

CAEP ANNUAL REPORT: 2024

WESTERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY

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

| | |
|--|-----|
| CAEP Accountability Measures AY 2022-2023 | 1 |
| Measure 1: Initial Completer Effectiveness | 1 |
| Table 1: Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators Disaggregated by Evaluator: Spring 2023..... | 1 |
| Table 2: Secondary Education (7-12) Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators Disaggregated by Evaluator: Spring 2023..... | 4 |
| Table 3: Health Education (K-12) Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators Disaggregated by Evaluator: Spring 2023..... | 11 |
| 2024 TEAM Data Danbury School District..... | 13 |
| Satisfaction of Employers of AY 2022-2023 Program Completers (Initial Level) | 15 |
| <i>Descriptions and Procedures</i> | 15 |
| <i>Results</i> | 15 |
| Table 5 Results of CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey of AY 2022-2023 completers: Elementary Education | 16 |
| Table 6 Results of CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey of AY 2022-2023 completers: Secondary Education..... | 17 |
| Table 7. Results of CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey of AY 2022-2023 completers: Health Education..... | 18, |
| 2024 Case Study of Program Completers..... | 19 |
| Measure 2: Satisfaction of Employers and Stakeholder Involvement (Initial & Advanced) | 26 |
| Satisfaction of Employers of AY 2022-2023 Program Completers (Advanced Level)..... | 26 |
| <i>Descriptions and Procedures</i> | 26 |
| <i>Results</i> | 28 |
| Table 8 CAEP Advanced Programs MSSED Literacy & Language Arts Employer Survey 2024 | 28 |
| Analysis (Strengths/Areas for Improvement) for the Overall Programs based on the Aggregate Data..... | 28 |
| <i>Strengths</i> | 28 |
| <i>Areas of Improvement</i> | 28 |
| CAEP Initial Programs AY 2022-2023 Completer Satisfaction..... | 29 |

| | |
|---|----|
| <i>Descriptions and Procedures</i> | 29 |
| <i>Results</i> | 29 |
| Table 9. CAEP Initial Programs Completer Survey AY 2022-2023 | 30 |
| Analysis (Strengths/Areas for Improvement) for the Overall Programs based on the Aggregate Data (Initial) | 37 |
| <i>Strengths</i> | 37 |
| <i>Areas of Improvement</i> | 37 |
| <i>Action Plan for the Overall Programs based on the Aggregate Data Areas of Improvement</i> | 37 |
| CAEP Advanced Programs AY 2022-2023 Completer Satisfaction | 37 |
| <i>Descriptions and Procedures</i> | 37 |
| <i>Results</i> | 42 |
| Table 10 CAEP Advanced Programs Alumni Survey: MSED in Literacy and Language Arts 2023 Program Completers | 38 |
| Analysis (Strengths/Areas for Improvement) for the Advanced Programs based on the Aggregate Data | 40 |
| <i>Strengths</i> | 40 |
| <i>Areas of Improvement</i> | 40 |
| <i>Action Plan for the Advanced Programs based on the Aggregate Data</i> | 40 |
| Cohort 2023 Case Study of Initial Completers | 41 |
| <i>Description</i> | 41 |
| <i>Methods</i> | 41 |
| AY 2022-2023 Completers: Analysis of Case Study Findings | 41 |
| Measure 3: Candidate Competency at Completion (Initial & Advanced) | 45 |
| 2022-2023 (edTPA) | 45 |
| Table 11. Connecticut edTPA Certifications, Approved Handbooks, and Passing Scores | 46 |
| Table 12: Summary: Practice edTPA Rubric Score Distribution for Elementary, Secondary Programs 2023 | 47 |
| Analysis (Strengths/Areas for Improvement) for the Individual Programs based on the edTPA Practice Portfolio Scores | 48 |
| <i>Overall Performance</i> | 48 |

| | |
|---|----|
| <i>edTPA Component Areas of Strength</i> | 48 |
| <i>edTPA Portfolio Areas of Improvement</i> | 48 |
| <i>edTPA Component Areas of Improvement</i> | 48 |
| Advanced Programs | 49 |
| Table 13. CAEP Advanced Literacy and Language Arts Program Practicum Evaluation: Summer 2023..... | 49 |
| Table 14 CAEP Advanced MSED Special Education Program Practicum Evaluation: Summer 2023 | 52 |
| Measure 4: Ability of Completers to be Hired (Initial & Advanced) | 56 |
| Table 15 Title II Licensure Pass Rates..... | 56 |
| Table 16. CSDE EPP Dashboard 2019-2022..... | 57 |
| Analysis of AY 2022-2023 CAEP Accountability Measures | 57 |
| Appendix: Initial & Advanced Program Focus Groups | 58 |

