CAEP ANNUAL REPORT: 2023

WESTERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY

Catherine O'Callaghan, Ph.D., CAEP Coordinator

CAEP Accountability Measures AY 2021-2022

Measure 1: Initial Completer Effectiveness

Due to COVID-19 and budgetary constraints, CSDE did not provide the EPP with TEAM data for 2022 program completers. Therefore, the EPP has provided the Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) data for 2022 program completers. The STEI is the SEED teacher evaluation instrument used in Connecticut.

- Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI)
- CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey 2022

Table 1: Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators Disaggregated by Evaluator: Spring 2022

Elementary Education (1-6) Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor Spring 2022																		
			Elementary Education (1-6) Key Indicators															
			University Supervisor (n=11)							Mentor (n=11)								
Domain	Element	Competency	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	9	2	0	3.18	0.39	0	0	7	4	0	3.36	0.48
	[2a.2]	Content of lesson appropriate to sequence of lessons and	0	0	10	1	0	3.09	0.29	0	0	6	5	0	3.45	0.50

| | | | Elementary Education (1-6) Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor Spring 2022 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Domain	Element	Competency	Elementary Education (1-6) Key Indicators													
			University Supervisor (n=11)							Mentor (n=11)							
			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	9	1	0	3.00	0.43	0	0	5	6	0	3.55	0.50
	[3a.3]	Content progression and level of challenge	0	0	10	1	0	3.09	0.67	0	0	8	3	0	3.27	0.45
		Frequencies	0	1	38	5	0			0	0	26	18	0		
Percentage of Competencies Scored Below Standard			0.00%							0.00%						
Percentage of Competencies Scored Developing			2%							0.00%						
Percentage of Competencies Scored Proficient			86%							76%						

Domain	Element	Competency	Elementary Education (1-6) Key Indicators													
			University Supervisor (n=11)							Mentor (n=11)						
			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

Elementary Education (1-6)

Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators

Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor

Spring 2022

Elementary Education (1-6) Key Indicators

Percentage of Competencies Scored Exemplary	13%		24%
Spring 2022Mean	3.09		3.40

Overall Candidate Performance: University Supervisor and Mentor Elementary Education Key Indicators - Spring 2022

Percentage Passing (Developing, Proficient, and Exemplary) = 100%

Overall Elementary 2022 Mean = 3.24

Table 2: Secondary Education (7-12) Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators Disaggregated by Evaluator: Spring 2022

- 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 2022.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="17">Secondary Education
Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators
Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor
Spring 2022</td></tr>
</table>

Domain	Element	Competency	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

Secondary Education Key Indicators by Program spans the evaluator columns; **University Supervisor** spans columns 4–10; **Mentor** spans columns 11–17.

Domain	Element	Competency	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary	N/A	Mean	Std Dev	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary	N/A	Mean	Std Dev
	[2a.1]	**Content of lesson plan is aligned with standards**														
		Biology														
2. Planning for Active Learning		**English**	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.0	0
		Mathematics	0	0	4	0	0	3	0	0	0	6	0	0	3.0	0
		Social Studies	0	0	5	0	0	3	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.0	0
		World Languages, Spanish	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.0	0
		MAT Biology	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0

		Secondary Education Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor Spring 2022														
			Secondary Education Key Indicators by Program													
			University Supervisor							Mentor						
Domain	Element	Competency	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
		MAT Social Studies	0	0	1	3	0	3.7	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.2	0
		MAT Spanish	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		[2a.1] Totals	**0**	**0**	**17**	**3**	**0**	**3.1**		**0**	**0**	**17**	**1**	**0**	**3.27**	
	[2a.2]	Content of lesson appropriate to sequence of lessons and appropriate level of challenge														
		Biology														
		English	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	0.50
		Mathematics	0	0	6	0	0	3	0	0	0	6	0	0	3	0
		Social Studies	0	0	4	0	0	3	0	0	0	4	0	0	3	0

		Secondary Education Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor Spring 2022														

			Secondary Education Key Indicators by Program													
			University Supervisor							Mentor						
Domain	**Element**	**Competency**	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
		World Languages, Spanish	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0
		MAT Biology	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		MAT Social Studies	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	0.43	0	0	5	0	0	3	0
		MAT Spanish	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		[2a.2] Totals	**0**	**0**	**18**	**3**	**0**	**3.10**		**0**	**0**	**17**	**1**	**0**	**3.10**	
3. Instruction for Active Learning	**[3a.2]**	**Content accuracy**														
		Biology														
		English	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 2022													
			Secondary Education Key Indicators by Program													
			University Supervisor							**Mentor**						
Domain	**Element**	**Competency**	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
		Mathematics	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	0.37	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	0.69
		Social Studies	0	0	4	0	0	3	0	0	2	2	0	0	2.50	0.50
		World Languages, Spanish	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0
		MAT Biology	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		MAT Social Studies	0	0	0	4	0	4	0	0	1	4	0	0	2.80	0.40
		MAT Spanish	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		[3a.2] Totals	**0**	**0**	**16**	**5**	**0**	**3.16**		**0**	**5**	**11**	**2**	**0**	**2.69**	
	[3a.3]	Content progression and level of challenge														

		Secondary Education Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor Spring 2022														
			Secondary Education Key Indicators by Program													
			University Supervisor						Mentor							
Domain	Element	Competency	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
		Biology														
		English	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	0
		Mathematics	0	0	6	0	0	3	0	0	0	6	0	0	3	0
		Social Studies	0	0	4	0	0	3	0	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	0.43
		World Languages, Spanish	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	0		3	0
		MAT Biology	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		MAT Social Studies	0	1	1	3	0	3.75	0.43	0	0	5	0	0	3	0
		MAT Spanish	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	0.47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Secondary Education Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor Spring 2022																	
			Secondary Education Key Indicators by Program														
			University Supervisor							Mentor							
Domain	Element	Competency	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
		[3a.3] Totals	0	2	17	3	0	3.06		0	1	12	0	0	2.95	
		Frequencies	0	2	50	11	0			0	6	57	4	0		
Percentage of Competencies Scored Below Standard			0.00%							0.00%						
Percentage of Competencies Scored Developing			3.17%							8.90%						
Percentage of Competencies Scored Proficient			79.36%							85.07%						
Percentage of Competencies Scored Exemplary			17.46%							5.97%						

			Secondary Education Key Indicators by Program														
			University Supervisor							Mentor							
Domain	Element	Competency	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
		Spring 2022Mean	3.10							3.02						

Secondary Education

Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators

Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor

Spring 2022

Overall Candidate Performance: University Supervisor and Mentor Secondary Education (7-12) Key Indicators – Spring 2022

Percentage Passing (Developing, Proficient, and Exemplary) = 100%

Overall Secondary 2022 Mean = 3.02

Satisfaction of Employers of AY 2021-2022 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 2023, the survey polled employers of AY 2021-2022 completers from the Elementary Education, Secondary Education, and Health Education initial programs. Names of employers were obtained from program completers who responded to the Alumni Survey. There were no responses from the MAT Secondary Education program completers and therefore it was not possible to discern employment

status. Three follow-up emails were sent to employers as well as phone calls to increase response rate. To supplement survey findings, the EPP hosted a focus group of employers of initial program completers and the findings are in the Appendix.

