PERCA Continuous Improvement
Reporting Guidelines
for Initial Licensure Programs

Produced by:
Educator Preparation Policy Council
Office of Teacher Education

College of Education and Human Development
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities

2015-16 Version

PART 1. Introduction to PERCA and these Guidelines

MN BOARD OF TEACHING PERCA PROCESS
According to Minnesota Administrative Rule 8705.2200 Continuing Teacher Preparation
Program Approval (PERCA) [https://www.revisor.leg.state.mn.us/rules/?id=8705.2200], all
teacher licensure programs in Minnesota must submit a continuous approval report to the
Minnesota Board of Teaching on a biennial basis. These program approval rules became
effective January 1, 2016.

PURPOSE OF THESE CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT REPORTING GUIDELINES
The overall PERCA process includes reporting on several program curriculum elements. These
guidelines focus on one aspect of the PERCA reporting requirements—the *continuous
improvement* report in which programs analyze aggregate data, set program improvement goals,
and report on progress toward those goals.

The MN Board of Teaching has set out six questions for initial licensure programs reporting in
the *continuous improvement* process. These guidelines include those six questions and the
guidance provided by the Board of Teaching (question and text inside boxes).

In addition, the Educator Preparation Policy Council (EPPC) is making some recommendations
for how to respond to these questions with two key ideas in mind: 1) focusing on program
improvement that is based on strong patterns of evidence, and 2) using our teacher candidate
performance data as evidence of program improvement.

The Office of Teacher Education (OTE) will facilitate the process for submitting all aspects of
the PERCA reporting requirements including the *continuous improvement* reports.

With continuous improvement being part of the program continual approval process, we run the
risk of falling into a bureaucratic process of "reporting for reporting sake." These guidelines
provide some suggestions for how to examine aggregate data, set reasonable improvement goals,
and mark progress toward improvement through curriculum changes, program design changes,
and clinical learning opportunities. We draw on CAEP's definition of continuous improvement
for guidance in defining continuous improvement:

> An organizational process through which data are collected on all aspects of a
> provider's activities; analyzed to determine patterns, trends, and progress; and
> used to define changes for the purpose of improving the quality of programs,
> faculty, candidates, policies, procedures, and practices of educator preparation.
> -CAEP Commission

PART 2. OTE support for writing continuous improvement reports

2015-16 PERCA REPORTING TIMELINE

Fall 2015: Programs notified that all teacher education syllabi must be submitted to the OTE by May 1, 2016. The syllabi are a required part of the biennial PERCA reporting process. Syllabi must meet template requirements and include the standards of effective practice, Special Ed CORE standards (if applicable), and subject matter/content standards in the front of the syllabus. In addition, the learning activity(ies) and assessment(s) covering each standard must be identified in the syllabus. Finally, each assessment should include a rubric that specifies how candidate performance on the standards is assessed.

February 2016: OTE uploads program data to the server for all teacher licensure programs to use for developing the continuous improvement narratives and handbook for writing program narratives is distributed.

May 1, 2016: First drafts of the program continuous improvement narratives are submitted to the OTE.

May 1, 2016: All program syllabi are submitted to OTE.

May 16, 2016: Program narratives first drafts are used by programs during the Annual Curriculum Summit.

June 1, 2016: Syllabi that need to be revised are returned to programs/course instructors for revision.

September 15, 2016: Final syllabi and program narratives are submitted to OTE.

October 1, 2016: All PERCAs are submitted to MNBOT by OTE.

WHAT DATA SHOULD BE USED IN THE CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT REPORT?
The Board of Teaching expects several data sources to be used in the *continuous improvement* reporting. Specifically, the guiding questions refer to teacher surveys, supervisor surveys, candidate performance assessments, and candidate content knowledge tests. The Office of Teacher Education will provide the following data for program reporting:
- Entry Survey summary
- Exit Survey results (program and UMN aggregate)
- Transition to Teaching Survey results (program and UMN aggregate)
- Supervisor Survey results (program and UMN aggregate)
- edTPA results (program and UMN aggregate)
- Dispositions Assessment (program and UMN aggregate)
- Student Teaching Observation Rubric (program and UMN aggregate)
- MTLE results (program specific content knowledge and pedagogical tests)
- Enrollment information

In addition, programs can use program specific data such as:
- Assessments embedded in program courses and used to monitor candidate performance
- Supervisor reports about candidate performance
- Focus group information from candidates and school partners

Note that the number of respondents to surveys should be included when reporting survey responses. In some cases, the response rates are low and we do not account for a description of the population on non-respondents. In these cases, programs should use caution in drawing conclusions based solely on responses to a single survey response and look for patterns across multiple data points before drawing conclusions.

CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT REPORTS

Each program report will have an introduction provided by the OTE that provides the following information
- Summary of the CEHD Assessment System
- Summary of how data are collected across all programs
- Reporting of the populations surveyed by CEHD and response rates
- Disaggregated information about program response rates
- Summary of efforts to address low response rates, with some description of specific efforts related to programs with very low response rates
- Summary of CEHD areas of opportunities and areas of strength
- Overall program satisfaction ratings based on candidate and supervisor surveys
- Enrollment Data and Completion Dates
- Ethnicity, Gender, and GPA information

Part 3. Writing the Continuous Improvement report

PERCA CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT REPORTING QUESTIONS—INITIAL PROGRAMS (revised by MN Board of Teaching February 2016)

Program Narrative: Questions for Initial Licensure Areas

General Guidance
  A. In rule, "Unit" refers to the Teacher Preparation Institution and "Program" refers to the specific licensure programs. The program narrative should report on the specific licensure program.
  B. Questions 1-5 specifically ask about data, feedback, and analysis in targeted areas. Question 6 is meant to represent the goals that flow from concerns/areas of improvement that are raised from surveys (questions 1 and 2), program data (question 3), advisory group (question 4), and progress on prior goals (question 5).
  C. If the number of candidates in the aggregated data is low:
     - Note the low n in your response.
     - Attempt to combine data over multiple years and report the aggregated data.
     - Attempt to combine similar licensure areas and report the aggregated data.

- If answers/goals will be similar across program narratives, explain why. (i.e. "Our data indicated that many programs struggled with classroom management standards in their key assessments and on edTPA scores, so we have developed a unit-wide goal…")
  D. Answers should be succinct summaries. Note the character limitation for each question.
  E. Answers should include program specific, aggregated data (no data from other programs should be included in this report).

1. Provide a summary of findings based on responses to locally determined surveys, aligned to the SEPs, completed by graduates of this program after one year of teaching experience. Analysis must include program strengths, areas for improvement, and specific response rates, including plans to improve rates. (max 8000 characters)
   (8705.2200 Subp C1 & 2)
   Address:
   - *Alignment to SEPs*
   - *Response rates by specific program (if low, describe the plan to improve rates)*
   - *Strengths noted, specific to this licensure area.*
   - *Areas of improvement noted, specific to this licensure area*

2. Provide a summary of findings based on responses to locally determined surveys, aligned to the SEPs, school administrators employing program completers at the end of their first year of classroom teaching. Analysis must include program strengths, areas for improvement, and specific response rates, including plans to improve rates. (max 8000 characters)
   (8705.2200 Subp C1 & 2)
   Address:
   - *Alignment to SEPs*
   - *Response rates by specific program (if low, describe the plan to improve rates)*
   - *Strengths noted, specific to this licensure area.*
   - *Areas of improvement noted, specific to this licensure area*

3. Describe the ways in which aggregated data from multiple assessments are regularly analyzed for program evaluation purposes, including content-specific data, licensure examinations, performance assessments, and others required by the unit and/or program. Identify program strengths and areas for improvement based on the program-specific internal and external assessments. (Note: Make sure to include specific aggregated data points to illustrate and explain identified program strengths and areas of improvement. (max 8000 characters)
   (8705.2200. Subp.2.C.6)
   Address:
   - *The ways regular analysis of assessment data occurs.*
   - *Summary of key assessment data – use specific data points only when illustrating a strength or area of improvement. (i.e. "On standard 3.e.i, we noticed students have steadily improved from 3.2 to 3.5 average score in the last two years. We think this strength is due to….")*
   - *Discuss any low MTLE passing rates – use data from "Testing" screen in EPPAS, and supplement as needed.*
   - *Discuss any low edTPA threshold rates (by specific licensure area) – use data*

from "edTPA" screen in EPPAS, and supplement as needed. (in 2016, the institution will need to compile their edTPA results and directly address this as the data will not be in EPPAS yet)
- *Identify how areas of improvement and strengths are directly correlated with one or more of the licensure area-specific assessments.*

4. Identify the constituent groups, including representatives from partner schools, practicing public school teachers licensed in the content area, faculty with content expertise, and unit faculty that collaborate with program faculty in the regular and systematic evaluation of this program. Provide a description of their role, their evaluation process, and a summary of the most recent feedback provided on this program. (max 8000 characters)

    (8705.2200 sub 2.C.7)