***Note: Completer data reported in this review represents program completers who were granted degrees in spring/summer 2023 and completed final practicum experience in spring/summer 2023.**

CAEP Accountability Measures AY 2022-2023

Measure 1: Initial Completer Effectiveness

The Connecticut State Department of Education does not provide EPPs TEAM data due to budget constraint. In 2023-2024, WCSU worked with Danbury School District, our major employer district, to obtain TEAM data on our program completers. This performance portfolio is completed by all beginning teachers in the district to measure impact for learning. The EPP has provided the Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) data for 2023 program completers before completion as baseline data. The STEI is the SEED teacher evaluation instrument used in Connecticut.

- Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI)
- CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey 2023

Table 1: Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators Disaggregated by Evaluator: Spring 2023

| Elementary Education (1-6) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|--|---|---|---|---|-----|------|--------------------|---|---|---|---|-----|------|--------------------|
| Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Spring 2023 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Domain | Element | Competency | Elementary Education (1-6) Key Indicators | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | University Supervisor (n=18) | | | | | | | Mentor (n=13) | | | | | | |
| | | | 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 | [2a.1] | Content of lesson plan is aligned with standards | 0 | 0 | 15 | 3 | 0 | 3.17 | 0.37 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 3.31 | 0.46 |

Elementary Education (1-6)
Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators
Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor
Spring 2023

| Domain | Element | Competency | Elementary Education (1-6) Key Indicators | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|---|---|---|---|---|----------|------|--------------------|---|---|---|---|----------|------|--------------------|
| | | | University Supervisor (n=18) | | | | | | | Mentor (n=13) | | | | | | |
| | | | 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 |
| for Active Learning | [2a.2] | Content of lesson appropriate to sequence of lessons and appropriate level of challenge | 0 | 1 | 15 | 2 | 0 | 3.06 | 0.40 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 3.23 | 0.58 |
| 3. Instruction for Active Learning | [3a.2] | Content accuracy | 0 | 0 | 12 | 6 | 0 | 3.33 | 0.47 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 3.23 | 0.58 |
| | [3a.3] | Content progression and level of challenge | 0 | 1 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | 0.33 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 3.23 | 0.42 |
| Frequencies | | | 0 | 2 | 58 | 12 | 0 | | | 0 | 1 | 28 | 19 | 0 | | |
| <i>Percentage of Competencies Scored Below Standard</i> | | | 0.00% | | | | | | | 0.00% | | | | | | |
| <i>Percentage of Competencies Scored</i> | | | .02% | | | | | | | 0.02% | | | | | | |

Elementary Education (1-6)
Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators
Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor
Spring 2023

| Domain | Element | Competency | Elementary Education (1-6) Key Indicators | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|---------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|------|--------------------|---|---|---|---|-----|------|--------------------|
| | | | University Supervisor (n=18) | | | | | | | Mentor (n=13) | | | | | | |
| | | | 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 |
| | | <i>Developing</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | <i>Percentage of Competencies Scored Proficient</i> | 74% | | | | | | | 58% | | | | | | |
| | | <i>Percentage of Competencies Scored Exemplary</i> | 24% | | | | | | | 40% | | | | | | |
| | | <i>Spring 2023 Mean</i> | 3.14 | | | | | | | 3.25 | | | | | | |

Overall Candidate Performance: University Supervisor and Mentor Elementary Education Key Indicators - Spring 2023
Percentage Passing (Developing, Proficient, and Exemplary) = 100%
Overall Elementary 2023 Mean = 3.19

Table 2: Secondary Education (7-12) Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators Disaggregated by Evaluator: Spring 2023

