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# **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, Employer Surveys, Alumni Surveys, CAEP Annual Reporting Measures, and Analysis the CAEP Eight Annual Reporting Measures.

# **2018-2020 Impact on Student Learning (edTPA)**

## **Description**

The Connecticut State Department of Education does not share teacher evaluation measures with state EPPs. Furthermore, due to COVID-19, districts did not allow observations of initial program completers in the virtual learning environment. Therefore, the EPP has provided data on the edTPA practice portfolio which is completed in the fall of the final year. CSDE waived submission of the edTPA portfolio to Pearson due to COVID-19. 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.

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.

### **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:** **Summary: Practice edTPA Rubric Score Distribution for Elementary, Secondary, and All Levels (Health) Programs by Ethnicity Fall 2018 – Fall 2020**

| **Practice edTPA Rubric Score Distribution for Elementary, Secondary, and All Levels (Health) Programs by Ethnicity**  **Fall 2018 – Fall 2020** | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Overall**  **Percentages** | **Fall 2020** | | **Fall 2019** | | **Fall 2018** | |
|  |  | **Frequencies** | **Percentage** | **Frequencies** | **Percentage** | **Frequencies** | **Percentage** |
| ***Percentage Scoring at Emerging (2)*** | **10.63%** | **16** | 3.87% | **63** | 14.48% | **46** | **14.02%** |
| % of Emerging Ethnicity: WHITE | 11 | 68.75% | 54 | 85.71% | 31 | 67.39% |
| % of Emerging Ethnicity: ASIAN | 0 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% |
| % of Emerging Ethnicity: BLACK | 0 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% |
| % of Emerging Ethnicity: MRACES | 1 | 6.25% | 0 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% |
| % of Emerging Ethnicity: HISPA | 4 | 25.00% | 7 | 11.11% | 8 | 17.39% |
| % of Emerging Ethnicity: NSPEC | 0 | 0.00% | 2 | 3.17% | 7 | 15.22% |
| ***Percentage Scoring at Proficient (3)*** | **66.84%** | **294** | **71.19%** | **303** | **69.66%** | **189** | **57.62%** |
| % of Proficient Ethnicity: WHITE | 203 | 69.05% | 236 | 77.89% | 168 | 88.89% |
| % of Proficient Ethnicity: ASIAN | 0 | 0.00% | 15 | 4.95% | 1 | 0.53% |
| % of Proficient Ethnicity: BLACK | 0 | 0.00% | 3 | 0.99% | 0 | 0.00% |
| % of Proficient Ethnicity: MRACES | 4 | 1.36% | 0 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% |
| % of Proficient Ethnicity: HISPA | 87 | 29.59% | 37 | 12.21% | 9 | 4.76% |
| % of Proficient Ethnicity: NSPEC | 0 | 0.00% | 12 | 3.96% | 11 | 5.82% |
| ***Percentage Scoring at Advanced (4)*** | **22.53%** | **103** | **24.94%** | **69** | **15.86%** | **93** | **28.35%** |
| % of Advanced Ethnicity: WHITE | 95 | 92.23% | 57 | 82.61% | 87 | 93.55% |
| % of Advanced Ethnicity: ASIAN | 0 | 0.00% | 3 | 4.35% | 0 | 0.00% |
| % of Advanced Ethnicity: BLACK | 0 | 0.00% | 5 | 7.25% | 0 | 0.00% |
| % of Advanced Ethnicity: MRACES | 1 | 0.97% | 0 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% |
| % of Advanced Ethnicity: HISPA | 7 | 6.80% | 2 | 2.90% | 5 | 5.38% |
| % of Advanced Ethnicity: NSPEC | 0 | 0.00% | 2 | 2.90% | 1 | 1.08% |
| ***Total items scored across all programs*** | **1176** | **435** | | **328** | | **328** | |
| ***Mean by Year*** | **3.12** | **3.21** | | **3.01** | | **3.14** | |
| **Summary Practice edTPA**  **Fall 2018 – Fall 2020**  **Overall Mean = 3.12** | | | | | | | |

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

***Practice edTPA Portfolio Areas of Strength.***

* *The Practice edTPA Portfolio is designed to prepare our candidates for the actual edTPA. All candidates are scored on 15 competencies which are aligned with the edTPA Rubrics, with the exception of Spanish (13 competencies aligned with edTPA) and Elementary Education which has an additional 3 competencies (total 18).*
* **Overall Performance**
  + For out purposes, a strength is considered a mean of 3.15 or above.
  + The overall mean in this assessment was 3.12.
* **Practice edTPA Component Areas of Strength**
  + 1.How do the candidate’s plans build students’ abilities to…(content specific):
    - Overall, 30% of candidates scored at the Advanced level (mean of 4.0) in this competency.
    - The overall mean for this competency was 3.18, indicating an area of strength.
  + 3.How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her students to justify instructional plans? 
    - Overall, 24.32% of candidates scored at the Advanced level (mean of 4.0) in this competency even though the overall mean was 3.0.
  + 4. How does the candidate identify and support language demands associated with a key (content) learning task?
    - Overall, 24.32% of candidates scored at the Advanced level (mean of 4.0).
    - The overall mean for this competency was 3.19, indicating an area of strength.
  + 6. How does the candidate demonstrate a positive learning environment that supports students’ engagement in learning? 
    - Overall, 36.36% of candidates scored at the Advanced level (mean of 4.0).
    - The overall mean for this competency was 3.31 indicating an area of strength.
  + 7. How does the candidate actively engage students in…(content specific): 
    - Overall, 27.63% of candidates scored at the Advanced level (mean of 4.0).
    - The overall mean for this competency was 3.18, indicating an area of strength.
  + 10. How does the candidate use evidence to evaluate and change teaching practice to meet students’ varied learning needs?
    - Overall, 27.03% of candidates scored at the Advanced level (mean of 4.0).
    - The overall mean for this competency was 3.15, indicating an area of strength.
  + 12. What type of feedback does the candidate provide to focus students?
    - The overall mean for this competency was 3.27, indicating an area of strength.
  + 15. How does the candidate use the analysis of what students know and are able to do to plan next steps in instruction?
    - Overall, 30.00% of candidates scored at the Advanced level (mean of 4.0).
    - The overall mean for this competency was 3.23, indicating an area of strength.

***Practice edTPA Portfolio Areas of Improvement.***

* A mean under 3.0 is considered an overall area of improvement. (The overall mean for this assessment was 3.12.)
* 10.63% of Candidates scored at the Developing level in this assessment.
* **Practice edTPA Component Areas of Improvement** 
  + 1.How do the candidate’s plans build students’ abilities to…(content specific):
    - Overall, 12.5% of candidates scored at emerging in this competency.
  + 3.How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her students to justify instructional plans? 
    - Overall, 24.32% of the candidates scored at the Emerging level in this competency.
  + 17. How does the candidate use student work to analyze mathematical errors, confusions, and partial understandings?
    - Overall, 15.63% of the Elementary Education candidates scored at the Emerging level in this competency.
  + 18. How does the candidate examine the re-engagement lesson to further student learning?
    - Overall, 16.67% of Elementary Education candidates scored at the Emerging level in this competency.

# **2020 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. Due to COVID-19, observations were not permitted by school districts and therefore the EPP focused on employer/alumni survey results and analysis of journal prompts. 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.

### **Quantitative Data**

Alumni surveys were sent to all initial and advanced program completers. Completers’ responses were followed up with employer surveys.

**2020 Completers: Analysis of Findings**

Note: To ensure confidentiality the EPP has previously reported survey results from EPP completers in the aggregate. Although not in the CAEP rubric, CAEP requested results of EPP completer surveys to be reported by program. Therefore, beginning in 2020- 2021 data year, EPP completer survey is reported by program. Analysis will be provided comparing mean responses by program in 2020 -2021 to prior mean survey responses to all programs combined. Caution is noted as, based on CAEP request of by- program results this analysis is not apples to apples, so to speak for the 2020- 2021 to 2019 year. However, as we go forward, we will report survey results by program, comparatively from year to year. In addition to reporting 2020 results by program, we will compare each program’s survey results to the aggregated results of 2019. See Exhibit 4.x below to see ratings for each program for 2020-2021 and for differences between 2019 aggregate for all programs combined and 2020-2021 scores, aggregated by program.

