

# CAEP ANNUAL REPORT: 2022

---

WESTERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY

Kathryn Campbell, Ph.D., CAEP COORDINATOR  
Catherine O'Callaghan, Ph.D., Elementary Education Coordinator

<b>CAEP Accountability Measures AY 2020-2021 .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Measure 1: Initial Completer Effectiveness.....</b>	<b>1</b>
Table 1: Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators Disaggregated by Evaluator: Spring 2021.....	1
Table 2: Secondary Education (7-12) Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators Disaggregated by Evaluator: Spring 2020.....	3
Satisfaction of Employers of AY 2020-2021 Program Completers (Initial Level) .....	10
<i>Descriptions and Procedures</i> .....	10
<i>Results</i> .....	10
Table 3 Results of CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey of AY 2020-2021 completers: Elementary Education (2 responders).....	11
Table 4 Results of CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey of AY 2020-2021 completers: Secondary Education (3 respondents).....	12
Table 5. Results of CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey of AY 2020-2021 completers: M.A.T. Secondary Education (1 respondent).....	13
<b>Measure 2: Satisfaction of Employers and Stakeholder Involvement (Initial &amp; Advanced) .....</b>	<b>14</b>
Satisfaction of Employers of AY 2020-2021 Program Completers (Advanced Level).....	14
<i>Descriptions and Procedures</i> .....	14
<i>Results</i> .....	14
Table 6 CAEP Advanced Programs MSED Literacy & Language Arts Employer Survey 2021 (1 Respondent) .....	15
Analysis (Strengths/Areas for Improvement) for the Overall Programs based on the Aggregate Data.....	16
<i>Strengths</i> .....	16
<i>Areas of Improvement</i> .....	16
CAEP Initial Programs AY 2020-2021 Completer Satisfaction.....	17
<i>Descriptions and Procedures</i> .....	17
<i>Results</i> .....	17
Table 7. CAEP Initial Programs Completer Survey AY 2020-2021 .....	18
Analysis (Strengths/Areas for Improvement) for the Overall Programs based on the Aggregate Data (Initial) .....	22
<i>Strengths</i> .....	22

<i>Areas of Improvement</i> .....	22
<i>Action Plan for the Overall Programs based on the Aggregate Data Areas of Improvement</i> .....	23
CAEP Advanced Programs AY 2020-2021 Completer Satisfaction .....	23
<i>Descriptions and Procedures</i> .....	23
<i>Results</i> .....	23
Table 8 CAEP Advanced Programs Alumni Survey: MSED in Literacy and Language Arts 2021 Program Completers ( 3 Respondents) .....	24
Table 9 CAEP Advanced Programs Alumni Survey: MSED Special Education 2021 Program Completers (2 Respondents) .....	25
Analysis (Strengths/Areas for Improvement) for the Advanced MSED Programs in Literacy and Language Arts and MSED Special Education based on the Aggregate Data .....	27
<i>Strengths</i> .....	27
<i>Areas of Improvement</i> .....	28
<i>Action Plan for the MSED Programs based on the Aggregate Data</i> .....	28
Cohort 2021 Case Study of Initial Completers .....	28
<i>Description</i> .....	28
<i>Methods</i> .....	28
AY 2020-2021 Completers: Analysis of Case Study Findings .....	29
<b>Measure 3: Candidate Competency at Completion (Initial &amp; Advanced)</b> .....	29
2020-2021 (edTPA) .....	29
Table 10. Connecticut edTPA Certifications, Approved Handbooks, and Passing Scores .....	30
Table 11: Summary: Practice edTPA Rubric Score Distribution for Elementary, Secondary Programs by Ethnicity Fall 2020 – Fall 2021 .....	31
Analysis (Strengths/Areas for Improvement) for the Individual Programs based on the edTPA Practice Portfolio Scores .....	32
<i>Overall Performance</i> .....	33
<i>Practice edTPA Component Areas of Strength</i> .....	33
<i>Practice edTPA Portfolio Areas of Improvement</i> .....	34
<i>Practice edTPA Component Areas of Improvement</i> .....	34
Advanced Programs .....	34

Table 12. CAEP Advanced Literacy and Language Arts Program Practicum Evaluation: Summer 2021 .....	34
Table 13 CAEP Advanced MSED Special Education Program Practicum Evaluation: Summer 2021 .....	36
<b>Measure 4: Ability of Completers to be Hired (Initial &amp; Advanced)</b> .....	<b>41</b>
Initial Programs .....	41
Advanced Programs .....	41
CAEP Accountability Measures AY 2020-2021 .....	42
Analysis of AY 2020-2021 CAEP Accountability Measures .....	45
<b>Appendix: Initial Program Focus Group</b> .....	<b>48</b>

**CAEP Accountability Measures AY 2020-2021**

**Measure 1: Initial Completer Effectiveness**

*Due to COVID-19, CSDE did not provide the EPP with TEAM data for 2021 program completers. Therefore, the EPP has provided the Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) data for 2021 program completers. The STEI is the SEED teacher evaluation instrument used in Connecticut. There were no Health Education program completers in 2021.*

- Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI)
- CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey 2021

Table 1: Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators Disaggregated by Evaluator: Spring 2021

Elementary Education (1-6) Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor Spring 2021																
Domain	Element	Competency	Elementary Education (1-6) Key Indicators													
			University Supervisor (n=9)							Mentor (n=9)						
			Below Standard (Indicator Not Met) -	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) -	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	7	2	0	3.22	0.47	0	0	7	2	0	3.22	0.47
	[2a.2]	Content of lesson appropriate to sequence of lessons and	0	0	7	2	0	3.22	0.47	0	0	7	2	0	3.22	0.47

**Elementary Education (1-6)**  
**Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators**  
**Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor**  
**Spring 2021**

Domain	Element	Competency	Elementary Education (1-6) Key Indicators													
			University Supervisor (n=9)							Mentor (n=9)						
			Below Standard (Indicator Not Met) -	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) -	Developing (Indicator Partially Met) - 2	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully Met)* - 4	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation
		appropriate level of challenge														
3. Instruction for Active Learning	[3a.2]	Content accuracy	0	1	4	4	0	3.33	0.67	0	0	4	5	0	3.56	0.50
	[3a.3]	Content progression and level of challenge	0	0	8	1	0	3.11	0.31	0	0	8	1	0	3.11	0.31
<b>Frequencies</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>		
<i>Percentage of Competencies Scored Below Standard</i>			<b>0.00%</b>							<b>0.00%</b>						
<i>Percentage of Competencies Scored Developing</i>			<b>2.07%</b>							<b>0.00%</b>						
<i>Percentage of Competencies Scored Proficient</i>			<b>72.22%</b>							<b>72.22%</b>						

Elementary Education (1-6)													
Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators													
Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor													
Spring 2021													
Domain	Element	Competency	Elementary Education (1-6) Key Indicators										
			University Supervisor (n=9)						Mentor (n=9)				
			Below Standard (Indicator Not Met) -	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) -	Developing (Indicator Partially Met) - 2	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully Met)* - 4
<i>Percentage of Competencies Scored Exemplary</i>			25%						27.77%				
<i>Spring 2021 Mean</i>			3.22						3.27				
<p><b>Overall Candidate Performance: University Supervisor and Mentor Elementary Education Key Indicators - Spring 2021</b></p> <p><b>Percentage Passing (Developing, Proficient, and Exemplary) = 100%</b></p> <p><b>Overall Elementary 2021 Mean = 3.124</b></p>													

Table 2: 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 2021**

Domain	Element	Competency	Secondary Education Key Indicators by Program													
			University Supervisor							Mentor						
			Below Standard (Indicator Not Met)	Developing (Indicator Partially)	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully)	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation	Below Standard (Indicator Not Met)	Developing (Indicator Partially)	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully)	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation
2. Planning for Active Learning	[2a.1]	<b>Content of lesson plan is aligned with standards</b>														
		<b>Biology</b>														
		<b>English</b>	0	0	6	0	0	3	0	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	0
		<b>Mathematics</b>	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.0	0
		<b>Social Studies</b>	0	0	5	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.50	0
		<b>World Languages, Spanish</b>														
		<b>MAT Biology</b>	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0
		<b>MAT English</b>	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	0
		<b>MAT Spanish</b>	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0