Results

In AY 2021-2022 there were a total of 43 initial program completers. Of the 17 elementary education majors, 6 (35%) responded to the Completer Survey giving us the names of their employers. One of the 6 employers (16%) polled then responded to the Employer Survey; of the 14 Secondary Education Majors, 3 (21%) responded to the Completer Survey giving us the names of their employers; 2 of the 3 employers (66%) responded to the Employer Survey; of the 3 Health Education completers, 1 (33%) responded to the Completer Survey giving us the names of their employers; 1 of the 1 employers (100%) responded to the Employer Survey. As was mentioned above, there were no MAT Secondary Education Program Completer responses.

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. There were no Health Education completers in AY 2020-2021.Except for the MAT Secondary Education program completers, the 2023 survey response rates are at or above the CAEP minimum requirements, and they are similar to response rates obtained for the AY 2020-2021 cohort of completers.

A comparison of Employer Survey response rates across the two years revealed a consistent rate of responding on the part of the employers surveyed. Tables 3-5 below report results from the 2023 Employer Surveys. Comparisons of Employer Survey ratings for the past three cohorts of completers (AY2019-2020, AY2020-2021 and AY 2021-2022) 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, for the AY 2020-2021 cohort, 2.73, and slightly lower for AY 2021-2022 cohort at 2.38. 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 three Secondary Education completer cohorts were 2.77, 2.60 and 2.88, respectively. Comparisons of Health Education Program ratings was not possible because there was not a cohort of Health Education completers in AY 2020-2021. Only one employer rated one AY 2021-2022 Health Education 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 2021-2022 completers: Elementary Education (1 responder)

WCSU Employer Survey			
Academic Year	**Content Indicator**	**Mean**	**Range**
2021-2022	1.Integrates appropriate standards into instruction	2.0	(2)
	2. Adapts instruction to diverse students and differences in learning.	2.0	(2)
	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	2.0	(2)
	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	2.0	(2)
	11. Creates effective learning environments	2.0	(2)
	12. Behaves in accordance with professional ethics	3.0	(3)
	13. Effectively integrates technology into their instruction	3.0	(3)
Overall Mean: 2.38			

Table 4 Results of CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey of AY 2021-2022 completers: Secondary Education (2 respondents)

WCSU Employer Survey			
Academic Year	**Content Indicator**	**Mean**	**Range**
2021-2022	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	2.5	(2-3)
	7. Interacts well with parents and community members	2.5	(2-3)
	8. Assesses student learning	2.5	(2-3)
	9. Engages in reflective thinking during the entire instructional cycle	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)
Overall Mean: 2.88			

Table 5. Results of CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey of AY 2021-2022 completers: Health Education (1 respondent)

WCSU Employer Survey			
Academic Year	**Content Indicator**	**Mean**	**Range**
2021-2022	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)
Overall Mean: 3.0			

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 2023 Elementary Education
- CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey 2023 Secondary Education
- CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey 2023 Health Education
- CAEP Initial Programs Alumni Survey 2023 Elementary Education
- CAEP Initial Programs Alumni Survey 2023 Secondary Education
- CAEP Initial Programs Alumni Survey 2023 Health Education
- CAEP Advanced Programs MSED Literacy & Language Arts Employer Survey 2023
- CAEP Advanced Programs MSED Literacy & Language Arts Alumni Survey 2023
- CAEP Advanced Programs MSED Special Education Alumni Survey 2023
- CAEP Advanced Programs MSED Special Education Employer Survey 2023
- CAEP Advanced Programs 092 Program Alumni Survey 2023
- CAEP Advanced Programs 092 Program Employer Survey 2023
- Initial and Advanced Program Completer Focus Group
- Employer Focus Group

As mentioned above, Tables 3 through 5 displayed in the Measure 1 component reported the initial program employer surveys. The following tables report the Employer surveys for the advanced programs.

Satisfaction of Employers of AY 2021-2022 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 1 employer of the completers from the MSED in Special Education program. Three surveys were sent to the employers of the 092 program completers. There was one survey response from the employer in the MSED in Literacy and Language Arts program (33%) and none from the MSED in Special Education program. One

employer responded to the 092 survey (33%). The EPP followed up to improve the response rate, calling the schools and emailing three times to remind principals to complete the survey. A focus group interview was held consisting of employers of all three advanced programs to supplement the findings (see Appendix).

Results

Only one employer responded to the surveys that were sent for completers of the 092 Certificate in Intermediate Administration and Supervision Program. Table 6 contains this data. Examination of this table reveals that the mean score for the 092 Certificate in Intermediate Administration and Supervision was 3.5 (response options ranged from 2 to 4) Six indicators were rated "3" (Proficient) and 1 indicator was rated "4" (Exemplary). Comparison cannot be made for the 092 Certificate in Intermediate Administration and Supervision across the AY 2020-2021 and AY 2021-2022 cohorts because there were no program completers in 2021.

Table 6 CAEP Advanced Programs 092 Certificate in Intermediate Administration and Supervision Employer Survey 2023 (1 Respondent)

CAEP Advanced Programs Employer Survey 2023		
Academic Year	**Content Indicator**	**Mean**
2021-2022	1. The administrator/educational leader: Is able to develop, articulate, implement, and steward a vision characterized by respect for students, their families, and community stakeholders.	2.0
	2. The administrator/educational leader: Is able to plan for appropriate curriculum and instruction at the school and/or district level.	3.0
	3. The administrator/educational leader: Is able to monitor curriculum and instruction at the school and/or district level.	2.0
	4. The administrator/educational leader: Is able to manage school and/or district-based operations.	2.0
	5. The administrator/educational leader: Is able to manage school and/or district-based resources and budgets.	2.0
	6. The administrator/educational leader: Is able to manage, interpret and use data for school improvement.	3.0
	7. The administrator/educational leader: Is able to manage building and/or district scheduling	2.0
	8. The administrator/educational leader: Collaborates effectively with faculty, parents, and community members	3.0

CAEP Advanced Programs Employer Survey 2023		
Academic Year	**Content Indicator**	**Mean**
	9. The administrator/educational leader: Acts ethically demonstrating integrity and fairness.	4.0
	10. The administrator/educational leader: Is able to use problem-solving to formulate sound strategies to deal with educational dilemmas.	3.0
	11. The administrator/educational leader: Is able to advocate for the diverse needs of students, parents, and faculty.	3.0
	12. The administrator/educational leader: Is able to create a school climate and culture that facilitates the growth and development of all students.	3.0
Overall Mean=3.5		

Table 7 CAEP Advanced Programs MSED Literacy & Language Arts Employer Survey 2023(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.	4.0
	3. Adapts instruction to differences in learning.	4.0
	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

CAEP Advanced Programs Employer Survey 2021		
Academic Year	**Content Indicator**	**Mean**
	7. Applies classroom management practices	4.0
	8. Interacts well with parents and community members.	4.0
	9. Assesses student learning.	4.0
	10. Grows professionally through reflection.	4.0
	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
	15. Reaches employment milestones (i.e., promotion, tenure) at rates comparable to graduates of other teacher preparation programs.	4.0
Overall Mean=4.0		

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 satisfactory ratings to most of the indicators, evincing a high degree of employer satisfaction. No indicators were rated below satisfactory.

