WESTERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY

2020 CAEP ANNUAL REPORT

Catherine O'Callaghan, Ph.D.

Chair of E & EPY Department

Contents

Introduction

Standard 4: Component 4.1—P-12 Student Learning and Development

4.1 The provider documents, using multiple measures that program completers contribute to an expected level of student-learning growth. Multiple measures shall include all available growth measures (including value-added measures, student-growth percentiles, and student learning and development objectives) required by the state for its teachers and available to educator preparation providers, other state-supported P-12 impact measures, and any other measures employed by the provider.

4.2 The provider demonstrates, through structured validated observation instruments and/or student surveys, that completers effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve.

4.3 The provider demonstrates, using measures that result in valid and reliable data and including employment milestones such as promotion and retention, that employers are satisfied with the completer's preparation for their assigned responsibilities in working with P-12 students.

4.4 The provider demonstrates, using measures that result in valid and reliable data, that program completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job, and that the preparation was effective.

WCSU is committed to the ongoing assessment of student learning and development. This document includes the results of the following assessments of the undergraduate teacher preparation programs at WCSU:

- edTPA Reports, Case Studies of Graduates--including journals, semi-structured interviews, and classroom observations, Employer Surveys, Alumni Surveys, CAEP Annual Reporting Measures, and Analysis the CAEP Eight Annual Reporting Measures.

2017-2019 Impact on Student Learning (edTPA)

Description

The edTPA assessment (SCALE, 2013) is a subject-specific performance assessment implemented during Student Teaching. The edTPA consists of three tasks: Planning, Instruction, and Assessment. Starting in Fall 2018, all candidates seeking CT initial licensure are required to complete an edTPA portfolio. Starting in Fall 2019, all candidates will need to earn the CT-set passing score on the edTPA in order to earn certification. The portfolio is scored by Pearson. At WCSU, we have been piloting the edTPA since 2016.

Consistent with state college and career readiness content standards, and the InTASC Standards, edTPA assesses teaching behaviors that focus on student learning. edTPA includes two primary components: 1) Teaching-related performance tasks embedded in clinical practice that that focus on planning, instruction, assessment, academic language, and analysis of teaching; and 2) a 3-to-5-day documented learning segment. The design of edTPA is based on theory and research that identifies constructs associated with effective teaching. SCALE's Review of Research on Teacher Education provides a research foundation for the role of assessment in teacher education, for the common edTPA architecture, and for each of the fifteen shared rubric constructs.

edTPA was nationally validated in 2013 to establish the reliability and validity of the assessment system. The results from more than 125,000 edTPA portfolios submitted by teacher candidates during the first three years of edTPA implementation and further evidence of reliability and validity are presented in the 2014, 2015, and 2016 edTPA Administrative Reports.

Effective September 1, 2019, a passing score was required for initial licensure teacher candidates completing SBE-approved preparation programs in Connecticut. The initial Connecticut edTPA passing scores for all WCSU certification areas are listed below in Table 1. The Connecticut cut score represents one Standard Error of Measurement (SEM) below the national recommended professional performance standard.

Data

Table 1. Connecticut edTPA Certifications, Approved Handbooks, and Passing Scores

Table 1.: Connecticut edTPA Passing Scores			
Connecticut Certification Endorsement Code	CSDE Certification Area	Approved edTPA Handbook	Passing Score
13	Elementary, Grades K–6	Elementary Education: Literacy with Mathematics Task 4	44
15	English, Grades 7–12	Secondary English-Language Arts	37
26	History/Social Studies, Grades 7–12	Secondary History/Social Studies	37
29	Mathematics, Grades 7–12	Secondary Mathematics	37
30	Biology, Grades 7–12	Secondary Science	37
31	Chemistry, Grades 7–12	Secondary Science	37
23	Spanish, Grades 7–12	World Language	32
43	Health Grades, PK–12	Health Education	37
305	Elementary, Grades 1–6	Elementary Education: Literacy with Mathematics Task 4	44

Table 2: edTPA EPP Performance Summary (18 Rubric Handbooks) – July 2017 - June 2019

Table 2. edTPA EPP Performance Summary (18 Rubric Handbooks)
July 2017 – June 2019

Date Range	Endorsement Area(s)	N	Total Score Mean	Planning					Instruction					Assessment					Mathematics			Mean by Task		
				P01	P02	P03	P04	P05	I06	I07	I08	I09	I10	A11	A12	A13	A14	A15	M19	M20	M21	P	I	A
August 2018- June 2019	All 18-Rubric Handbooks	10	50.4	2.7	3.1	3.0	2.6	2.4	3.0	2.7	2.7	2.9	2.9	2.7	3.1	2.7	3.0	3.0	2.7	2.8	2.4	13.8	14.2	14.5
	Elementary Education: Literacy with Mathematics Task 4	10	50.4	2.7	3.1	3.0	2.6	2.4	3.0	2.7	2.7	2.9	2.9	2.7	3.1	2.7	3.0	3.0	2.7	2.8	2.4	13.8	14.2	14.5
July 2017– June 2018	All 18-Rubric Handbooks	1	45.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	10.0	14.0	14.0
	Elementary Education	1	45.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	10.0	14.0	14.0
July 2016 – June 2017	All 18-Rubric Handbooks	10	47.2	2.7	3.2	2.9	2.8	2.6	2.9	2.6	2.7	2.7	2.8	2.5	3.1	2.3	2.3	2.9	2.2	2.4	1.9	13.9	13.7	13.1
	Elementary Education	10	47.2	2.7	3.2	2.9	2.8	2.6	2.9	2.6	2.7	2.7	2.8	2.5	3.1	2.3	2.3	2.9	2.2	2.4	1.9	13.9	13.7	13.1

Score Mean Range = 45.0-50.4

Elementary Education: Literacy with Mathematics Task 4 and Elementary Education

Table 3: edTPA EPP Performance Summary (15 Rubric Handbooks) July 2017 – June 2019