**Table 3: Comparison of Alumni Survey Cohort Scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scores for Alumni Survey, aggregated for 2019 compared to aggregated by program for 2020-2021** | | | | | | | |
| **Scores** | **2019**  **N= 7** | **2020 Elementary**  **EPP Completers**  **N = 10** | **Difference** | **2020 Secondary EPP Completers**  **N = 2** | **Difference** | **2020 Health EPP Completers**  **N = 2** | **Difference** |
| **4** | **0** | 0 | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** |
| **3-3.9** | **0** | 1 | **+1** | **0** | **0** | **9** | **+9** |
| **2.5- 2.9** | **0** | 17 | **+17** | **9** | **+9** | **12** | **+12** |
| **2- 2.4** | **8** | 4 | **- 4** | **4** | **-4** | **1** | **-7** |
| **1 -.1.9** | **15** | 1 | **-14** | **9** | **-6** | **1** | **-14** |
| **>1** | **0** | 0 | **0** | **1** | **+1** | **0** | **0** |

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

* Overall analysis of surveys indicates that 2020 responding program completers (N= 14; Elementary = 10; Secondary = 2; Health = 2) rated the majority of indicators at 2.0 or above on self-reported ratings; one a survey of learning through the EPP Teacher preparation program and one a survey asking EPP completers to rate elements of the preparation program.
* Alumni Survey Analysis:
* Elementary: 22 of 23 indicators rating satisfaction with what had been learned in the program were rated 2 or above with 18 of the 23 indicators rated 2.5 or above by Elementary EPP completers. Health: 21 of 23 indicators rated 2.5 and above

(12 rated 2.5 and 9 rated 3) by Health EPP completers. Secondary: 13 of 23 indicators were rated at 2 and above.

* 2020 By-program aggregated results compared to 2019 All- programs aggregated results. Table 3 displays the marked improvements in ratings especially for Elementary and Health program completers. For example, in 2019, aggregate results from all programs combined showed no ratings in the 2.5- 2.9 or 3 categories for any indicator, 2020 aggregate results from Elementary completers show an increase of 17 rated in the “2.5 – 2.9” category and 1 indicator rated in the “3” category. In addition, a review of the mean for each survey item shows an increase in rating for every item, with the increase sometimes jumping from 1.7 to 2.5, or more modestly from 2.43 to 2.50.
* Secondary completer respondent responses also showed an overall improvement in number of ratings reported as 2 compared to the 2019 All programs combined results, up from 8 to 13 (See Table X). However, a closer review of each item shows that ratings on some indicators declined.
* The highest rated indicators across performance indicators for the three programs were ‘integrate appropriate professional and educational standards, facilitate student critical thinking, problem solving, and higher order thinking skills, encourage and motivate all students to learn’, create effective learning environments, effectively communicate with students through both written and oral modes, ‘grow professionally through reflection’, and develop positive disposition towards students.
* Satisfaction with Elements of Program Preparation Survey:
* Survey results assessing satisfaction with elements of the EPP Teacher preparation program showed improvements across all Programs (Elementary, Secondary, Health) in comparison to 2019 survey results of All programs combined.
* Nine out of 10 indicators were rated 2 for Elementary completers, 7 out of 10 for Secondary completers, and 9 out of 10 for Health completers. This compares to 1 out of 10 rated 2 and above in 2019 for all programs combined; reflecting clear improvement in program preparation elements as reported by EPP completers in three programs.

**Areas of Improvement**

* The lowest rated indicators across all programs’ performance indicators were ‘integrate technology in instruction, use individual, small group and large group instructional arrangements, appropriately apply effective classroom management practices’ (Elementary), and ‘develop online learning expectations for students’.
* As noted earlier, ratings increased for Secondary completer respondents along with other programs. However, unlike the other programs in which all indicators of learning showed an increased rating, Secondary completers rated the following indicators of learning lower in 2020 compared with aggregate scores of all program completers in 2019: *Identify and adapt instruction to diverse student learners and learning*, *integrate technology into the classroom, effectively interact with students, teachers, parent and community members, develop sensitivity and respect for the needs of all students, recognize both how the organization of the district and school can affect individual teacher, collaborate with peers and coordinate instruction with special education.* An area of improvement noted by both Secondary and Health completers is,*appropriately select and use a wide variety of instructional strategies, resource materials, and media.*
* Secondary responders reported a need for EPP to make program improvements on the following indicators: to *clearly outline program for candidates, program/course learning objectives* and *prepares carefully for classes*.
* Although classroom management preparation was rated as satisfactory (2, 2.5; 2.5) in the survey across the 3 programs, triangulation using prompts and brief telephone interviews found that EPP completers felt classroom management was an area in need of improvement and recommended additional courses in classroom management (See Journal Prompt analysis)

Qualitative Journal Prompts and Brief Interviews: Journal prompts were emailed to all EPP completers, giving all completers an opportunity to provide written feedback. Five completed journal prompts were provided by EPP completers with brief interviews conducted with an additional undergraduate EPP completers and 8 graduate EPP completers. Prompts and questions focused on strengths and areas in need of improvement in the Teacher Preparation program.

Strengths: Themes that emerged from quantitative data analysis as strengths of the program included:

1. Extensive, on-going, and early access to classrooms for observation and hands-on experiences in a diversity of classrooms.

* The extensive experiences provided “many observational hours, especially in junior and senior years of the program”, which “provided many models, teaching styles, and strategies that we could use in our practice”.
* Prepared well enough to go right from a full year of student teaching into an actual full time job experience; Such extensive and varied classroom experiences as undergraduates helped them to “land their jobs.”
* Being placed in multiple different grade levels throughout program was also a strength.
* Observation hours spent in middle school very helpful for current position.

1. Particularly strong preparation to teach science and math. Secondary teachers especially noted this strength of the EPP program; “Really prepared me to teach science and math”; “Strong foundation to teach science and math coming into the job.” Enjoyed lab style courses of math and science.
2. Benefits of having professors still involved in schools and districts. Such connections “allowed us to get into classrooms very early and get so much experience” having knowledge of school issues and their involvement”.
3. Faculty who shared similar experiences faced by EPP candidates. Articulating how they addressed similar experiences “helped strengthen my toolbelt (of practices and strategies.) Students also reported appreciating that they were able to talk openly to most of their professors.
4. Being prepared for the unexpected through use of Mursion mixed reality situation. EPP did a “good job of preparing me for the unexpected. Curveball scenarios through Mursion helped me deal with situations I’d not expect to happen.”\_
5. Felt prepared in ability to bounce back and forth relatively easily between in person teaching and distance learning; “.. I was able to do both [in person and distance learning] during time while student teaching.
6. Value of Ed technology course. Course “was also very helpful in giving me innovative ideas to teach online.”
7. Preparation for certification exams. Strength and gratitude for course work that was geared specifically toward the state exams and requirements necessary to become certified, as many programs and universities leave that aspect of becoming a teacher up to the students, which can be very confusing. A strength to be able to guide other future teachers and answer questions they have regarding how/when to take PRAXIS, Foundations, edTPA, etc. since they don't get that guidance from their programs like we did. “I was so lost and confused on how to get my certification and the process that I needed to go through.” appreciate all of WCSU's help for me to be successful and the amount of preparation we went through before we actually took the edTPA was highly beneficial because it gave us a taste of what was to come. I did several mock edTPAs which seemed to help me greatly once I actually moved on to the real edTPA. Without that I would have not been successful

**Ways to improve**: Themes that emerged as areas in need of improvement included:

1. More classes on virtual and online learning
2. More emphasis on secondary teaching overall in core Education classes , and more time on the high school level in the field.

* Less grouping of secondary with elementary level in courses. Such grouping *does not benefit us because we are secondary*. *I know it may be easier to chunk all of the education people together but really it disrupts the amount of equity in each class and if elementary is focused on more or if secondary is focused on more in a combined class.* … *elementary and secondary course work is never taught and/or distributed evenly;* *Address amount of busy work that does not pertain to my degree.*

1. More courses and instruction on classroom management and access to classroom management strategies and ideas (e.g., *whole brain teaching*)

* *One or more courses on behavior and classroom management would have been extremely beneficial, as the ways one teacher accomplishes this (student teaching) is far from the only way and a broader understanding would have been helpful.*

1. Course on social justice; especially a “way of talking to students today about all that is going on politically in our society”.
2. Additional literacy courses and literacy intervention courses.
3. More preparation on ways to motivate students. “… especially this year during the pandemic as so many are unmotivated”.
4. Opportunity to observe/student teach in rural and urban districts (outside of Danbury) to provide *more rounded experiences and skill sets for future teachers.*
5. While EPP completers identified preparation for exams as a strength, several interviewed students felt that the edTPA specifically, could be better taught and organized, with *more* *consistency* as they found different teachers assess what is required for edTPA differently, and there were differing amounts of instruction offered.

* Secondary EPP completers commented that elementary professors need more guidance on how to comment on lesson plans for a secondary pre-service teacher.
* Elementary EPP completers noted a need for a stronger social studies class as the social studies course was devoted to edTPA preparation.