    Address:
- *The specific group and their roles. (may note answer from previous year)*
- *Licensure-specific members. (may note answer from previous year)*
- *That the group looks at program data.*
- *What feedback the group has given for this specific licensure area.*

5. Provide a summary of progress made toward the goals and plans reported in the previous PERCA cycle. If the program has an approval status of Approved with a Continuous Improvement Focus established by the board, the summary must additionally and explicitly address progress within the identified area(s). (Note: Use data to support stated progress on goals identified in question six from the previous PERCA report.) (max 8000 characters)

    Address:
- *(not required for reports expiring 2016 and 2017)*
- *Next reporting years (expiring 2018 and 2019):*
  - *Continuous Improvement Focus identified by the Program Review Panel, if applicable.*
  - *Specific action taken and specific progress (or lack of) on prior year goals.*

6. Based on the data and feedback reported in questions 1-5, identify the program specific goals for the next two years. (Note: Make sure to clearly articulate new and/or continuing improvement goals.) (max 8000 characters)

    (8705.2200 Subp 2.C. 6 & 7)

    Address:
- *How questions 1-5 have informed these goals.*
- *At least one goal that is licensure area specific.*
- *Succinct and clear goals.*

APPROACHES AND EXAMPLES FOR WRITING THE CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT REPORTS

QUESTION 1

Provide a summary of findings based on responses to locally determined surveys, aligned to the SEPs, completed by graduates of this program after one year of teaching experience. Analysis must include program strengths, areas for improvement, and specific response rates, including plans to improve rates. (max 8000 characters)
        (8705.2200 Subp C1 & 2)

Address:
- *Alignment to SEPs*
- *Response rates by specific program (if low, describe the plan to improve rates)*
- *Strengths noted, specific to this licensure area.*
- *Areas of improvement noted, specific to this licensure area*

Response strategies
- This question focuses only on data from the Transition to Teaching Survey administered at the end of the first year of our candidates' teaching. Focus your responses on data from this survey.
- Begin the response by reporting the surveyed population and the response rate (provided by the OTE).
- Look for a group of survey items related to a particular SEP and write about the trends you see in the survey items related to that SEP. The program could do this for 2-3 SEPs overall.
- Link the strengths of the finding to an aspect or two of the overall program design—include both content-specific aspects as well as common content aspects of the candidate's program experience.
- Link the areas for improvement that you identify to an aspect of the program that can be strengthened (e.g., pedagogy of instructors, different or improved course assignments, links between field placements and course-work, more focus on a particular aspect of the curriculum, scaffolding for learning new knowledge or skills, coherence across different parts of the candidate learning experience).

Example responses that illustrate some of these response strategies

Communication Arts and Literature Report (2015)
The Communication Arts and Literature (CAL) program area has survey data from 2012 (gathered between March and May 2012) and 2013 (gathered from March and May 2013) for graduates of our program between 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 respectively. Response rates for this survey were 33.3% in 2012 and 38.9% in 2013.

Based on the 2012 and 2013 Transition to Teaching Surveys, graduates of the CAL program feel confident in and perform the following effective teacher practices:
- Integrating a variety of media and learning technologies into instruction (8 of 9 respondents); **SEPS:** Subp. 7. Standard 6, communication: D, I, K

- Designing activities in which students learn skills directly related to subject matter (9 of 9 respondents)
- Building upon students' prior knowledge (9 of 9 respondents)
- Aligning instructional plans to objectives and content standards (9 of 9 respondents); **SEPS:** Subp. 8. Standard 7, planning instruction: A, F, G, H
- Creating an environment to support culturally and ethnically diverse students (8 of 9 respondents). **SEPS:** Subp. 4. Standard 3, diverse learners: E, F, H

Data suggest that, overall, a key strengths of our CAL program is that it prepares teacher candidates to design and implement effective lessons, integrate media and technology, and support culturally diverse learners.

At the same time, data suggest that our program must continue to improve upon the following areas in teacher preparation:
- Using assessments to monitor student learning and diagnose gaps in students' knowledge and skills (only 4 of 9 respondents agreed they had been prepared in this regard); **SEPS:** Subp. 9. Standard 8, assessment: B, E
- Responding to misbehavior in the classroom (only 3 of 9 agreed); **SEPS:** Subp. 6. Standard 5, learning environment: E
- Designing instruction for special education students (results varied across these questions, but tended toward disagreement with the statements); **SEPS:** Subp. 4. Standard 3, diverse learners: B, K, L

Interestingly, while respondents tended to feel that the program had not prepared them to use assessments to support student learning, to respond to misbehavior in the classroom, and to design instruction for special education students, survey results also indicated that respondents did practice these skills once they were in their own classrooms.