Table 3. edTPA EPP Performance Summary (15 Rubric Handbooks) July 2017 – June 2019																						
Date Range	Endorsement Area(s)	N	Total Score Mean	Planning					Instruction					Assessment					Mean by Task		
				P01	P02	P03	P04	P05	I06	I07	I08	I09	I10	A11	A12	A13	A14	A15	P	I	A
August 2018-June 2019	All 15-Rubric Handbooks	17	42.2	3.2	2.8	3.0	2.7	2.8	3.0	3.3	2.8	3.1	2.4	2.7	2.6	2.2	2.9	2.7	14.6	14.6	13.1
	Health Education	1	31.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	12.0	13.0	6.0
	Secondary English-Language Arts	2	43.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.3	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.8	3.0	3.0	2.8	3.3	15.3	13.0	14.8
	Secondary History/Social Studies	3	46.7	3.7	3.0	3.3	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.7	3.3	3.0	2.3	3.3	3.0	2.3	3.7	3.0	16.0	15.3	15.3
	Secondary Mathematics	1	47.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	16.0	16.0	15.0
July 2017 – June 2018	All 15-Rubric Handbooks	1	41.0	3.0	2.0	4.0	3.0	1.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.0	3.0	4.0	2.5	2.5	2.0	13.5	13.5	14.0
	Secondary Mathematics	1	41.0	3.0	2.0	4.0	3.0	1.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.0	3.0	4.0	2.5	2.5	2.0	13.5	13.5	14.0
July 2016 – June 2017	All 15-Rubric Handbooks	17	40.1	3.0	2.9	2.9	2.8	3.2	2.6	2.8	2.6	2.7	2.5	2.5	2.6	2.0	2.5	2.4	14.7	13.3	12.1
	Health Education	1	32.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	10.0	13.0	9.0

Table 3. edTPA EPP Performance Summary (15 Rubric Handbooks)
July 2017 – June 2019

Date Range	Endorsement Area(s)	N	Total Score Mean	Planning					Instruction					Assessment					Mean by Task		
				P01	P02	P03	P04	P05	I06	I07	I08	I09	I10	A11	A12	A13	A14	A15	P	I	A
	Secondary English-Language Arts	1	45.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	16.0	14.0	15.0
	Secondary History/Social Studies	2	42.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	3.3	2.5	2.5	2.8	14.5	14.0	13.5
	Secondary Mathematics	2	45.5	3.5	3.3	3.5	3.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.8	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.3	2.8	3.0	2.5	16.8	14.3	14.5

Score Mean Range = 31.0-47.0

Table 4: edTPA EPP Performance Summary (13 Rubric Handbooks) World Language ONLY January 2017 – June 2017

Table 4 edTPA EPP Performance Summary (13 Rubric Handbooks) July 2017 – June 2019																					
Date Range	Endorsement Area(s)	N	Total Score Mean	Planning					Instruction					Assessment					Mean by Task		
				P01	P02	P03	P04	P05	I06	I07	I08	I09	I10	A11	A12	A13	A14	A15	P	I	A
August 2018- June 2019	No Candidates	NC																			
July 2017 – June 2018	No Candidates	NC																			
January 2017 – June 2017	All 13-Rubric Handbooks	2	34.0	2.5	3.0	3.5		2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	3.0		2.5	11.5	12.0	10.5
	World Language	2	34.0	2.5	3.0	3.5		2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	3.0		2.5	11.5	12.0	10.5
Score Mean = 34																					
100% of 13 Rubric Handbook: World Language (Spanish) Candidates Passed																					

Analysis (Strengths/Areas for Improvement) for the Individual Programs based on the edTPA Portfolio Scores

Areas of Strength: For the purpose of this analysis, a mean of 2.7 and above is considered a strength.

Elementary Education

o Candidates achieved an overall mean of 2.19 in their edTPA performance over three collections of data (2016-2019).

- Candidates were the strongest in edTPA Task 2: Instructing and Engaging Student Learning, demonstrating the strongest performance in the July 2016 – June 2017 and the August 2018-June 2019 testing periods.

- Candidates were consistently strong in edTPA Task 3: Assessing Student Learning, demonstrating the strongest performance in the August 2018-June 2019 testing period.

- 53.97% of the edTPA Rubrics were evaluated at or above a mean of 2.7.

Health Education

- Candidates achieved an overall mean of 2.1 in their edTPA performance over three collections of data (2016-2019).

- Candidates demonstrated a strong performance in edTPA Task 2: Instructing and Engaging Student Learning, in both the July 2016 – June 2017 and the August 2018-June 2019 testing periods

- 26.92% of the edTPA Rubrics were evaluated at a mean of 3.0 over the two rounds of edTPA data collected and analyzed (there were no candidates enrolled in the July 2017 – June 2018 test period)

Secondary English-Language Arts

- Candidates demonstrated very strong performance in edTPA Task 1: Planning for Instruction and Assessment and Task 3: Assessing Student Learning, with a mean range between 2.8 and 4.0.

- 83.33% of Candidates in Secondary English-Language Arts scored at a 2.8 mean and above in the edTPA Rubrics evaluated across two rounds of edTPA data (there were no candidates enrolled during the July 2017 – June 2018 testing period).

Secondary History/Social Studies

- Candidates achieved an overall mean of 2.99 in their edTPA performance over three collections of data (2016-2019).

- Candidates demonstrated very strong performance in Task 1: Planning for Instruction and Assessment and Task 3: Assessing Student Learning, with a mean range between 2.8 and 3.7.

- 73.33% of Candidates in Secondary History/Social Studies scored at 2.8 and above in the Rubrics evaluated across two rounds of edTPA data (there were no candidates enrolled during the July 2017 – June 2018 testing period).

Secondary Mathematics

- Candidates achieved an overall mean of 2.57 in their edTPA performance over three collections of data (2016-2019).

- Math candidates scored consistently above a 2.8 mean in 80% of the edTPA Rubrics scored over the reporting period (20160-2019).

Secondary Spanish

- Candidates achieved an overall mean of 2.62 in their edTPA performance over three collections of data (2016-2019).

- There were two edTA areas of strength indicated: Rubric 2: Planning to Support Varied Student Needs and Rubric 3: Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning.

Areas for Improvement: For the purpose of this analysis, a mean of 2.6 and below is being considered an area of possible improvement.

Elementary Education

- 12.7% of the edTPA Rubrics evaluated fell at or below a mean of 2.6.

Health Education

o Only two Health Education candidates were enrolled during this testing period (July 2016-June 2019), therefore it is difficult to determine any significant patterns in the data.

o 73.08% of the edTPA Rubrics were evaluated at a mean of 2.0 or below.

Secondary English-Language Arts

o If a 2.0 or 2.5 mean are considered weak, then English-Language Arts candidates need to improve their performance in edTPA Task 2: Instructing and Engaging Student Learning.

o 16.67% of Candidates in Secondary English-Language Arts scored at 2.5 or below in the edTPA Rubrics evaluated across two rounds of data (there were no candidates enrolled during the July 2017 – June 2018 testing period). These "weak" areas fell into the Rubrics associated with Task 2: Instruction.

Secondary History/Social Studies

o Candidates scored relatively low in edTPA Rubrics 10. Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness and 13. Student Use of Feedback (2.3).

o 26.67% of Candidates in Secondary History/Social Studies scored between .3 and 2.5 in the edTPA Rubrics evaluated across two rounds of data (there were no candidates enrolled during the July 2017 – June 2018 testing period). Only two of these lower scores fell during the most recent testing period (August 2018 – June 2019).