1. While Mursion was viewed by the majority as beneficial, at least two interview respondents found it intimidating to role play unexpected classroom and parent engagement situations.

* Action Plan: To help ease the discomfort/stress of responding to unexpected scenarios professors might state at the beginning that it is normal to feel uncomfortable performing and part of the learning to feel that way, possibly provide some scripted reactions to initially provide models, and continually remind candidates they are available to discuss any discomfort.

1. Improve consistency in the workload across the board; some professors gave few assignments and some *overloaded*, sometimes with busy work that lacked feedback, or assignments that changed over the semester.

* Action Plan: Suggestion by EPP completers for “new professors to be placed in a team-teaching situation with someone “who knows the ropes.”

**Action Plan** **for the Overall Programs based on the Aggregate Data**

**Areas of Improvement**

* Continue to monitor program completer data on developing online learning expectations for 2021 cohort.
* Monitor the implementation of the technology integration module beginning in summer 2021.
* Consider additional access, exposure, and course work in classroom management and social justice.
* Review communications and text concerning clear outlining of program course learning objectives for candidates.
* Within constraints of requirements, involve candidates in aspects of making curriculum where feasible.

**ADVANCED PROGRAMS**

Data collection to determine satisfaction with the EPP’s Program Programs included two surveys (Learning due to EPP Program and Satisfaction with Elements of EPP Program) and brief phone interviews with EPP completers. Note: The MS in Special Education (MS SPED and MS in Literacy Cohorts are first round cohort completers as both programs are new with only one round of completing cohorts. Therefore, results are not comparable to prior years of survey results. The 092 IntermediateAdministration and Supervision 2020 Completers is the only advanced area with prior years of survey results.

MSED Literacy and Language Arts

Surveys results from the first cohort of MS Literacy completers is mixed and requires monitoring and follow-up. Means for x of the items reveal satisfaction with the program by two of the 3 responders, with x number of items receiving a mean of two or above, and x items receiving less than 2. However, one responder rated all items as 0. Note that the range of responses is from 0- 4 or 0-3, with the 0 rating lowering means on all items. A brief phone call interview with completers indicated higher levels of satisfaction with the program. Therefore, it is unclear if the 0 ratings were an error or intentional. A focus group with MS Literacy completers is planned to learn more about areas of strength and areas in need of improvement in this new program given the wide range of responses, albeit in a very small group of first cohort completers.

The pattern of ranges from 0- 4 holds for both surveys. For the survey measuring perceptions of learning, we looked at mean and ranges in scoring to help analyze the results and found that four items were rated less than satisfactory in range and mean. These include *appropriately apply effective classroom management practices,* *develop classroom and school leadership, develop online learning expectations for students, and recognize both how the organization of the district and school can affect the individual teacher.*

**Table 4. CAEP Advanced Programs Alumni Survey: MSED in Literacy and Language Arts 2020 Program Completers**

* On the survey (See survey below) measuring elements of the MSED in Literacy and Language Arts, of the 12 items measured, ten (10) items showed scores ranging from 0-4 or 0-3; 7 ranged from 0-4, 2 ranged from 0-3, and 3 ranged from 0-2.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **The WCSU Teacher Preparation Program… MSED Literacy & Language Arts N = 3** | **Mean** | **Range** |
| 1. Involved student candidates in making curriculum modifications. | 2.00 | (0-3) |
| 2. Clearly outlines for candidates, program/course learning objectives. | 2.00 | (0-4) |
| 3. Demonstrated and assisted me to obtain my educational goals. | 2.00 | (0-4) |
| 4. Were readily available to advise me. | 2.00 | (0-4) |
| 5. Modeled a variety of instructional approaches. | 1.33 | (0-2) |
| 6. Discussed current research/activities in the field of teaching. | 1.33 | (0-2) |
| 7. Provided intellectually stimulating classes. | 1.67 | (0-3) |
| 8. Prepared carefully for classes. | 2.00 | (0-4) |
| 9. Provided opportunities for learning outside the classroom. | 2.33 | (0-4) |
| 10. Prepared me well for a teaching career. | 1.33 | (0-2) |
| 11. Integrated learning about different cultural and ethnic groups within their classes. | 2.00 | (0-4) |
| 12. Insured that library resources were current and sufficient. | 2.00 | (0-4) |

MSED SPED Special Education

* Survey results of the first cohort of MSSPED completers indicate satisfaction with the program; both in elements of the program and what the EPP learned to do.

Satisfaction with Elements of the Program Survey

**Table 5. CAEP Advanced Programs Alumni Survey: MSED Special Education 2020 Program Completers N =3**

| **Content Indicator MSED SPED 2020 N = 3** | **Mean** | **Range** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Integrate appropriate professional and educational standards. | 3.00 | (2-4) |
| 2. Identify and adapt instruction to diverse student learners. | 3.00 | (2-4) |
| 3. Adapt instruction to diverse student learning. | 3.00 | (2-4) |
| 4. Facilitate student critical thinking, problem solving and higher order thinking skills. | 3.00 | (2-4) |
| 5. Encourage and motivate all student to learn. | 3.00 | (2-4) |
| 6. Create effective learning environments. | 3.00 | (2-4) |
| 7. Integrate technology into classroom instruction. | 2.33 | (2-3) |
| 8. Effectively communicate with students through both oral and written modes. | 3.00 | (2-4) |
| 9. Grow professionally through reflection. | 3.33 | (2-4) |
| 10. Appropriately apply effective classroom management practices. | 2.33 | (2-3) |
| 11. Effectively interact with students, teachers, parent, and community members. | 2.33 | (2-3) |
| 12. Understand human development as it relates to the teaching-learning process. | 2.67 | (2-3) |
| 13. Demonstrate appropriate ethical and professional behavior. | 3.00 | (2-4) |
| 14. Develop Sensitivity and Respect for the needs and feelings of all students. | 3.00 | (2-4) |
| 15. Recognize both how the organization of the district and school can affect the individual teacher. | 3.00 | (2-4) |
| 16. Develop classroom and school leadership. | 3.00 | (2-4) |
| 17. Develop a positive disposition toward students. | 3.33 | (2-4) |
| 18. Collaborate with peers and coordinate instruction with special education teachers. | 3.00 | (2-4) |
| 19.Develop quality instructional units. | 2.00 | (2) |
| 20. Appropriately select and use a wide variety of instructional strategies, resource materials, and media. | 2.33 | (2-3) |
| 21. Implement, interpret and use student performance assessments for effective instruction. | 2.33 | (2-3) |
| 22. Use individual, small group and large group instructional arrangements. | 2.33 | (2-3) |
| 23. Develop online learning expectations for students. | 2.33 | (2-4) |

* As displayed on the Table above fourteen (14) of the twenty-three (23) items self- measuring what Completers learned as a result of the MSED SPED program had a mean of 3 or above, with 3 being slightly above satisfaction and 4 well above satisfaction. The other nine (9) items were rated a mean of 2 or above, with a rating of 2 indicating Satisfactory. Ranges for items were between 2-4, with no item rated lower than Satisfactory.
* Highest rated items included: *Grow professionally through reflection* and *Develop a positive disposition toward students.*
* Lowest rated item at a mean of 2.0 was, ‘*Develop quality instructional units’*

**Satisfaction with Elements of MSSPED program survey**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **The WCSU Teacher Preparation Program… N = 3** | **Mean** | **Range** |
| 1. Involved student candidates in making curriculum modifications. | 3.00 | (2-4) |
| 2. Clearly outlines for candidates, program/course learning objectives. | 3.00 | (2-4) |
| 3. Demonstrated and assisted me to obtain my educational goals. | 3.00 | (2-4) |
| 4. Were readily available to advise me. | 3.33 | (2-4) |
| 5. Modeled a variety of instructional approaches. | 2.67 | (2-4) |
| 6. Discussed current research/activities in the field of teaching. | 3.00 | (2-4) |
| 7. Provided intellectually stimulating classes. | 3.00 | (2-4) |
| 8. Prepared carefully for classes. | 3.00 | (2-4) |
| 9. Provided opportunities for learning outside the classroom. | 3.00 | (2-4) |
| 10. Prepared me well for a teaching career. | 3.00 | (2-4) |
| 11. Integrated learning about different cultural and ethnic groups within their classes. | 2.33 | (2-3) |
| 12. Insured that library resources were current and sufficient. | 2.67 | (2-3) |

* As shown on the Table above, on a survey measuring satisfaction with elements of the MS SPED program, nine (9) of the twelve (12) items had a mean rating of 3, with three (3) items having mean ratings of 2.3 and 2.67
* Range of responses included ten items with a range of 2-4 and two items with a range of 2-3

**092 Certificate in Intermediate Administration and Supervision 2020 Completers**

**Advanced Programs Alumni Survey: 092 Certificate in Intermediate Administration and Supervision 2020 Completers**

* As displayed by the two Tables below (Table 6 and 7) EPP Completers reported high levels of satisfaction with their Preparation in the 092 Certificate in Intermediate Administration and Supervision.