- The mean scores for the MSED in Literacy and Language Arts program continue to improve with 4.0 in AY 2021-2022 and 3.26 in AY 2020-2021.

Areas of Improvement

- Relative weaknesses (mean ratings of 2 out of 3) for the Elementary Education program completers were in the areas of integrating standards, differentiating instruction, 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 classroom management, interacting with parents and community members, and assessing student learning.

- The EPP must continue to make efforts to improve employer satisfaction survey response rates. 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.

CAEP Initial Programs AY 2021-2022 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 2023 survey polled AY 2021-2022 program completers of all initial programs. The survey was sent to 17 Elementary Education completers, 14 Secondary Education completers, 3 Health Education completers, and 9 M.A.T. Secondary Education completers.

Results

Of the 17 AY 2021-2022 Elementary Education completers, 7 returned the survey for a response rate of 41%; of the 14 AY 2020-2021 Secondary Education completers, 4 returned the survey for a response rate of 28%; 100% of the Health Education completers returned the survey, with zero MAT Secondary Education program completers responding. Except for the MAT Secondary Education program completers, these response rates are at or above the CAEP minimum requirements, and they are similar to response rates obtained for the AY 2020-2021 cohort of completers that were reported in the 2022 Annual Report (30% for Elementary Education completers and 50% 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 2021-2022 Elementary Education, Secondary Education and Health Education program completers were 2.35, 2.62, and .47, respectively. Comparisons can be made with the AY 2020-2021 completers in Elementary Education and

Secondary Education, where the overall means were 1.55 and 1.76, respectively. There were no Health Education program completers in AY 2020-2021.

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 2021-2022 Secondary Education survey mean of 2.62 is significantly higher than means reported for the previous two cohorts. Similarly, the AY 2021-2022 Elementary Education program survey mean of 2.35 was higher than previous AY 2020-21 1.55 mean. It should be noted that these higher means may be the result of more consistent in person fieldwork and courses post-COVID lockdown. However, the AY Health Education program mean of .47 was significantly low. Examination of individual survey response protocols revealed consistently low ratings on most of the indicators across respondents.   The low survey mean may be due to the death of the program coordinator a few years ago that resulted in disruption of program advisement and coordination. The issue has now been resolved with a new program coordinator and the program is back on track.

The 2022 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). In AY 2021-2022 these indicators were rated higher with 1) *Collaborate with peers and coordinate instruction with special education teachers* scoring a mean of 2.49 and (2) *Implement and interpret and use student performance assessments for effective instruction* with a mean of 2.4, indicating improvement in these areas.

Table 8. CAEP Initial Programs Completer Survey AY 2021-2022

Table 8a. CAEP Initial Programs Alumni Survey: Elementary Education AY 2021-2022 Program Completers (7 respondents)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
2022 ELEM ED	1. Integrate appropriate professional and educational standards.	2.5	(2-3)
	2. Identify and adapt instruction to diverse student learners.	2.3	(2-3)
	3. Adapt instruction to diverse student learning.	2.5	(2-3)
	4. Facilitate student critical thinking, problem solving and higher order thinking skills.	2.5	(2-3)
	5. Encourage and motivate all student to learn.	2.7	(2-3)
	6. Create effective learning environments.	2.7	(2-3)
	7. Integrate technology into classroom instruction.	2.2	(2-3)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
	8. Effectively communicate with students through both oral and written modes.	2.3	(2-3)
	9. Grow professionally through reflection.	2.5	(2-3)
	10. Appropriately apply effective classroom management practices.	2.4	(2-3)
	11. Effectively interact with students, teachers, parent, and community members.	2.1	(2-3)
	12. Understand human development as it relates to the teaching-learning process.	2.5	(1-3)
	13. Demonstrate appropriate ethical and professional behavior.	2.5	(2-3)
	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.	2.2	(2-3)
	16. Develop classroom and school leadership.	2.2	(2-3)
	17. Develop a positive disposition toward students.	2.5	(2-3)
	18. Collaborate with peers and coordinate instruction with special education teachers.	2.4	(1-3)
	19.Develop quality instructional units.	2.2	(2-3)
	20. Appropriately select and use a wide variety of instructional strategies, resource materials, and media.	2.1	(1-3)
	21. Implement, interpret and use student performance assessments for effective instruction.	2.2	(2-3)
	22. Use individual, small group and large group instructional arrangements.	2.2	(2-3)
	23. Develop online learning expectations for students.	2.0	(1-3)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
Overall Mean: 2.35			

Table 8.b CAEP Initial Programs Alumni Survey Secondary Education AY 2021-2022 Program Completers (4 Respondents)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
2022 SEC ED	1. Integrate appropriate professional and educational standards.	3.00	(2)
	2. Identify and adapt instruction to diverse student learners.	2.75	(2-3)
	3. Adapt instruction to diverse student learning.	2.75	(2-3)
	4. Facilitate student critical thinking, problem solving and higher order thinking skills.	2.50	(2-3)
	5. Encourage and motivate all student to learn.	2.75	(2-3)
	6. Create effective learning environments.	2.75	(2-3)
	7. Integrate technology into classroom instruction.	2.50	(2-3)
	8. Effectively communicate with students through both oral and written modes.	2.75	(2-3)
	9. Grow professionally through reflection.	2.50	(2-3)
	10. Appropriately apply effective classroom management practices.	2.25	(2-3)
	11. Effectively interact with students, teachers, parent, and community members.	2.25	(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.	3.00	(3)
	14. Develop Sensitivity and Respect for the needs and feelings of all students.	2.75	(2-3)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
	15. Recognize both how the organization of the district and school can affect the individual teacher.	2.5	(2-2)
	16. Develop classroom and school leadership.	2.75	(2-3)
	17. Develop a positive disposition toward students.	2.75	(2-3)
	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.	2.50	(2-3)
	21. Implement, interpret and use student performance assessments for effective instruction.	2.75	(2-3)
	22. Use individual, small group and large group instructional arrangements.	2.75	(2-3)
	23. Develop online learning expectations for students.	2.50	(2-3)
Overall Mean: 2.62			

Table 8.c. CAEP Initial Programs Alumni Survey: Health Education 2022 Program Completers (3 Respondents)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
2022	1. Integrate appropriate professional and educational standards.	.67	(0-2)
	2. Identify and adapt instruction to diverse student learners.	.33	(0-1)
Health Education	3. Adapt instruction to diverse student learning.	.33	(0-1)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
	4. Facilitate student critical thinking, problem solving and higher order thinking skills.	.67	(0-2)
	5. Encourage and motivate all student to learn.	.67	(0-2)
	6. Create effective learning environments.	.67	(0-2)
	7. Integrate technology into classroom instruction.	.67	(0-2)
	8. Effectively communicate with students through both oral and written modes.	.67	(0-2)
	9. Grow professionally through reflection.	.67	(0-2)
	10. Appropriately apply effective classroom management practices.	.33	(0-1)
	11. Effectively interact with students, teachers, parent, and community members.	.33	(0-1)
	12. Understand human development as it relates to the teaching-learning process.	.33	(0-1)
	13. Demonstrate appropriate ethical and professional behavior.	.67	(0-2)
	14. Develop Sensitivity and Respect for the needs and feelings of all students.	.33	(0-1)
	15. Recognize both how the organization of the district and school can affect the individual teacher.	.33	(0-1)
	16. Develop classroom and school leadership.	.33	(0-1)
	17. Develop a positive disposition toward students.	.33	(0-1)
	18. Collaborate with peers and coordinate instruction with special education teachers.	.67	(0-2)
	19.Develop quality instructional units.	.33	(0-1)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
	20. Appropriately select and use a wide variety of instructional strategies, resource materials, and media.	.33	(0-1)
	21. Implement, interpret and use student performance assessments for effective instruction.	.33	(0-1)
	22. Use individual, small group and large group instructional arrangements.	.67	(0-2)
	23. Develop online learning expectations for students.	.33	(0-1)
Overall Mean: .47			

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

Strengths

- AY 2021-2022 BS in Education candidates, on average, rated many indicators as S*atisfactory* or above.

