

# Impact on P-12 Learning and Development

**Table 35: Individual Growth Measure of Completers by One State District**

Candidate	Candidate's License and Content	2013-2014 Rating	Median Growth	2014-2015 Rating	Median Growth	2015-2016 Rating	Median Growth	2016-2017 Rating	Median Growth
1	ELA 5-12	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	33.50%	3	50%
2	ELEM 1-6 MATH	4	70%	3	66%	3	48.50%	3	61%
3	ELEM 1-6	3	49.50%	3	59.50%	3	56.50%	NA	NA
4	ELEM 1-6	3	56.50%	3	67%	3	59%	3	65.50%
5	ELA 5-12	3	55%	3	47.50%	2	39.50%	2	43.50%
6	ELEM K-6	3	56.50%	3	47.55%	2	39.50%	2	43%
Overall Average Rating and Median		3.2	57.5%	3	57.51%	2.5	46.08%	2.6	52.6%

Note: ELEM includes ELA and MATH in median growth and rating

Standard 5	Impact on P-12 Learning and Development
Overview	<p><b>Data Analysis Plan for Completer Impact on P-12 Learning.</b> The EPP has developed a plan and begun the initial data collection of completers' impact on P-12 learning. Within this plan is an explanation of how the information is summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared, and acted upon for program improvement. The EPP will utilize two measures to analyze completer impact on P-12 learning, including Individual Growth Measure and the Indiana Department of Education's State Evaluation Rating.</p> <p><b>Individual Growth Measure</b> The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) recognizes the Individual Growth Measure (IGM) as "the required primary measure of student learning for teachers of tested subjects" (Beatson, Erbse, Pies, &amp; Regnier (2016). The tested subjects are math and English language arts between grades 4-8, and educators' rating are provided to their school corporation as 1-4 rating.</p>

The 1-4 rating distinction is as follows:

- 4 (Educators whose learners demonstrate median growth at or above 65)
- 3 (Educators whose learners demonstrate median growth at or above 50 though below 65)
- 2 (Educators whose learners demonstrate median growth below 50 though above 34)
- 1 (Educators whose learners demonstrate median growth at or below 34)

Annually, the EPP dean will submit official requests for the IGM externally benchmarked data from the IDOE and the two largest school districts employing completers. A complete summary of this data will be analyzed by the EPP dean and University's Office of Academic Affairs, then distributed within the EPP Year in Review report to the dean, EPP faculty, Stakeholder Advisory Committee, and Office of Academic Affairs. After the review of this data, any determined action will be considered by the Stakeholder Advisory Committee and if necessary, put into an action plan that will be reviewed annually by all parties involved in the initial analysis.

In 2017-2018, the EPP dean requested IGM data from the IDOE for all completers and to two local school districts who historically consistently hire completers. At the time of this publication, the EPP has not received the data from the State. One of the two districts was able to provide the data (Table A35). The EPP dean will work with both districts in the future to determine if this data can be provided consistently.

#### **State Evaluation Rating**

The IDOE requires all public schools to review educators' effectiveness through a performance evaluation. Per Indiana law, school districts can utilize RISE, a modified version of RISE, or develop their own evaluation plan, all of which must be IDOE-approved.

Requirements include:

- "Objective measures of student achievement and growth significantly inform all certificated employees' evaluations,
- Student performance results from statewide assessments inform evaluation of employees whose responsibilities include teaching tested subjects,
- Methods of assessing student growth in evaluations of employees who do not teach tested subjects,
- Student assessment results from locally developed assessments and other test measures in evaluations for certificated employees.
- Rigorous measures of effectiveness, including observations and other performance indicators,
- A summative rating as either highly effective, effective, improvement necessary, or ineffective,
- A final summative rating modification if and when a teacher negatively affects student growth,

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All evaluation components, including but not limited to student performance data and observation results, factored into the final summative rating, and</li> <li>• Recommendations for improvement and the time in which improvement is expected” (Beatson, Erbse, Pies, &amp; Regnier, 2016).</li> </ul> <p>Annually, the EPP dean will submit official requests for this externally benchmarked data from the IDOE and the two largest school districts employing completers. A complete summary of this data will be analyzed by the EPP dean and University’s Office of Academic Affairs, then distributed within the EPP Year in Review report to the dean, EPP faculty, Stakeholder Advisory Committee, and Office of Academic Affairs. After the review of this data, any determined action will be considered by the Stakeholder Advisory Committee and if necessary, put into an action plan that will be reviewed annually by all parties involved in the initial analysis.</p>
Data Tables	<p>Three cycles of data tables include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Table 35: Individual Growth Measure of Completers by One State District</li> </ul>
Trends	<p>Individual Growth Measure (IGM) of Completers by One State District Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Of completers’ 21 available measured ratings, 76% (16) demonstrated a rating of 3 or 4</li> <li>• In 2013-2014 and 2014-2015, 100% (10/10) completers’ ratings were 3 or 4</li> <li>• Median growth rose in 2016-2017 (2.6) from the lowest mark of 2.5 in 2015-2016</li> </ul> <p>IGM of Completers by One State District Areas of Challenge:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In 2015-2016, 100% of the 2 ratings (3) over three cycles were identified</li> <li>• 2015-2016 demonstrated the lowest average median growth (46.08%) across four cycles</li> </ul> <p>IGM of Completers by One State District Trends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The average median growth across four cycles was 2.82</li> <li>• The average median growth across 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 was higher than across 2015-2016 and 2016-2017</li> </ul>
Future Direction	<p>While completer data numbers are low, the IGM of completers demonstrate a positive impact on P-12 learning. These positive indicators provide the EPP with valued insight on how the teacher preparation program influences completers’ learners’ growth.</p> <p>Regarding the one district who replied to our IGM data request, their representative stressed that lower ratings and median growth percentages can be attributed to different state testing formats and increased depth of knowledge requirements of learners.</p>

	<p>Along with the Employer Surveys, Graduate Surveys, Employer Focus Groups, Completer Focus Groups, and Completer Case Study, all of which provide valuable perceptions of the teacher preparation program, the EPP can triangulate this data with Evaluation Ratings and IGM's to provide P-12 learning data. Holistically, these various and differentiated measures will inform the EPP on areas of strengths and improvement that will help inform annual program review.</p>
--	--