**Table 6 CAEP** **Advanced Programs Alumni Survey: 092 Certificate in Intermediate Administration and Supervision 2020 Completers**

| **2020 Content Indicator N= 5** | **Mean** | **Range** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. The 092 program prepared me to undertake the duties and responsibilities of an instructional leader. | 3.60 | (3-4) |
| 2. The 092 program prepared me to lead and motivate others. | 3.40 | (3-4) |
| 3. The 092 program prepared me to work collaboratively with teachers and other administrators. | 4.00 | (4) |
| 4. The 092 program prepared me to communicate effectively with students, parents/guardians. | 4.00 | (4) |
| 5. The 092 program prepared me to communicate effectively with community stakeholders. | 4.00 | (4) |
| 6. The 092 program prepared me to give effective instructional feedback to teachers. | 3.60 | (3-4) |
| 7. The 092 program prepared me to plan, develop, and adjust services to meet the needs of diverse learners. | 3.60 | (3-4) |
| 8. The 092 program prepared me to utilize relevant technologies. | 3.00 | (2-4) |
| 9. The 092 program prepared me to manage, interpret and use data for school improvement. | 3.40 | (3-4) |
| 10. The 092 program prepared me in the areas of professional, state and institutional standard and ethics. | 3.80 | (3-4) |
| 11. The 092 program prepared me in the areas of problem-solving and decision-making. | 3.80 | (3-4) |
| 12. The 092 program prepared me for state licensure examinations. | 3.80 | (3-4) |

* 2020 EPP 092 Program Completers reported positive levels of satisfaction with all aspects of the preparation they received as evidenced by means of three (3) and above on all items measured, and 3.50 to 4 on sixteen (16) of the nineteen (19) survey items, on a scale of 1-4, with a score of 4 indicating *Well Above Satisfactory, and 3 indicating Slightly above Satisfactory*.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 7** **2020 Graduate (Alumni) Survey Focus… N=5** | **Mean** | **Range** |
| 1. The WCSU 092 Program Faculty: Faculty in the 092 program provided topics related to instructional leadership. | 3.60 | (3-4) |
| 2. The WCSU 092 Program Faculty: Faculty in the 092 program were fully prepared for seminars or classes. | 3.60.00 | (3-4) |
| 3. The WCSU 092 Program Faculty: Faculty in the 092 program presented material that was current and relevant. | 3.60.00 | (3-4) |
| 4. The WCSU 092 Program Faculty: Faculty in the 092 program served as positive mentors. | 4.00 | (4) |
| 5. The WCSU 092 Program Faculty: Faculty in the 092 program were receptive to new ideas and ways of doing things. | 3.80 | (3-4) |
| 6. The WCSU 092 Program Faculty: Faculty in the 092 program provided useful feedback on performance. | 4.00 | (4) |
| 7. The WCSU 092 Program Faculty: Faculty in the 092 program were accessible to students. | 4.00 | (4) |

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

**Strengths**

* Analysis indicates that 2020 program completers in MSED Special Education and the 092 Certification for Intermediate Administration and Supervision rated the majority of indicators at 2.0 or above.
* The highest rated indicators across performance indicators were ‘integrate appropriate professional and educational standards, encourage and motivate all students to learn’, ‘grown professionally through reflection’, and demonstrate appropriate professional and ethical behavior’.

**Areas of Improvement**

* The lowest rated indicators across performance indicators were ‘integrate technology in instruction, use individual, small group and large group instructional arrangements, appropriately apply effective classroom management practices’, and ‘develop online learning expectations for students’.
* A focus group of MSED program completers will be held to delve into the findings of the MSED in Literacy and Language Arts program. One completer responded to the survey with all zeros and the other completer rated the program positively. It is not certain if the zeros entered by the one completer were in error.

**Action Plan** **for the Overall Programs based on the Aggregate Data**

**Areas of Improvement**

* Continue to monitor program completer data on developing online learning expectations for 2021 cohort.
* Monitor the implementation of the technology integration module beginning in fall 2021for the MSED programs.

# **2019-2020 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**

Due to COVID-19, CSDE did not provide the EPP with TEAM data for 2020 program completers. Therefore, the EPP has provided the Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) data for 2020 program completers. The STEI is the SEED teacher evaluation instrument used in Connecticut.

**Table** **8**

**Elementary Education** **(1-6) Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators Disaggregated by Evaluator: Spring 2020**

*Full Elementary (1-6) STEI Data may be viewed at Exhibit 1.3.d Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Data Analysis (p.4-19)*

| **Elementary Education (1-6)**  **Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators**  **Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor**  **Spring 2020** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Domain** | **Element** | **Competency** | **Elementary Education (1-6) Key Indicators** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **University Supervisor**  **(n=19)** | | | | | | | **Mentor**  **(n=12)** | | | | | | |
| Below Standard (Indicator Not Met) - 1 | Developing (Indicator Partially Met) - 2 | Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3 | Exemplary (Indicator Fully Met)\* - 4 | N/A | Mean | Standard Deviation | Below Standard (Indicator Not Met) - 1 | Developing (Indicator Partially Met) - 2 | Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3 | Exemplary (Indicator Fully Met)\* - 4 | N/A | Mean | Standard Deviation |
| **2. Planning for Active Learning** | **[2a.1]** | **Content of lesson plan is aligned with standards** | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 3.42 | 0.49 |
| **[2a.2]** | **Content of lesson appropriate to sequence of lessons and appropriate level of challenge** | 0 | 0 | 18 | 1 | 0 | 3.05 | 0.22 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 3.33 | 0.47 |
| **3. Instruction for Active Learning** | **[3a.2]** | **Content accuracy** | 0 | 4 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 2.89 | 0.55 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 3.33 | 0.62 |
| **[3a.3]** | **Content progression and level of challenge** | 0 | 1 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 2.95 | 0.22 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 3.17 | 0.69 |
| **Frequencies** | | | **0** | **5** | **68** | **3** | **0** |  |  | **0** | **3** | **27** | **18** | **0** |  |  |
| ***Percentage of Competencies Scored***  ***Below Standard*** | | | **0.00%** | | | | | | | **0.00%** | | | | | | |
| ***Percentage of Competencies Scored***  ***Developing*** | | | **6.58%** | | | | | | | **6.25%** | | | | | | |
| ***Percentage of Competencies Scored***  ***Proficient*** | | | **89.47%** | | | | | | | **56.25%** | | | | | | |
| ***Percentage of Competencies Scored***  ***Exemplary*** | | | **3.95%** | | | | | | | **37.50%** | | | | | | |
| ***Spring 2019 Mean*** | | | **2.97** | | | | | | | **3.31** | | | | | | |
| **Overall Candidate Performance: University Supervisor and Mentor Elementary Education Key Indicators - Spring 2020**  **Percentage Passing (Developing, Proficient, and Exemplary) = 100%**  **Overall Elementary 2020 Mean = 3.10** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

**Table 9**

**Secondary Education (7-12) Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators Disaggregated by Evaluator: Spring 2020**

*Full Secondary (7-12) STEI Data may be viewed at Exhibit 1.3.d Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Data Analysis (p.20-90)*