Areas of Improvement

- Relative low ratings for the areas of**;** *Collaborate with peers and coordinate instruction with special education teachers* and (2) *Implement and interpret and use student performance assessments for effective instruction.*
- Significantly low .47 mean survey response for the Health Education Program.
- No survey response from MAT Secondary Education program completers.

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 to better understand their assessments of program strengths and weaknesses.
- Continue to monitor Health Education program coordination and implementation of curriculum.

CAEP Advanced Programs AY 2021-2022 Completer Satisfaction

Descriptions and Procedures

In 2023 the CAEP Advanced Programs Completer Survey was sent to a total of 18 2021-2022 program completers (5 of whom were graduated from the MSED Special Education program, 9 of whom were graduated from the MSED Literacy and Language Arts Program, and 4 from the 092 Certificate in Intermediate Administration and Supervision). Follow-up phone calls and text messages were also made to attempt to increase response rates.

Results

One MSED Special Education completer responded, six MSED Literacy and Language Arts completers responded, and 4 092 Certificate in Intermediate Administration and Supervision completers, for response rates of 20 %, 66%, and 100% respectively. In 2022 the same survey had been sent to 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), for response rates of 50% and 43% respectively. There were no 092 Certificate in Intermediate Administration and Supervision program completers in 2021. The 2023 survey response rates are at or above the CAEP minimum requirements, and they are similar to response rates obtained for the AY 2020-2021 cohort of advanced program completers.

Results of the Alumni Survey filled out by 2021-2022 completers are summarized in Tables 9, 10 and 11. Rubric response options ranged from "2" *Satisfactory* to "4" *Well above satisfactory*. Examination of Table 9 reveals that the overall mean of the responses of the AY 2021-2022 MSED in Literacy and Language Arts to the completer survey across the 23 indicators was 2.18. This was lower than the overall mean of 3.6 reported last year yet similar to the mean of 2.01 obtained from the AY 2019-AY2020 MSED Literacy completers. Examination of Table 10 reveals that the overall mean of the responses of the AY 2021-2022 MSED in Special Education to the completer survey across the 23 indicators was 2.91, compared to the higher overall mean of 2.30 reported last year (AY 2020-2021) and the 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. Examination of Table 11 reveals that the overall mean of responses of the AY 2021-2022 092 Certificate in Intermediate Administration and Supervision program survey was 3.60 with 100% of completers responding.

Table 9 CAEP Advanced Programs Alumni Survey: MSED in Literacy and Language Arts 2021 Program Completers (6 Respondents)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
2022 MSED LIT	1. Integrate appropriate professional and educational standards.	2.3	(2-4)
	2. Identify and adapt instruction to diverse student learners.	2.8	(2-4)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
	3. Adapt instruction to diverse student learning.	2.5	(2-4)
	4. Facilitate student critical thinking, problem solving and higher order thinking skills.	2.1	(2-3)
	5. Encourage and motivate all student to learn.	2.3	(2-4)
	6. Create effective learning environments.	2.3	(2-3)
	7. Integrate technology into classroom instruction.	2.1	(2-3)
	8. Effectively communicate with students through both oral and written modes.	2.1	(2-3)
	9. Grow professionally through reflection.	2.3	(2-4)
	10. Appropriately apply effective classroom management practices.	2.3	(2-4)
	11. Effectively interact with students, teachers, parent, and community members.	2.1	(2-3)
	12. Understand human development as it relates to the teaching-learning process.	2.3	(2-4)
	13. Demonstrate appropriate ethical and professional behavior.	2.1	(2-3)
	14. Develop Sensitivity and Respect for the needs and feelings of all students.	2.1	(2-3)
	15. Recognize both how the organization of the district and school can affect the individual teacher.	2.3	(2-4)
	16. Develop classroom and school leadership.	2.0	(2)
	17. Develop a positive disposition toward students.	2.3	(2-4)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
	18. Collaborate with peers and coordinate instruction with special education teachers.	2.3	(2-4)
	19.Develop quality instructional units.	1.8	(1-3)
	20. Appropriately select and use a wide variety of instructional strategies, resource materials, and media.	2.0	(1-4)
	21. Implement, interpret and use student performance assessments for effective instruction.	1.6	(1-4)
	22. Use individual, small group and large group instructional arrangements.	2.3	(2-4)
	23. Develop online learning expectations for students.	2.0	(2)
Overall Mean: 2.18			

Table 10 CAEP Advanced Programs Alumni Survey: MSED Special Education 2022 Program Completers (1 Respondent)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
	1. Integrate appropriate professional and educational standards.	3.0	(3)
	2. Identify and adapt instruction to diverse student learners.	3.0	(3)
	3. Adapt instruction to diverse student learning.	3.0	(3)
2022 MSED SPED	4. Facilitate student critical thinking, problem solving and higher order thinking skills.	3.0	(3)
	5. Encourage and motivate all student to learn.	3.0	(3)
	6. Create effective learning environments.	3.0	(3)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
	7. Integrate technology into classroom instruction.	3.0	(3)
	8. Effectively communicate with students through both oral and written modes.	3.0	(3)
	9. Grow professionally through reflection.	4.0	(4)
	10. Appropriately apply effective classroom management practices.	3.0	(3)
	11. Effectively interact with students, teachers, parent, and community members.	3.0	(3)
	12. Understand human development as it relates to the teaching-learning process.	3.0	(3)
	13. Demonstrate appropriate ethical and professional behavior.	3.0	(3)
	14. Develop Sensitivity and Respect for the needs and feelings of all students.	3.0	(3)
	15. Recognize both how the organization of the district and school can affect the individual teacher.	3.0	(3)
	16. Develop classroom and school leadership.	3.0	(3)
	17. Develop a positive disposition toward students.	3.0	(3)
	18. Collaborate with peers and coordinate instruction with special education teachers.	2.0	(2)
	19.Develop quality instructional units.	3.0	(3)
	20. Appropriately select and use a wide variety of instructional strategies, resource materials, and media.	3.0	(3)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
	21. Implement, interpret and use student performance assessments for effective instruction.	3.0	(3)
	22. Use individual, small group and large group instructional arrangements.	2.0	(2)
	23. Develop online learning expectations for students.	2.00	(2)
Overall Mean: 2.91			

