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This report addresses the following items from the CAEP Annual Report:

4.1 Annual Reporting Measures (CAEP Component 5.4|A.5.4):
   Impact Measures (CAEP Standard 4)
   1. Impact on P-12 learning and development.
   2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness.

Completer impact on P-12 learning and development and indicators of teaching effectiveness were measured using data collected by the NM Public Education Department.

- Completers are defined as teachers who completed their initial teacher licensure requirements at UNM and are currently employed as teachers in the state of New Mexico.
- The College of Education identified students who completed licensure eligibility requirements in the last three years (2015-2016, 2016-2017, and 2017-2018). The list of completers was sent to the NM Public Education Department, who returned teacher evaluation scores for the people who are working in a NMPED school.
- Students who completed licensure in:
  - 2015-2016 were first year teachers in 2016-2017 and have two years of data.
  - 2016-2017 were first year teachers in 2017-2018 and have one year of data.
  - 2017-2018 were first year teachers in 2018-2019 and do not yet have any evaluation data.

1. Impact on P-12 learning and development was measured using value-added student achievement data from a variety of standardized tests.
   - Value-added scores were converted to ratings using cutpoints determined to be meaningful by UNM as follows:
     - Exemplary - Greater than 1: the teacher improved student achievement scores more than one standard deviation above expected.
     - Highly Effective - Between 0.5 and 1: the teacher improved student achievement scores half a standard deviation to a whole standard deviation above expected.
     - Effective - Between -0.5 and 0.5: the teacher improved student achievement scores within half a standard deviation of expected.
     - Minimally Effective - Between -0.5 and -1: the teacher improved student achievement scores half a standard deviation to a whole standard deviation below expected.
     - Ineffective - Below -1: the teacher improved student achievement scores more than a standard deviation below expected.

2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness were measured using administrators’ observations of classroom teaching.
   - Exemplary - 5
   - Highly Effective - 4
   - Effective - 3
   - Minimally Effective - 2
   - Ineffective - 1
Report Highlights

- Overall, Novice teachers from UNM perform similarly to the general teacher population.
  - 64.1% of teachers from UNM were effective or higher in their first two years of teaching, compared to 65.8% of all teachers.
- Impact on P-12 learning and development shows improvement between the first and second years of teaching.
  - 66.4% of first year teachers were Effective or Better.
  - 74.4% of second year teachers were Effective or Better.
- Analysis of student learning by program implies that the value-added model for standardized test scores provides useful data for traditional classroom teachers in elementary and secondary education, however the data from teachers of different populations (special education and early childhood) and specialty areas (art, music, and physical education) is difficult to interpret.
  - This may be due the smaller sample sizes, some as low as one student.
  - It may also be due to the difficulty of assessing students outside the traditional classroom.
- The observation measure of teacher effectiveness also shows that all teachers are Effective or Better in their first year of teaching, but still show improvement between the first and second years of teaching.
  - 28.8% of first year teachers were Highly Effective.
  - 49.3% of second year teachers were Highly Effective, with one person (0.7%) scoring Exemplary.
The Public Education Department annually evaluates teachers on the following components:

- Improved Student Achievement (35%)
- Classroom Observations (40%)
- Planning, Preparation and Professionalism (15%)
- Student Surveys (5%)
- Teacher Attendance (5%)

Each item is rated on a five point scale:

1 = Ineffective
2 = Minimally Effective
3 = Effective
4 = Highly Effective
5 = Exemplary
NMPED Evaluation Scores: 2015-2016 Completers

2016-2017 Scores (Year 1)
- Exemplary: 0.7%
- Highly Effective: 17.1%
- Effective: 40.4%
- Minimally Effective: 37.0%
- Ineffective: 4.8%

2017-2018 Scores (Year 2)
- Exemplary: 1.5%
- Highly Effective: 20.6%
- Effective: 42.6%
- Minimally Effective: 34.6%
- Ineffective: 0.7%
### NMPED Evaluation Scores:
#### 2017-2018 Scores by Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Minimally Effective</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Education</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NMPED Value-Added Scores:
2015-2016 and 2016-2017 Completers

- Exemplary
- Highly Effective
- Effective
- Minimally Effective
- Ineffective

2016-2017 Scores:
- 13.1% Exemplary
- 8.7% Highly Effective
- 43.2% Effective
- 19.7% Minimally Effective
- 15.3% Ineffective

2017-2018 Scores:
- 9.6% Exemplary
- 10.3% Highly Effective
- 54.0% Effective
- 14.9% Minimally Effective
- 11.1% Ineffective
NMPED Value-Added Scores:
2015-2016 Completers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016-2017 Scores (Year 1)</th>
<th>2017-2018 Scores (Year 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Exemplary
- Highly Effective
- Effective
- Minimally Effective
- Ineffective
NMPED Value-Added Scores: 2017-2018 Scores by Program

- Exemplary
- Highly Effective
- Effective
- Minimally Effective
- Ineffective


Domain 1: Planning & Preparation
1A: Demonstrating knowledge of content
1B: Designing Coherent Instruction
1C: Setting Instructional Outcomes
1D: Demonstrating knowledge of resources
1E: Demonstrating knowledge of students
1F: Designing student assessment

Domain 2: Creating an Environment for Learning
2A: Creating an environment of respect and rapport
2B: Organizing Physical Space
2C: Establishing a culture for learning
2D: Managing Classroom Procedures
2E: Managing Student Behavior

Domain 3: Teaching for Learning
3A: Communicating with Students
3B: Using questioning and discussion techniques
3C: Engaging students in learning
3D: Assessment in Instruction
3E: Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness

Domain 4: Professionalism
4A: Communicating with Families
4B: Participating in a Professional Community
4C: Reflecting on Teaching
4D: Demonstrating Professionalism
4E: Growing and Developing Professionally
4F: Maintaining Accurate Records
NMTEACH Observation Scores: Overall Mean
2015-2016 Completers

2016-2017 Scores (Year 1)
- Exemplary: 28.8%
- Highly Effective: 71.2%

2017-2018 Scores (Year 2)
- Exemplary: 0.7%
- Highly Effective: 49.3%
- Effective: 50.0%
2017-2018 NMTEACH Observation Scores: Overall Mean by Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Minimally Effective</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood (N = 14)</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education (N = 158)</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education (N = 58)</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education (N = 32)</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education (N = 13)</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Education (N = 9)</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Education (N = 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>