data are only from one school division which was able to share measures to calculate this type of score.

Overall Preparation Scaled Descriptive (2019-2020)

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

Overall Preparation Scaled Descriptive (2020-2021)

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

Overall Preparation Scaled Descriptive (2021-2022)

Group	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	Lower 95% CI from Mean	Upper 95% CI from Mean	N
University of Richmond	4.47	.51	0.11	4.25	4.69	19
All VEAC	4.43	.79	0.02	4.39	4.47	1,100

*Values range from 1 to 5

Overall Preparation Scaled Descriptive (2022-2023)

Group	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	Lower 95% CI from Mean	Upper 95% CI from Mean	N
University of Richmond	4.29	1.01	.22	3.86	4.72	21
All VEAC	4.33	.90	.03	4.30	4.36	1208

*Values range from 1 to 5

Overall Preparation Scaled Descriptive (2023-2024)

Group	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	Lower 95% CI from Mean	Upper 95% CI from Mean	N
University of Richmond	4.50	1.05	.23	4.05	4.95	20
All VEAC	4.41	.86	.02	4.37	4.45	1431

*Values range from 1 to 5