Table 11 CAEP Advanced Programs Alumni Survey: 092 Program Completers (4 Respondents)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
	1. The 092 program prepared me to undertake the duties and responsibilities of an instructional leader.	3.5	(3-4)
	2. The 092 program prepared me to lead and motivate others.	3.5	(3-4)
	3. The 092 program prepared me to work collaboratively with teachers and other administrators.	3.7	(3-4)
	4. The 092 program prepared me to communicate effectively with students, parents/guardians.	3.5	(3-4)
2022 092 Program	5. The 092 program prepared me to communicate effectively with community stakeholders.	3.7	(3-4)
	6. The 092 program prepared me to give effective instructional feedback to teachers.	3.5	(3-4)
	7. The 092 program prepared me to plan, develop, and adjust services to meet the needs of diverse learners.	3.5	(3-4)
	8. The 092 program prepared me to utilize relevant technologies.	3.5	(3-4)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
	9. The 092 program prepared me to manage, interpret and use data for school improvement.	3.5	(3-4)
	10. The 092 program prepared me in the areas of professional, state and institutional standard and ethics.	3.5	(3-4)
	11. The 092 program prepared me in the areas of problem-solving and decision-making.	3.7	(3-4)
	12. The 092 program prepared me for state licensure examinations.	4.0	(4)
Overall Mean: 3.6			

Analysis (Strengths/Areas for Improvement) for the Advanced MSED Programs in Literacy and Language Arts, MSED Special Education and 092 Program based on the Aggregate Data

Strengths

- All but two of the mean ratings given to items by AY2021-2022 program completers in MSED in Literacy and Language Arts were 2 or higher, suggesting overall average satisfaction with the program. Mean ratings given by the MSED in Special Education were higher than last year, suggesting completer satisfaction as above average most areas of the program. All 092 Certificate in Intermediate Administration and Supervision program completers rated the program as well above or above satisfaction on all indicators.

- The highest mean ratings of 3.7 were observed in a number of areas rated by the 092 Certificate in Intermediate Administration and Supervision completers, including; '*The 092 program prepared me to work collaboratively with teachers and other administrators; The 092 program prepared me to communicate effectively with community stakeholders; and The 092 program prepared me in the areas of problem-solving and decision-making*'.

Areas of Improvement

- The lowest rated indicators across performance indicators given by the 2021-2022 completers were in the MSED Literacy and Language Arts program survey in the following areas; '*Develop quality instructional units; Appropriately select and use a wide variety of instructional strategies, resource materials, and media; and Implement, interpret and use student performance assessments for effective instruction.*' 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.

- Weaknesses identified by the MSED Special Education completers were in the areas of '*collaborate with peers and coordinate instruction with special education teachers, use individual, small group and large group instructional arrangements, and develop online learning expectations for students.* These areas received satisfactory mean ratings yet were lower than the other indicators.

- There were no identified areas of weakness in the 092 Certificate in Intermediate Administration and Supervision

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 limited number of survey responses which makes data interpretation, drawing conclusions, and observing patterns difficult.

- Hold exit interviews with the members of the AY 2022-2023 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 2022 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 participant approvals. Observations are not permitted by school districts due to union regulations and therefore the EPP focused on employer/alumni survey results, 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: Focus Groups (Completer and Employer) (4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4): Qualitative data were collected in the form of focus group interviews. The question prompts were 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 2021-2022 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, implementation of assessments, and comprehensive fieldwork.

- Consider additional course content and practice with how to communicate and collaborate with all stakeholders.

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.

2021-2022 (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 11. 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

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

Table 12: Summary: Practice edTPA Rubric Score Distribution for Elementary, Secondary Programs, Health Education Programs Jan-July 2022

	N	Total Score Mean	Planning					Instruction					Assessment					Mean by Task		
			P01	P02	P03	P04	P05	I06	I07	I08	I09	I10	A11	A12	A13	A14	A15	P	I	A
All 15-Rubric Handbooks	27	43.4	3.1	2.9	3.0	2.9	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.7	2.9	2.7	2.9	3.1	2.8	2.9	2.7	14.9	14.1	14.4
Health Education	3	45.0	3.3	3.3	3.0	3.0	3.3	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.7	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.7	2.7	3.0	16.0	14.7	14.3
K-12 Performing Arts	8	44.6	3.1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.8	3.0	3.2	3.0	2.8	3.1	3.1	15.1	14.3	15.2
Secondary English-Language Arts	1	39.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	14.0	12.0	13.0
Secondary History/Social Studies	8	42.8	3.0	2.9	3.0	2.9	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.6	2.8	2.6	2.6	3.1	2.6	14.8	14.3	13.8
Secondary Mathematics	6	42.7	3.2	2.7	3.0	3.0	3.2	3.0	2.3	2.5	3.0	2.3	2.7	3.8	3.0	2.7	2.3	15.0	13.2	14.5
Secondary Science	1	43.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	2.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	12.0	17.0	14.0

	N	Total Score Mean	Planning					Instruction					Assessment					Mean by Task		
			P01	P02	P03	P04	P05	I06	I07	I08	I09	I10	A11	A12	A13	A14	A15	P	I	A
All 13-Rubric Handbooks	3	28.7	2.3	2.7	2.7		2.0	3.0	2.7	2.0	1.7	2.0	1.7	2.3	1.7		2.0	9.7	11.3	7.7
World Language	3	28.7	2.3	2.7	2.7		2.0	3.0	2.7	2.0	1.7	2.0	1.7	2.3	1.7		2.0	9.7	11.3	7.7

	N	Total Score Mean	Planning					Instruction					Assessment					Mathematics			Mean by Task		
			P01	P02	P03	P04	P05	I06	I07	I08	I09	I10	A11	A12	A13	A14	A15	M19	M20	M21	P	I	A
All 18-Rubric Handbooks	15	48.8	2.6	2.5	2.8	2.7	2.4	3.0	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.5	2.7	3.6	2.7	2.6	2.9	2.4	2.8	2.6	13.0	13.5	14.5
Elementary Education: Literacy with Mathematics Task 4	15	48.8	2.6	2.5	2.8	2.7	2.4	3.0	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.5	2.7	3.6	2.7	2.6	2.9	2.4	2.8	2.6	13.0	13.5	14.5

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 for 15-Rubric Handbooks was 43.4 and for 18-Rubric Handbooks it was 48.8.

Practice edTPA Component Areas of Strength

- 1.How do the candidate's plans build students' abilities to…(content specific):
  - Overall, 75% of 2022 candidates scored at the Advanced level (mean of 3.0) in this competency. This was higher than last year's cohort.
  - The overall mean for this competency was 3.3, indicating an area of strength.
- 3.How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her students to justify instructional plans?
  - Overall, 62% of 2022 candidates scored at the Advanced level (mean of 3.0) in this competency with an overall of 3.18.
- 4. How does the candidate identify, and support language demands associated with a key (content) learning task?
  - Overall, 57% of candidates scored at the Advanced level (mean of 3.0).
  - The overall mean for this competency was 3.07.
- 6. How does the candidate demonstrate a positive learning environment that supports students' engagement in learning?
  - Overall, 100% of candidates scored at the Advanced level (mean of 3.0).
  - The overall mean for this competency was 3.0.
- 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 2.6.
  - One Secondary Science candidate scored at the Exemplary 4.0 level.
- 10. How does the candidate use evidence to evaluate and change teaching practice to meet students' varied learning needs?
  - Overall, 37% of candidates scored at the Advanced level (mean of 3.0).
  - The overall mean for this competency was 3.0.
- 12. What type of feedback does the candidate provide to focus students?
  - Overall, 75% of candidates scored at the Advanced level (mean of 3.0).
  - The overall mean for this competency was 3.5.
  - One Secondary Science candidate scored at the Exemplary 4.0 level.
- 15. How does the candidate use the analysis of what students know and are able to do to plan next steps in instruction?
  - Overall, 37% of candidates scored at the Advanced level (mean of 3.0).

o   The overall mean for this competency was 2.95.