Other key data points include the finding that only 55.5% of respondents felt well prepared for job interviews. That said, 90% of respondents received a job offer and 82% were teaching at the time of the survey and 100% planned to teach for six years or more.

Special Education Report (2015)
[Introductory statement about the survey population and response rate.] A majority of respondents to Transition to Teaching Surveys consistently indicate that, in their first teaching experience, they felt prepared to implement Standards of Effective Practice related to:
- student learning (Subp. 3, Standard 2);
- planning, delivering, and assessing effects of instruction in their content area (Subps. 5, 7, 8, Standards 4, 6, 7);
- working with diverse learners (Subp. 4, Standard 3);
- creating positive learning environments that promote engagement (Subp. 6, Standard 5); and
- carrying out their instructional duties with professionalism (Subp 11, Standard 10).

Areas for improvement include:

- Disaggregating all data by program licensure area. Currently, enrollments by licensure area are too low to provide meaningful disaggregated data, but as each licensure area grows, disaggregated data will become more useful.
- Address areas where teacher candidates felt less prepared during their first year of teaching. These areas include:
  - Integrating a variety of media and technology into instruction
  - Designing instruction for special education students with cognitive impairments
  - Designing instruction for special education students with emotional/behavioral impairments
  - Designing instruction for students with mental health needs
  - Designing instruction of English language learners
  - Effectively teaching students who have experienced trauma

---

QUESTION 2
Provide a summary of findings based on responses to locally determined surveys, aligned to the SEPs, school administrators employing program completers at the end of their first year of classroom teaching. Analysis must include program strengths, areas for improvement, and specific response rates, including plans to improve rates. (max 8000 characters)
    (8705.2200 Subp C1 & 2)
    Address:
- *Alignment to SEPs*
- *Response rates by specific program (if low, describe the plan to improve rates)*
- *Strengths noted, specific to this licensure area.*
- *Areas of improvement noted, specific to this licensure area*

Response strategies
- This question focuses only on data from the Supervisor Survey administered at the end of the first year of our program completers' teaching. Focus your responses on data from this survey.
- Begin the response by reporting the surveyed population and the response rate (provided by the OTE).
- Look for a group of survey items related to a particular SEP and write about the trends you see in the survey items related to that SEP. The program could do this for 2-3 SEPs overall.
- Look for any trends between the Transition to Teaching Survey responses reported in Question 1 and what you see in the Supervisor Survey results. These trends will help focus the improvement goals in later questions.
- Link the strengths of the finding to an aspect or two of the overall program design-- include both content-specific aspects as well as common content aspects of the candidate's program experience.
- Link the areas for improvement that you identify to an aspect of the program that can be strengthened (e.g., pedagogy of instructors, different or improved course assignments, links between field placements and course-work, more focus on a particular aspect of the curriculum, scaffolding for learning new knowledge or skills, coherence across different parts of the candidate learning experience).

Example responses that illustrate some of these response strategies

Agricultural Education Report (2015)
We have seen an increased response rate by our school administrators employing our program completers at the end of their first year of classroom teacher. Between 2011-2012 and 2012-2013, our response rate increased from 51.2% to 75.9%. There is a deepening relationship and rise in the number of partner schools as well. In addition, of the 72 completers in 2013-2014, 23 were hired into our partner network schools. Principals are becoming aware of our impact on them by hiring our highly qualified candidates, and are more apt to return their surveys, since they are aware that we are responding to their feedback data.

Strengths:
9L - Standard 9: Reflection and Professional Development, L. understand the responsibility for obtaining and maintaining licensure, the role of the teacher as a public employee, and the purpose and contributions of educational organizations
10A - Collaboration, Ethics, and Relationships, A. understand the responsibility for obtaining and maintaining licensure, the role of the teacher as a public employee, and the purpose and contributions of educational organizations

Our program completers demonstrate strength in the understanding of their responsibility for obtaining and maintaining licensure, the role of the teacher as a public employee, and the purpose and contributions of educational organizations. In addition, they understand schools as organizations within the larger community context and understand the operations of the relevant aspects of the system(s) within which they work.

Area for Improvement:
9H - Standard 9: Reflection and Professional Development, H. use classroom observation, information about students, and research as sources for evaluating the outcomes of teaching and learning and as a basis for reflecting on and revising practice;

Over the next two years, our areas for improvement would be aligned with SEP 9H. We are working with districts to increase induction programs based on our experience with the Minneapolis Public Schools. Our goal is to create a similar model in other partner districts by 2017 thus improving the continuity between and among our partners. We want to have long term impact connecting edTPA and the induction process. The educative nature of the performance assessment will improve the continuity. Performance assessment through induction with continue throughout our program and right up to the National Board Certification thus improving Teaching Development.

