

# Title II Meeting

## February 20, 2019

### Attending:

Concordia: Mark Robertson | Corban: Roy Bunch | EOU: Evelyn Paredes | GF: Steve Tillery and Becky Jensen | L&C: Esme Miller | NCU: Kathy Owen (attempted: unable to log on) | OSU: Kristin Kinman | PSU: Steve Micke | SOU: Anita Caster | UO: Julie Wren | WP: Gustavo Olvera and Jody Haggard | WOU: Sarah Beaird | Pearson: Jeanne Kenney | Westat: Carrie Murthy | TSPC staff: Dr. Anthony Rosilez, Executive Director (welcome) and Candace Robbecke, Liaison to Higher Education

### Welcome and introductions:

- Dr. Rosilez welcomed attendees. As part of his budget presentation to the Legislature, he shared his request for a program approval director in the budget request. There was some interest in that proposal so he is cautiously optimistic the agency might get this as a new position.

### Uniform reporting:

- Candace: Last year reporting **teachers prepared by subject** came up. Julie attempted to sort out a common way for EPPs to report this information, which proved difficult to do via email.
- Julie: When we look at reporting there are endorsement areas and what we would consider authorization levels. Those are:
  - Junior high, intermediate and middle level;
  - Secondary; and
  - Whether or not you consider elementary as one, too.
- EPP reporting is not consistent for this reporting area.
- There are a couple ways to move forward since everyone is on a K-12 license, we could pick the endorsement area (SPED, elementary area, etc.) and always choose multiple levels because they can teach at multiple levels. That seems like the cleanest way to do it.
- If that doesn't work for Title II, we need to figure out how to use the elementary ed space. Do we use it as an endorsement and not authorization level?
- First option: Choosing multiple levels:
  - Issues? (Cricket.)
  - Support: Kristin: Where are you talking about in the Title II report?
  - Julie: When you're reporting how you license the individuals. Teachers prepared by subject area. The options are: Teacher, education, special education. Another is teacher education multiple levels. You're allowed to double-count here and then there's also teacher education junior high, teacher education secondary education. For all of our endorsements we're automatically picking at least two because elementary would have middle. We don't have any endorsements that don't span at least one other level.
  - Kristin: At OSU, it's easier to go by subject area and not fuss with the authorization level.
  - Julie: Instead of choosing that they have a multiple level, just report it and skip the level altogether.
  - Esme: At L&C for secondary they count people at the secondary and [missed]. That's somewhat similar to what Julie is proposing.
  - Julie: We can continue to pick the subject area (such as science) and multiple levels for a candidate rather than specifying junior and high school.
  - Esme: To be clear: **Report people under their subject area and then everyone would show up under multiple levels and we ignore the junior high, intermediate, and secondary areas.**
  - JW: Yes.
  - Esme: **For Elementary and Middle School, report under teacher education elementary education and teacher education multiple levels.**

- Tony: More worried about what the feds want. We purposely didn't tie licensing to a grade level. Are you in a self-contained or multiple subjects situation? If it is a class that's only teaching science all day, it should have a science teacher. What you're suggesting sounds right, just wants to make sure we're aligned with what the feds want. Do they need to know how many elementary teachers we have, vs. secondary, etc.?
- Carrie: The current reporting instruments that lay out what questions we ask expire at the end of this year. The department essentially has the choice this year to request approval for the same reporting instruments now in use or make some small tweaks. The law hasn't changed so any changes would still be in line with the law but the department has the opportunity to clarify areas so they have been working with the department over the past several months and they take this type of feedback into account. She remembered this discussion from last year and realized it is confusing when multiple levels are offered but then there is a category that itself is called multiple levels.
- They are most interested in the subject area. How many math teachers are being prepared, for example? How many science teachers? In 2020, if the proposed tools are approved and implemented, the categories will be pretty much the same minus the multiple levels and secondary. Elementary will still be there because a lot of states have elementary as a stand-alone area without an additional content area. They went back and forth on the middle school. It varies from state to state what grade levels count as middle level. It may also be a stand-alone area in some states.
- With these two categories, the multiple subjects one becomes the most confusing. Would you also say they could teach at middle school, would you check that? She would advise no. The department seems more interested in subject area and less interested in levels.
- In terms of requirements or the way the department has provided guidance on this section, they have always said to check all applicable subject areas so if someone is prepared in more than one, check more than one.
- Dr. Rosilez summarized what to select for reporting **teachers prepared by subject:**
  - **Elementary: Select elementary and multiple levels.**
  - **For secondary: Select multiple levels and the content area.**
- Julie: Question: When they are reporting an ESOL completer (which is ESOL multiple levels) and [missed], do they count the multiple levels twice or just count a raw number?
- Dr. Rosilez: That would depend on how the format looks. Thought for each subject or endorsement area they wanted to know what the levels were. If that's true, you would need to show the multiple levels. He did not know if that's still the same.
- Julie: That is pretty consistent, just wanted to clarify.
- Kristin: On the report now, it does not associate multiple levels with the subject areas, it just gives you a section that's multiple levels.
- **Dr. Rosilez: If it is not tied to the subject or endorsement area, as long as you note the levels that person can teach in once, that will be good.**
- Esme: Makes sense. Current format, the levels are in a long list along with the subject area so here's no level associated.
- TR: That's our plan then.