*The Master of Arts in Teaching Program (MAT) placed candidates in Student Teaching in Spring 2020.*

| **Secondary Education**  **Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators**  **Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor**  **Spring 2020** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Domain** | **Element** | **Competency** | **Secondary Education Key Indicators by Program** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **University Supervisor** | | | | | | | **Mentor** | | | | | | |
| Below Standard (Indicator Not Met) - 1 | Developing (Indicator Partially Met) - 2 | Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3 | Exemplary (Indicator Fully Met)\* - 4 | N/A | Mean | Standard Deviation | Below Standard (Indicator Not Met) - 1 | Developing (Indicator Partially Met) - 2 | Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3 | Exemplary (Indicator Fully Met)\* - 4 | N/A | Mean | Standard Deviation |
| **2. Planning for Active Learning** | **[2a.1]** | **Content of lesson plan is aligned with standards** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Biology** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **English** | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| **Mathematics** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Social Studies** | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| **World Languages, Spanish** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **MAT English** | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| **MAT Math** | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| **[2a.1] Totals** | **0** | **0** | **4** | **1** | **0** |  |  | **0** | **0** | **4** | **0** | **0** |  |  |
| **[2a.2]** | **Content of lesson appropriate to sequence of lessons and appropriate level of challenge** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Biology** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **English** | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| **Mathematics** | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Social Studies** | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| **World Languages, Spanish** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **MAT English** | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| **MAT Math** | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| **[2a.2] Totals** | **0** | **0** | **5** | **0** | **0** |  |  | **0** | **0** | **4** | **0** | **0** |  |  |
| **3. Instruction for Active Learning** | **[3a.2]** | **Content accuracy** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Biology** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **English** | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| **Mathematics** | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Social Studies** | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| **World Languages, Spanish** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **MAT English** | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| **MAT Math** | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| **[3a.2] Totals** | **0** | **0** | **5** | **0** | **0** |  |  | **0** | **0** | **3** | **1** | **0** |  |  |
| **[3a.3]** | **Content progression and level of challenge** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Biology** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **English** | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
|  | **Mathematics** | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | **Social Studies** | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
|  | **World Languages, Spanish** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **MAT English** | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
|  | **MAT Math** | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
|  | **[3a.3] Totals** | **0** | **0** | **5** | **0** | **0** |  |  | **0** | **0** | **4** | **0** | **0** |  |  |
| **Frequencies** | | | **0** | **0** | **15** | **1** | **0** |  |  | **0** | **0** | **11** | **1** | **0** |  |  |
| ***Percentage of Competencies Scored***  ***Below Standard*** | | | **0.00%** | | | | | | | **0.00%** | | | | | | |
| ***Percentage of Competencies Scored***  ***Developing*** | | | **0.00%** | | | | | | | **0.00%** | | | | | | |
| ***Percentage of Competencies Scored***  ***Proficient*** | | | **93.75%** | | | | | | | **91.67%** | | | | | | |
| ***Percentage of Competencies Scored***  ***Exemplary*** | | | **6.25%** | | | | | | | **8.33%** | | | | | | |
| ***Spring 2020 Mean*** | | | **3.06** | | | | | | | **3.08** | | | | | | |
| **Overall Candidate Performance: University Supervisor and Mentor Secondary Education (7-12) Key Indicators - Fall 2020**  **Percentage Passing (Developing, Proficient, and Exemplary) = 100%**  **Overall Secondary 2020 Mean = 3.07** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

**Health Education (PK-12) Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators Disaggregated by Evaluator: Spring 2020**

*Full Health Education STEI Data may be viewed at Exhibit 1.3.d Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Data Analysis (p.91-106)*

| **Table 10 Health Education (PK-12)**  **Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators**  **Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor**  **Spring 2020** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Domain** | **Element** | **Competency** | **Health Education (PK-12) Key Indicators** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **University Supervisor**  **(n=19)** | | | | | | | **Mentor**  **(n=12)** | | | | | | |
| Below Standard (Indicator Not Met) - 1 | Developing (Indicator Partially Met) - 2 | Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3 | Exemplary (Indicator Fully Met)\* - 4 | N/A | Mean | Standard Deviation | Below Standard (Indicator Not Met) - 1 | Developing (Indicator Partially Met) - 2 | Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3 | Exemplary (Indicator Fully Met)\* - 4 | N/A | Mean | Standard Deviation |
| **2. Planning for Active Learning** | **[2a.1]** | **Content of lesson plan is aligned with standards** | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 3.42 | 0.49 |
| **[2a.2]** | **Content of lesson appropriate to sequence of lessons and appropriate level of challenge** | 0 | 0 | 18 | 1 | 0 | 3.05 | 0.22 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 3.33 | 0.47 |
| **3. Instruction for Active Learning** | **[3a.2]** | **Content accuracy** | 0 | 4 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 2.89 | 0.55 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 3.33 | 0.62 |
| **[3a.3]** | **Content progression and level of challenge** | 0 | 1 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 2.95 | 0.22 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 3.17 | 0.69 |
| **Frequencies** | | | **0** | **5** | **68** | **3** | **0** |  |  | **0** | **3** | **27** | **18** | **0** |  |  |
| ***Percentage of Competencies Scored***  ***Below Standard*** | | | **0.00%** | | | | | | | **0.00%** | | | | | | |
| ***Percentage of Competencies Scored***  ***Developing*** | | | **6.58%** | | | | | | | **6.25%** | | | | | | |
| ***Percentage of Competencies Scored***  ***Proficient*** | | | **89.47%** | | | | | | | **56.25%** | | | | | | |
| ***Percentage of Competencies Scored***  ***Exemplary*** | | | **3.95%** | | | | | | | **37.50%** | | | | | | |
| ***Spring 2019 Mean*** | | | **2.97** | | | | | | | **3.31** | | | | | | |
| **Overall Candidate Performance: University Supervisor and Mentor Health Education (PK-12) Key Indicators - Spring 2020**  **Percentage Passing (Developing, Proficient, and Exemplary) = 100%**  **Overall Health Education 2020 Mean = 3.10** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

# **2019-2020 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. There was a total of 30 initial program completers, however only eleven responded with employment information. Five of the eight Elementary Education employers responded to the survey for a 62% return rate.One of the two Secondary Education employers responded to the survey for a 50% return rate. The health education completers were only in substitute teaching positions and therefore the survey was not sent to their employers. A focus group was held to supplement the findings and is reported in the Appendix.

**Table 11** **CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey 2021: Elementary Education (5 responders)**

| **WCSU Employer Survey** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Academic Year** | **Content Indicator** | **Mean** | **Range** |
| 2019-2020 | 1.Integrates appropriate standards into instruction | 3.0 | (3) |
| 2. Adapts instruction to diverse students and differences in learning. | 3.0 | (3) |
| 3. Facilitates critical thinking, problem solving and /or other higher-level thinking | 2.8 | (2-3) |
| 4. Motivates students to learn | 3.0 | (3) |
| 5. Communicates well with students. | 3.0 | (3) |
| 6. Effectively applies classroom management practices | 2.8 | (2-3) |
| 7. Interacts well with parents and community members | 2.8 | (2-3) |
| 8. Assesses student learning | 3.0 | (3) |
| 9. Engages in reflective thinking during the entire instructional cycle | 3.0 | (3) |
| 10. Collaborates well with peers | 3.0 | (3) |
| 11. Creates effective learning environments | 2.8 | (2-3) |
| 12. Behaves in accordance with professional ethics | 3.0 | (3) |
| 13. Effectively integrates technology into their instruction | 3.0 | (3) |

**Table 12 CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey 2021: Secondary Education (1 respondent)**

| **WCSU Employer Survey** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Academic Year** | **Content Indicator** | **Mean** | **Range** |
| 2019-2020 | 1.Integrates appropriate standards into instruction | 3.0 | (3) |
| 2. Adapts instruction to diverse students and differences in learning. | 3.0 | (3) |
| 3. Facilitates critical thinking, problem solving and /or other higher-level thinking | 2.0 | (2) |
| 4. Motivates students to learn | 3.0 | (3) |
| 5. Communicates well with students. | 3.0 | (3) |
| 6. Effectively applies classroom management practices | 3.0 | (3) |
| 7. Interacts well with parents and community members | 2.0 | (2) |
| 8. Assesses student learning | 2.0 | (2) |
| 9. Engages in reflective thinking during the entire instructional cycle | 3.0 | (3) |
| 10. Collaborates well with peers | 3.0 | (3) |
| 11. Creates effective learning environments | 3.0 | (3) |
| 12. Behaves in accordance with professional ethics | 3.0 | (3) |
| 13. Effectively integrates technology into their instruction | 3.0 | (3) |

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

**Strengths**

* Ratings were higher across the majority of indicators for both Elementary and Secondary Education program completers compared to last year’s results.
* Employers consistently rating the following indicators at 2.5 or higher; classroom management practices and creates effective learning environments.
* The following indicators rated at 3.0; integrates appropriate standards in instruction, adapts instruction for diverse students and differences in learning, behaves in accordance with professional ethics, and effectively integrates technology into instruction.
* All survey items across both candidates were rated at satisfactory and above.

**Areas of Improvement**

* Low rate of return for Secondary Education program completers makes it difficult to discern patterns.

**Advanced Programs Employer Survey**

The EPP monitors employer feedback through a survey that is sent electronically every January. The survey was sent to employers of the completers in the first cohort of MSED in Special Education and the MSED in Literacy and Language Arts programs. Employers of the five 092 Intermediate and Administration Certification completers who provided district information were also sent the survey. CAEP Advanced Programs Employer Survey 2021 was sent to 8 employers of the 2020 program completers and only one employer responded regarding the 092 Intermediate Administration and Supervision completer for a return rate of 20%. The EPP followed up to improve the response, however the data did not change. A focus group interview was held to supplement the findings due to the low return rate. The minutes of this interview are reported in the Appendix.