Practice edTPA Portfolio Areas of Improvement

- A mean under 2.0 is considered an overall area of improvement.
- 1.2% 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?
  - o   Overall, 1.2 % of the candidates scored at the Emerging level in this competency.
- How does the candidate use student feedback to analyze learning?
  - o   Overall, 1.2 % of candidates scored at the Emerging level in this competency.

Advanced Programs

Table 13. CAEP Advanced Literacy and Language Arts Program Practicum Evaluation: Summer 2022

CAEP Advanced Literacy and Language Arts Program **Practicum Evaluation** **2022**							
Standard Elements **Reading/Literacy Specialist**	**Summer 2022** **n= 9**						
	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	1	8	0	0	2.8	0.31
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	2	7	0	0	2.7	0.41

CAEP Advanced Literacy and Language Arts Program Practicum Evaluation 2022							
Standard Elements **Reading/Literacy Specialist**	**Summer 2022** **n= 9**						
	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation
4.1 Candidates demonstrate knowledge of foundational theories about diverse learners, equity, and culturally responsive instruction.	0	0	9	0	0	3.0	0.00
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	1	0	3.1	0.31
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	1	0	3.1	0.31
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	9	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	8	1	0	3.1	0.31
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	9	0	0	3.0	0.31
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	0	8	1	0	3.1	0.31
Frequencies	**0**	**3**	**74**	**4**	**0**		
% Below Standard	**0.00%**						

CAEP Advanced Literacy and Language Arts Program Practicum Evaluation 2022							
Standard Elements **Reading/Literacy Specialist**	**Summer 2022** **n= 9**						
	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation
% Developing	3%						
% Proficient	93%						
% Exemplary	4%						
Overall Mentor Mean by Cohort	3.01						
Literacy and Language Arts Program Practicum Evaluation (2022) **100% Passing (Developing, Proficient, and Exemplary)**							

Table 14 CAEP Advanced MSED Special Education Program Practicum Evaluation: Summer 2022

MSED in Special Education Practicum Assessment:							
Rubric Element	Summer 2022 n= 5						
	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation
CEC 2.1 Beginning special education professionals through collaboration with general educators and other colleagues create safe, inclusive, culturally responsive learning environments to engage individuals with exceptionalities in meaningful learning activities and social interactions.	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	0.40
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	5	0	0	3.00	0.00
CEC 2.3 Beginning special education professionals know how to intervene safely and appropriately with individuals with exceptionalities in crisis.	0	0	5	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	3	2	0	3.40	0.49

Rubric Element	Summer 2022 n= 5						
	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation
CEC 3.3 Beginning special education professionals modify general and specialized curricula to make them accessible to individuals with exceptionalities.	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	0.00
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	0	4	1	0	3.20	0.40
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	5	0	0	3.00	0.00
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	5	0	0	3.00	0.00
CEC 5.1 Beginning special education professionals consider individual abilities, interests,	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	0.00

MSED in Special Education Practicum Assessment:

Rubric Element	Summer 2022 n= 5						
	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation
learning environments, and cultural and linguistic factors in the selection, development, and adaptation of learning 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	5	0	0	3.00	0.00
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	5	0	0	3.00	0.00
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	5	0	0	3.00	0.00
CEC 7.1	0	0	5	0	0	3.0	0.00

MSED in Special Education Practicum Assessment:

Rubric Element	Summer 2022 n= 5						
	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation
Beginning special education professionals use the theory and elements of effective collaboration.							
CEC 7.2 Beginning special education professionals serve as a collaborative resource to colleagues.	0	0	5	0	0	3.0	0.00
Frequencies	**0**	**0**	**66**	**4**	**0**		
% Below Standard	0%						
% Developing	0%.						
% Proficient	94%						
% Exemplary	6%						
Overall Mean by Cohort	3.05						

MSED in Special Education Practicum Assessment (Summer 2022)

100% Passing (Developing, Proficient, and Exemplary)

Table 15 CAEP Advanced 092 Administration Program Mentorship Survey: Spring 2022

			Advanced Program: 092 Administration Program CAEP 092 Program ED 665 5a University Supervisor and Mentor Survey2022 (Mentor Report)						
Year of Assessment	**Course**	**Total N**	**Rubric Component**	**Number at Unacceptable**	**Number at Developing**	**Number at Proficient**	**Number at Exemplary**	**Mean**	**Standard Deviation**
2022	ED 665	5	5a.01. Develop, articulate, implement, and steward a vision at the building level (1.1). Candidates understand and can collaboratively develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared vision of learning for a school.	0	0	0	5	4.0	0.00
2022	ED 665	5	5a.02. Plan for appropriate curriculum and instruction at the building level (2.1).	0	0	1	4	3.8	0.40
2022	ED 665	5	5a.03. Monitor curriculum and instruction at the building level (2.4). Candidates understand and can promote the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning in a school environment.	0	0	1	4	3.8	0.40
2022	ED 665	5	5a.04. Manage school-based operations at the building level (3.1).Candidates understand and can monitor and evaluate school management and operational systems.	0	0	1	4	3.8	0.40
2022	ED 665	5	5a.05. Manage school resources and budgets at the building level (3.2). Candidates understand and can efficiently use human, fiscal, and technological resources to manage school operations.	0	0	1	4	3.8	0.40
2022	ED 665	5	5a.06. Manage school policy at the building level (3.3). Candidates understand and can promote school-based policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety of students and staff within the school.	0	0	3	2	3.60	0.49
2022	ED 665	5	5a.07. Model and develop the capacity for distributed leadership at the building level (3.4) Candidates understand and can develop school capacity for distributed leadership..	0	0	4	1	3.80	0.40

			Advanced Program: 092 Administration Program CAEP 092 Program ED 665 5a University Supervisor and Mentor Survey2022 (Mentor Report)						
Year of Assessment	Course	Total N	Rubric Component	Number at Unacceptable	Number at Developing	Number at Proficient	Number at Exemplary	Mean	Standard Deviation
2022	ED 665	5	5a.08. Manage school scheduling at the building level (3.5). Candidates understand and can ensure teacher and organizational time focuses on supporting high-quality school instruction and student learning.	0	0	4	1	3.80	0.40
2022	ED 665	5	5a.09. Collaborate with faculty and community members at the building level (4.1).Candidates understand and can collaborate with faculty and community members by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to the improvement of the school's educational environment.	0	0	0	5	4.0	0.00
2022	ED 665	5	5a.10. Collaborate with families and caregivers at the building level (4.3). Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining positive school relationships with families and caregivers.	0	0	0	5	4.0	0.00
2022	ED 665	5	5a.11. Act ethically, demonstrating integrity and fairness at the building level (5.1). Candidates understand and can act with integrity and fairness to ensure a school system of accountability for every student's academic and social success.	0	0	0	5	4.0	0.00
2022	ED 665	5	5a.12. Formulate sound school strategies to educational dilemmas at the building level (5.4). Candidates understand and can evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the school.	0	0	2	3	3.60	0.49
2022	ED 665	5	5a.13. Advocate for the diverse needs of students, parents, and faculty at the building level (6.1). Candidates understand and can advocate for school students, families, and caregivers.	0	0	0	5	4.0	0.00
2022	ED 665	5	5a.14. Understand the larger context in order to act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions at the building level (6.3). Candidates understand and can anticipate and assess emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt school-based leadership strategies.	0	0	1	4	3.80	0.40
			Frequencies	0	0	18	52		
			% Below Standard	0.00%					
			% Developing	0.00%					