**Secondary Education**  
**Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators**  
**Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor**  
**Spring 2021**

Domain	Element	Competency	Secondary Education Key Indicators by Program													
			University Supervisor							Mentor						
			Below Standard (Indicator Not Met)	Developing (Indicator Partially)	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully)	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation	Below Standard (Indicator Not Met)	Developing (Indicator Partially)	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully)	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation
		<b>[2a.1] Totals</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3.27</b>	
	<b>[2a.2]</b>	<b>Content of lesson appropriate to sequence of lessons and appropriate level of challenge</b>														
		<b>Biology</b>														
		<b>English</b>	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	0	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	0
		<b>Mathematics</b>	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.40	0
		<b>Social Studies</b>	0	0	5	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	0
		<b>World Languages, Spanish</b>														
		<b>MAT Biology</b>	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0
		<b>MAT English</b>	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	0

**Secondary Education**  
**Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators**  
**Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor**  
**Spring 2021**

Domain	Element	Competency	Secondary Education Key Indicators by Program														
			University Supervisor							Mentor							
			Below Standard (Indicator Not Met)	Developing (Indicator Partially)	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully)	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation	Below Standard (Indicator Not Met)	Developing (Indicator Partially)	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully)	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation	
		<b>MAT Spanish</b>	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	
		<b>[2a.2] Totals</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3.11</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3.32</b>		
<b>3. Instruction for Active Learning</b>	<b>[3a.2]</b>	<b>Content accuracy</b>															
		<b>Biology</b>															
		<b>English</b>	0	2	2	2	0	3	0	0	2	1	3	0	3.17	0	
		<b>Mathematics</b>	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	
		<b>Social Studies</b>	0	0	5	0	0	3	0	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	0	
		<b>World Languages, Spanish</b>															
		<b>MAT Biology</b>	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	

**Secondary Education**  
**Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators**  
**Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor**  
**Spring 2021**

Domain	Element	Competency	Secondary Education Key Indicators by Program													
			University Supervisor							Mentor						
			Below Standard (Indicator Not Met)	Developing (Indicator Partially)	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully)	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation	Below Standard (Indicator Not Met)	Developing (Indicator Partially)	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully)	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation
		<b>MAT English</b>	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	0
		<b>MAT Spanish</b>	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0
		<b>[3a.2] Totals</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3.14</b>	
	<b>[3a.3]</b>	<b>Content progression and level of challenge</b>														
		<b>Biology</b>														
		<b>English</b>	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	0	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	0
		<b>Mathematics</b>	0	1	1	0	0	2.75	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	0
		<b>Social Studies</b>	0	0	5	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	0
		<b>World Languages, Spanish</b>														

**Secondary Education**  
**Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators**  
**Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor**  
**Spring 2021**

Domain	Element	Competency	Secondary Education Key Indicators by Program													
			University Supervisor							Mentor						
			Below Standard (Indicator Not Met)	Developing (Indicator Partially)	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully)	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation	Below Standard (Indicator Not Met)	Developing (Indicator Partially)	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully)	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation
		<b>MAT Biology</b>	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0
		<b>MAT English</b>	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	0
		<b>MAT Spanish</b>	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0
		<b>[3a.3] Totals</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2.90</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3.17</b>	
<b>Frequencies</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>		
<i>Percentage of Competencies Scored Below Standard</i>			<b>0.00%</b>							<b>0.00%</b>						
<i>Percentage of Competencies Scored Developing</i>			<b>5.88%</b>							<b>7.35%</b>						
<i>Percentage of Competencies Scored</i>			<b>86.76%</b>							<b>64.70%</b>						

**Secondary Education**  
**Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators**  
**Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor**  
**Spring 2021**

Domain	Element	Competency	Secondary Education Key Indicators by Program													
			University Supervisor							Mentor						
			Below Standard (Indicator Not Met)	Developing (Indicator Partially)	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully)	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation	Below Standard (Indicator Not Met)	Developing (Indicator Partially)	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully)	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation
		<i>Proficient</i>														
		<i>Percentage of Competencies Scored Exemplary</i>	7.35%							27.94%						
		<i>Spring 2021 Mean</i>	3.00							3.22						

**Overall Candidate Performance: University Supervisor and Mentor Secondary Education (7-12) Key Indicators – Spring 2021**  
**Percentage Passing (Developing, Proficient, and Exemplary) = 100%**  
**Overall Secondary 2021 Mean = 3.15**

## Satisfaction of Employers of AY 2020-2021 Program Completers (Initial Level)

### *Descriptions and Procedures*

The EPP monitors employer feedback through an Employer Survey that is sent electronically through LiveText every January or early February. This instrument was validated in 2016. In 2022, the survey polled employers of AY 2020-2021 completers from the Elementary Education, Secondary Education, and M.A.T. initial programs. There were no Health Education program completers since the next cohort will not finish until August 2023. Names of employers were obtained from program completers who responded to the Alumni Survey. This year, for the first time, a question was added to the Alumni Survey requesting the name of the person to whom the Employer Survey should be sent. The EPP hoped to increase response rate and response accuracy by procuring this information. In the past, the Employer Survey was sent to the building principal or district superintendent, depending on general employment information given by completers. Two follow-up emails were sent to employers in an attempt to increase response rate.

### *Results*

In AY 2020-2021 there were a total of 26 initial program completers. Of the 10 elementary education majors, 3 (30%) responded to the Completer Survey giving us the names of their employers. Two of the 3 employers (67%) polled then responded to the Employer Survey; of the 12 Secondary Education Majors, 6 (50%) responded to the Completer Survey giving us the names of their employers; 3 of the 6 employers (50%) responded to the Employer Survey; of the 4 M.A.T. completers, 2 (50%) responded to the Completer Survey giving us the names of their employers; 1 of the 2 employers (50%) responded to the Employer Survey. As was mentioned above, there were no Health Education completers in AY 2020-2021.

In AY 2019-2020, there had been 30 initial program completers, and eleven had 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 comparison of Employer Survey response rates across the two years revealed a consistent rate of responding on the part of the employers surveyed. Each year, 10 surveys were sent to employers based on information given to the EPP by completers. Each year, 6 of the 10 surveys ( 60%) were returned via LiveText. Tables 2-4 below report results from the 2022 Employer Surveys. Comparisons of Employer Survey ratings for the past two cohorts of completers (AY2019-2020 and AY2020-2021) reveal fairly consistent employer satisfaction levels. The mean rating for Elementary Education majors across the 13 performance indicators for the AY 2019-2020 cohort was 2.94, and for the AY 2020-2021 cohort, 2.73. The highest rating possible on this survey is a “3”, thus suggesting that employers view WCSU completers with a high degree of satisfaction. Similarly, rating means for the two Secondary Education completer cohorts were 2.77 and 2.60, respectively. Only one employer rated one AY 2020-2021 M.A.T. completer, and all ratings were “3”, the highest possible rating on this survey. Given the small number of program completers and the small number of surveys completed by employers, results must be interpreted with caution.

A focus group was held to supplement the findings, and results are reported in the Appendix.

