

---

# Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee

April 21, 2014



---

Florida Department of Education  
Bureau of Educator Recruitment, Development, and Retention

---

# Primary Goal of TLPIC

- Provide input, feedback and recommendations to the state on the development and implementation of performance standards and targets for continued approval of state-approved teacher and school leadership preparation programs.



# TLPIC Committee Members

- ❑ Dr. Vivian Posey
- ❑ Dr. Elisa Calabrese
- ❑ Dr. Susan Trauschke-McEachin
- ❑ Ana Blaine
- ❑ Dr. Erin Harrel
- ❑ Catherine S. Boehme
- ❑ Dr. Mark Howse
- ❑ Dr. Adriana McEachern
- ❑ Susan Moxley
- ❑ Dr. Gregory K. Adkins,
- ❑ Dr. Valerie Storey
- ❑ Ms. Tamara Perry
- ❑ Debbie Cooke
- ❑ Megan Pankiewicz
- ❑ Dr. Gloria Artecona-Pelaez
- ❑ Dr. Lance J. Tomei
- ❑ Jasmine Ulmer
- ❑ Dr. Joe Joyner



---

# Focus for Today

- Determine performance targets for Teacher Evaluation metric



# Metrics for Teacher Preparation Accountability Model

- Placement – ITP and EPI only
- Retention
- Performance of students on statewide assessments
- Student Performance by Subgroup
- **Teacher Evaluation Results**
- Production of completers in Critical Teacher Shortage Areas



# Teacher Evaluation Metric

- Consists of four levels of program performance based on 3-year aggregated annual teacher evaluation data.
- Initial proposed performance ranges were drafted by FL DOE staff.
- Proposal was edited to ensure that performance descriptors for each level were distinct and collectively included all possible outcomes.
- Historical data (teacher evaluation data for 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11 for program completers employed in 2011-12) were analyzed using the revised performance levels.
- Based on a review of resulting data, one additional revision is proposed for Level Four.



# Teacher Evaluation Metric

## First Draft of Performance Levels

- Level 4 = At least 10% of the program's completers received a Highly Effective rating **and** at least 80% of the program's completers received an Effective rating **and** no completers were rated unsatisfactory
- Level 3 = At least 80% of the program's completers received **either** Highly Effective **or** Effective rating
- Level 2 = At least 50% of the program's completers received an Effective rating **and** no completers were rated unsatisfactory
- Level 1 = Less than 50% of the program's completers received an Effective rating



# Teacher Evaluation Metric

## Second Draft of Performance Levels

- Level 4 = At least 10% of the program's completers received a Highly Effective rating **AND** at least 90% of the program's completers received either Highly Effective or Effective ratings **AND** no completers were rated Unsatisfactory
- Level 3 = Criteria for Level 4 are not met, but at least 80% of the program's completers received **either** Highly Effective **or** Effective ratings **AND** no completers were rated Unsatisfactory
- Level 2 = At least 60% of the program's completers received Highly Effective or Effective ratings **AND** no more than 5% (no more than one for  $n < 20$ ) of the program's completers were rated Unsatisfactory
- Level 1 = Less than 60% of the program's completers received Highly Effective or Effective ratings **OR** more than 5% (more than 1 for  $n < 20$ ) of the program's completers were rated unsatisfactory.





# Teacher Evaluation Metric

## Third Draft of Performance Levels

- Level 4 = At least 40% of the program's completers received a Highly Effective rating **AND** at least 90% of the program's completers received Highly Effective or Effective ratings **AND** no completers were rated Unsatisfactory
- Level 3 = Criteria for Level 4 are not met, but at least 80% of the program's completers received Highly Effective **or** Effective ratings **AND** no completers were rated Unsatisfactory
- Level 2 = At least 60% of the program's completers received Highly Effective or Effective ratings **AND** no more than 5% (no more than one for  $n < 20$ ) of the program's completers were rated Unsatisfactory
- Level 1 = Less than 60% of the program's completers received Highly Effective or Effective ratings **OR** more than 5% (more than 1 for  $n < 20$ ) of the program's completers were rated Unsatisfactory.



# Historical Data Analysis (10%)

(2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11 Data for Completers Employed in 2011-12)

Program Type	Levels by Program				Total
	1	2	3	4	
DACP	1	6	14	22	43
EPI		5	6	21	32
ITP	5	18	131	173	327
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>402</b>



# Historical Data Analysis (10%)

(2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11 Data for Completers Employed in 2011-12)

Program Type	Levels By Institution (Only Impacts ITPs)				Total
	1	2	3	4	
DACP	1	6	14	22	43
EPI		5	6	21	32
ITP		6	13	20	39
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>114</b>



# Historical Data Analysis (20%)

(2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11 Data for Completers Employed in 2011-12)

Program Type	Levels by Program				Total
	1	2	3	4	
DACP	1	6	18	18	43
EPI		5	16	11	32
ITP	5	18	180	124	327
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>402</b>



# Historical Data Analysis (25%)

(2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11 Data for Completers Employed in 2011-12)

Program Type	Levels by Program				Total
	1	2	3	4	
DACP	1	6	18	18	43
EPI		5	17	10	32
ITP	5	18	199	105	327
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>402</b>



# Historical Data Analysis (30%)

(2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11 Data for Completers Employed in 2011-12)

Program Type	Levels by Program				Total
	1	2	3	4	
DACP	1	6	20	16	43
EPI		5	20	7	32
ITP	5	18	224	80	327
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>402</b>



# Historical Data Analysis (40%)

(2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11 Data for Completers Employed in 2011-12)

Program Type	Levels by Program				Total
	1	2	3	4	
DACP	1	6	21	15	43
EPI		5	22	5	32
ITP	5	18	256	48	327
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>299</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>402</b>



# Historical Data Analysis (40%)

(2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11 Data for Completers Employed in 2011-12)

Program Type	Levels By Institution (Only Impacts ITPs)				Total
	1	2	3	4	
DACP	1	6	21	15	43
EPI		5	22	5	32
ITP		6	33		39
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>114</b>





# Teacher Evaluation Metric

## Third Draft: Proposed Performance Levels

- Level 4 = At least 40% of the program's completers received a Highly Effective rating **AND** at least 90% of the program's completers received Highly Effective or Effective ratings **AND** no completers were rated Unsatisfactory
- Level 3 = Criteria for Level 4 are not met, but at least 80% of the program's completers received Highly Effective **or** Effective ratings **AND** no completers were rated Unsatisfactory
- Level 2 = At least 60% of the program's completers received Highly Effective or Effective ratings **AND** no more than 5% (no more than one for  $n < 20$ ) of the program's completers were rated Unsatisfactory
- Level 1 = Less than 60% of the program's completers received Highly Effective or Effective ratings **OR** more than 5% (more than 1 for  $n < 20$ ) of the program's completers were rated Unsatisfactory.



# TLPIC Timeline/ Next Steps

- May 2014
  - Conference call with TLPIC regarding school leadership preparation program accountability model
  - Incorporate performance target for teacher evaluation metric in draft Rule (6A-5.066)
  - Release draft Rule language for public comment
- Summer 2014
  - Recommend rule language to Commissioner for possible adoption by State Board

