



# Standard 17: Outcomes

The program and institution collect and monitor data on their graduates.

## Why this standard?

Just as teachers use information about their students' performance to improve their instruction, teacher preparation programs can use surveys and other information about the performance of their graduates to inspire and inform improvement.

## What is the focus of the standard?

This standard examines how extensively and regularly institutions gather information from surveys of graduates and employers, data models, and performance assessments. We carefully consider the state policy context to determine what data are available and to determine where institutions do more than the state in which they're located requires. The standard's "strong design" (🏆) indicators address the use of outcomes information for program improvement.

Standard applies to elementary, secondary and special education programs.

**Standard and Indicators** .....page 2

**Rationale** .....page 3

The rationale summarizes research about this standard. The rationale also describes practices in the United States and other countries related to this standard, as well as support for this standard from school leaders, superintendents and others education personnel.

**Methodology** .....page 4

The methodology describes the process NCTQ uses to score institutions of higher education on this standard. It explains the data sources, analysis process, and how the standard and indicators are operationalized in scoring.



# Standard and Indicators

## Standard 17: Outcomes

The program and institution collect and monitor data on their graduates.

**Standard applies to: Elementary, Secondary and Special Education programs.**

### Indicators that the institution meets the standard:

- 17.1 The institution surveys its graduates regarding topics relevant to program evaluation.
- 17.2 The institution surveys its graduates' employers about their professional performance.
- 17.3 The institution secures data from teacher performance assessments (e.g., California's PACT) administered to candidates just prior to or at graduation.
- 17.4 Either through state data systems or on its own, the institution secures growth data on its graduates' students, including any teacher evaluations which are based at least partially on such data.
- 17.5 All forms of data noted are collected on an established timetable that supports regular program evaluation.

### STRONG DESIGN

- 17.6 An institution that satisfies indicators 17.1-17.5 and is able to secure student-growth data on its graduates (indicator 17.4) from a state data system will receive a "strong design" designation if it demonstrates that it uses the data for program improvements. Documents that may be used for this demonstration include those that pertain to redesigned courses or clinical experiences; changes in student teacher assessment practices; new school partnerships for clinical placements; changes in recruitment and selection practices.
- 17.7 In the absence of analyses conducted by the state, an institution that has secured student-growth data on its graduates (indicator 17.4) through its own devices and has satisfied all other indicators may also receive a "strong design" designation if it demonstrates that it uses the data for program improvements. Documents that may be used for this demonstration include those that pertain to redesigned courses or clinical experiences; changes in student teacher assessment practices; new school partnerships for clinical placements; changes in recruitment and selection practices.
- 17.8 In the absence of analyses conducted by the state and the capacity to gain access to meaningful student-growth data through its own devices, an institution that satisfies all indicators except for 17.4 will receive a "strong design" designation if it demonstrates that it has developed institutional capacity to use outcomes data for continuous improvement. Documents that may be used for demonstration include the following: an evidence plan enabling the institution to collect, analyze, and draw solid conclusions from data about the impact of program graduates on pupil learning; instruments to assess the teaching skills and classroom teaching performance of its candidates; a formal organizational mechanism to use data to improve the preparation program; a plan to measure and report persistence rates for a complete cohort of its graduates.



# Rationale

## Standard 17: Outcomes

The program and institution collect and monitor data on their graduates.

**Standard applies to elementary, secondary and special education programs.**

### Why this standard?

Just as teachers use information about their students' performance to improve their instruction, teacher preparation programs can use surveys and other information about the performance of their graduates to inspire and inform improvement.

### What is the focus of the standard?

This standard examines how extensively and regularly institutions gather information from surveys of graduates and employers, data models, and performance assessments. We carefully consider the state policy context to determine what data are available and to determine where institutions do more than the state in which they're located requires. The standard's "strong design" (🏆) indicators address the use of outcomes information for program improvement.

### Rationale

#### **Research base for this standard**

No "strong research"<sup>1</sup> exists to support this standard.

#### **Other support for this standard**

Mirroring a similar commitment now found in K-12 education, higher education institutions should embrace data-driven decision making and accountability by tracking the performance of their graduates. In states such as Louisiana, Tennessee and Florida, state education agencies are developing this capacity through their longitudinal data systems and have begun to provide teacher preparation programs with the results. With the advent of the Race to the Top grants, 10 more states will collect and report these data; several states will also use these data for accountability purposes.<sup>2</sup> The most sophisticated use of such data is to measure the performance of the students taught by an institution's graduates relative to the performance of students taught by the graduates of other institutions in the state.

This standard also garners support from school district superintendents.