Table 3 Results of CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey of AY 2020-2021 completers: Elementary Education (2 responders)

<b>WCSU Employer Survey</b>			
<b>Academic Year</b>	<b>Content Indicator</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Range</b>
2020-2021	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.	2.5	(2-3)
	6. Effectively applies classroom management practices	2.5	(2-3)
	7. Interacts well with parents and community members	3.0	(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	(3)
	11. Creates effective learning environments	2.5	(2-3)
	12. Behaves in accordance with professional ethics	3.0	(3)
	13. Effectively integrates technology into their instruction	2.0	(2)
<b>Overall Mean: 2.73</b>			

Table 4 Results of CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey of AY 2020-2021 completers: Secondary Education (3 respondents)

<b>WCSU Employer Survey</b>			
<b>Academic Year</b>	<b>Content Indicator</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Range</b>
2020-2021	1. Integrates appropriate standards into instruction	3.0	(3)
	2. Adapts instruction to diverse students and differences in learning.	2.3	(2-3)
	3. Facilitates critical thinking, problem solving and /or other higher-level thinking	2.3	(2-3)
	4. Motivates students to learn	3.0	(3)
	5. Communicates well with students.	3.0	(3)
	6. Effectively applies classroom management practices	2.6	(2-3)
	7. Interacts well with parents and community members	3.0	(3)
	8. Assesses student learning	2.6	(2-3)
	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	3.0	(3)
	12. Behaves in accordance with professional ethics	3.0	(3)
	13. Effectively integrates technology into their instruction	3.0	(3)
<b>Overall Mean: 2.60</b>			



Table 5. Results of CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey of AY 2020-2021 completers: M.A.T. Secondary Education (1 respondent)

<b>WCSU Employer Survey</b>			
<b>Academic Year</b>	<b>Content Indicator</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Range</b>
2020-2021	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	3.0	(3)
	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	3.0	(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	3.0	(3)
	12. Behaves in accordance with professional ethics	3.0	(3)
	13. Effectively integrates technology into their instruction	3.0	(3)
<b>Overall Mean: 3.0</b>			

## **Measure 2: Satisfaction of Employers and Stakeholder Involvement (Initial & Advanced)**

The EPP has chosen the following instruments to measure Satisfaction of Employers and Stakeholder Involvement:

- CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey 2021 Elementary Education
- CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey 2021 Secondary Education
- CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey 2021 MAT Secondary Education
- CAEP Initial Programs Alumni Survey 2021 Elementary Education
- CAEP Initial Programs Alumni Survey 2021 Secondary Education
- CAEP Initial Programs Alumni Survey 2021 MAT Secondary Education
- CAEP Advanced Programs MSED Literacy & Language Arts Employer Survey 2021
- CAEP Advanced Programs MSED Literacy & Language Arts Alumni Survey 2021
- CAEP Advanced Programs MSED Special Education Employer Survey 2021
- Employer Focus Group

As mentioned above, Tables 2 through 4 displayed in the Measure 1 component reported the initial program employer surveys. The following tables report the Employer surveys for the advanced programs. There were no 092 advanced program completers in 2021.

### Satisfaction of Employers of AY 2020-2021 Program Completers (Advanced Level)

#### *Descriptions and Procedures*

The EPP monitors employer feedback through a survey that is sent electronically every January or early February. The same procedures used for the distribution of the Employer Surveys to employers of initial program completers was used for the employers of advanced program completers. The survey was sent to 3 employers of completers of the MSED in Literacy and Language Arts program and to 2 employers of the completers from the MSED in Special Education program. There were no 092 program completers. One employer from the MSED in Literacy and Language Arts responded for a response rate of 30%. The EPP followed up to improve the response rate, calling the schools to remind principals to complete the survey. A focus group interview will be held to supplement the findings.

#### *Results*

Only one MSED employers responded to the surveys that were sent in Literacy and Language Arts. Table 6 contains this data. Examination of this table reveals that the mean score for the MSED Literacy and Language Arts was 3.26 (response options ranged from 1 to 4) Seven indicators were rated “3” (Proficient) and 8 indicators were rated “4” (Exemplary). Comparison cannot be made for the MSED programs in Special Education and in

Literacy and Language Arts across the AY 2019-2020 and the AY 2020-2021 cohorts because no MSED employers responded to the 2021 Employer Survey.

Table 6 CAEP Advanced Programs MSED Literacy & Language Arts Employer Survey 2021 (1 Respondent)

CAEP Advanced Programs Employer Survey 2021		
Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean
2020-2021	1. Integrates appropriate standards into instruction.	4.0
	2. Adapts instruction to diverse students.	3.0
	3. Adapts instruction to differences in learning.	3.0
	4. Facilitates critical thinking, problem solving and /or other higher-level thinking.	4.0
	5. Motivates students to learn.	4.0
	6. Communicates well with students.	4.0
	7. Applies classroom management practices	3.0
	8. Interacts well with parents and community members.	3.0
	9. Assesses student learning.	3.0
	10. Grows professionally through reflection.	3.0
	11. Collaborates well with peers.	4.0
	12. Creates effective learning environments.	4.0
	13. Uses professional ethics.	4.0
	14. Integrates technology into their instruction.	4.0

CAEP Advanced Programs Employer Survey 2021		
Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean
	15. Reaches employment milestones (i.e., promotion, tenure) at rates comparable to graduates of other teacher preparation programs.	3.0
<b>Overall Mean=3.26</b>		

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*

- Employers of completers from both initial and advanced gave the top rating to most of the indicators, evincing a high degree of employer satisfaction. No indicators were rated below satisfactory.

*Areas of Improvement*

- Relative weaknesses (mean ratings of 2.8 out of 3) for the Elementary Education program completers were in the areas of facilitating critical thinking, applying classroom management, and creating effective learning environments.
- Relative weaknesses (mean ratings of 2 out of 3) for the Secondary Education program completers were in the areas of facilitating critical thinking and interacting with parents and community members, and assessing student learning
- The EPP must continue to make efforts to improve employer satisfaction survey response rates. Exit interviews with completers and enlisting them to directly approach their employers may be helpful. Phone calls to completers did improve the Alumni Survey return rates, but a similar approach for employers was unsuccessful, probably because the EPP cannot call employers directly, but can only talk to office personnel.
- It was discovered that discrepancies existed among the rating systems used for different programs. In one case, the top category had been omitted from the survey. The EPP needs to monitor the rubrics carefully and double check for discrepancies that can interfere with interpretations and comparisons.

## CAEP Initial Programs AY 2020-2021 Completer Satisfaction

### *Descriptions and Procedures*

The EPP monitors program completer satisfaction through an Alumni Survey that is sent electronically every January or early February. This instrument was validated in 2016. The 2022 survey polled AY 2020-2021 program completers of all initial programs. The survey was sent to 10 Elementary Education completers, 12 Secondary Education completers, and 4 M.A.T. completers. There were no Health Education completers in AY 2020-2021.

### *Results*

Of the 10 AY 2020-2021 Elementary Education completers, 3 returned the survey for a response rate of 30%; of the 12 AY 2020-2021 Secondary Education completers, 5 returned the survey for a response rate of 42%; and, of the 4 AY 2020-2021 M.A.T. completers, 2 returned the survey for a response rate of 50%. These response rates are at or above the CAEP minimum requirements, and they are similar to response rates obtained for the AY 2019-2020 cohort of completers that were reported in the 2021 Annual Report (50% for Elementary Education completers and 40% for Secondary Education completers).

Survey results can be found in Tables 7, 7.a, 7b, and 7.c below and report mean satisfaction scores for each of the indicators rated on the survey. A rating of “2” indicates *Satisfactory*, with “0” indicating *Well Below Satisfactory*, “1” indicating *Slightly Below Satisfactory* and “3” indicating *Slightly Above Satisfactory*.

Overall mean scores on the Alumni Survey for the AY 2020-2021 Elementary Education, Secondary Education and M.A.T completers were 1.55, 1.76, and 2.39, respectively. Comparisons can be made with the AY 2019-2020 completers in Elementary Education and Secondary Education, where the overall means were 2.41 and 1.6, respectively.