**Table 13 CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey 2021**

| **CAEP Advanced Programs Employer Survey**  **2021** | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Academic Year** | **Content Indicator** | **Mean** |
| 2019-2020 | 1. Is able to develop, articulate, implement, and steward a vision characterized by respect for students, their families, and community stakeholders. | 4.0 |
| 2. Is able to plan for appropriate curriculum and instruction at the school and/or district level. | 4.0 |
| 3. Is able to monitor curriculum and instruction at the school and/or district level. | 4.0 |
| 4. Is able to manage school and/or district-based operations. | 2.0 |
| 5. Is able to manage school and/or district-based resources and budgets. | 2.0 |
| 6. Is able to manage, interpret and use data for school improvement. | 2.0 |
| 7. Is able to manage building and/or district scheduling. | 2.0 |
| 8. Collaborates effectively with faculty, parents, and community members. | 4.0 |
| 9. Acts ethically demonstrating integrity and fairness. | 4.0 |
| 10. Is able to use problem-solving to formulate sound strategies to deal with educational dilemmas. | 4.0 |
| 11. Is able to advocate for the diverse needs of students, parents, and faculty. | 4.0 |
| 12. Is able to create a school climate and culture that facilitates the growth and development of all students. | 4.0 |
| **Overall Mean=3.33** | | |

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

**\***The analysis is limited due to the small sample size, however patterns are consistent with previous cohorts.

**Strengths**

* Employer consistently rated indicators satisfactory or higher.
* The following indicators were rated at 4.0; developing and implementing a vision, planning and monitoring curriculum, collaborating effectively with stakeholders, acts ethically, advocates for diverse needs, and creates a school climate to facilitate growth.

**Areas of Improvement**

* Employer rated the following indicators at the satisfactory level however they were slightly lower rated than other indicators: budgeting, scheduling, and managing building/district operations.

# **2019-2020 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 2021 survey polled AY 2019-2020 program completers in initial and advanced programs.

## **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 2021 CAEP Initial Programs Completers Survey was sent to 2019-2020 program completers(N=30). The survey was sent to 20 Elementary Education program completers and ten responded for a return rate of 50%. The 2020 Secondary Education alumni survey was sent to 5 program completers and 2 responded for a 40% return rate. The survey was sent to the five 2020 Health Education program completers and two responded for a 40% 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 14. CAEP Initial Programs Completer Survey 2020**

**CAEP Initial Programs Alumni Survey: Elementary Education 2020 Program Completers**

| **Academic Year** | **Content Indicator** | **Mean** | **Range** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2020  ELEM ED | 1. Integrate appropriate professional and educational standards. | 3.0 | (2-3) |
| 2. Identify and adapt instruction to diverse student learners. | 2.5 | (1-3) |
| 3. Adapt instruction to diverse student learning. | 2.5 | (1-3) |
| 4. Facilitate student critical thinking, problem solving and  higher order  thinking skills. | 2.5 | (1-3) |
| 5. Encourage and motivate all student to learn. | 2.50 | (2-3) |
| 6. Create effective learning environments. | 2.50 | (2-3) |
| 7. Integrate technology into classroom instruction. | 2.50 | (2-3) |
| 8. Effectively communicate with students through both oral and written modes. | 2.50 | (2-3) |
| 9. Grow professionally through reflection. | 2.50 | (2-3) |
| 10. Appropriately apply effective classroom management practices. | 2.0 | (1-3) |
| 11. Effectively interact with students, teachers, parent, and community members. | 2.50 | (2-3) |
| 12. Understand human development as it relates to the teaching-learning process. | 2.50 | (2-3) |
| 13. Demonstrate appropriate ethical and professional behavior. | 2.50 | (2-3) |
| 14. Develop Sensitivity and Respect for the needs and feelings of all students. | 2.50 | (2-3) |
| 15. Recognize both how the organization of the district and school can affect the individual teacher. | 2.50 | (2-3) |
| 16. Develop classroom and school leadership. | 2.50 | (2-3) |
| 17. Develop a positive disposition toward students. | 2.50 | (2-3) |
| 18. Collaborate with peers and coordinate instruction with special education teachers. | 2.50 | (1-3) |
| 19.Develop quality instructional units. | 2.0 | (1-3) |
| 20. Appropriately select and use a wide variety of instructional strategies, resource materials, and media. | 2.0 | (1-3) |
| 21. Implement, interpret and use student performance assessments for effective instruction. | 2.50 | (2-3) |
| 22. Use individual, small group and large group instructional arrangements. | 1.90 | (1-3) |
| 23. Develop online learning expectations for students. | 2.0 | (1-3) |

**CAEP Initial Programs Alumni Survey Secondary Education 2020 Program Completers**

| **Academic Year** | **Content Indicator** | **Mean** | **Range** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2020 SEC ED | 1. Integrate appropriate professional and educational standards. | 2.50 | (2-3) |
| 2. Identify and adapt instruction to diverse student learners. | 1.50 | (1-2) |
| 3. Adapt instruction to diverse student learning. | 1.50 | (1-2) |
| 4. Facilitate student critical thinking, problem solving and  higher order  thinking skills. | 2.50 | (2-3) |
| 5. Encourage and motivate all student to learn. | 2.50 | (2-3) |
| 6. Create effective learning environments. | 2.50 | (2-3) |
| 7. Integrate technology into classroom instruction. | 1.50 | (1-2) |
| 8. Effectively communicate with students through both oral and written modes. | 2.50 | (2-3) |
| 9. Grow professionally through reflection. | 2.50 | (2-3) |
| 10. Appropriately apply effective classroom management practices. | 2.50 | (2-3) |
| 11. Effectively interact with students, teachers, parent, and community members. | 1.50 | (2-3) |
| 12. Understand human development as it relates to the teaching-learning process. | 2.00 | (1-3) |
| 13. Demonstrate appropriate ethical and professional behavior. | 2.00 | (1-3) |
| 14. Develop Sensitivity and Respect for the needs and feelings of all students. | 1.50 | (1-2) |
| 15. Recognize both how the organization of the district and school can affect the individual teacher. | .50 | (0-1) |
| 16. Develop classroom and school leadership. | 2.00 | (2) |
| 17. Develop a positive disposition toward students. | 2.50 | (2-3) |
| 18. Collaborate with peers and coordinate instruction with special education teachers. | 1.00 | (0-2) |
| 19.Develop quality instructional units. | 2.00 | (2) |
| 20. Appropriately select and use a wide variety of instructional strategies, resource materials, and media. | 1.50 | (1-2) |
| 21. Implement, interpret and use student performance assessments for effective instruction. | 1.50 | (1-2) |
| 22. Use individual, small group and large group instructional arrangements. | 2.50 | (2-3) |
| 23. Develop online learning expectations for students. | 1.50 | (1-2) |

**CAEP Initial Programs Alumni Survey: Health Education 2020 Program Completers**

| **Academic Year** | **Content Indicator** | **Mean** | **Range** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2020 | 1. Integrate appropriate professional and educational standards. | 2.50 | (2-3) |
| 2. Identify and adapt instruction to diverse student learners. | 2.50 | (2-3) |
| 3. Adapt instruction to diverse student learning. | 3.00 | (3) |
| 4. Facilitate student critical thinking, problem solving and  higher order  thinking skills. | 2.50 | (2-3) |
| 5. Encourage and motivate all student to learn. | 2.50 | (2-3) |
| 6. Create effective learning environments. | 3.00 | (3) |
| 7. Integrate technology into classroom instruction. | 3.00 | (3) |
| 8. Effectively communicate with students through both oral and written modes. | 3.00 | (3) |
| 9. Grow professionally through reflection. | 2.50 | (2-3) |
| 10. Appropriately apply effective classroom management practices. | 2.50 | (2-3) |
| 11. Effectively interact with students, teachers, parent, and community members. | 2.50 | (2-3) |
| 12. Understand human development as it relates to the teaching-learning process. | 3.00 | (3) |
| 13. Demonstrate appropriate ethical and professional behavior. | 3.00 | (3) |
| 14. Develop Sensitivity and Respect for the needs and feelings of all students. | 3.00 | (3) |
| 15. Recognize both how the organization of the district and school can affect the individual teacher. | 3.00 | (3) |
| 16. Develop classroom and school leadership. | 2.50 | (2-3) |
| 17. Develop a positive disposition toward students. | 3.00 | (3) |
| 18. Collaborate with peers and coordinate instruction with special education teachers. | 2.50 | (2-3) |
| 19.Develop quality instructional units. | 2.50 | (2-3) |
| 20. Appropriately select and use a wide variety of instructional strategies, resource materials, and media. | 1.00 | (0-1) |
| 21. Implement, interpret and use student performance assessments for effective instruction. | 2.50 | (2-3) |
| 22. Use individual, small group and large group instructional arrangements. | 2.50 | (2-3) |
| 23. Develop online learning expectations for students. | 2.00 | (1-3) |

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

**Strengths**

* Analysis indicates that 2020 program completers rated the majority of indicators at 2.0 or above.
* The highest rated indicators across performance indicators were ‘integrate appropriate professional and educational standards, encourage and motivate all students to learn’, ‘grown professionally through reflection’, and demonstrate appropriate professional and ethical behavior’.