Special Education Report (2015)
[Introductory statement about survey population and response rate]. A majority of respondents consistently indicate that they believe graduates of our program effectively implement Standards of Effective Practice related to:
   •   Student learning (Subp. 3, Standard 2);

- planning, delivering, and assessing effects of instruction in their content area (Subps. 5, 7, 8, Standards 4, 6, 7);
- Working with diverse learners (Subp. 4, Standard 3);
- Creating positive learning environments that promote engagement (Subp. 6, Standard 5); and
- Carrying out their instructional duties with professionalism (Subp 11, Standard 10).

While ratings were generally positive, within the above standards, we noted some variability in employer ratings of the following areas:
- sets clear subject matter learning goals for students
- strategically uses a variety of assessments to monitor student learning
- designs instruction and learning tasks that connect core content to real-life experiences for students
- asks her/his students to self-assess their own learning
- uses colleague feedback to support her/his development as a teacher
- uses community/home resources to foster student learning

We recognize that these standards are particularly critical for special education teachers, and we would like to ensure that our graduates are consistently strong in these areas. To gather more data about how our graduates are performing in these areas, we will conduct focus groups with employers to gain further insights into our areas of strength and weakness. These focus groups will give us qualitative data about what specifically needs to be improved.

QUESTION 3
Describe the ways in which aggregated data from multiple assessments are regularly analyzed for program evaluation purposes, including content-specific data, licensure examinations, performance assessments, and others required by the unit and/or program. Identify program strengths and areas for improvement based on the program-specific internal and external assessments. (Note: Make sure to include specific aggregated data points to illustrate and explain identified program strengths and areas of improvement. (max 8000 characters)
    (8705.2200. Subp.2.C.6)
    Address:
- *The ways regular analysis of assessment data occurs.*
- *Summary of key assessment data – use specific data points only when illustrating a strength or area of improvement. (i.e. "On standard 3.e.i, we noticed students have steadily improved from 3.2 to 3.5 average score in the last two years. We think this strength is due to….")*
- *Discuss any low MTLE passing rates – use data from "Testing" screen in EPPAS, and supplement as needed.*
- *Discuss any low edTPA threshold rates (by specific licensure area) – use data from "edTPA" screen in EPPAS, and supplement as needed. (in 2016, the institution will need to compile their edTPA results and directly address this as the data will not be in EPPAS yet)*
- *Identify how areas of improvement and strengths are directly correlated with one or more of the licensure area-specific assessments.*

Response strategies
- This question has two purposes. First, it is asking you to describe the process your program uses to examine candidate assessment data and second, you are asked to draw some findings from your analysis that enable some program improvement decisions.
- Describe your program area's practice / process with regard to using data for program evaluation and continuous improvement (e.g., how often you meet, what data you look at, how you monitor program improvement). This description should be short and simple in the early reporting years and become more robust over time.
- The data that you highlight in response to this question should target candidate performance data specifically (e.g., exit survey data is not that pertinent to this question). Remember, question 1 was based on the Transition to Teaching Survey and question 2 was based on the Supervisor Survey. The response to this question should focus on other forms of candidate assessment / performance data.
- Highlight findings from your analysis—one or two strengths and one or two areas for improvement.
- You can highlight findings from your analysis that align with your reporting in questions 1 and 2 and this can help identify program improvement goals in later questions. You may also see patterns in candidate performance that are different from what you reported in questions 1 and 2.
- Note that this question does not require that you actually show your data set unless you think it will be helpful to have that information reported here. In other words, you can have raw data about teacher candidate performance in other forms and describe the aggregated results here with the rationale for why you chose the aggregated data that you chose.

Example responses that illustrate some of these response strategies

Arts Education Report (2015)
With our school partners, the art education program area has found these areas as opportunities for improvement based on the results of the 2014 edTPA:
- Improving individual scores on Task 3: Assessment of the edTPA
- Increasing the edTPA composite score to more closely align with state and national averages
- Raising the number of visual art teacher candidates completing the edTPA
We have identified the following areas for program improvement in our practicum observations and student teaching rounds practices:
- Increasing communication between the following key stakeholders: Art Education Program Coordinator, Art Education Practicum Facilitator, University Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers (Cooperating Teacher Survey Results, 2014)
- Improving teacher candidate placement during the observation practicum and student teaching rounds to better align content expertise and experience (Cooperating Teacher Survey Results, 2014)
- Clarifying expectations of teacher candidates and cooperating teachers around issues pertaining to lesson plan development, classroom management, and reflecting on student data (Teacher Preparation Program Exit Survey 2012: C6c, C6j, C6k).