While mean satisfaction ratings for the Secondary Education completers remained fairly consistent across the AY 2020-2021 and the AY 2019-2020 cohorts, with overall means of 1.76 and 1.6, respectively, this year’s AY 2020-2021 Elementary Education survey mean of 1.55 is significantly lower than the 2.41 mean reported for the AY2019-2020 cohort. Examination of individual survey response protocols revealed several interesting findings regarding the variability in responses. For example, one Secondary Education completer assigned ratings of “0” to all indicators, while three completers assigned “2”s or “3”s” to all indicators. Ways of better understanding some of these issues around completer satisfaction or dissatisfaction will be presented in the AFI Section below. It will also be interesting to see whether completer satisfaction is improved once all of the Covid restrictions have been relaxed and education in the schools and at the University returns to “normal”. Since the lock-down, student teachers have taught and have been taught remotely, and our candidates have not had the opportunities to do pre-student teaching fieldwork in person in the schools

The 2021 Annual Report stated that the two indicators that were rated the lowest, with a mean scores of 1.73, were (1) *Collaborate with peers and coordinate instruction with special education teachers* and (2) *Implement and interpret and use student performance assessments for effective instruction* and these weaknesses remain unchanged for the AY 2020-2021 Elementary Education completers (means of 1.33 for each of the indicators) and for the AY 2020-2021 Secondary Education completers (means of 1.80 for each of the indicators). Interestingly the M.A.T. completers, as a group, rated these indicators at 2.0 and 3.0, respectively, signifying solid satisfaction in the areas assessed by these indicators.

Table 7. CAEP Initial Programs Completer Survey AY 2020-2021

Table 7a. CAEP Initial Programs Alumni Survey: Elementary Education AY 2020-2021 Program Completers (3 respondents)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
2021 ELEM ED	1. Integrate appropriate professional and educational standards.	2.33	(2-3)
	2. Identify and adapt instruction to diverse student learners.	1.33	(1-2)
	3. Adapt instruction to diverse student learning.	1.33	(1-2)
	4. Facilitate student critical thinking, problem solving and higher order thinking skills.	1.67	(1-3)
	5. Encourage and motivate all student to learn.	1.67	(1-3)
	6. Create effective learning environments.	2.00	(2)
	7. Integrate technology into classroom instruction.	1.33	(1-2)
	8. Effectively communicate with students through both oral and written modes.	1.67	(1-3)
	9. Grow professionally through reflection.	1.67	(0-3)
	10. Appropriately apply effective classroom management practices.	1.0	(0-1)
	11. Effectively interact with students, teachers, parent, and community members.	1.33	(0-2)
	12. Understand human development as it relates to the teaching-learning process.	1.67	(1-2)
	13. Demonstrate appropriate ethical and professional behavior.	2.33	(2-3)
	14. Develop Sensitivity and Respect for the needs and feelings of all students.	2.00	(2)
	15. Recognize both how the organization of the district and school can affect the individual teacher.	0.67	(0-1)
	16. Develop classroom and school leadership.	1.33	(0-2)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
	17. Develop a positive disposition toward students.	2.00	(1-3)
	18. Collaborate with peers and coordinate instruction with special education teachers.	1.33	(0-2)
	19. Develop quality instructional units.	2.0	(2)
	20. Appropriately select and use a wide variety of instructional strategies, resource materials, and media.	2.0	(2)
	21. Implement, interpret and use student performance assessments for effective instruction.	1.33	(1-2)
	22. Use individual, small group and large group instructional arrangements.	1.33	(1-2)
	23. Develop online learning expectations for students.	1.67	(1-2)
<b>Overall Mean: 1.55</b>			

Table 7.b CAEP Initial Programs Alumni Survey Secondary Education AY 2020-2021 Program Completers (5 Respondents)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
2021 SEC ED	1. Integrate appropriate professional and educational standards.	2.00	(0-3)
	2. Identify and adapt instruction to diverse student learners.	1.40	(0-2)
	3. Adapt instruction to diverse student learning.	1.80	(0-3)
	4. Facilitate student critical thinking, problem solving and higher order thinking skills.	1.14	(0-3)
	5. Encourage and motivate all student to learn.	2.00	(0-3)
	6. Create effective learning environments.	2.22	(0-3)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
	7. Integrate technology into classroom instruction.	2.22	(0-3)
	8. Effectively communicate with students through both oral and written modes.	2.00	(0-3)
	9. Grow professionally through reflection.	2.22	(0-3)
	10. Appropriately apply effective classroom management practices.	1.20	(0-2)
	11. Effectively interact with students, teachers, parent, and community members.	1.80	(0-3)
	12. Understand human development as it relates to the teaching-learning process.	1.60	(0-3)
	13. Demonstrate appropriate ethical and professional behavior.	2.00	(0-3)
	14. Develop Sensitivity and Respect for the needs and feelings of all students.	2.00	(0-3)
	15. Recognize both how the organization of the district and school can affect the individual teacher.	1.80	(0-2)
	16. Develop classroom and school leadership.	1.80	(0-3)
	17. Develop a positive disposition toward students.	2.00	(0-3)
	18. Collaborate with peers and coordinate instruction with special education teachers.	1.20	(0-2)
	19. Develop quality instructional units.	1.80	(0-3)
	20. Appropriately select and use a wide variety of instructional strategies, resource materials, and media.	1.60	(0-3)
	21. Implement, interpret and use student performance assessments for effective instruction.	1.80	(0-3)
	22. Use individual, small group and large group instructional arrangements.	1.20	(0-2)
	23. Develop online learning expectations for students.	1.80	(0-3)



Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
<b>Overall Mean: 1.76</b>			

Table 7.c CAEP Initial Programs Alumni Survey: MAT Secondary Education 2021 Program Completers (2 Respondents)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
2021  M.A.T.	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.	2.00	(1-3)
	4. Facilitate student critical thinking, problem solving and higher order thinking skills.	2.00	(2)
	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.	2.00	(2)
	9. Grow professionally through reflection.	2.50	(2-3)
	10. Appropriately apply effective classroom management practices.	2.00	(2)
	11. Effectively interact with students, teachers, parent, and community members.	2.00	(2)
	12. Understand human development as it relates to the teaching-learning process.	2.00	(2)
	13. Demonstrate appropriate ethical and professional behavior.	3.00	(3)
	14. Develop Sensitivity and Respect for the needs and feelings of all students.	2.50	(2-3)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
	15. Recognize both how the organization of the district and school can affect the individual teacher.	2.00	(2)
	16. Develop classroom and school leadership.	1.00	(0-1)
	17. Develop a positive disposition toward students.	2.50	(2-3)
	18. Collaborate with peers and coordinate instruction with special education teachers.	2.50	(2-3)
	19. Develop quality instructional units.	2.00	(2)
	20. Appropriately select and use a wide variety of instructional strategies, resource materials, and media.	2.50	(2-3)
	21. Implement, interpret and use student performance assessments for effective instruction.	3.00	(3)
	22. Use individual, small group and large group instructional arrangements.	2.50	(2-3)
	23. Develop online learning expectations for students.	2.50	(2-3)
<b>Overall Mean: 2.39</b>			

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

*Strengths*

- AY 2020-2021 BS in Education candidates, on average, rated many indicators as *Satisfactory* or above.
- AY2020-2021 M.A.T. program completers rated all but one indicator as *Satisfactory* or above.

*Areas of Improvement*

- As stated above, Collaborate with peers and coordinate instruction with special education teachers and (2) Implement and interpret and use student performance assessments for effective instruction continue to be among the lowest rated performance indicators.

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

- Given the apparent high degree of variability among respondents, the EPP will hold exit interviews with completers in order to better understand their assessments of program strengths and weaknesses.
- Report median as well as mean scores to reduce the effect of outliers on the measures of central tendency.
- Consider revise the rating categories for the Initial programs Alumni Survey. The current survey has categories that may not do a good job of discriminating performance: “0” indicating *Well Below Satisfactory*, “1” indicating *Slightly Below Satisfactory*, “2” indicating *Satisfactory* and “3” indicating *Slightly Above Satisfactory*. The top category, “4” *Well Above Satisfactory*, was actually omitted from the survey
- It was discovered that discrepancies existed among the rating systems used for different programs. In one case, the top category had been omitted from the survey. The EPP needs to monitor the rubrics carefully and double check for discrepancies that can interfere with interpretations and comparisons.