#### **Data support:**

- CR: This is the first year EPPs are doing all the data entry. Previously, TSPC created starter information that the EPPs went through and tidied up. With the transition to eLicensing, we lost the associations to the EPPs.
- Jeanne: The pass rate data piece is owned by Pearson because to calculate pass rates, the lists of program completers provided by programs must be matched against testing records. They are currently doing data collection activities for the 2017-18 program year. The data collection model was changed since they didn't have the institution affiliation information from the state anymore.

The new model is to start with blank worksheets and to start earlier. Everyone submitted worksheets that were accepted. The work sheet data were sent to the other testing companies to match to other test records. Pearson posted the matching reports and gave everyone another opportunity to review the data. Just under half of the programs submitted updated worksheets in January. Now they are finishing off the final data exchange with the other testing companies and will post the final report for final review this week. (It was supposed to be today but we have a topic at the end of the meeting that may make it Friday instead.)

- What did people think of starting with a blank worksheet? Was there anything difficult or unusual? She asked Esme, who has a lot of experience.
- Esme: The blank worksheet was actually less work than getting the state data because often the state data included information for advanced candidates that they had to weed out. From their perspective, it was really easy to include just initial completers.
- Kristin: Agreed.
- Julie: Agreed it was much easier to start with a blank worksheet.
- Jeanne: We are going into the final review stage. If you are in a program and have not logged on and gotten your draft pass rate reports and matching reports that list people on your completer list, you should do that. Log in, download your PDF reports, review them, and make sure you're seeing what you expected to see. The final deadline is next Friday, March 1.
- If you log into the site, in addition to the PDF reports, there is also a flyer that is a cheat sheet that is the best way to review your PDF reports. It also has the support line information. Their support people are really good at working through questions.
- After Pearson is done, they generate the final reports to submit to Westat in March. There is a review in April.
- **Including SSNs:**
  - Right now, the data worksheet captures the last four digits of SSNs. This is to improve matching. If your institution cannot use this information, they can match without them, but it impacts matching ability.
  - Jeanne encouraged everyone to make sure they have the most accurate DOB information possible. If you have DOB information, you can look them up by that in the score reports.
- **Questions and answers:**
  - Steve Micke: We seem to have a lot of people with name changes from test to test. Is there space for an alternate name?
  - Jeanne: The system maintains one name per person so as their name changes, their master records change. If someone is Robert the first time and Bob the second time, Bob is the name of record. If you are not sure which name to capture, reach out to the support line.
- **Data-sharing agreement:**
  - Julie: UO needs to have a data-sharing agreement for the future. They normally don't share this data with Pearson so there were concerns about providing information that could violate FERPA. It might just be that additional clarification is needed for their registrar's office that this is covered under FERPA because it's federal data that is going to an intermediate agency.
  - WOU needs the data agreement information, too.
  - EOU has the same issue.
  - Jeanne will look into this and follow up with the institutions that had such concerns.
  - Carrie: No identifying information comes through to Westat. Once Pearson shares the pass rate information, they never see names or any identifying information.