Communication Arts and Literature Report (2015)

Through our analyses of this information collectively, we have found that these areas are strengths of the Communication Arts and Literature program:

- Candidates felt prepared to meet the needs of culturally and ethnically diverse students; (evidenced in Transition to Teaching Surveys; Standards Rubric; Exit Surveys); **SEPS:** Subp. 4. Standard 3, diverse learners: E, F, H
- Candidates felt knowledgeable in and prepared to teach the central concepts, content, and tools of inquiry of the discipline; (evidenced in edTPA Scores; Standards Rubrics; Student Teaching Evaluation Summary; MTLE Scores; Exit Surveys); **SEPS:** Subp. 2. Standard 1, subject matter: A, E, F
- Candidates felt prepared to create and maintain an engaging and positive learning environment (evidenced in edTPA Scores; Standards Rubric); **SEPS:** Subp. 6. Standard 5, learning environment: C, H, Q

With our school partners, we have found these areas as opportunities for improvement and where candidates need more support:

- Designing and modifying assessments (including students' self-assessments) to accommodate students with diverse learning needs; (evidenced in Transition to Teaching Surveys; Standards Rubric; Student Teaching Evaluation Summary; edTPA Scores; Exit Surveys); **SEPS:** Subp. 9. Standard 8, assessment: I, K
- Responding to misbehavior in the classroom; (evidenced in Transition to Teaching Surveys; Exit Surveys; Supervisor Survey); **SEPS:** Subp. 6. Standard 5, learning environment: E
- Differentiating instruction for diverse learning needs (evidenced in Supervisor Survey; Transition to Teaching Surveys; Exit Surveys); **SEPS:** Subp. 5. Standard 4, instructional strategies: F, I

Other program area findings suggest that our teacher candidates:

- Maintain a high level of professionalism in the field (Dispositions Assessments; Student Teaching Evaluation Summary);
- Are strong communicators (Student Teaching Evaluation Summary; Standards Rubric;);
- Feel confident integrating technology and media into their teaching (Transition to Teaching Surveys; Exit Surveys).

Moreover, graduates of our program seem satisfied with the support they receive from their university supervisors, instructors, and cooperating teachers. We are also proud that so many of our graduates intend to teach in urban settings (70% according to Exit Surveys).

Special Education Report (2015)

In addition to participating in OTE/CEHD sponsored events, Faculty and supervisors within the Special Education Program engage with each other and with school partners in several ways. We hold monthly program-wide licensure meetings to examine data and current practices and engage in problem solving and continuous improvement discussions. We frequently invite members of the OTE and members of the community (e.g., school partners) for specific discussion topics and training in new systems (e.g., training of personnel to use the new TK20 system).

We collect teacher candidate data from course instructors throughout the program, and from cooperating teachers and supervisors during student teaching. Data include dispositions

assessments, a Standards of Effective Practice rubric, evaluations of student teaching, edTPA, and MTLE. Based on our review of data from multiple assessments, we have identified the following strengths:

- In 2013-14, 100% of teacher candidates for whom dispositions assessment data are available ($n = 26$) were rated as "meets expectations" on all dispositions categories (Professional Conduct, Professional Qualities, Communication and Collaboration).
- In 2013-14, 0% of items on the Standards of Effective Practice Rubric were rated as "unsatisfactory," and only .2% were marked as "developing" based on evaluations of 48 teacher candidates.
- In 2013-14, 100% of teacher candidates for whom student teaching evaluations were completed ($n = 51$) were rated as performing satisfactorily or better in all areas (professionalism, reflective practice, learning environment, instructional skill and responsibilities, work with families and communities, content knowledge and skills).
- In 2013-14, 3 special education teacher candidates completed the edTPA. The mean score was 43.0, compared to State mean (33.5) and national mean (37.4).
- The pass rate of MTLE takers from the Special Education Programs on Special Ed Core Skills are consistently higher than the State pass rate (see table below).