### CAEP Advanced Programs AY 2020-2021 Completer Satisfaction

#### *Descriptions and Procedures*

In 2022 the CAEP Advanced Programs Completer Survey was sent to a total of 11 2020-2021 program completers (4 of whom were graduated from the MSED Special Education program and 7 of whom were graduated from the MSED Literacy and Language Arts Program). Follow-up phone calls were also made in order to attempt to increase response rates. There were no 092 Certificate in Intermediate Administration and Supervision completers in AY 2020-2021.

#### *Results*

Two MSED Special Education completers responded, and 3 MSED Literacy and Language Arts completers responded, for response rates of 50 % and 43%, respectively. In 2021 the same survey had been sent to 18 2019-2020 (4 MSED Literacy and Language Arts program completers, of whom 3 responded for a return rate of 75%; and 8 MSED Literacy and Language Arts program completers, 3 of whom responded for a return rate of 38%.

Results of the Alumni Survey filled out by 2020-2021 completers are summarized in Tables 7 and 8. Rubric response options ranged from “0” *Well below satisfactory* to “4” *Well above satisfactory*. A rating of “2” represented *Satisfactory*. Examination of Table 7 reveals that the overall mean of the responses of the AY 2020-2021 MSED in Literacy and Language Arts to the completer survey across the 23 indicators was 3.63. This was significantly better than the overall mean of 2.01 obtained from the AY 2019-AY2020 MSED Literacy completers. Examination of Table 8 reveals that the overall mean of the responses of the AY 2020-2021 MSED in Special Education to the completer survey across the 23 indicators was 2.30, compared to the higher overall mean of 2.77 obtained from the AY 2019-2020 MSED in Special Education. These results must be interpreted with caution given the small number of respondents.

Table 8 CAEP Advanced Programs Alumni Survey: MSED in Literacy and Language Arts 2021 Program Completers (3 Respondents)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
2021 MSED LIT	1. Integrate appropriate professional and educational standards.	3.3	(2-4)
	2. Identify and adapt instruction to diverse student learners.	3.3	(2-4)
	3. Adapt instruction to diverse student learning.	3.3	(2-4)
	4. Facilitate student critical thinking, problem solving and higher order thinking skills.	3.6	(3-4)
	5. Encourage and motivate all student to learn.	3.6	(3-4)
	6. Create effective learning environments.	2.6	(0-4)
	7. Integrate technology into classroom instruction.	3.33	(2-4)
	8. Effectively communicate with students through both oral and written modes.	3.6	(2-4)
	9. Grow professionally through reflection.	3.6	(3-4)
	10. Appropriately apply effective classroom management practices.	3.6	(3-4)
	11. Effectively interact with students, teachers, parent, and community members.	2.6	(0-4)
	12. Understand human development as it relates to the teaching-learning process.	3.3	(2-4)
	13. Demonstrate appropriate ethical and professional behavior.	3.6	(3-4)
	14. Develop Sensitivity and Respect for the needs and feelings of all students.	3.6	(3-4)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
	15. Recognize both how the organization of the district and school can affect the individual teacher.	3.0	(1-4)
	16. Develop classroom and school leadership.	3.33	(2-4)
	17. Develop a positive disposition toward students.	3.6	(3-4)
	18. Collaborate with peers and coordinate instruction with special education teachers.	3.6	(3-4)
	19. Develop quality instructional units.	3.3	(2-4)
	20. Appropriately select and use a wide variety of instructional strategies, resource materials, and media.	3.3	(2-4)
	21. Implement, interpret and use student performance assessments for effective instruction.	3.6	(3-4)
	22. Use individual, small group and large group instructional arrangements.	3.3	(2-4)
	23. Develop online learning expectations for students.	3.0	(3)
<b>Overall Mean: 3.63</b>			

Table 9 CAEP Advanced Programs Alumni Survey: MSED Special Education 2021 Program Completers (2 Respondents)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
2021 MSED SPED	1. Integrate appropriate professional and educational standards.	2.0	(2)
	2. Identify and adapt instruction to diverse student learners.	3.0	(3)
	3. Adapt instruction to diverse student learning.	2.0	(2)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
	4. Facilitate student critical thinking, problem solving and higher order thinking skills.	2.0	(2)
	5. Encourage and motivate all student to learn.	2.0	(2)
	6. Create effective learning environments.	2.5	(2-3)
	7. Integrate technology into classroom instruction.	2.5	(1-4)
	8. Effectively communicate with students through both oral and written modes.	1.5	(1-2)
	9. Grow professionally through reflection.	2.0	(1-3)
	10. Appropriately apply effective classroom management practices.	2.0	(2)
	11. Effectively interact with students, teachers, parent, and community members.	2.0	(2)
	12. Understand human development as it relates to the teaching-learning process.	2.0	(2)
	13. Demonstrate appropriate ethical and professional behavior.	2.0	(2)
	14. Develop Sensitivity and Respect for the needs and feelings of all students.	2.5	(2-3)
	15. Recognize both how the organization of the district and school can affect the individual teacher.	2.5	(2-3)
	16. Develop classroom and school leadership.	1.5	(1-2)
	17. Develop a positive disposition toward students.	2.5	(2-3)
	18. Collaborate with peers and coordinate instruction with special education teachers.	3.00	(3)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
	19. Develop quality instructional units.	1.5	(1-2)
	20. Appropriately select and use a wide variety of instructional strategies, resource materials, and media.	2.0	(2)
	21. Implement, interpret and use student performance assessments for effective instruction.	2.5	(2-3)
	22. Use individual, small group and large group instructional arrangements.	2.5	(2-3)
	23. Develop online learning expectations for students.	3.00	(3)
<b>Overall Mean: 2.30</b>			

Analysis (Strengths/Areas for Improvement) for the Advanced MSED Programs in Literacy and Language Arts and MSED Special Education based on the Aggregate Data

*Strengths*

- All but two of the mean ratings given to items by AY2020-2021 program completers in MSED in Literacy and Language Arts were 3 or higher, suggesting overall **above average** satisfaction with the program. Mean ratings given by the MSED in Special Education were lower although most completers expressed at least **average** satisfaction with most areas of the program.
- The highest mean ratings of 3.6 were observed in a number of areas rated by the MSED in Literacy completers, including *Facilitate student critical thinking, problem solving and higher order thinking skills; Implement, interpret and use student performance assessments for effective instruction; Encourage and motivate all student to learn; Effectively communicate with students through both oral and written modes; Grow professionally through reflection; and Appropriately apply effective classroom management practices.*
- The lowest rated indicators across performance indicators given by the 2019-2020 completers 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.’ These indicators were not among the lowest ratings given by the 2020-2021 completers, which suggests improvements in the areas of weakness noted last year.

### *Areas of Improvement*

- Relative program weaknesses identified by the MSED in Literacy and Language Arts completers, suggested by mean scores of 2.6, were in the areas of *Effectively interact with students, teachers, parent, and community members* and *Create effective learning environments*. The range for scores in these two areas was 0-4, suggesting considerable variability of opinion.
- Weaknesses identified by the MSED Special Education completers were in the areas of *Effectively communicate with students through both oral and written modes* and *Develop quality instructional units*. Both of these areas received **below satisfactory** mean ratings.

### *Action Plan for the MSED Programs based on the Aggregate Data*

- Continue to monitor data on areas of weakness and relative weakness for each program.
- Collecting cumulative data across cohorts will be important given the small number of completers and the correspondingly small number of survey responses which makes data interpretation, drawing conclusions, and observing patterns difficult.
- Hold exit interviews with the members of the AY 2021-2022 cohorts in order to better understand program strengths and weaknesses and response variability. During the exit interviews, stress the importance of completing the Alumni Survey and encouraging their employers to complete the Employer Survey.

### Cohort 2021 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, journal prompts, and a focus group. 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 and Focus Group (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 and a focus group based upon the journal prompts. The journal prompt was designed to collect participants' perceptions of the relevance of their training in their day to day practice. The Focus Group data is reported in the Appendix.