## Reporting requirements for EPPs: *Carrie Murthy, Westat*



Oregon Title II IPRC  
2019 Overview.pptx

- Overview of Title II reporting:
  - Title II reporting is mandated by law.
  - Congress wrote into law that a fine of \$27,500 may be imposed for failure to provide the data in a timely or accurate manner. The department has not ever actually fined anyone and they've had a 100% response rate as far back as she can remember.
- Who submits an Institution and Report Card?
  - Traditional educator preparation providers (EPPs) across the country.
  - Alternate teacher prep programs based within an institution of higher education (IHE).
  - Alt prep programs not based at an IHE.
  - In Oregon there are only traditional programs.
- Timeline for 2019 reporting:
  - Jeanne walked you through what you've been doing with Pearson.
  - In the last couple weeks the IPRC reporting system was opened up. This is the Institution and Program Report Cards.
  - Users should have received user names and passwords.
  - Pearson sends Westat the pass rate files. This is opened up in early April, which opens up the submission window.
  - April 15-30 is when EPPs can certify. EPPs do not have pass rates earlier than that anyway. The first part of April is spent getting that information uploaded.
  - Reports are due from EPPs by March 3.
- What are the data used for?
  - IPRC – Institution and Program Report Cards.
  - State Report Cards (SRC)
  - Data are publically available on the title2.ed.gov and inform the Secretary's Report to Congress.
    - People use this information for research, etc.
    - It is valuable data and she gets data requests all the time.
- Pre-populated data:
  - Westat prepopulates everything that is likely to stay the same from year to year.
  - There is a list of what is pre-loaded on the PPT. A list of **EPP programs offered is pre-loaded. It is not on the PPT but should be.**
- IPRC to-do list:
  - Institution Information (info on TQP grants)
  - Section I: Enrollment
  - Section I: Program Information (median GPA, supervised clinical experience: Number of faculty, adjunct faculty, and students participating)
  - Section I: Teachers Prepared by Subject Area and Academic Major
  - Section I: Program completers (data for AY 2017-18)
  - Section II: Annual Goals (report on progress towards previously set goals and set new goals for future)
    - They pre-load goals you previously set.
    - You load goals for next year.
  - Certification
  - Not pre-populated: Section III: Pass rates. This is on Westat's to-do list once they get them from Pearson. Westat will notify EPPs once that information is loaded up. EPPs need to review the data and save it as complete once it has been reviewed.

- Overview of Oregon data:
  - Oregon teacher prep by the numbers:
    - Number of IHEs with teacher prep programs: 17
    - Number of unique teacher prep programs: 77
    - Number of candidates enrolled: enrollment was up 10% from the previous year
    - Completers was up 11% from the previous year.
      - Nationally, they have been seeing drops in enrollment for several years in a row. Doesn't know if that was the case in Oregon, too, or if it's been pretty steady.
    - Testing Company: Pearson
- Program types: All traditional in Oregon.
- Enrollment by gender: AY 2016-2017:
  - 28% male and 72% female.
  - Increase in male enrollment from 26% to 28%. That is worth pointing out because it's a pretty heavily female profession and there have been a lot of efforts to increase the numbers of males into the teaching profession.
- Race and ethnicity:
  - Largely a white female profession.
  - The racial and ethnic make-up of teachers does not match the racial/ethnic make-up of students. Seeing changes in Oregon.
    - Hispanic enrollment in teacher preparation programs: 8.6% in 2015-16, closing the gap a bit in 2016-17: 11.3%.
    - Two or more increased from 4.6% to 5.7%.

### **Reporting pages and tips and tools:**

- Main dashboard: Dashboard provides information on who to contact when. Shows where you are with your report. You will only see the traditional report and traditional tab. The PPT showed traditional and alternative. If you see an alternative tab, let them know. Hopefully you'll only see traditional.
- As you scroll down, you'll see the account information section where you can click edit and account information. That's where you'll go if you need to update your security questions or add more contact information.
- There's a send mail feature, which allows you to send email to Title II, the state coordinator, or both.
- Scrolling back up to the top of the dashboard, the status boxes on the right let you know how your progress is coming along. As you save pages as complete, the pie chart will fill up. Start Report will change to Continue Report.
- Start Report takes you to the home page. This gives information on tracking the report and tracking changes. The pie chart is in the upper right-hand side.
- Navigate the report using the right-side menu that lists the different sections of the report.
- *Section I: Program Information.*
  - The section expands to show information.
  - List of Programs: Each page provides a description and instructions as well as a box that says what is included on the page. Many have just one subsection.
  - If you scroll down past the instructional text, you'll see a list of programs pre-loaded. You can click edit to change the name of any programs listed or delete if a program is no longer being offered. There's an empty row on the bottom where you can add.
  - You can save pages as in progress or completed. In progress means you need to come back to the page for any reason. This keeps the page marked with a red dot in the side menu.
  - Saving the page as completed changes the red dot to a green page and updates the percent pie chart.