MTLE Subject Area Results (program is in white, state in gray)

Subtest (from 2010 – current)	# Takers	Pass Rate	# Takers - State	Pass Rate - State	# Att. 1	Pass Rate At. 1	# Att. 1 - State	Att. 1 Pass Rate - State	# Retakers	Retaker Pass Rate	# Retakers - State	Retaker Pass Rate - State
Spec Ed Core Skills Sub 1	243	90%	3728	80%	227	93%	3190	84%	16	44%	538	55%
Spec Ed Core Skills Sub 2	237	95%	3366	90%	227	96%	3154	92%	10	90%	212	57%

Areas for improvement include:

- We need to establish a regular set of procedures to review and respond to data across multiple assessments. To understand our areas of strength and weakness better, we will create a system to evaluate formative assessment data on an ongoing basis. To do so, we will establish a specific time (e.g., at the end of each semester) when, as a program, we

will commit to filling out and reviewing dispositions assessment data. We have already established monthly meetings, so data completion and analysis will become a periodic agenda item in these meetings.
- Current data are primarily quantitative; additional qualitative data would shed additional light on specific areas of strength and weakness. We will explore whether there are ways to supplement quantitative data with qualitative data. We will work with OTE to determine additional data sources that can be added to supplement current assessment information.
- As we receive more data from students taking the edTPA, we will identify gaps in our program and ensure that these areas are strengthened in coursework and/or fieldwork experiences as necessary. We will ensure that these areas align with the IDEAL problem-solving model that provides the overarching framework of our program.
- As a program, we will increase consistency in the ways we use student teaching portfolio data across special education programs (establish systems/procedures). These data are particularly salient to judging whether students have met competencies, are aligned with SEP and special education standards, and should play a more prominent role in our identification of program strengths and weaknesses.

QUESTION 4

Identify the constituent groups, including representatives from partner schools, practicing public school teachers licensed in the content area, faculty with content expertise, and unit faculty that collaborate with program faculty in the regular and systematic evaluation of this program. Provide a description of their role, their evaluation process, and a summary of the most recent feedback provided on this program. (max 8000 characters)

(8705.2200 sub 2.C.7)

Address:
- *The specific group and their roles. (may note answer from previous year)*
- *Licensure-specific members. (may note answer from previous year)*
- *That the group looks at program data.*
- *What feedback the group has given for this specific licensure area.*
-

Response strategies
- This question is targeting the larger issue of who collaborates on the ongoing evaluation of the program with specific focus on school partner engagement and content area specialist engagement.
- The first part of the question can be answered directly with a list or table that shows the people engaged in program evaluation / continuous improvement work, the position they hold, and how they are involved in the program. It is less important to have a long list and more important to show how stakeholders are really engaged.
- The second part of the question asks you to describe the processes in which these constituent groups are engaged and the feedback they provided. This question can be addressed in bulleted descriptions of how the program engages particular groups of stakeholders and what the program has learned through these engagement processes.

Example responses that illustrate some of these response strategies

Special Education Report (2015)
Within individual licensure areas, we have informal mechanisms to engage with school partners to get feedback and input on our programs (e.g., meetings with cooperating teachers and administrators in existing as well as potential student teaching sites). As an example, the Early Childhood Special Education program hosted several 'Breakfast with the UMN' sessions at partner early learning centers to have informal discussions with teachers about their experiences with our students and priorities they set for pre-service professional development. We intend to develop formal structures to hold more intentional, systematic meetings with school partners program wide as well as within individual program areas.

In addition, as part of funds provided to the Early Childhood Special Education program from the Minnesota Department of Education, formal reviews are being conducted during the 2014-2015 academic year by a content expert (Dr. Donna Miller) and an Early Childhood Special Education Administrator (Ms. Candace Larson, Osseo Area Schools). The intent of the review is to offer recommendations about content and scaffolding of skills prioritized for teachers licensed to work as Early Childhood Special Education Teachers.

QUESTION 5
Provide a summary of progress made toward the goals and plans reported in the previous PERCA cycle. If the program has an approval status of Approved with a Continuous Improvement Focus established by the board, the summary must additionally and explicitly address progress within the identified area(s). (Note: Use data to support stated progress on goals identified in question six from the previous PERCA report.) (max 8000 characters)
> *Address:*
> - *(not required for reports expiring 2016 and 2017)*
> - *Next reporting years (expiring 2018 and 2019):*
>   - *Continuous Improvement Focus identified by the Program Review Panel, if applicable.*
>   - *Specific action taken and specific progress (or lack of) on prior year goals.*

Response strategies
- The 2016 reporting will be the first year for reporting on this question.
- "Continuous Improvement Focus" areas will be specified by the Program Review Panel process through Board of Teaching Review. Programs must report on these areas.
- In answering this question, the program should return to the previously set goals and report on program progress toward those goals. It will be important to link the progress reporting to data from the Transition to Teaching Survey, the Supervisor Survey, edTPA results, MTLE scores, dispositions assessment, student teaching observation rubrics, common assessment rubrics, or program-specific assessments for which you have aggregated data.
- See question 6 below for more guidance in setting program goals.