Secondary Mathematics

o Candidates scored low (2.0 mean) in edTPA Rubric 15: Using Assessment to Inform Instruction as compared to the rest of their performance.

- 20% of Candidates in Secondary Mathematics scored between 1.5 and 2.5 mean in the edTPA Rubrics evaluated across three rounds of data. Only one of these lower scores fell during the most recent testing period (August 2018 – June 2019).

- One Candidate during the July 2017-June 2018 testing period scored 1.5 mean in edTPA Rubric 5: Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Student Learning.

Secondary Spanish

- Candidates scored low (2.0 mean) in edTPA Rubric 9: Subject-specific Pedagogy.

- 84.6% of the edTPA Rubrics evaluated were at the mean of 2.5; 50% of the edTPA scores were at a mean of 2.

2019 Case Study of Initial Completers

Description

The CT State Department of Education does not share teacher evaluation data with EPPs. Therefore, EPPs are dependent upon alumni to volunteer to participate in case studies and to acquire principal approval for observations. In Spring 2018, and Spring 2019, the EPP conducted case studies of initial program completers. A mixed-methods approach was used using both quantitative and qualitative methodology.

Methods

A mixed method approach was employed using qualitative and quantitative methodology to prepare a case study analysis to generate findings related to Standard 4 (4.1, 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4). Case study with its emphasis on mixed methods research is fitting for this type of data-driven project because of the focus that the department of education has on understanding and answering the how and why questions (Stake, 1995; Yin, 2009) associated with the quality of education that WCSU students receive, as well as how employers view new teachers' preparedness to be in the field. Case study also allows for the collection of both qualitative interviews and quantitative survey data, which enhances the ability to triangulate data

(Anfara, Brown, & Mangione, 2009; Rubin & Rubin, 2011) and gain a more comprehensive understanding (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009) as is required by the emphasis on continuous performance that is associated with CAEP Standard 4. Case study also facilitates a culture of evidence by contextualizing the unique strengths of the WCSU teacher preparation program and allows for the voices of those who have been trained through the program to be shared. In this way, the WCSU EPP has systematically worked to assess its impact. The data collected will be used to make programmatic decisions.

Qualitative Data

To conduct the case study, data were collected through multiple sources to provide triangulation of data and greater assurance of accuracy. Data sources included:

Journal Entries (4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4): Qualitative data were collected in the form of journal entries guided by a journal prompt that was provided to participants. The journal prompt was designed to collect participants' perceptions of the relevance of their training in their day to day practice. Using the prompt[1], participants were asked to complete a journal entry three times (January, February, April) over the course of the spring semester.

Participant Interviews: Interview data was collected to follow up on the journal prompts. Teachers were asked to respond the following semi-structured interview questions:

1. Tell me about your experiences as a novice teacher?

2. What has been the emphasis for new teachers and professional development in the district? How does this take place?

---

[1] Reflective Journal Prompt: *Thinking about your teaching career this week, both the wins and challenges you have experienced, write about the strengths of the WCSU teacher preparation. Once you have done this, write about a specific topic that you think should be addressed by the WCSU teacher preparation program that you think would help you be better prepared for your career as a teacher.*

3. Based on the professional development areas emphasized in the school district, how in line with these was your training at WCSU?

4. Thinking more about your teacher preparation courses at WCSU, what are the strengths of your experiences? With what areas would you have liked to have had more experiences? (Course Content, Student Management, Parent Communication)

5. What can you tell me about your experiences working with students? What, if any concerns have you had? How have your interactions with parents been? How did your program at WCSU prepare you for working with students/parents?

6. What do you think could have helped you be a more successful teacher? (Teacher Preparation Training, District Mentoring, Other)

7. The WCSU Teacher Preparation Program is interested in continuous improvement, what recommendations do you have for enhancing teacher preparation courses at WCSU?

8. Given what we have talked about today, is there anything else that you would like me to understand about your preparation through WCSU for a career in education?

Quantitative Data

Classroom Observations of Participants. (4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4): Classroom observations of case study participants were conducted by experienced faculty twice during the first year. Analysis of classroom observations are reported in the aggregate to ensure confidentiality. Quantitative analysis of observations was conducted using descriptive statistics and focus on scores and progress in each criterion (e.g., first observation to second observation), areas of strength across participants, and areas in need of improvement. The Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) was used to observe participants. This is the same instrument used for student teaching and is the Connecticut SEED assessment for in-service teachers in public schools.

Sample

The sample consisted of three alumni from initial teacher preparation programs (Elementary Education, Secondary Education Math, and Secondary Education Spanish). The university had originally contacted ten graduates to participate in the study in Spring 2018. However, when the details of the study were presented to the potential participants, they all dropped out and a new pool was contacted, which delayed the start of the study.

To conduct the case study, data were collected through multiple sources to provide triangulation of data and greater assurance of accuracy. Data sources included:

Results

Years 1 (2018) and 2 (2019) Emerging Outcomes: Based on journal responses and interviews, once again, the overall pattern of results suggest that participants found the WCSU teacher preparation program beneficial to their development and practice. They expressed satisfaction with the nature and effectiveness of the teacher preparation program at WCSU and offered suggestions for refocusing and improvement.

Strengths and Benefits

Themes expressing the benefits of the program reiterated those expressed in Year 1, with additional detail/follow-up this year:

A. (Years 1 and 2) Early, ongoing, and diverse classroom experiences that strengthened instructional practice, comfort, and familiarity with how classrooms function. These included:

- Classroom experience/teaching even prior to student teaching
- Classroom experience/teaching in more than one district.
- Early and ongoing observations

The WCSU program included sufficient time in the classroom, including pre-student teaching placements as well as a full year of student teaching. Such exposure and time helped novice teachers in setting expectations at the beginning of the year in classroom practice such as raising hands, transitions, etc.

(Years 1 and 2) Participants described the value of WCSU providing early and diverse classroom experiences that allowed them to observe many different teaching methods and classrooms populated with a diversity of students, with diverse needs.   The early and ongoing classroom experiences were viewed as "valuable learning opportunities" that participants have been able to apply to their own teaching. Such familiarity with classrooms made the transition into becoming a teacher easier; "although I was nervous when I first began teaching, the extent of opportunities to practice and observe in classrooms, lessened the nervousness.   Opportunities to observe and teach in more than one school and more than one district allowed for familiarity with bell schedules in two districts. Gained knowledge that schedules change frequently and being familiar with this allowed for a smoother transition and easier adaptation when actual teaching began.