---

<sup>1</sup> NCTQ has created "research inventories" that describe research conducted within the last decade or so that has *general* relevance to aspects of teacher preparation also addressed by one or more of its standards (with the exceptions of the Outcomes and Evidence of Effectiveness standards). These inventories categorize research along two dimensions: design methodology and use of student performance data. Research that satisfies our standards on both is designated as "strong research" and will be identified as such. That research is cited here if it is *directly* relevant to the standard; strong research is distinguished from other research that is not included in the inventory or is not designated as "strong" in the inventory. Refer to the [introduction](#) to the research inventories for more discussion of our approach to categorizing research. If a research inventory has been developed to describe research that generally relates to the same aspect of teacher prep as addressed by a standard, the inventory can be found in the back of this standard book.

<sup>2</sup> Crowe, E. (2011). *Race to the top and teacher preparation: Analyzing state strategies for ensuring real accountability and fostering program innovation*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress; [www.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/issues/2011/03/pdf/teacher\\_preparation.pdf](http://www.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/issues/2011/03/pdf/teacher_preparation.pdf)



# Scoring Methodology

## How NCTQ scores the Outcomes Standard

### [Standard and indicators](#)

#### Data used to score this standard

Evaluation of institutions of higher education (IHEs) on Standard 17: Outcomes uses the following sources of data:

- Surveys administered by the IHE and/or the state to program alumni
- Surveys administered by the IHE and/or the state to the employers of program graduates
- Documents provided by the IHE regarding voluntary or required use of standardized Teacher Performance Assessments (TPAs)
- Information provided by state agencies regarding required use of standardized TPAs
- Documents provided by the IHE regarding growth data secured on graduates' students
- Reports from any state teacher preparation "value added model" (VAM) using growth data on graduates' students
- Additional documents on use of outcomes data for program improvement (for evaluation of "strong design" indicators only)

#### Who analyzes the data

Two [general analysts](#) evaluate each program using a detailed scoring protocol from which this scoring methodology is abstracted. For information on the process by which scoring discrepancies are resolved, see the "scoring processes" section of the [General Methodology](#).

#### Scope of analysis

This standard's evaluation is based on surveys and reports provided by the IHE in combination with information on the context set by statewide initiatives related to program outcomes that are provided by the IHE or based on our own research. Our analysis provides an evaluation of each indicator across all of the IHE's **undergraduate** and **graduate** elementary, secondary and special education programs included in the *Review*.

The table below summarizes how our analysis is conducted using IHE documents in combination with information on the state context:

**How evaluation on the Outcomes Standard uses both IHE documents and information on state initiatives**

Indicator	Evaluation is based on documents provided by IHE	State initiative is factored into evaluation
17.1: Graduate surveys	✓	✓ California (University of California and California State University systems only), Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Mississippi, Missouri, Oregon, Texas
17.2: Employer surveys	✓	✓ California (University of California and California State University systems only), Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Mississippi, Missouri, Oregon, South Carolina, Texas
17.3: TPAs	✓	✓ California, Minnesota, and Washington (statewide); Tennessee and Ohio (IHEs identified by state officials). <sup>2</sup>
17.4: Growth data on graduates' students <sup>3</sup>	✓	✓ Louisiana, North Carolina (public IHEs only), Tennessee, Texas (IHEs with more than 10 graduates annually)
17.5: Regular data collection	✓	✓ All states listed above

Because the absence of information on the frequency of data collection (Indicator 17.5) leads to a presumption in our analysis that collection is done with sufficient frequency, it was possible to make a determination on all indicators and evaluate all IHEs in the sample on this standard.

<sup>1</sup> While non-standardized TPAs are evaluated in the **Lesson Planning Standard** and the **Assessment and Data Standard**, only a standardized TPA satisfies this indicator in the **Outcomes Standard**: Only a standardized TPA allows evaluation of the IHE's teacher candidates with the external frame of reference necessary for use as an outcomes measure. This standard evaluates use of standardized TPAs on an institutional basis and is satisfied by use in any given program or even part of a program.

<sup>2</sup> In these states, the relevant IHEs need not provide evidence of adoption of a TPA. In all other states, analysis includes adoption of a TPA if the IHE: 1) is on a list of adopters posted at <http://www.edtpa.com>, or 2) provides evidence of adoption.

<sup>3</sup> While North Carolina's teacher preparation VAM report is the only such report evaluated for the **Evidence of Effectiveness Standard**, many additional IHEs in other states with teacher preparation VAMs satisfy Indicator 17.4. **Florida's** IHEs do not, however, satisfy the indicator: while they previously received relevant reports and will do so again soon, they have not received reports during the *Review's* period of data collection and analysis.

Although this indicator absolves IHEs in states other than those listed from responsibility for obtaining student growth data if "state data systems preclude access to meaningful data," the resourcefulness of numerous IHEs in obtaining this data even in the face of state data systems that do not facilitate such access leads us to evaluate this indicator as applicable to any IHE in any state. (See the findings report on this standard for examples of IHEs that obtained this data in the absence of a state initiative.) However, scoring for this standard allows an IHE to meet the standard even if it does not satisfy this indicator.)