- If you save a page as complete and then need to make changes, you can do so. You can still go in and edit the same way. It's mainly a tool for you to be able to measure what is done and what needs more work.
- *Section I: Program Requirements*
  - There are multiple subjections.
  - If you click on supervised clinical experience, I can go right to that page (for example).
  - Esme: There are two ambiguous pages that we have come to agreement on in Oregon. The questions are so vague that in the past people reported wildly different things. Three years ago we had a series of discussions and decided those would be the useful data points to report.
  - How to report the number of adjunct faculty:
    - **Number of FTE faculty supervising clinical experience:** We have done this by doing an **absolute count of our internal faculty**, not our cooperating teachers, so this should reflect the number of IHE faculty who were involved in supervision of clinical experiences.
    - **Number of faculty supervising clinical experiences: We have done this as a head-count of cooperating teachers (CTs).**
  - Carrie provided an update on this section: They recognized these questions are not written as well as they could be and allow for differences in interpretation. The guidance they've given is that states can clarify (which is what we have done in Oregon) so there is consistency across the state. The problem at the national level is these numbers of not meaningful because states vary in how they report the information.
  - They held focus groups in October with institutions and states to get feedback and identify how to make this easier. Revised questions you'll see in this section, if approved:
    - They are looking at the first three questions: Reporting the number of clock hours. This will be split so if you have a student teaching model, you will answer the first two questions. (Candace didn't capture the next scenario but it doesn't apply to Oregon anyway.)
    - The first three questions are in their own set.
    - Then we are looking at the participants. Number of FTE faculty supervising clinical experiences during the academic year. They found the term was something Congress wrote into law so they cannot change it. She was into eliminating this so we could get an absolute count; however, they do not have the authority to do that.
    - For next year, if approved, you will see that exact question with an optional tool to help you calculate FTE. That tool will also help clarify what the department is looking for. Because there were questions around do we care if they're employed full-time by the university or is it actually supposed to reflect how much time they spend supervising clinical experiences? It is how much they are employed that is what is desired. If they spend any amount of time supervising clinical experiences, that is what they are going for.
    - Esme: How Carrie described it is how L&C reported it before we came to this agreement. The adjunctions ended up being counted less.
    - Carrie: Acknowledged sometimes guidance from the department has been inconsistent. Then, at some points, the guidance has not been consistent with the language of the question.
  - Number of adjunct faculty supervising CP (PK-12 staff): This does not help because they aren't adjunct faculty. The change will break this into two questions.
    - You will have the number of adjunct (head count).
    - Then there will be the number of CTs supervising clinical experiences. This is where you will report your CTs.
  - Definition of adjunct:
    - Kristin: Hopes they will define adjunct as this varies from institution to institution.

- Carrie: So far, the department has not been interested in defining this because the assumption is that each institution will have a definition of what it means for them.
- Kristin: At OSU, they define adjunct as someone who works in another department at the university whereas at other places it means someone who is part-time and not fixed term faculty.
- Carrie: In some cases the faculty member actually works in a different department?
- Kristin: Yes.
- FTE faculty question:
  - Esme: Re: Changes for next year. In the FTE faculty question, would we include adjuncts in there at whatever their FTE equivalency would be or only count them below on the line for adjunct faculty?
  - Carrie: Only include them in the line for adjunct faculty. She'll make sure this is clear in the instructions.
- Becky Jensen (GF): Is new to this so the last question, number of students in supervised clinical experiences during the academic year: They have say 25 in the fall and 25 in the spring but some are the same students.
- Carrie: You would want to not duplicate those that did two supervised clinical experiences. If they did one in the fall and spring, that's just one person. But you do want to capture everyone that did a supervised clinical experience in the fall, spring, or summer. The academic year is Sept. 1 through August 31. That is the timeframe. It is a headcount. If someone did more than one semester, they would count as one person.
- *Section I: Program Requirements:*
  - Another tool for checking the status of your report and getting a quick look at your to-do list is on the certification page. It's on the bottom of the right-side menu.
- *Report Card Certification:*
  - Lists items that need to be completed.
  - If you clear all the items in the checklist before April 15, there will be a message that says when the certification opens.
  - As you enter data into your report and mark things as complete, this checklist will get smaller and smaller.