B. (Year 2) Opportunities to work specifically in and with the Danbury School district.

- Danbury school district is increasing student enrollment

- All Danbury schools use the workshop model.

- Diverse student body

A participant described the many experiences in the Danbury School District as provided by WCSU as being of major positive significance given that the district is one of the only in Connecticut that has increasing enrollment:

"WCSU students who choose to take full advantage of their time in Danbury Public Schools to build relationships, network, and become familiar with the daily functions of an elementary school will be much more qualified and likely obtain a position as a long-

term substitute, literacy interventionist, building substitute, and even a classroom teacher." The same participant suggested that it

may even increase the benefits of such opportunities by explicitly teaching candidates to "get yourself out there and to meet everyone

you can" "take the many opportunities to meet different principals and learn how to benefit from those relationships." The

participant credits his securing a teaching position to those opportunities.

 Another participant echoed the benefits of working in the Danbury Schools including:

"the fact that [all of the Danbury schools] use the workshop model…When I went into my first year of teaching, I was one of the few

teachers who had experience teaching this way beforehand." While this participant expressed the challenges of working on

informational books for upper elementary students who are below grade level in reading, the participant described the feeling of

satisfaction when, using the workshop model, a "very slow", generally unengaged reader came to a conference "ready to talk about

all of the things she was learning about the Ancient Egyptians. She was asking questions about her novel such as 'Why would the

Pharaoh drown his own brother? How did this brother survive?' and she was very interested when we started to talk about how even

though this is non-fiction, that does mean that the information is true, but it is just what the Egyptians wrote and believed. We were

able to connect this to ancient Greek mythology. This was a great discussion and [student] was really engaged. She wanted to know

more and she was even talking about finding a book on Greek mythology."

C.   (Year 2) Preparation provided in how to teach gifted and talented students.

A participant noted that WCSU provided information that has been very helpful in understanding how to teach talented and gifted

students by challenging them rather than simply giving them more work, bigger assignments, or use them as "assistant teachers." Describing

her work on an informational book with a student in the enrichment program, the participant explained that she "challenged this student to use

her research to help guide the chapters of the book…[and] to use other programs to create her own chart or graph": "I asked her to plan the

sections on her own" which she was able to do, "and find enough information for each section. I also challenged her to develop a graph or chart using Google Sheets and she was able to embed that not her informational book." I really try to challenge the students within the curriculum and within the assignments to keep them engaged but also to not give them a lot more work than the other students."

D. (Years 1 and 2) Excellent preparation in various content areas by WCSU program.

(Year 1) "Fantastic" preparation in content area. As a result of the courses and preparation from WCSU, through the journal, participant expressed high level of satisfaction with the preparation WCSU provided in her content area. As a result, she was very comfortable teaching all aspects of her content area and felt well prepared and familiar with middle school and high school curriculum. The preparation she had received enabled a sense of ease in planning lessons and participating in curriculum revisions.

(Year 2) "Great job of preparing us in foundations of literacy in both theory and practice (phonemic awareness, phonological awareness, etc.)

(Year 2) "Great job in teaching science classes as inquiry-based learning" I'm not a science teacher but the way science was taught at WCSU I'd be interested in teaching it."

E. (Years 1&2) Wholistic teacher training model, including socio-emotional learning

(Year 1) In addition to preparation for the content area being viewed as highly effective, WCSU provided a teacher training model that went beyond teaching content area curriculum to include a wholistic model of teaching and learning. Preparation in socio-emotional learning, for example, learning how outside stress could affect student in the classroom was perceived as highly valuable. (See areas in need of improvement below) Strategies such as differentiating assignments based on student needs beyond academic needs as well as ongoing, one on one conversations to provide emotional reassurance and ease stress were learned through the WCSU program and have been found to be

effective in the classroom. The importance and role of classroom conversation beyond the content, even such conversations as how the holiday break went, was also viewed as beneficial preparation in implementing a wholistic instructional practice.

(Year 2) The importance of differentiating a program based on what is best for your students was discussed, rather than focusing solely on "complete" fidelity to a program - if it is not working for a particular student.

(Years 1 and 2) The importance of one-on-one conversations for socio-emotional and academic support was identified as a strength in the program.

In Year 1 data, the importance of having been prepared by WCSU to provide one-on-one interactions was highlighted in the journal entries.

In Year 2, the one-on-one conversation was discussed as conferencing/workshop model.   In particular, one-on-one conferencing for writing allowed for differentiation based on student needs and allowed for targeted feedback based on those specific student needs.

WCSU taught "how important it is to have conversations with our students regarding their work" to; "meet individual student needs; to convey to students their individual importance and teachers interest in their lives ; to convey the teacher's role in helping each student to improve based on individual need as evidenced by performance."

F. (Year 2) Great job in teaching use of classroom assessments.

A participant noted that WCSU did a "great job" in preparing candidates in the administration and use of classroom assessments. Preparation to use classroom assessments such as running records, DRA, etc. was highlighted and well understood. (This participant differentiated the highly effective teaching of classroom assessments with a need for greater understanding of standardized assessments, especially state testing.)

G. (Year 1) Capacity to meet deadlines.

     A journal entry highlighted the extensive workload teachers face in the classroom, and the view that the deadlines set in WCSU classes helped in learning to keep up with work.

H. (Year 1) Familiarity and comfort with Technology.

     A participant expressed confidence in technology as a result of a mentor teacher who has been instrumental in providing training and support in technology.)

Areas in Need of Improvement in the Program

A. <u>(Year 2)</u> Additional coursework to learn about appropriate interventions, practical and real-world strategies for students below grade level in literacy (reading and writing)

     Appropriate Interventions for Upper Elementary Students: Provide classes that focus on teaching upper elementary grade reading and writing skills, generally, and more specifically for struggling students in the upper elementary grades. As strong and beneficial as participants found the classes in teaching early elementary skills, a need for classes that provide tools to teach skills of reading and writing for students who are below grade level in upper elementary grades (5th and 6th grade) was expressed.

> *"One of the biggest challenges I have been facing… is giving students appropriate interventions. A vast majority of my students are reading below grade level… I feel like WCSU prepared me better for interventions at the K-3 level in reading but not for 5th and 6th grade level."*

     Additional coursework in 1) teaching small group and conferring strategies in literacy, 2) SRBI process, specifically Tier II interventions in addition to current class on 504s and IEPs.

"While there is a team for 504s and IEPs, the classroom teacher is ...fully responsible for moving students from tier I to tier II and administering the intervention 3- 5 days a week and maintaining the assessment data and paperwork that goes along with that. I currently have 6 tier II students and it is extremely challenging to pull those small groups throughout the day with everything else that I am responsible for. To me, this needs to be built into the teacher preparation programs."