Advanced Program: 092 Administration Program CAEP 092 Program ED 665 5a University Supervisor and Mentor Survey2022 (Mentor Report)										
Year of Assessment	Course	Total N	Rubric Component	Number at Unacceptable	Number at Developing	Number at Proficient	Number at Exemplary	Mean	Standard Deviation
% Proficient				25%					
% Exemplary				75%					
Overall Mentor Mean by Cohort				3.84					
092 Administration Program Mentorship Survey (2022) 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: 46% (80% in AY 2020-2021)

- Secondary Education: 78% (100% in AY 20220-2021)

- MAT Program: 78% (100% in AY 2020-2021)

Advanced Programs

- MSED Literacy and Language Arts: Two completers took the licensing exam and passed (100%)

- MSED Special Education: No completers took the licensing exam.

- 092 Program: 100%

CAEP Accountability Measures AY 2021-2022

CAEP Accountability Measure	WCSU Accountability Measure	Results
Measure 1: Initial Completer Effectiveness	*Due to COVID-19, CSDE did not provide the EPP with TEAM data for 2022 program completers. Therefore, the EPP has provided the Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) data for 20222 program completers. The STEI is the SEED teacher evaluation instrument used in Connecticut.* • Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) • CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey 2023 .	**Elementary Education**: **STEI** Mean was 3.24 with Domain 3 Instruction for Active Learning posting a mean of 3.41. Both means were higher than the AY 2020-2021 cohort. **CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey 2023 Elementary Education:** Employers rated 2022 completers **Proficient** on their ability to integrate technology in instruction. 2022 completers were rated either **Satisfactory** or **Proficient** across all indicators. **Secondary Education:** **STEI** Mean was 3.02 with Domain 3 Instruction for Active Learning posting a mean of 2.69. **CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey 2023 Secondary Education:** Employers rated 2022completers **Satisfactory** on their ability to adapt instruction to diverse students and differences in learning. 2022 completers were rated either **Satisfactory** or **Proficient** across all indicators. **CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey 2021** **Health Education:** Employers rated 2022 completers **Proficient** across all indicators.

| Measure 2: Satisfaction of Employers and Stakeholder Involvement (Initial & Advanced) | **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** | **Initial Programs**
CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey 2023 Elementary Education: Survey mean was 2.38 indicating that employers rated completers Satisfactory.
CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey 2023 Secondary Education: Survey mean was 2.88 indicating that completers were rated Satisfactory by their employers.
CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey 2023 Health Education: Survey mean was 3.0 indicating that completers were rated Proficient by their employers.
CAEP Initial Programs Alumni Survey 2023 Elementary Education: Survey mean was 2.35 indicating overall satisfaction with program preparation.
CAEP Initial Programs Alumni Survey 2023 Secondary Education: Survey mean was 2.62 indicating overall satisfaction with program preparation.
CAEP Initial Programs Alumni Survey 2023 Health Education: Survey mean was .47 indicating that completers rated their program in the range of unsatisfactory to satisfactory. **Advanced Programs**
CAEP Advanced Programs MSED Literacy & Language Arts Employer Survey 2023: Survey mean was 3.0 indicating that advanced completers were rated Proficient by their employers. |

		CAEP Advanced Programs MSED Literacy & Language Arts Alumni Survey 2023: Survey mean was 2.18 indicating that completers rated their program above satisfactory. **CAEP Advanced Programs 092 Program Employer Survey 2023:** Survey mean was 3.5 indicating that advanced completers were rated Proficient by their employers. **CAEP Advanced Programs 09 Program Alumni Survey 2023:** Survey mean was 3.6 indicating that completers rated their program above satisfactory.
Measure 3: Candidate Competency at Completion (Initial & Advanced)	**Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI)** **edTPA Performance Assessment** **MSED Literacy & Language Arts Internship Instrument** **MSED Special Education Internship Instrument**	**Initial Programs** **Elementary Education**: STEI Mean was 3.24 with Domain 3 Instruction for Active Learning posting a mean of 3.41. Both means were higher than the AY 2020-2021 cohort. **Secondary Education:** STEI Mean was 3.02 with Domain 3 Instruction for Active Learning posting a mean of 2.69. **edTPA Performance Assessment across Initial Programs:** 85% of initial completer programs scored above the Proficient level. **Advanced Programs** **MSED Literacy & Language Arts Internship Instrument:** Mean was 3.01 indicating that the majority of candidates were rated Proficient.

			MSED Special Education Internship Instrument: Mean was 3.05 indicating that the majority of candidates were rated Proficient.
			• **092 Program Mentorship Survey:** Mean was 3.84 indicating that majority of candidates were rated Proficient.
Measure 4: Ability of Completers to be Hired (Initial & Advanced)	• **Ability of Completers to Meet Licensing Requirements (Percentage taking the licensure exams and passing)**	**Initial Programs** Elementary Education: 46% Secondary Education: 78% MAT Program: 78%
		Advanced Programs • MSED Literacy and Language Arts: Two completers took the licensing exam and passed (100%) • MSED Special Education: No completers took the licensing exam. • 092 Program**:** 100%

Analysis of AY 2021-2022 CAEP Accountability Measures

Accountability Measures	Analysis of Trends	Comparisons with Benchmarks	Source
Measure 1: Initial Completer Effectiveness			
2021-2022STEI 2021-2022 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.	STEI: A rating of 3 indicates a Proficient performance.	CT SEED Rubric

	Employers rated 2022 completers **Satisfactory** to **Proficient** across all indicators.	CAEP Initial Programs Employer Surveys: A 20% return rate and overall rating of satisfactory.	
Measure II. Satisfaction of Employers and Stakeholder Involvement			
2021-2022 CAEP Initial Programs Employer Surveys 2021-2022 CAEP Initial Programs Alumni Surveys 2022 Case Studies of Initial Program Completers & Employers	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 and fieldwork earlier in the program. Employers rated 2022 completers **Satisfactory to Proficient** across all indicators which was an improvement from previous cohorts.	CAEP Initial Programs Employer Surveys: A 20% return rate and overall rating of satisfactory The EPP has not established a benchmark for case studies.	Completer and Employer Surveys Case Study reflective prompts and focus groups.
Measure III. Candidate Competency at Completion			
STEI edTPA Performance Assessment Advanced Internship Instruments	Analysis indicates that program completers were rated Proficient on the majority of indicators by their supervisors and mentors on the STEI.	STEI: A rating of 3 indicates a Proficient performance. edTPA: A rating of 3 indicates a Proficient performance.	CT SEED Rubric SCALE (2013)

	Analysis of edTPA data indicates that the majority of program completers had a positive impact on P-12 learning and development. The majority of 2022 program completers scored at the Proficient category with a few at the Exemplary level.	Advanced Internship Instruments: A rating of 3 indicates a Proficient performance.	
Measure IV. Ability of Completers to be Hired			
Ability of Completers to Meet Licensing Requirements	Data indicates that 2022 initial program completers delayed the taking of the certification exams which may have been due to COVID or for financial reasons. MSED Literacy & Language Arts program completers who took the licensure exam passed it. No MSED Special Education program completers took the licensure exam and 100% of 092 Program completers passed making them eligible to be hired as administrators. The EPP will investigate further why initial and program completers are not registering for the certification exams.	The benchmark for this measure is 80% of completers meet licensing requirements.	Initial & Advanced Programs Completer Surveys

Appendix: Initial & Advanced Programs Focus Groups

Case Study Initial Completers Focus Group

March 7, 2022 & March 14, 2023

Description: Due to myriad differences in the schedules of participants, the interviews were held in two sessions.