### *Quantitative Data*

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

## AY 2020-2021 Completers: Analysis of Case Study Findings

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

- Continue to monitor program completer satisfaction with technology integration.
- Hold exit interviews with program completers to delve more deeply into assessments of program strengths and weaknesses, obtain feedback from all completers and encourage greater participation in Alumni and Employer Surveys.
- Consider additional access, exposure, and course work in classroom management, developmental psychology, and mental health.
- Consider additional course content and practice with how to communicate and conference with parents.
- Hold ongoing support/information sessions for M.A.T. candidates.

## **Measure 3: Candidate Competency at Completion (Initial & Advanced)**

The EPP uses the following assessments to measure candidate competency at completion:

- Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI)
- edTPA Performance Assessment
- MSED Literacy & Language Arts Internship Instrument
- MSED Special Education Internship Instrument

Note: The Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) is displayed in Table 1.

### 2020-2021 (edTPA)

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 10. Connecticut edTPA Certifications, Approved Handbooks, and Passing Scores

<b>Table 1.: Connecticut edTPA Passing Scores</b>			
<b>Connecticut Certification Endorsement Code</b>	<b>CSDE Certification Area</b>	<b>Approved edTPA Handbook</b>	<b>Passing Score</b>
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

<b>Table 1.: Connecticut edTPA Passing Scores</b>			
<b>Connecticut Certification Endorsement Code</b>	<b>CSDE Certification Area</b>	<b>Approved edTPA Handbook</b>	<b>Passing Score</b>
305	Elementary, Grades 1–6	Elementary Education: Literacy with Mathematics Task 4	44

Table 11: Summary: Practice edTPA Rubric Score Distribution for Elementary, Secondary Programs by Ethnicity Fall 2020 – Fall 2021

	<b>Overall Percentages</b>	<b>Fall 2020</b>		<b>Fall 2021</b>	
		<b>Frequencies</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Frequencies</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b><i>Percentage Scoring at Emerging (1)</i></b>	<b>19.93%</b>	<b>16</b>	3.87%	<b>9</b>	1.60%
% of Emerging Ethnicity: WHITE		11	68.75%	7	28.00%
% of Emerging Ethnicity: ASIAN		0	0.00%	0	0.00%
% of Emerging Ethnicity: BLACK		0	0.00%	0	0.00%
% of Emerging Ethnicity: MRACES		1	6.25%	2	0.08%
% of Emerging Ethnicity: HISPA		4	25.00%	0	0.00%
% of Emerging Ethnicity: NSPEC		0	0.00%	0	0.00%
<b><i>Percentage Scoring at Proficient (2)</i></b>		<b>52.23%</b>	<b>294</b>	<b>71.19%</b>	<b>187</b>
% of Proficient Ethnicity: WHITE	203		69.05%	89	47.59%

	Overall Percentages	Fall 2020		Fall 2021	
% of Proficient Ethnicity: ASIAN		0	0.00%	0	0.00%
% of Proficient Ethnicity: BLACK		0	0.00%	0	0.00%
% of Proficient Ethnicity: MRACES		4	1.36%	13	06.95%
% of Proficient Ethnicity: HISPA		87	29.59%	85	45.45%
% of Proficient Ethnicity: NSPEC		0	0.00%	0	0.00%
<b>Percentage Scoring at Advanced (3)</b>	<b>19.76%</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>24.94%</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>14.59%</b>
% of Advanced Ethnicity: WHITE		95	92.23%	71	86.58%
% of Advanced Ethnicity: ASIAN		0	0.00%	0	0.00%
% of Advanced Ethnicity: BLACK		0	0.00%	0	0.00%
% of Advanced Ethnicity: MRACES		1	0.97%	6	7.31%
% of Advanced Ethnicity: HISPA		7	6.80%	5	6.09%
% of Advanced Ethnicity: NSPEC		0	0.00%	0	0.00%
<b>Mean by Year</b>		<b>2.74</b>	<b>3.21</b>		<b>2.28</b>

*\*There were no Health Education completers in 2021.*

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

*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 our purposes, a strength is considered a mean of 2.5 or above.
- The overall mean in this assessment was 2.74

### *Practice edTPA Component Areas of Strength*

- 1. How do the candidate's plans build students' abilities to...(content specific):
  - Overall, 38% of 2021 candidates scored at the Advanced level (mean of 3.0) in this competency.
  - The overall mean for this competency was 2.61, indicating an area of strength.
- 3. How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her students to justify instructional plans?
  - Overall, 37.50% of 2021 candidates scored at the Advanced level (mean of 3.0) in this competency even though the overall mean was 2.37.
- 4. How does the candidate identify, and support language demands associated with a key (content) learning task?
  - Overall, 23.07% of candidates scored at the Advanced level (mean of 3.0).
  - The overall mean for this competency was 2.23.
- 6. How does the candidate demonstrate a positive learning environment that supports students' engagement in learning?
  - Overall, 40% of candidates scored at the Advanced level (mean of 3.0).
  - The overall mean for this competency was 2.4.
- 7. How does the candidate actively engage students in...(content specific):
  - Overall, 30.76% of candidates scored at the Advanced level (mean of 3.0).
  - The overall mean for this competency was 2.30
- 10. How does the candidate use evidence to evaluate and change teaching practice to meet students' varied learning needs?
  - Overall, 29% of candidates scored at the Advanced level (mean of 3.0).
  - The overall mean for this competency was 2.29.
- 12. What type of feedback does the candidate provide to focus students?
  - Overall, 46% of candidates scored at the Advanced level (mean of 3.0).
  - The overall mean for this competency was 2.46.
- 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 3.0).
  - The overall mean for this competency was 2.30.

*Practice edTPA Portfolio Areas of Improvement*

- A mean under 2.0 is considered an overall area of improvement.
- 1.6% of Candidates scored at the Emerging level in this assessment.

*Practice edTPA Component Areas of Improvement*

- How does the candidate analyze evidence of student learning?
  - Overall, 7.6% of the candidates scored at the Emerging level in this competency.
- How are the informal and formal assessments selected or designed to monitor students’ conceptual understanding?
  - Overall, 7.6% of candidates scored at the Emerging level in this competency.

Advanced Programs

Table 12. CAEP Advanced Literacy and Language Arts Program Practicum Evaluation: Summer 2021

<b>CAEP Advanced Literacy and Language Arts Program Practicum Evaluation 2021</b>							
<b>Standard Elements Reading/Literacy Specialist</b>	<b>Summer 2021 n= 8</b>						
	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation
2.2 Candidates design, select, adapt, teach, and evaluate evidence-based instructional approaches, using both informational and narrative texts, to meet the literacy needs of whole class and groups of students in the academic disciplines and other subject areas, and when learning to read, write, listen, speak, view, or visually represent.	0	0	8	0	0	3.0	0.00
2.3 Candidates select, adapt, teach, and evaluate evidence-based, supplemental, and intervention approaches and programs; such instruction is explicit, intense, and provides adequate scaffolding to meet the literacy needs of individual and small groups of students, especially those who experience difficulty with reading and writing.	0	1	7	0	0	2.8	0.33
4.1 Candidates demonstrate knowledge of foundational theories about diverse learners, equity, and culturally responsive instruction.	0	0	8	0	0	3.0	0.00

**CAEP Advanced Literacy and Language Arts Program  
Practicum Evaluation  
2021**

<b>Standard Elements Reading/Literacy Specialist</b>	<b>Summer 2021 n= 8</b>						
	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation
4.2 Candidates demonstrate understanding of themselves and others as cultural beings through their pedagogy and interactions with individuals both within and outside of the school community.	0	0	8	0	0	3.0	0.00
5.1 Candidates, in consultation with families and colleagues, meet the developmental needs of all learners (e.g., English learners, those with difficulties learning to read, the gifted), taking into consideration physical, social, emotional, cultural, and intellectual factors.	0	0	8	0	0	3.0	0.00
5.2 Candidates collaborate with school personnel and provide opportunities for student choice and engagement with a variety of print and digital materials to engage and motivate all learners.	0	0	8	0	0	3.0	0.00
5.3 Candidates integrate digital technologies into their literacy instruction in appropriate, safe, and effective ways and assist colleagues in these efforts.	0	0	7	1	0	3.1	0.33
5.4 Candidates facilitate efforts to foster a positive climate that support the physical and social literacy-rich learning environment, including knowledge of routines, grouping structures, and social interactions.	0	0	6	2	0	3.2	0.43
6.1 Candidates demonstrate the ability to reflect on their professional practices, belong to professional organizations, and are critical consumers of research, policy, and practice.	0	1	7	0	0	2.8	0.33
<b>Frequencies</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>		
<b>% Below Standard</b>	<b>0.00%</b>						
<b>% Developing</b>	<b>2%</b>						
<b>% Proficient</b>	<b>93%</b>						