B. (Year 1) Greater exposure to data driven outcome/objectives (and accreditation) terminology

Year 1 Journal entries expressed the view that time should be spent familiarizing students themselves with data driven outcome terminology. For example, a participant expressed a lack of knowledge of the terminology, SLOs (Student Learning Objectives/Outcomes) and teacher goals used as measures in the federal grant program, "Race to the Top." She was able to learn about SLO from colleagues.

During the semi-structured interview, the participant was asked, "How is working towards accreditation in her school or what is required for accreditation at your school in line with your training at WCSU." She responded that she was not familiar with NEASC prior to teaching position and was not prepared by WCSU program. She initially felt intimidated but ultimately had the opportunity to learn about accreditation requirements from colleagues and realized even experienced teachers were unclear on the process.

C. (Years 1 and 2) Increase experience in collecting and interpreting student data for student and teacher improvement.

Year 1 Interview response indicated a lack of recall in learning about collecting student data and "learning how to improve ourselves as we look at how students are doing"

D. (Year 2) Data Interpretation of Large-Scale Data Sets:

Increase knowledge and skill in pulling information out of and interpreting large-scale data sets, including how to "read" and interpret a diversity of graphs, tables, etc. for longitudinal cohort data sets.

A participant explained that PD has changed in his school from being literacy and math days, meaning days devoted to focusing on practices in content areas. The participant felt unprepared to interpret large sets of data.

"We are now following data cohorts…given 10 years of data on a H.S. cohort, we're being asked to see where there is growth in students overall and where students are dropping out. We're looking at the cohort in their first year of Algebra I and then the percent who are dropping out in their second year. [In addition] we're being asked to look at [interpret the data] of subsections of the cohorts such as students receiving free and reduced lunch to look at their test scores each year and see what their test scores are telling you.

"we are asked to look at the test scores and interpret them in relation to the standards of Algebra I and where specifically students are having trouble. We look back at the [correlating] standards for 1st and 2nd grade to see the origins of when they first started learning those algebra standards in the elementary grades. The foundations of algebra begin in 1st and 2nd grade. We are looking at where did the problem begin?" The participant explained that they are learning in PD that understanding this will help inform their teaching as a district.

A participant also suggested that students need more preparation in understanding what the below and meeting expectations categories really mean and how interpreting it correctly can help understand the problem. Participants did add that veteran teachers and novice teachers across the district were not comfortable or able to negotiate the use of large data sets or understand how to extract meaningful data to inform their practice.

E. (Year 2) Increase knowledge of selection and administration of appropriate tests.

Correctly selecting and understanding different kinds of tests, the purpose of administering an assessment, importance of validity and reliability of selected tests, what specific tests are designed to assess, what you can and can't learn from a specific assessment, etc., needs more attention. A participant noted that the program could improve candidate preparation of determining the appropriate test along with

the intervention needed based on a correct understanding of the test given. The example was given of administering a core phonics assessment and being able to answer the question, "Would you understand the fluency of a child given this assessment?" The answer should be "No, because [the core phonics assessment] is not assessing fluency." It should also be noted that the participant felt that this skill was weak among veteran teachers as well.

F. (Year 2) More applied practice in Social – Emotional Learning.

A participant noted that while general principles of social -emotional learning are taught in the WCSU program, more preparation was needed in applied practices of restorative practices to help novice teachers help their student regulate their own emotions. Relatedly, more understanding in how to build trusting relationships in the classroom was needed. One participant described it as follows:

The role of social-emotional learning should be increased to "learn how to incorporate it into everyday teaching"; "when students are frustrated it's hard to know how to bring them back down from getting upset. It's hard to find time in the school day to teach kids how to communicate, to express how they are feeling. When kids know you care, they'll respond… not yell at 1st graders…that's not why I became a teacher."

G. Years 1& 2: Training in Trust Building and Communication:

With Colleagues

Make the importance and 'how to' of trust and relationship building with colleagues an explicit part of the WCSU program. Help candidates understand that problems in their teaching will arise and it's not only acceptable, but appropriate and beneficial to talk to colleagues and everyone about issues you are having to try to learn from others.

You've got to have conversations with colleagues about what works, what doesn't … I've learned that once you start talking, about your problems, everyone else starts saying the same thing. That should be part of the WSCU program … can feel lonely and you can

25

feel disconnected… if you are a male teacher and don't relate to some of the topics of female teachers and/or teachers who have children. Sharing problems you're having as a teacher can connect you…"

With Parents

(Years 1 and 2) The need to receive training in all aspects of effective parent communication, including emails, phone conversations, letters, etc. was expressed. Participants noted the challenges of trying to open up a conversation with parents and the limited value of leaving a voicemail. The need to learn different ways of talking with parents that might be effective was highlighted, along with understanding the parents' perspectives, etc. The lack of such skills was described as a challenge.

H. (Year 2) Post-Graduate Continued Engagement

A participant suggested monthly get togethers to catch up with everyone and to learn about topics of need including: data interpretation including understanding different types of graphs, pie charts on longitudinal assessment data, different tests, developing trusting relationships with students, colleagues, parents, over course of years , tests, etc. Opportunities for reflection such as those afforded by the case study (probing questions that generate reflection) was also recommended. ("I've really enjoyed this conversation…. it's provided a period of [interactive] reflection that rarely happens.")

Classroom Observations

Year 1 Classroom observations of two participants were analyzed in the aggregate to ensure confidentiality to assess areas of strength and areas in need of improvement. The observation instrument scores range from a low of 1 to a high of 4. Participants scores indicated "proficiency" in the vast majority of criteria, with a few scores in the "developing" range. In comparing the first and second observations, participants in their (1st, 2nd? Year of teaching) showed overall strength and improvement, with an increase from the first observation in the frequency of ratings of 3

compared to the frequency of ratings of 2. One area that remained a "2 rating" was "use of data to plan instruction /uses multiple sources of data.".

This finding is in line with the expressed view by case study participants that an area of preparation in need of strengthening includes data collection, data analysis, interpretation of data, and terminology.

Year 2 Classroom observations were not conducted per participants' wishes.

Analysis (Strengths/Areas for Improvement) for the Overall Programs based on the Aggregate Data

Strengths

- o Data indicate that program completers overall rated their preparation positively.

- o Program completers felt prepared to teach diverse candidates.

- o Program completers reported that fieldwork experiences in Danbury schools prepared them to work with English language learners and other diverse students.

- o Another strength reported by candidates was differentiation of curriculum to meet students' needs.

Areas of Improvement

- o Program completers reported that more work was needed in interpreting data sets and using analysis to drive instruction.