Example responses that illustrate some of these response strategies
None available at this time.

QUESTION 6
Based on the data and feedback reported in questions 1-5, identify the program specific goals for the next two years. (Note: Make sure to clearly articulate new and/or continuing improvement goals.) (max 8000 characters)
　　　　(8705.2200 Subp 2.C. 6 & 7)
　　　Address:
- *How questions 1-5 have informed these goals.*
- *At least one goal that is licensure area specific.*
- *Succinct and clear goals.*

Response strategies
- The 2016 reporting will be the first year for reporting on this question.
- The goals that are set should reflect the overall program evaluation based on the data that were analyzed. In setting goals, programs should be reasonably confident they can make progress toward the goal within the two-year cycle of continuous improvement set up through PERCA.
- Setting program goals within the continuous improvement cycle is a key element of answering this question. There is not an expectation that each low-scoring survey item be identified as an area for improvement through the program continuous improvement discussions and reporting. The program goals should be targeted toward a key area of improvement, should be actionable with specific strategies that the program can accomplish, and should correlate to a way to see improvement in candidate performance (e.g., improvements in candidate assessment scores, survey ratings, or program-specific assessments).
- Broad and vaguely stated goals such as "improve the communication within our program" will be harder to identify how the program has made progress. A goal like this is also difficult to link to candidate performance outcomes. This is a worthy program goal, however, the program should consider how it will demonstrate improvement when reporting in subsequent years.
- Very narrow defined goals can also limit overall program improvement opportunities. For example, setting a goal of improving scores on a particular task in the edTPA is reasonable, measurable, and is linked to candidate performance. The program might consider how the goal statement targets an area of the curricular improvement such as teaching candidates how to assesses student performance or how to use student performance to guide instruction and then use the edTPA results as a measure of whether the curricular improvements correlate to an improvement in candidate performance.
- In setting new goals, the program should review the "areas for improvement" reported in questions 1, 2, and 3 and draw on them to create actionable program improvement goals.

Example responses that illustrate some of these response strategies

Social Studies Education Report (2015)

The Social Studies Education program area has identified the following areas in need of improvement, followed by specific actions to address the areas:

1. Develop students' skills in working with special education students
   a. Convey results to special education faculty with the goal of generating more effective ways of preparing our students to work with special education students, both in terms of the special education course and our methods courses.
   b. Convene panel of social studies and special education co-teaching pairs to meet with the Teacher Candidates
2. Strengthen students' content and pedagogical content knowledge, particularly in geography and economics (MTLE data indicate 59% passed this section of the test on the first attempt) and World History (79% passed this section of the MTLEs on the first attempt).
   a. Require Teacher Candidates to attend Geofest in the fall semester (to date, they have been encouraged to attend)
   b. Devote more class sessions in CI 5743 to these subject areas
   c. Be intentional about using geographic, economic, and world history content in methods demonstration lessons.
   d. We have established a strong working relationship with the Minnesota Council on Economic Education. In fall 2015, an expert Economics teacher from the Council conducted a 3-hour session with our students. We plan to increase the amount of time a representative from MCEE spends with our students.
3. Assess student learning and use data to inform instruction
   a. Have 1-2 class sessions specifically devoted to reviewing student assessment data and revising instruction in light of data
4. Plan instruction for the whole class while differentiating for diverse learning needs
   . Review what we are currently doing in relation to differentiation, and consider options such as additional readings, specific assessments.

Elementary Education Report (2015)

- Based on aggregate and program specific data, we will improve our MTLE scores from 85% to 100%.
- Improve our data results in the areas of assessment and reflection on the edTPA in particular.
- Increase our edTPA scores in the areas of Assessment and Reflection by meeting with OTE and continuing to hold bi-annual data retreats focusing on our Methods courses and strategies for teaching Assessment and Reflection.
- Improve use of Technology throughout the Elementary Education Program based on the Exit Survey of students. By meeting with OTE and our Technology instructors, we will explore how our Methods courses can integrate greater use of technology for our students.

RESOURCES

MN Board of Teaching Program Renewal Process Summary
1. Submission Timeline 2015-2017
2. PERCA and RIPA Process
3. Program Review Panel Operations
4. Program Review Criteria mapped to Minnesota Rule
5. Program Review Evaluation Form
6. Video Link (15 min)

Program Review Panel/PERCA Overview PREZI June 2015

PERCA Reporting Requirements (3 Tiers) (note: Due dates are specified at December, but they have been moved to October).