**Areas of Improvement**

* The lowest rated indicators across performance indicators were ‘integrate technology in instruction, use individual, small group and large group instructional arrangements, appropriately apply effective classroom management practices’, and ‘develop online learning expectations for students’.

**Action Plan** **for the Overall Programs based on the Aggregate Data** **Areas of Improvement**

* Continue to monitor program completer data on developing online learning expectations for 2021 cohort.
* Monitor the implementation of the technology integration module beginning in summer 2021.

### **CAEP Advanced Programs Completer Survey 2021**

The 2021 CAEP Advanced Programs Completers Survey was sent to 2020 program completers(N=18). The survey was sent to 4 MSED Literacy and Language Arts program completers and three responded for a return rate of 75%. The 2020 MSED Special Education alumni survey was sent to the 8 program completers and 3 responded for a 38% return rate. The survey was sent to the six 2020 092 Certificate in Intermediate Administration and Supervision completers and five responded for an 83% return rate.

**Table 15 CAEP Advanced Programs Alumni Survey: MSED in Literacy and Language Arts 2020 Program Completers**

| **Academic Year** | **Content Indicator** | **Mean** | **Range** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2020  MSED LIT | 1. Integrate appropriate professional and educational standards. | 2.33 | (0-4) |
| 2. Identify and adapt instruction to diverse student learners. | 2.33 | (0-4) |
| 3. Adapt instruction to diverse student learning. | 2.33 | (0-4) |
| 4. Facilitate student critical thinking, problem solving and  higher order  thinking skills. | 1.67 | (0-3) |
| 5. Encourage and motivate all student to learn. | 2.67 | (0-4) |
| 6. Create effective learning environments. | 2.33 | (0-4) |
| 7. Integrate technology into classroom instruction. | 2.67 | (0-4) |
| 8. Effectively communicate with students through both oral and written modes. | 2.00 | (0-3) |
| 9. Grow professionally through reflection. | 2.67 | (0-4) |
| 10. Appropriately apply effective classroom management practices. | .67 | (0-1) |
| 11. Effectively interact with students, teachers, parent, and community members. | 2.00 | (0-4) |
| 12. Understand human development as it relates to the teaching-learning process. | 2.00 | (0-4) |
| 13. Demonstrate appropriate ethical and professional behavior. | 2.67 | (0-4) |
| 14. Develop Sensitivity and Respect for the needs and feelings of all students. | 2.33 | (0-3) |
| 15. Recognize both how the organization of the district and school can affect the individual teacher. | 1.33 | (0-4) |
| 16. Develop classroom and school leadership. | 1.00 | (0-3) |
| 17. Develop a positive disposition toward students. | 2.33 | (0-3) |
| 18. Collaborate with peers and coordinate instruction with special education teachers. | 1.67 | (0-3) |
| 19.Develop quality instructional units. | 2.0 | (0-4) |
| 20. Appropriately select and use a wide variety of instructional strategies, resource materials, and media. | 2.33 | (0-4) |
| 21. Implement, interpret and use student performance assessments for effective instruction. | 1.67 | (0-3) |
| 22. Use individual, small group and large group instructional arrangements. | 2.00 | (0-3) |
| 23. Develop online learning expectations for students. | 1.33 | (0-3) |

**Table 16 CAEP Advanced Programs Alumni Survey: MSED Special Education 2020 Program Completers**

| **Academic Year** | **Content Indicator** | **Mean** | **Range** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2020 MSED SPED | 1. Integrate appropriate professional and educational standards. | 3.00 | (2-4) |
| 2. Identify and adapt instruction to diverse student learners. | 3.00 | (2-4) |
| 3. Adapt instruction to diverse student learning. | 3.00 | (2-4) |
| 4. Facilitate student critical thinking, problem solving and  higher order  thinking skills. | 3.00 | (2-4) |
| 5. Encourage and motivate all student to learn. | 3.00 | (2-4) |
| 6. Create effective learning environments. | 3.00 | (2-4) |
| 7. Integrate technology into classroom instruction. | 2.33 | (2-3) |
| 8. Effectively communicate with students through both oral and written modes. | 3.00 | (2-4) |
| 9. Grow professionally through reflection. | 3.33 | (2-4) |
| 10. Appropriately apply effective classroom management practices. | 2.33 | (2-3) |
| 11. Effectively interact with students, teachers, parent, and community members. | 2.33 | (2-3) |
| 12. Understand human development as it relates to the teaching-learning process. | 2.67 | (2-3) |
| 13. Demonstrate appropriate ethical and professional behavior. | 3.00 | (2-4) |
| 14. Develop Sensitivity and Respect for the needs and feelings of all students. | 3.00 | (2-4) |
| 15. Recognize both how the organization of the district and school can affect the individual teacher. | 3.00 | (2-4) |
| 16. Develop classroom and school leadership. | 3.00 | (2-4) |
| 17. Develop a positive disposition toward students. | 3.33 | (2-4) |
| 18. Collaborate with peers and coordinate instruction with special education teachers. | 3.00 | (2-4) |
| 19.Develop quality instructional units. | 2.00 | (2) |
| 20. Appropriately select and use a wide variety of instructional strategies, resource materials, and media. | 2.33 | (2-3) |
| 21. Implement, interpret and use student performance assessments for effective instruction. | 2.33 | (2-3) |
| 22. Use individual, small group and large group instructional arrangements. | 2.33 | (2-3) |
| 23. Develop online learning expectations for students. | 2.33 | (2-4) |

**Table 17 CAEP Advanced Programs Alumni Survey: 092 Intermediate Administration and Supervision 2020 Completers**

| **Academic Year** | **Content Indicator** | **Mean** | **Range** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2020 | 1. The 092 program prepared me to undertake the duties and responsibilities of an instructional leader. | 4.00 | (3-4) |
| 2. The 092 program prepared me to lead and motivate others. | 3.50 | (3-4) |
| 3. The 092 program prepared me to work collaboratively with teachers and other administrators. | 4.00 | (4) |
| 4. The 092 program prepared me to communicate effectively with students, parents/guardians. | 4.00 | (4) |
| 5. The 092 program prepared me to communicate effectively with community stakeholders. | 4.00 | (4) |
| 6. The 092 program prepared me to give effective instructional feedback to teachers. | 4.00 | (3-4) |
| 7. The 092 program prepared me to plan, develop, and adjust services to meet the needs of diverse learners. | 4.00 | (3-4) |
| 8. The 092 program prepared me to utilize relevant technologies. | 3.50 | (2-4) |
| 9. The 092 program prepared me to manage, interpret and use data for school improvement. | 3.50 | (3-4) |
| 10. The 092 program prepared me in the areas of professional, state and institutional standard and ethics. | 3.50 | (3-4) |
| 11. The 092 program prepared me in the areas of problem-solving and decision-making. | 3.50 | (3-4) |
| 12. The 092 program prepared me for state licensure examinations. | 3.50 | (3-4) |
|

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

**Strengths**

* Analysis indicates that 2020 program completers in MSED Special Education and the 092 Certification for Intermediate Administration and Supervision rated the majority of indicators at 2.0 or above.
* The highest rated indicators across performance indicators were ‘integrate appropriate professional and educational standards, encourage and motivate all students to learn’, ‘grown professionally through reflection’, and demonstrate appropriate professional and ethical behavior’.

**Areas of Improvement**

* The lowest rated indicators across performance indicators were ‘integrate technology in instruction, use individual, small group and large group instructional arrangements, appropriately apply effective classroom management practices’, and ‘develop online learning expectations for students’.
* A focus group of MSED program completers will be held to delve into the findings of the MSED in Literacy and Language Arts program. One completer responded to the survey with all zeros and the other completer rated the program positively. It is not certain if the zeros entered by the one completer were in error.

**Action Plan** **for the Overall Programs based on the Aggregate Data**

* Continue to monitor program completer data on developing online learning expectations for 2021 cohort.
* Monitor the implementation of the technology integration module beginning in fall 2021for the MSED programs.