- o Another area for improvement was designing interventions, in particular, for upper elementary education students who are struggling in literacy.

Employer Focus Group

In March of 2019 qualitative data from four employers of WCSU graduates were collected through an Employer focus group. The focus group was conducted to probe the perceptions and experiences with WCSU graduate hires, along with retention. Participants represented four different districts in the state.

All new hires "doing very well."

Participants indicated that they have hired WCSU graduates and that all are "doing very well." Two employers noted that they have "hired 092 program completers as district administrators and they are doing very well. They are knowledgeable about instruction and curriculum as well as administrative tasks. "A second employer noted, "they are doing excellent work."

Very positive turnaround of the WCSU program

Employers commended WCSU on the very positive turnaround of the program, commenting that "10 years ago the district would not hire WCSU initial program graduates due to their weaknesses." "… the program has done a 180 in now graduating candidates that are excellent hires. "… WCSU completers are now in the running for jobs with flagship schools in the state that never happened before."

Employer Recommendations for Improvement of New Hires and WCSU Program

Asked how the program might improve to strengthen new hires, employers emphasized the need for more phonics instruction overall as new teachers need work in that area.   Participants also suggested adding a program for paraprofessionals that would be tailored to their needs and timeframe. A participant suggested focusing it on TESOL or Special Education.

2018-2019 Indicators of Teacher Effectiveness (4.2)

Description: The CT State Department of Education in June 2019 issued the following directive regarding CAEP Standard 4.1:

> *CAEP Standard 4, Element 1: CAEP standard 4, element 1 requires EPPs to provide data regarding the impact of teaching on student learning. Connecticut policy strictly prohibits the public distribution of student assessment data by student, which means that Connecticut EPPs do not have direct access to student test data. During September 2018, the CSDE presented to CAEP for consideration a proposal describing an alternative methodology for meeting CAEP standard 4 requirements. Specifically, the CSDE proposed that Connecticut EPPs report impact data from the Teacher and Education Mentoring (TEAM) program, Connecticut's two-year induction program. TEAM requires beginning teachers to complete instructional modules in the areas of (1) Classroom Management and Environment; (2) Planning; (3) Instruction; (4) Student Assessment; and (5) Professional Responsibility. Each module requires beginning teachers to analyze the impact of practice on student learning from multiple data sources (e.g., student Page 2 of 2 | Connecticut State Department of Education work/classroom assessments, state student achievement testing), with the Student Assessment module requiring an even deeper dive into assessment literacy. Performance profiles are used to identify module goals and module criteria are used by trained reviewers to evaluate module success. Beginning teachers must successfully complete TEAM in order to advance from an Initial Educator Certificate to a Provisional Educator Certificate. CAEP consultant Gary Railsback reviewed the full proposal, and during a September 2018 conference call, approved Connecticut moving forward with the proposal for meeting CAEP standard 4 requirements.*

Results

According to the TEAM data results for 2013-2018, WCSU had the largest percentage of completers in the state working for their partnership district with 53 (23%). The rubric and data chart denote results for 2013-2018 per module. CSDE did not provide disaggregated data per completer year.

29

Table 5. TEAM Module Indicators and Descriptors

Modules	Indicators						
Module 1 Environment, Student Engagement and Commitment to Learning	(1) Creating a class climate that is responsive to and respectful of the learning needs of students with diverse backgrounds, interests and performance levels.	(2) Promoting engagement in and shared responsibility for the learning process including encouraging opportunities for students to initiate their own questions and inquiry.	(3) Providing explicit instruction about social skills to develop students' social competence and responsible and ethical behavior by using a continuum of proactive strategies that may be individualized to student needs.	(4) Fostering appropriate standards of behavior that support a productive learning environment for all students.	(5) Maximizing the amount of time spent on learning by effectively managing routines and transitions.		
Module2 Planning for Active Learning	(1) Determining students' prior knowledge to ensure that content instruction is at an appropriate level of challenge and differentiated to meet their learning needs.	(2) Developing and organizing coherent and relevant units, lessons and learning tasks that build on students' prior knowledge, skills and interests and engage students in the work of the discipline.	(3) Selecting appropriate assessment strategies to monitor ongoing student progress	(4) Designing or selecting academic/ behavioral interventions through differentiated, supplemental, specialized instruction for students who do not respond to primary instruction alone.	(5) Including strategies for teaching and supporting content area literacy skills, and when appropriate, numeracy skills (across the curriculum).		
Module 3 Instruction for Active Learning	(1) Using a variety of evidence-based instructional strategies to enable students to apply and construct new learning.	(2) Using differentiated instruction and supplemental intervention to support students with learning difficulties, disabilities, and/or particular gifts and talents	(3) Using Technological and digital resources strategically to support learning.	(4) Leading students to construct meaning through the use of active learning strategies such as purposeful discourse and/or inquiry-based learning.	(5) Varying the student and teacher roles in ways that develop independence and interdependence of learners with the gradual release of responsibility to students.	(6) Monitoring student learning and adjusting teaching during instruction in response to student performance and engagement in learning tasks.	(7) Providing meaningful, appropriate and specific feedback to students during instruction to improve their performance.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Module4 Assessment for Learning	Using and/or designing a variety of formative and summative assessments and criteria that directly align with the learning objectives and value the diversity of ways in which students learn.	Using a comprehensive set of data that provides depth and breadth of understanding of student achievement at a particular point in time and over time.	Collaborating with colleagues to review and interpret assessment data to monitor and adjust instruction to ensure students' progress.	Providing students with assessment criteria and individualized, descriptive feedback to help them improve their performance and assume responsibility for their learning.	Supporting students' progress by communicating academic and behavioral performance expectations and results with students, their families and other educators.	Using academic, behavioral and health data to select and/or design interventions, and assist in the development of Individualized educational programs for students with disabilities.