## How a program earns a “strong design” rating

All IHEs in **Louisiana, North Carolina** and **Tennessee** fully satisfying all indicators, or all IHEs in any other state satisfying all indicators except for 17.4, were eligible for evaluation against one of three “strong design” indicators. All such IHEs received invitations to submit the additional material necessary for evaluation of the relevant strong design indicator. In all three evaluations for strong design there is a review of evidence that the outcome data available to the IHE has been used for program improvement. This might include, for example, information on redesigned coursework or clinical experiences, or on new instruments to assess teaching skills.

Common misconceptions about how analysts evaluate the Outcomes Standard:

- *IHEs can receive credit of use of an institution-designed “teacher performance assessment” (TPA) or for use of PRAXIS III results.* The basis for awarding credit for use of any teacher candidate assessment is whether the assessment is designed to allow comparison of candidates to the general population of teacher candidates and thus provide information for program improvement purposes. “In-house” TPAs and the PRAXIS III are not designed to do so.
- *IHEs can only receive credit for use of information from models providing information on the performance of graduates if a state data model exists.* The Outcomes Standard recognizes IHEs that made an effort to gather data on their graduates’ effectiveness even in the absence of a state data model.
- *IHEs can receive credit for in-progress initiatives, such as state data models in development.* Initiatives at the state or institutional level do not receive credit unless they are fully operational.

## Examples of what satisfies or does not satisfy the standard’s indicators

### Surveying graduates (Indicator 17.1)

✓ - fully satisfies the indicator	✗ - does not satisfy the indicator
<p>The IHE’s survey of its graduates focuses on topics relevant to the quality of the teacher preparation program that would be useful for program evaluation: skills, coursework and areas for improvement.</p> <p>Examples of questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <i>How well did our elementary education program prepare you to teach reading? Please answer on a scale of 1 to 5.</i></li> <li>■ <i>Using the Likert scale, please rate how helpful you found EDUC 300 to be.</i></li> <li>■ <i>In narrative form, please describe the strengths and weaknesses of your clinical experience.</i></li> </ul>	<p>The IHE does not survey graduates, or its survey of graduates focuses on whether a graduate is employed or general features of the undergraduate or graduate experience.</p> <p>Examples of questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <i>What would you consider the biggest benefit of attending this university?</i></li> <li>■ <i>Please describe your employment status.</i></li> <li>■ <i>What is your current mailing address? Your alumni association wants to keep you in the loop!</i></li> </ul> <p>Alternatively, the institution surveys graduates prior to exit.</p> <p>Example of question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <i>Now that you have come to the end of your student teaching experience, what would you say are the strengths and weaknesses of our program?</i></li> </ul>

**Surveying graduates' employers (Indicator 17.2)**

✓ - fully satisfies the indicator	✗ - does not satisfy the indicator
<p>At least one observation or evaluation instrument addresses the teacher candidate's ability to reinforce standards of classroom behavior.</p> <p>Examples of questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <i>Please assess our graduates' knowledge of the state curriculum standards.</i></li> <li>■ <i>In general, do graduates of our School of Education integrate technology into the curriculum as appropriate?</i></li> <li>■ <i>What are the distinguishing strengths of graduates of the College of Education? Are there any domains where we could improve our preparation of teacher candidates?</i></li> </ul>	<p>The IHE does not survey graduates' employers, or its survey of graduates' employers focuses on salary or employment information.</p> <p>Examples of questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <i>How many College of Education graduates do you currently employ in your district?</i></li> <li>■ <i>Have you sent representatives to the College of Education's job fair in the last five years?</i></li> </ul>

**Securing data from TPAs (Indicator 17.3)**

✓ - fully satisfies the indicator	✗ - does not satisfy the indicator
<p>The IHE is either required by the state to administer a standardized TPA as a condition of preparation completion or licensure OR the institution has chosen to require a standardized TPA for program completion.</p>	<p>The IHE does not require any TPA or requires a TPA that is not standardized.</p>

**Securing growth data on graduates' students (Indicator 17.4)**

✓ - fully satisfies the indicator	✗ - does not satisfy the indicator
The IHE receives reports on the effectiveness of its graduates from the state or generates such reports on its own.	The IHE does not receive reports on the effectiveness of its graduates from the state and does not generate such reports on its own.

**Data collected regularly (Indicator 17.5)**

✓ - fully satisfies the indicator	✗ - does not satisfy the indicator
<p>The IHE receives survey information from its graduates and/or its graduates' employers no less frequently than every three years either by its own initiative, the state's initiative or a combination.</p> <p>In the absence of evidence of frequency (in, for example, a survey titled only "Graduate Survey" as opposed to one titled "2007 Graduate Survey"), the frequency is presumed to be no less than every three years.</p>	The IHE does not receive survey information from its graduates and/or its graduates' employers, or it does so, but with insufficient frequency in the case of either or both.