<b>CAEP Advanced Literacy and Language Arts Program Practicum Evaluation 2021</b>							
<b>Standard Elements Reading/Literacy Specialist</b>	<b>Summer 2021 n= 8</b>						
	<b>Below Standard</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
<b>% Exemplary</b>	<b>5%</b>						
<b>Overall Mentor Mean by Cohort</b>	<b>2.98</b>						
<b>Literacy and Language Arts Program Practicum Evaluation (2021) 100% Passing (Developing, Proficient, and Exemplary)</b>							

Table 13 CAEP Advanced MSED Special Education Program Practicum Evaluation: Summer 2021

<b>MSED in Special Education Practicum Assessment:</b>							
<b>Rubric Element</b>	<b>Summer 2021 n= 4</b>						
	<b>Below Standard</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
<b>CEC 2.1</b> Beginning special education professionals through collaboration with	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	0.43



## MSED in Special Education Practicum Assessment:

Rubric Element	Summer 2021 n= 4						
	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation
general educators and other colleagues create safe, inclusive, culturally responsive learning environments to engage individuals with exceptionalities in meaningful learning activities and social interactions.							
CEC 2.2 Beginning special education professionals use motivational and instructional interventions to teach individuals with exceptionalities how to adapt to different environments.	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	0.43
CEC 2.3 Beginning special education professionals know how to intervene safely and appropriately with individuals with exceptionalities in crisis.	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	0.00
CEC 3.2 Beginning special education professionals understand and use general and specialized content knowledge for teaching across curricular content areas to individualize learning for individuals with exceptionalities	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	0.50
CEC 3.3 Beginning special education professionals modify general and specialized curricula to	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	0.43

## MSED in Special Education Practicum Assessment:

Rubric Element	Summer 2021 n= 4						
	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation
make them accessible to individuals with exceptionalities.							
CEC 4.3 Beginning special education professionals in collaboration with colleagues and families use multiple types of assessment information in making decisions about individuals with exceptionalities.	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	0.00
CEC 4.4 Beginning special education professionals engage individuals with exceptionalities to work toward quality learning and performance and provide feedback to guide them.	0	0	3	1	0	3.75	0.43
CEC 5.0 Beginning special education professionals select, adapt, and use a repertoire of evidence-based instructional strategies to advance learning of individuals with exceptionalities.	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	0.439933
CEC 5.1 Beginning special education professionals consider individual abilities, interests, learning environments, and cultural and linguistic factors in the selection, development, and adaptation of learning	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	0.50

## MSED in Special Education Practicum Assessment:

Rubric Element	Summer 2021 n= 4						
	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation
experiences for individuals with exceptionalities.							
CEC 5.2 Beginning special education professionals use technologies to support instructional assessment, planning, and delivery for individuals with exceptionalities.	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	0.43
CEC 5.5 Beginning special education professionals develop and implement a variety of education and transition plans for individuals with exceptionalities across a wide range of settings and different learning experiences in collaboration with individuals, families, and teams.	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	0.50
CEC 5.7 Beginning special education professionals teach cross-disciplinary knowledge and skills such as critical thinking and problem solving to individuals with exceptionalities.	0	0	1	3	0	3.7	0.43
CEC 7.1 Beginning special education professionals use the theory and elements of effective collaboration.	0	0	1	3	0	3.7	0.43

**MSED in Special Education Practicum Assessment:**

Rubric Element	Summer 2021 n= 4						
	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation
CEC 7.2 Beginning special education professionals serve as a collaborative resource to colleagues.	0	0	1	3	0	3.7	0.43
<b>Frequencies</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>0</b>		
<b>% Below Standard</b>	<b>0%</b>						
<b>% Developing</b>	<b>1%.</b>						
<b>% Proficient</b>	<b>52%</b>						
<b>% Exemplary</b>	<b>46%</b>						
<b>Overall Mentor Mean by Cohort</b>	<b>3.50</b>						

**MSED in Special Education Practicum Assessment (Summer 2021)**

**100% Passing (Developing, Proficient, and Exemplary)**

#### **Measure 4: Ability of Completers to be Hired (Initial & Advanced)**

The EPP used the percentage of completers who met licensing requirements upon program completion as evidence for this measure.

##### Initial Programs

- Elementary Education: 80%
- Secondary Education: 100%
- MAT Program: 100%

##### Advanced Programs

- MSED Literacy and Language Arts: Three completers took the licensing exam and all passed (100%).
- MSED Special Education: Three completers took the licensing exam and all passed (100%).

CAEP Accountability Measures AY 2020-2021

CAEP Accountability Measure	WCSU Accountability Measure	Results
<p><b>Measure 1: Initial Completer Effectiveness</b></p>	<p><i>Due to COVID-19, CSDE did not provide the EPP with TEAM data for 2021 program completers. Therefore, the EPP has provided the Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) data for 2021 program completers. The STEI is the SEED teacher evaluation instrument used in Connecticut.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI)</li> <li>• CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey 2021</li> </ul> <p>*There were no Health Education program completers at the initial level nor 092 program completers at the advanced level in 2021.</p>	<p><b><u>Elementary Education:</u></b> STEI Mean was 3.124 with Domain 3 Instruction for Active Learning posting a mean of 3.33.</p> <p><b>CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey 2021 Elementary Education:</b> Employers rated 2021 completers <b>Proficient</b> on their ability to adapt instruction to diverse students and differences in learning. 2021 completers were rated <b>Satisfactory</b> on their ability to facilitate critical thinking.</p> <p><b><u>Secondary Education:</u></b> STEI Mean was 3.15 with Domain 3 Instruction for Active Learning posting a mean of 3.14.</p> <p><b>CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey 2021 Secondary Education:</b> Employers rated 2021 completers <b>Satisfactory</b> on their ability to adapt instruction to diverse students and differences in learning. 2021 completers were rated <b>Satisfactory</b> on their ability to facilitate critical thinking.</p> <p><b>CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey 2021 MAT Secondary Education:</b> Employers rated 2021 completers <b>Proficient</b> on their ability to adapt instruction to diverse students and differences in learning. 2021 completers were rated <b>Proficient</b> on their ability to facilitate critical thinking.</p>

<b>Measure 2: Satisfaction of Employers and Stakeholder Involvement (Initial &amp; Advanced)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey 2021 Elementary Education</b></li> <li>• <b>CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey 2021 Secondary Education</b></li> <li>• <b>CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey 2021 MAT Secondary Education</b></li> <li>• <b>CAEP Initial Programs Alumni Survey 2021 Elementary Education</b></li> <li>• <b>CAEP Initial Programs Alumni Survey 2021 Secondary Education</b></li> <li>• <b>CAEP Initial Programs Alumni Survey 2021 MAT Secondary Education</b></li> <li>• <b>CAEP Advanced Programs MSED Literacy &amp; Language Arts Employer Survey 2021</b></li> <li>• <b>CAEP Advanced Programs MSED Literacy &amp; Language Arts Alumni Survey 2021</b></li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Initial Programs</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey 2021 Elementary Education:</b> Survey mean was 2.73 indicating that employers rated completers Satisfactory.</li> <li>• <b>CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey 2021 Secondary Education:</b> Survey mean was 2.60 indicating that completers were rated Satisfactory by their employers.</li> <li>• <b>CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey 2021 MAT Secondary Education:</b> Survey mean was 3.0 indicating that completers were rated Proficient by their employers.</li> <li>• <b>CAEP Initial Programs Alumni Survey 2021 Elementary Education:</b> Survey mean was 1.55 indicating that completers rated their program in the range of unsatisfactory to satisfactory.</li> <li>• <b>CAEP Initial Programs Alumni Survey 2021 Secondary Education:</b> Survey mean was 1.76 indicating that completers rated their program in the range of unsatisfactory to satisfactory.</li> <li>• <b>CAEP Initial Programs Alumni Survey 2021 MAT Secondary Education:</b> Survey mean was 2.39 indicating that completers rated their program satisfactory.</li> </ul>
		<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Advanced Programs</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CAEP Advanced Programs MSED Literacy &amp; Language Arts Employer Survey 2021:</b> Survey mean was 3.26</li> </ul>