Table 6. Danbury TEAM Data

EPP Name	#/%
Alternate Route to Cert	5 **(2%)**
Central Connecticut State University	7 (3%)
Charter Oak	1 (.4 %)
Eastern Connecticut State University	4 (2%)
Fairfield U.	12 (5%)
Out of State	65 **(28%)**
Quinnipiac U.	**8 (4%)**
5HU	**8 (4%)**
Southern Connecticut State University	21 (9%)
TFA	1 (.4%)
UB	25 (11%)
USJ	1 (.4 %)
University of Connecticut	15 (7%)
University of Hartford	2 **(.8%)**
Western Connecticut State University	**53 (23%)**
TOTAL	228 (100%)

Table 7. Danbury TEAM Data by EPP: WCSU (W) Versus All Other CT EPPs (All Other)

Module 1: Indicators											
	Indicator 1		Indicator 2		Indicator 3		Indicator 4		Indicator 5		TOTALS
#Reviews Required	W	All Other	W	All Other	W	All Other	W	All Other	W	All Other	
1	2	9	6	31	1	5	15	52	22	65	208
2	1	0	0	4	0	0	4	2	2	3	16
3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4
TOTALS	3	9	6	35	1	5	19	56	24	70	**228**

Module 2: Indicators											
	Indicator 1		Indicator 2		Indicator 3		Indicator 4		Indicator 5		TOTALS
#Reviews Required	W	All Other	W	All Other	W	All Other	W	All Other	W	All Other	
1	9	36	8	34	11	32	8	30	7	16	191
2	3	4	1	5	3	5	1	2	0	1	25
3	0	3	0	2	2	2	0	1	0	1	11
4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
TOTALS	12	44	9	41	16	39	9	33	7	18	**228**

Module 3: Indicators														
	Indicator 1		Indicator 2		Indicator 3		Indicator 4		Indicator 5		Indicator 6		Indicator 7	
#Reviews Required	W	All Other	W	All Other	W	All Other	W	All Other	W	All Other	W	All Other	W	All Other	ALL
1	2	4	8	41	9	21	7	23	9	17	4	12	7	32	196
2	0	0	1	1	0	4	1	0	0	1	0	4	2	0	14
3	0	2	1	4	2	0	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	1	15
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
TOTALS	2	6	10	46	11	26	8	26	9	19	4	19	9	33	**228**

#Reviews Required	Module 4: Indicators												
	Indicator 1		Indicator 2		Indicator 3		Indicator 4		Indicator 5		Indicator 6		TOTALS
	W	All Other	W	All Other	W	All Other	W	All Other	W	All Other	W	All Other EPPs	
1	20	43	4	13	6	25	12	59	5	9	0	7	203
2	0	1	0	1	0	3	2	1	2	0	0	1	11
3	1	2	0	1	0	2	0	2	0	0	1	0	9
4	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	5
Totals	21	48	4	16	6	31	14	63	7	9	1	8	228

Analysis (Strengths/Areas for Improvement) for the Overall Programs based on the Aggregate Data

Strengths

- According to the TEAM data results for 2013-2018, WCSU had the largest percentage of completers in the state working for their partnership district with 53 (23%).

- Data indicate that the most frequently chosen modules are the following:

  Module 1, Indicators 4 & 5= Classroom behavioral and logistical management

  Module 2, Indicators 3 & 1: Selecting appropriate assessment strategies; Prior knowledge of students

  Module 3, Indicators 3, 2, & 7: Differentiation

Areas of Improvement

- Module 2, Indicator 3: Selecting appropriate assessment strategies to monitor. Both TEAM and edTPA data indicate that selecting assessment strategies surface as areas for growth.

- Module 3, Indicator 2: Using differentiation strategies is a TEAM area of improvement yet this was an area on which initial candidates demonstrated improvement over the course of the five years of edTPA data that we reviewed.

2018-2019 Satisfaction of Employers (4.3, A4.1)

Description

The EPP monitors employer feedback through a survey that is sent electronically every January. The instrument was validated in 2016. The 2020 survey polled employers of AY 2018-2019 program completers. There were no 092 Program advanced program completers as the next cohort will finish in August 2020.

Results

Annually in fall and early spring, the EPP follows up with the previous year's cohort to seek employment information. In January the employer survey is sent out through LiveText based upon program completers' responses. CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey 2020 was sent to eleven employers of the 2019 Elementary Education cohort. One of the thirteen employers responded to the survey for a 11% return rate. Five surveys were sent to employers of the 2019 Secondary Education cohort and two responded for a 40% return rate. There were no 092 program cohort completers and the employer of the one Health Education graduate did not respond.

Table 8. CAEP Initial Programs Elementary Education Employer Survey 2020

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
2020	1.Integrates appropriate standards into instruction	2.0	NA
	2. Adapts instruction to diverse students and differences in learning.	2.0	NA
	3. Facilitates critical thinking, problem solving and /or other higher-level thinking	2.0	NA
	4. Motivates students to learn	2.0	NA
	5. Communicates well with students.	2.0	NA
	6. Effectively applies classroom management practices	2.0	NA
	7. Interacts well with parents and community members	3.0	NA
	8. Assesses student learning	2.0	NA
	9. Engages in reflective thinking during the entire instructional cycle	3.0	NA
	10. Collaborates well with peers	3.0	NA
	11. Creates effective learning environments	2.0	NA
	12. Behaves in accordance with professional ethics	3.0	NA
	13. Effectively integrates technology into their instruction	2.0	NA

Table 8. CAEP Initial Programs Secondary Education Employer Survey 2020

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
	1.Integrates appropriate standards into instruction	2.5	2-3
2020	2. Adapts instruction to diverse students and differences in learning.	2.5	2-3
	3. Facilitates critical thinking, problem solving and /or other higher-level thinking	2.5	2-3
	4. Motivates students to learn	2.5	2-3

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
	5. Communicates well with students.	2.5	2-3
	6. Effectively applies classroom management practices	2.5	2-3
	7. Interacts well with parents and community members	2.5	2-3
	8. Assesses student learning	2.5	2-3
	9. Engages in reflective thinking during the entire instructional cycle	2.5	2-3
	10. Collaborates well with peers	3.0	NA
	11. Creates effective learning environments	2.5	2-3
	12. Behaves in accordance with professional ethics	2.5	2-3
	13. Effectively integrates technology into their instruction	3.0	NA

2018-2019 Satisfaction of Completers (4.4, A4. 2)

Description

The EPP monitors alumni feedback through a survey that is sent electronically every January. The instrument was validated in 2016. The 2020 survey polled AY 2018-2019 program completers.

Results

Annually in fall and early spring, the EPP follows up with the previous year's cohort to seek employment information. In January the alumni survey is sent out through LiveText. The 2019 CAEP Initial Programs Completers Survey was sent to 2018-2109 program completers(N=18). Eleven of the 18 completers responded for a 61% return rate. Analysis indicates that alumni rated the program highest for helping them to '*grow professionally through reflection*' at 2.55. Two indicators were rated the lowest: '*Collaborate with peers and coordinate instruction with special*

education teachers and *Implement, interpret and use student performance assessments for effective instruction'* at 1.73. These findings are in alignment with the case studies of program completers who indicated the need for further preparation on designing targeted interventions for students with special needs.