#### **Data quality tips for success:**

- Use the "Mark as Completed" feature.
- Save the certification page to see your certification checklist.
- Start early and plan ahead for various levels of review.
- Take advantage of technical assistance webinars and resources.

Westat has four people helping around 2,000 people. They reply to emails within 24 hours.

Title II Support Center

[Title2@westat.com](mailto:Title2@westat.com)

877-684-8532

Title2.ed.gov

#### **Q & A:**

- Kristin: There are two at the institution that get log-ins. They've always just used one log-in because they were not sure if what one person enters will show up on the other person's report.
- Carrie: Every user should have their own log-in. If there are multiple users for an institution, you are working collaboratively together. They recommend, to the extent possible, that only one person be logged in at a time. If one person saves while the other is entering information, that could cause issues but otherwise, when one person saves it, it is saved to that report. The data base stores who is making what changes so if there is ever a reason we would need that

information, they have it available. If you're sharing the same user name and password, they're not able to do this.

- Kristin: Manages the data and the other person does the report.

### **Fails to passes:**

- CR: Last year we had to undergo a laborious process to correct certain completers who were listed in the Pearson PDF report as fails that the Commission considers passes.
- Jeanne: There were 20 NES exams that, when they were first adopted, had passing scores of over 220. In April 2017, the cut-scores were changed to 220. If someone took the test in October 2016 and got 222, that shows in the Title II reports as a fail instead of a pass.
- If we just look at Title II to make this pass rate reporting simpler, if it is the case that anyone who ever got a 220 or above on the NES tests would always be a passer, Pearson can set the Title II reports (the matched completer PDF) to show that anyone at 220 or over would be listed as Pass. Then in the pass rate D-1 table, they would also be counted as a passer.
- Jeanne asked: Is a score of 220 always considered passing for a completer?
- Candace: The administrator and Civil Rights tests are over 220
- Jeanne: Those are not NES tests (post meeting note: they are ORELA tests) and did not have the cut-score change, so it isn't an issue. This would only impact the tests that had the cut-score change. There are 20 of them. As long as it is true that everybody who passed with a 220 or above for those 20 tests is a Pass, they can tell this specific Title II piece of software to count them as passers.
- JW: They would count as passing the test but wouldn't necessarily be considered completers.
- Jeanne: There's no case when 222 would still be considered a fail?
- Julie: Not that she's aware of. Anyone that came to her with a 222 would be eligible.
- Candace: From the state's perspective, they would be considered as passing the exams.
- Jeanne: If we decide today we want to re-run the PDF reports and match them differently for those 20 fields and say 220 is passing regardless of when someone took the test, we can get these out this week.
- Esme: Thinks that's a lovely idea. Thinks that would be gratefully appreciated.
- Mark, Concordia: Strongly agreed.
- Jeanne: Does anyone not agree?
- Becky: What you're saying is, if I have three students that showed on the PDF report as failed, you're re-running the reports so they'll now show as passing?
- Jeanne: Yes. If they got a 222, they'll now say Pass. If they say 219, they will still show as fails. They'll count in the pass rates, too.
- Esme: The Commission's action was to honor the scores retroactively.
- Candace: What do EPPs have to do?
- Jeanne: We were planning to reopen today but were holding the reopen pending this discussion. Their team will re-run the reports and the EPPs will get an email by Friday saying the site is open. When you get this email, you can log on and you'll have a week to make any changes to your work sheet. If you need help, talk to the support group and we'll move forward as planned.
- Candace: Do they do anything if everything is fine?
- Jeanne: No, if the worksheet is fine as is, then this is the data that will go to Westat at the end of March. Although you'll have a chance to review the data on the Westat site, changes should be made now, before March 1.

Adjourned 11:37.