		<p>indicating that advanced completers were rated Proficient by their employers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CAEP Advanced Programs MSED Literacy &amp; Language Arts Alumni Survey 2021:</b> Survey mean was 3.6 indicating that completers rated their program above satisfactory.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Measure 3: Candidate Competency at Completion (Initial &amp; Advanced)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI)</b></li> <li>• <b>edTPA Performance Assessment</b></li> <li>• <b>MSED Literacy &amp; Language Arts Internship Instrument</b></li> <li>• <b>MSED Special Education Internship Instrument</b></li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u><b>Advanced Programs</b></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Elementary Education: STEI</b> Mean was 3.124 with Domain 3 Instruction for Active Learning posting a mean of 3.33.</li> <li>• <b>Secondary Education: STEI</b> Mean was 3.15 with Domain 3 Instruction for Active Learning posting a mean of 3.14.</li> <li>• <b>edTPA Performance Assessment across Initial Programs:</b> 52.23% of initial completers scored at the Proficient level with 19.76% scoring at the Exemplary level.</li> </ul>
		<p style="text-align: center;"><u><b>Advanced Programs</b></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>MSED Literacy &amp; Language Arts Internship Instrument:</b> Mean was 2.98 indicating that the majority of candidates were rated Proficient.</li> <li>• <b>MSED Special Education Internship Instrument:</b> Mean was 3.50 indicating that the majority of candidates were rated Proficient.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Measure 4: Ability of Completers to be Hired (Initial &amp; Advanced)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Ability of Completers to Meet Licensing Requirements</b></li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u><b>Initial Programs</b></u></p> <p>Elementary Education: 80%</p>



		Secondary Education: 100% MAT Program: 100%
		<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Advanced Programs</u></b></p> MSED Literacy and Language Arts: Three completers took the licensing exam and all passed (100%). MSED Special Education: Three completers took the licensing exam, and all passed (100%).

Analysis of AY 2020-2021 CAEP Accountability Measures

Accountability Measures	Analysis of Trends	Comparisons with Benchmarks	Source
<b>Measure 1: Initial Completer Effectiveness</b>			
2020-2021 STEI 2020-2021 CAEP Initial Programs Employer Surveys	Analysis indicates that program completers were rated Proficient on the majority of indicators by their supervisors and mentors on the STEI. Employers rated 2021 completers <b>Proficient</b> on their ability to adapt instruction to diverse students and differences in learning. 2021 completers were rated <b>Proficient</b> on their ability to facilitate critical thinking.	STEI: A rating of 3 indicates a Proficient performance. CAEP Initial Programs Employer Surveys: A 20% return rate and overall rating of satisfactory.	CT SEED Rubric
<b>Measure II. Satisfaction of Employers and Stakeholder Involvement</b>			

<p>2020-2021 CAEP Initial Programs Employer Surveys</p> <p>2020-2021 CAEP Initial Programs Alumni Surveys</p> <p>2021 Case Studies of Initial Program Completers</p>	<p>Analysis indicates that program completers overall rated their preparation positively. Program completers felt prepared to teach diverse candidates.</p> <p>They reported that fieldwork experiences in Danbury schools prepared them to work with English language learners and other diverse students.</p> <p>Another strength reported by candidates was differentiation of curriculum to meet students' needs. Program completers reported that more work was needed in classroom management. . Employers rated 2021 completers <b>Proficient</b> on their ability to adapt instruction to diverse students and differences in learning. 2021 completers were rated <b>Proficient</b> on their ability to facilitate critical thinking.</p>	<p>CAEP Initial Programs Employer Surveys: A 20% return rate and overall rating of satisfactory</p> <p>The EPP has not established a benchmark for case studies.</p>	<p>Completer and Employer Surveys</p> <p>Case Study reflective prompts and focus groups.</p>
<p><b>Measure III. Candidate Competency at Completion</b></p>			
<p>STEI</p> <p>edTPA Performance Assessment</p> <p>Advanced Internship Instruments</p>	<p>Analysis indicates that program completers were rated Proficient on the majority of indicators by their supervisors and mentors on the STEI.</p> <p>Analysis of edTPA data indicates that the majority of program completers had a positive impact on P-12 learning and development. The majority of 2021 program completers scored at the Proficient category with a few at the Exemplary level.</p>	<p>STEI: A rating of 3 indicates a Proficient performance.</p> <p>edTPA: A rating of 3 indicates a Proficient performance.</p> <p>Advanced Internship Instruments: A rating of 3 indicates a Proficient performance.</p>	<p>CT SEED Rubric</p> <p>SCALE (2013)</p>

**Measure IV. Ability of Completers to be Hired**

<p>Ability of Completers to Meet Licensing Requirements</p>	<p>Alumni were asked to report their place of employment in the survey response. Eighty percent of Elementary Education candidates were certified and eligible for employment. 100% of secondary education program completers were certified. Three MSED Literacy &amp; Language Arts program completers took the licensure exam and passed. Three MSED Special Education program completers took the licensure exam and passed making them eligible to be hired.</p>	<p>The benchmark for this measure is 80% of completers meet licensing requirements.</p>	<p>Initial &amp; Advanced Programs Completer Surveys</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------

## Appendix: Initial Program Focus Group

### Case Study Focus Group

April 4, 2022

Three Participants:

- Female M.A.T. 2021 graduate teaching high school biology
- Male M.A.T. 2021 graduate teaching Spanish
- Female Interdisciplinary Elementary Education B.S. 2021 graduate working as a K-5 Literacy Coach

#### **Question #1 What did the program offer that you have found most useful in your current position?**

All three respondents agreed that having the full year student teaching experience during the program has proved most important in their current position. They mentioned developing classroom management skills, forming relationships with students and colleagues, and their experience with lesson planning and curriculum sequencing as being important things they learned about during student teaching and/or in the program.

#### **Question #2 What would you like to see more of in the WCSU Education Program?**

Respondents wanted more classroom management strategies to address behavioral issues in general and post pandemic behavior in particular. They are seeing disengagement, lack of motivation, bullying and fighting among students in the classroom. They recommended having more courses in special education and psychology, using scenarios to see how to deal with anger, and having more information about how deal with the impact of social media on students.

#### **Question #3 How did the program prepare you to use technology?**

Respondents agreed that what they learned about technology has been very helpful in their current positions. They mentioned learning about Google Classroom and all the websites and platforms available to teachers. They agreed that student teaching was very technology intensive.

#### **Question #4 How did the program prepare you to serve diverse students and families?**

One participant said that the content in the courses provided her with strategies for ELL students, and lesson planning and curriculum development. Another mentioned SEL and standards as being important. All respondents agreed that they would have liked to have more work on dealing with parents and conducting parent-teacher conferences. One participant suggested more shadowing to learn strategies to help parents become more engaged and involved.

#### **Anything Else?**

The M.A.T students would have liked to have known about how intense the program was before they started out and given a heads up about what the summer course work would entail. They suggested zoom meetings with faculty and fellow students to offer support. The Elementary Education major suggested having more fieldwork earlier in the program.