Table 9. CAEP Initial Programs Completer Survey 2020

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
2020	1. Integrate appropriate professional and educational standards.	2.45	(2-3)
	2. Identify and adapt instruction to diverse student learners.	2.45	(2-3)
	3. Adapt instruction to diverse student learning.	2.18	(1-3)
	4. Facilitate student critical thinking, problem solving and higher order thinking skills.	2.27	(1-3)
	5. Encourage and motivate all student to learn.	2.27	(1-3)
	6. Create effective learning environments.	2.36	(2-3)
	7. Integrate technology into classroom instruction.	1.91	(1-3)
	8. Effectively communicate with students through both oral and written modes.	2.18	(1-3)
	9. Grow professionally through reflection.	2.55	(2-3)
	10. Appropriately apply effective classroom management practices.	1.83	(0-3)
	11. Effectively interact with students, teachers, parent, and community members.	1.91	(1-3)
	12. Understand human development as it relates to the teaching-learning process.	1.82	(1-3)
	13. Demonstrate appropriate ethical and professional behavior.	2.45	(2-3)
	14. Develop Sensitivity and Respect for the needs and feelings of all students.	2.45	(1-3)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
	15. Recognize both how the organization of the district and school can affect the individual teacher.	1.91	(0-3)
	16. Develop classroom and school leadership.	2.09	(1-3)
	17. Develop a positive disposition toward students.	2.36	(2-3)
	18. Collaborate with peers and coordinate instruction with special education teachers.	1.73	(1-3)
	19.Develop quality instructional units.	2.09	(1-3)
	20. Appropriately select and use a wide variety of instructional strategies, resource materials and media.	2.27	(1-3)
	21. Implement, interpret and use student performance assessments for effective instruction.	1.73	(0-3)
	22. Use individual, small group and large group instructional arrangements.	2.18	(0-3)
	23. Develop online learning expectations for students.	1.82	(0-3)

CAEP Annual Performance Measures

CAEP Annual Performance Measure	Results
Graduate Rates Initial Completers	Graduation Rate: 73%
Ability of Completers to Meet Licensing Requirements	Elementary Education: 80% Secondary Education: 100% Health Education: 100% *No 092 Program Completers
Ability of Completers to be Hired in Education Positions for which They were Prepared	Elementary Education: 61% Secondary Education: 83% Health Education:100% *No 092 Program Completers
University Student Loan Default Rate	7.7%

Analysis of 2019 CAEP Eight Annual Reporting Measures

Measure of Completer Impact	Analysis of Trends	Comparisons with Benchmarks	Source
I. Impact on P-12 Learning and Development			
2017-2019 edTPA (Scale 2013)	Analysis indicates that the majority of program completers had a positive impact on P-12 learning and development. The majority of program completers scored at the multistate passing rate or slightly below it. There were no spring 2019 Health Education program completers. The EPP conducted an edTPA summit in spring 2020 to discuss these results and to make	The national edTPA norming data provided the benchmarks for this measure.	edTPA (Scale, 2013)

	curriculum modifications to improve scores across subject areas.		
II. Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness			
2019 Case Studies of Initial Program Completers	Analysis indicates that program completers overall rated their preparation positively. Program completers felt prepared to teach diverse candidates. They reported that fieldwork experiences in Danbury schools prepared them to work with English language learners and other diverse students. Another strength reported by candidates was differentiation of curriculum to meet students' needs. Program completers reported that more work was needed in interpreting data sets and using analysis to drive instruction	The EPP has not established a benchmark for case studies.	Case Study reflective prompts, and focus groups.
WCSU Danbury TEAM Data 2013-2018	According to the TEAM data results for 2013-2018, WCSU had the largest percentage of completers in the state working for their partnership district with 53 (23%). Both TEAM and edTPA data indicate that selecting assessment strategies surface is an area for improvement.	CSDE stipulates that beginning teachers must successfully complete TEAM in order to advance from an Initial Educator Certificate to a Provisional Educator Certificate.	CSDE WCSU Danbury TEAM Data 2013-2018
III. Satisfaction of Employers and Employment Milestones			
CAEP WCSU Employers Survey (2018 Completers)	The response rate for the Elementary Education Initial program completers survey was low with only 11%, which is below the required CAEP benchmark. Those who did respond evaluated completers highly on the categories of collaborating with peers and reflection on practice. Adapting instruction for diverse learners is an	The benchmark for the survey was CAEP 20% required response rate.	CAEP WCSU Employer Survey

	area for improvement. The response rate for the Secondary Education program was higher at 40%. Employers highly rated completers on their collaboration with peers and integration of technology. All indicators were rated at 2.5 or above. The one employer of the Health Education completer did not return the survey.		
IV. Satisfaction of Completers			
CAEP WCSU Alumni Survey (2018 Completers)	The response rate for the survey was high at 61% for initial program completers. The 092-program survey was not launched as there were no cohorts in 2019. The highest indicators regarding preparation for initial program completers were; growing professionally through reflection, develop professional and ethical behavior and develop respect and sensitivity for the needs of all students. Lowest rated indicators for initial preparation were focused on differentiating instruction, classroom management, advisement, and preparation for online teaching. Analysis indicates that further efforts are needed in initial preparation programs on advisement, differentiated instruction, and online teaching.	The benchmark for the survey was CAEP 20% required response rate.	CAEP WCSU Alumni Survey
V. Graduation Rates			
WCSU IR Graduation Rate Report	WCSU Institutional Research determined a new graduation rate from enrollment in ED 206 Introduction to Education in the sophomore year to graduation. Evidence indicates that the majority	The EPP has not established a benchmark yet for this measure.	WCSU IR Graduation Rate Report

	of candidates are completing the program in four to five years.		
VI. Ability of Completers to Meet Licensing Requirements			
WCSU Alumni Survey	Alumni were asked to report their place of employment in the survey response. The majority of Elementary Education candidates were certified and eligible for employment. All secondary education program completers were certified. There was one Health Education program completer who did obtain licensure.	The EPP has not yet established a benchmark for this measure.	WCSU Alumni Survey CT Educator Certification System
VII. Ability of Completers to be Hired in Positions for which they were Prepared			
WCSU Alumni Survey	Alumni were asked to report their place of employment in the survey response. However, since not all included this information, the EPP used the CSDE certification database portal to confirm employment. Follow up phone calls were also utilized. Findings indicate that 61% of Elementary Education completers are working in public schools. This is a similar result from last year's rate of 64%. 83% of the secondary education completers are working in public school districts, which is a slight decrease from last year.	The EPP has not yet established a benchmark for this measure.	
VIII. University Student Loan Default Rate			
University Student Loan Default Rate	The university student loan default rate is 7.7%, which is a slight increase from last year.	The EPP has not established a benchmark for this measure.	Report from WCSU Financial Aid and Student Employment Office