Three Participants:

- Female Interdisciplinary Elementary Education B.S. 2022 graduate working as a third grade teacher
- Female Health Education BS 2022 graduate working as a health educator
- Male MS Special Education 2022 graduate working as a physical education teacher

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

Participants reported that they are using the knowledge and skills from their preparation program in their current positions. They commented that the diverse fieldwork settings in Danbury school district enabled them to develop strategies and awareness of inclusive instructional strategies. All participants commented on the value of their student teaching and internship experiences as they directly implemented the strategies that they learned in their coursework. One participant shared that the special education program helped the program graduate to create an adaptive physical education program in the district. Several participants had fieldwork experiences that were virtual due to the COVID practicum, and they recommended more fieldwork experiences, especially in the junior year.

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

Respondents wanted more fieldwork experiences that focused on specific aspects such as observing collaboration of team teachers in an inclusive classroom. Another suggestion for the initial programs was to include more interactive fieldwork experiences in the junior year. Further suggestions were to increase support for the Praxis certification examinations in specific courses as it is currently done for Math and Science courses. Another area for improvement for the advanced programs, was further instruction in the implementation of assessments. Due to the pandemic, the course in assessments was virtual and candidates needed more hands-on training in giving and interpreting assessments. Another participant recommended more support and clarification in the procedural issues of uploading the edTPA such as labeling of files, and other requirements for certification. Another area recommended for improvement was strengthening the coordination of the health education program so that it is aligned with the other initial programs.

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

Several respondents mentioned that due to the pandemic, their experience in using technology during the program may not have been typical. One advantage of the virtual classroom was learning about new tools during student teaching to teach online. They mentioned learning about how to use

technology to integrate literacy with content areas in specific courses. All respondents commented that their student teaching and internship experiences were most beneficial in learning how to integrate technology in a unit of study.

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

Several respondents commented that a strength of their programs was the diversity of Danbury school district. They stated it was an asset for learning about diverse students and families during their student teaching and practicum. One participant reported that reaching out to parents about consent letters for practicum work was a valuable experience. Another participant stated that working with professors of color at WCSU was also beneficial. All participants reported working with diverse families as part of the practicum and student teaching experience.

Anything Else?

One participant recommended hosting regular advisement meetings on what is needed for certification such as the licensing exams and edTPA. Another recommendation was to provide models of exemplary lessons, especially for the edTPA, so that candidates would have further guidance.

Initial & Advanced Employers Focus Group

WCSU Employer Focus Group A

March 9, 2023

Participant: One Female Middle School Assistant Principal Employer of completers in initial and advanced programs (Secondary Education; MSED Literacy & Language Arts; MSED in Special Education)

Question # 1: How prepared was the WCSU program completer to enter the classroom as compared to completers from other programs?

Participant responded that the district has a stable workforce and therefore the only comparison for initial program completers would be for the state ARC program. The participant reported that in comparison with the ARC program the WCSU program completers were well prepared. Both program completers are currently not working in the fields of their advanced programs of their own choice.

Question # 2: How prepared was the WCSU program completer to meet the needs of diverse students?
There were no concerns addressed about the program completers' ability to meet the needs of diverse students.

Question # 3: How prepared was the WCSU program completer to use technology in instruction?
Similarly, there were no concerns regarding the program completers' ability to integrate technology in their instruction. It was reported that one program completer uses technology to help students set SMART goals.

Question #4: How prepared was the WCSU program completer to work with diverse families?
There were no concerns addressed about the preparation to work with diverse families. Respondent indicated that the program completers' abilities to work with diverse families is similar to other staff members. They reach out to parents, hold parent-teacher conferences without any serious issues raised by the families.

Question # 5: Is there anything else you would like the program to know about teacher preparation?
Respondent reported that there were several student teachers in the school this year and they were prepared to teach. However, there were issues with the timing of the edTPA learning segment and the cumbersome length of triad meetings after school which sometimes run for two hours. The participant reported that this was not the case with other preparation programs.

WCSU Employer Focus Group B

March 16, 2023

Participants: One Female Middle School Principal Employer of completers in initial programs (Secondary Education; MAT Secondary Education Program; Health Education)
One Male Elementary School Principal Employer of completers in initial programs (Elementary Education)

Question # 1: How prepared was the WCSU program completer to enter the classroom as compared to completers from other programs?

Both participants reported that WCSU program completers were comparable to those from other EPPs. One participant remarked that WCSU program completers were stronger than a fast-track program that is currently a district internship opportunity. The Elementary School principal participant highlighted the residency year as a strength of the program and has seen the growth of candidates due to this experience. Respondents indicated that completers were similar to other EPP completers in that they needed more work in classroom management. Both participants noted that recently completers were not taking the licensure exams which hindered hiring for full-time employment. The Middle School principal participant reported that she discussed this with a recent WCSU Secondary Education completer and convinced her to take the licensure exams so that she could be hired. It was recommended that WCSU look into the possibility of a Grade 4-8 cross endorsement for Elementary Education candidates to make them more marketable.

Question # 2: How prepared was the WCSU program completer to meet the needs of diverse students?
Respondents reported that WCSU program completers were comparable to other EPP graduates in their ability to meet the needs of diverse candidates. Due to the rising number of second language learners, it was recommended that candidates delve deeply into the CELP standards and learn to differentiate between CELP 1 and CELP 2 students. The Middle School Principal also recommended further study of culturally responsive teaching as many completers across the state do not fully understand the concept, nor are able to define 'equity' in interviews.

Question # 3: How prepared was the WCSU program completer to use technology in instruction?

Both respondents reported that WCSU program completers were proficient in their use of technology.

Question #4: How prepared was the WCSU program completer to work with diverse families?
Respondents commented that many of the WCSU program completers are multilingual, and this is a tremendous asset for the school. It was reported that WCSU student teachers and residency candidates have been called upon to translate during meetings with parents and were professional throughout the session. The Middle School Principal commented that WCSU program completers were not hesitant to contact parents, and this was a strength compared to other EPP completers.

Question # 5: Is there anything else you would like the program to know about teacher preparation?
Both participants reiterated the need to prepare candidates for multilingual students that they will teach. It was also suggested that WCSU student teachers ask for a letter of recommendation from one of their students to represent the student's voice, as one of the EPPs in the area has instituted this policy.