**CAEP Annual Performance Measures AY 2019-2020**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CAEP Annual Performance Measure** | **Results** |
| Graduation Rates | Initial Program Graduation Rate: 63% |
| Advanced Program Graduation Rate:  MSED Literacy & Language Arts: 100%  MSED Special Education: 88%  092 Program: 100% |
| Ability of Completers to Meet Licensing Requirements | Elementary Education: 85%  Secondary Education: 75%  Health Education: 100%  MAT Program: 100% |
| **Advanced Programs:**  092 Program Completers: 100%  MSED Literacy and Language Arts: No completers took the licensing exam  MSED Special Education: Three completers took the licensing exam and all passed. |
| Ability of Completers to be Hired in Education Positions for which They were Prepared | Elementary Education: 80%  Secondary Education: 75%  MAT Program: 50%  Health Education:40% |
| **Advanced Programs:**  092 Program Completers: Two completers pursued a leadership position and was hired. The 092 certification option is embedded within the doctoral program and the majority of candidates wait until completion of the dissertation to pursue leadership positions.  MSED Literacy and Language Arts: No completers took the licensing exam  MSED Special Education: 75% of the completers who took the exam are working in special education. |
| University Student Loan Default Rate | 6.4% |

# **Analysis of 2021 CAEP Eight Annual Reporting Measures**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure of Completer Impact** | **Analysis of Trends** | **Comparisons with Benchmarks** | **Source** |
| **I. Impact on P-12 Learning and Development** | | | |
| 2017-2020 edTPA (Scale 2013) | Due to COVID, CSDE did not require candidates to submit to Pearson. The EPP did a locally scored portfolio in fall 2019 for the spring 2020 completers. Analysis indicates that the majority of program completers had a positive impact on P-12 learning and development. 69% of 2020 program completers scored at the Proficient category with 15% at the Exemplary level. The percentage of candidates scoring at the Proficient level was higher than the previous 2019 completer cohort. | The national edTPA norming data provided the benchmarks for this measure. | edTPA (Scale, 2013) |
| **II. Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness** | | | |
| 2020 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 classroom management. | The EPP has not established a benchmark for case studies. | Case Study reflective prompts, and focus groups. |
| **III. Satisfaction of Employers and Employment Milestones** | | | |
| CAEP WCSU Employers Survey (2020 Completers) | Initial Programs Employer Survey: There was a total of 30 initial program completers, however only eleven responded with employment information. Five of the eight Elementary Education employers responded to the survey for a 62% return rate.One of the two Secondary Education employers responded to the survey for a 50% return rate. The health education completers were only in substitute teaching positions and therefore the survey was not sent to their employers. Ratings were higher across the majority of indicators for both Elementary and Secondary Education program completers compared to last year’s results. Employers consistently rating the following indicators at 2.5 or higher; classroom management practices and creates effective learning environments.  The following indicators rated at 3.0; integrates appropriate standards in instruction, adapts instruction for diverse students and differences in learning, behaves in accordance with professional ethics, and effectively integrates technology into instruction.  Advanced Programs Employer Survey: CAEP Advanced Programs Employer Survey 2021 was sent to 8 employers of the 2020 program completers and only one employer responded regarding the 092 Intermediate Administration and Supervision completer for a return rate of 20%. The EPP followed up to improve the response, however the data did not change. The following indicators were rated at 4.0; developing and implementing a vision, planning and monitoring curriculum, collaborating effectively with stakeholders, acts ethically, advocates for diverse needs, and creates a school climate to facilitate growth. Areas of Improvement were budgeting, scheduling, and managing building/district operations. | The benchmark for the survey was CAEP 20% required response rate. | CAEP WCSU Employer Survey |
| **IV. Satisfaction of Completers** | | | |
| CAEP WCSU Alumni Survey (2020 Completers) | The survey was disaggregated per program for further analysis. Fifty percent of Elementary Education alumni returned the survey with 40% of Secondary and Health Education completers responding. Analysis indicates that 2020 program completers rated the majority of indicators at 2.0 or above.  The highest rated indicators across performance indicators were ‘integrate appropriate professional and educational standards, encourage and motivate all students to learn’, ‘grown professionally through reflection’, and demonstrate appropriate professional and ethical behavior’.  The first completer cohort of the MSED in Literacy and Language Arts had a 75% return rate with 38% of the MSED in Special Education responding. 83% of the 2020 092 completers returned the alumni survey. Analysis indicates that 2020 advanced program completers in MSED Special Education and the 092 Certification for Intermediate Administration and Supervision rated the majority of indicators at 2.0 or above.  The highest rated indicators across performance indicators were ‘integrate appropriate professional and educational standards, encourage and motivate all students to learn’, ‘grown professionally through reflection’, and demonstrate appropriate professional and ethical behavior’. | 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 of candidates are completing the program in four to five years. | The EPP has not established a benchmark yet for this measure. | WCSU IR Graduation Rate Report |
| **VI. Ability of Completers to Meet Licensing Requirements** | | | |
| WCSU Alumni Survey | Alumni were asked to report their place of employment in the survey response. Eighty-five percent of Elementary Education candidates were certified and eligible for employment. 75% of secondary education program completers were certified. All Health Education and MAT Secondary Education program completers obtained certification. | 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 80% of Elementary Education completers are working in public schools. This is an increase result from last year’s rate of 61%. 75% of the secondary education completers are working in public school districts, which is a slight decrease from last year. 40% of Health Education completers are working in the schools and 50% of MAT Secondary Education alumni. | 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 6.4 %, which is a slight decrease from last year. | The EPP has not established a benchmark for this measure. | Report from WCSU Financial Aid and Student Employment Office |

**Appendix: Employer Focus Groups**

**March 18, 2021 BS and MS Ed Employer Focus Group**

**Attendees:** Dr. Sal Pascarella (Danbury School District Superintendent), Kevin Walston (Danbury Asst. Superintendent), Dr. Christine Carver (Bethel School District Superintendent), Dr Patricia Cosentino (New Fairfield School District Superintendent), Dr. Kevin Smith (Wilton School District Superintendent

1. In the past year or two, have you hired any WCSU graduates to teach in your district? If so, how many and for what grade levels/subject areas?

Bethel CT Public School District: Yes, elementary, middle and high school

Danbury CT Public School District: Yes, a lot, and we are actively recruiting WCSU graduates. This was not true years ago.

New Fairfield, CT Public School District: Yes

Wilton CT Public School District: Yes, 2 elementary teachers

1. What do you consider the strengths of these teachers? You might consider areas such as knowledge of subject matter, ability to relate to students, colleagues, supervisors and parents, lesson planning, classroom management skills, and professionalism.

All concur: They are tech savvy and can engage students through technology. They can relate to different kinds of students—diverse students. New Fairfield Superintendent: They are real, authentic people with life experience—don’t always get that from more elite colleges. Bethel Superintendent: The partnerships—fieldwork, internships—give them a good knowledge of the district.

1. What do you consider the weaknesses of these teachers?

Danbury Public School District Asst Superintendent: Not a weakness, really, but think they should have more focus on equity, inclusion and racial justice so they can lead and participate with students and faculty in discussions of these issues—so they are not scared to discuss these things. Katie and I have discussed this issue.

1. Are any of these graduates at risk for nonrenewal of their contracts?

Don’t know. Nobody sticks out. Would have to check with HR.

1. Overall, how would you say the WCSU graduates compare to graduates from other teacher preparation programs?

They are well prepared. As stated above, they are actively recruited.

1. What suggestions for program improvement do you have for us?

Need to explore paid internships like some of the private colleges have. This is a state issue. Dean will look into it.

**March 18, 2021 092 Employer Focus Group**

**Attendees:** Dr. Sal Pascarella (Danbury School District Superintendent), Kevin Walston (Danbury Asst. Superintendent), Dr. Christine Carver (Bethel School District Superintendent), Dr Patricia Cosentino (New Fairfield School District Superintendent), Dr. Kevin Smith (Wilton School District Superintendent

1. In the past year or two, have you hired any WCSU graduates to serve as administrators/educational leaders in your district? If so, how many and for what positions were they hired?

No new hires since last year. All participants mention that they do have WCSU 092 people in their districts. They are in other districts and in New York State, too.

1. What do you consider the strengths of these administrators/educational leaders?

You might consider areas such as the ability to plan and monitor curriculum and instruction; the ability to manage resources, budgets, and scheduling; the ability to interpret and use data for school improvement; the ability to collaborate with colleagues, school personnel, and community stakeholders; the ability to manage crises and solve problems; and the ability to advocate for diverse needs of students, parents and faculty.

Rigorous as any program in Connecticut. 092 candidates exceptionally well prepared. Mursion Simulation and shadowing great for preparation.

1. What do you consider the weaknesses of these administrators/educational leaders?

None.

1. Are any of these administrators/educational leaders at risk for nonrenewal of their contracts?

All of them are doing well.

1. What suggestions for program improvement do you have for us?

None