

## Guidance for Measuring Candidate Impact on Student Learning

**This guidance outlines how Supervising Practitioners should identify student learning measures and set parameters for impact. This resource is for reference only.**

The Supervising Practitioner should identify at least one measure of student learning, growth, or achievement that assesses a meaningful sample of the content the Teacher Candidate is primarily responsible for teaching. The Supervising Practitioner will set clear expectations for how and when the measure will be administered and scored. In addition, relying on his/her professional experience with the identified measure(s) and his/her understanding of the specific learning context, the Supervising Practitioner will set parameters for a range of expected learning, growth, or achievement (see ESE's [Implementation Brief on Setting Parameters for Expected Growth](#) for more information about this process). Student outcomes below that range will be considered lower than expected and outcomes above that range will be considered higher than expected.

For example, if the Teacher Candidate is responsible for teaching a math unit, the Supervising Practitioner may choose the end of unit assessment as the measure of student learning to include in the CAP. If over the past four units the average end-of-unit assessment scores were 84, 89, 81, and 83, the Supervising Practitioner may determine that a class average between 80 and 90 represents expected achievement, less than 80 represents lower than expected achievement and more than 90 represents higher than expected achievement.

The candidate will administer the identified measure(s) of student learning, growth, or achievement. Administration does not need to occur at the end of the practicum, but rather at the instructionally appropriate time during the practicum. After the measure is scored, the candidate should analyze the results and compare them to the parameters set by the Supervising Practitioner. Did all students achieve the expected outcomes? If not, were there patterns in performance that might indicate why some students made higher or lower than expected gains?

The experience of administering, scoring, and analyzing a measure of student learning, growth, or achievement is a crucial component of CAP. It is an essential skill of every effective teacher to be able to draw conclusions about his/her practice from student outcome data. Therefore, it is important to gauge a candidate's aptitude to develop this skill. It is important to note that a measure of student learning, growth, or achievement is not a complete measure of a candidate's impact on student learning. In the educator evaluation framework, multiple measures over multiple years are used to inform conclusions about educator impact. Given the abbreviated classroom experience associated with CAP, it is impossible to generate enough data to draw a conclusion about the candidate's impact on student learning. It is possible, however, to assess the candidate's ability to reflect on student outcomes and make connections to his/her practice.

Wherever possible, measures of student growth should be used. As stated in [Technical Guide B](#), "Student growth scores provide greater insight into student learning than is possible through the sole use of single-point-in-time student achievement measures. This is because students do not enter a classroom with the same level of knowledge, skills, and readiness. Achievement scores provide valuable feedback to educators about student attainment against standards, but taken by themselves may not be a sufficient reflection of student progress." Growth measures allow students of all abilities an opportunity to demonstrate how much they have learned and in many ways provide a fuller picture of the impact of instruction.