- The Master of Arts in Teaching Program (MAT) placed candidates in Student Teaching in Spring 2023.

| Secondary Education Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor Spring 2023 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|---|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----|------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----|------|--------------------|
| 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] | Content of lesson plan is aligned with standards | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Chemistry | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.0 | 0 |
| | | English | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.0 | 0 |
| | | Mathematics | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.0 | 0 |
| | | Social Studies | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 3.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3.0 | 0 |

Secondary Education
Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators
Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor
Spring 2023

| 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 |
| | | World Languages, Spanish | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.0 | 0 |
| | | MAT Biology | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.0 | 0 |
| | | MAT English | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.0 | 0 |
| | | MAT Social Studies | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.0 | 0 |
| | | MAT Spanish | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.0 | 0 |
| | | [2a.1] Totals | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 3.0 | | 0 | 0 | 20 | 2 | 0 | 3.10 | |
| | [2a.2] | Content of lesson appropriate to sequence of lessons and appropriate level of challenge | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Chemistry | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.0 | 0 |

Secondary Education
Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators
Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor
Spring 2023

| 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 |
| | | English | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| | | Mathematics | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| | | Social Studies | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2.86 | 0.35 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2.83 | 0.37 |
| | | World Languages, Spanish | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| | | MAT Biology | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| | | MAT English | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.5 | 0.50 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.5 | 0.50 |
| | | MAT Social Studies | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| | | MAT Spanish | 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 2023

| 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 |
| | | [2a.2] Totals | 0 | 1 | 15 | 3 | 0 | 3.26 | | 0 | 1 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 3.25 | |
| 3. Instruction for Active Learning | [3a.2] | Content accuracy | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Chemistry | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| | | English | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.5 | 0.50 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.5 | 0.50 |
| | | Mathematics | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| | | Social Studies | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 3.43 | 0.49 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 3.33 | 0.47 |
| | | World Languages, Spanish | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.0 | 0 |
| | | MAT Biology | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.0 | 0 |
| | | MAT English | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.5 | 0.50 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.5 | 0.50 |

Secondary Education
Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators
Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor
Spring 2023

| 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 |
| | | MAT Social Studies | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.5 | 0.50 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1.0 |
| | | MAT Spanish | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| | | [3a.2] Totals | 0 | 0 | 8 | 9 | 0 | 3.50 | | 0 | 1 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 3.48 | |
| | [3a.3] | Content progression and level of challenge | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Chemistry | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| | | English | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.5 | .50 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.5 | .50 |
| | | Mathematics | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| | | Social Studies | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2.86 | .35 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2.83 | 0.37 |

Secondary Education
Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators
Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor
Spring 2023

| 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 |
| | | World Languages, Spanish | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| | | MAT Biology | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| | | MAT Social Studies | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| | | MAT Spanish | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| | | [3a.3] Totals | 0 | 2 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 3.04 | | 0 | 3 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 3.29 | |
| Frequencies | | | 0 | 3 | 56 | 13 | 0 | | | 0 | 5 | 51 | 16 | 0 | | |
| <i>Percentage of Competencies Scored Below Standard</i> | | | 0.00% | | | | | | | 0.00% | | | | | | |

Secondary Education
Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators
Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor
Spring 2023

| 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>Percentage of Competencies Scored Developing</i> | .02% | | | | | | | .06% | | | | | | |
| | | <i>Percentage of Competencies Scored Proficient</i> | 77.77% | | | | | | | 70.83% | | | | | | |
| | | <i>Percentage of Competencies Scored Exemplary</i> | 18.05% | | | | | | | 22.22% | | | | | | |
| | | <i>Spring 2023 Mean</i> | 3.25 | | | | | | | 3.28 | | | | | | |

Overall Candidate Performance: University Supervisor and Mentor Secondary Education (7-12) Key Indicators – Spring 2023
Percentage Passing (Developing, Proficient, and Exemplary) = 100%
Overall Secondary 2023 Mean = 3.26

Table 3: Health Education (K-12) Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators Disaggregated by Evaluator: Spring 2023

| Health Education (K-12) Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor Spring 2023 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|------|--------------------|---|---|---|---|-----|------|--------------------|
| Domain | Element | Competency | Health Education (K-12) Key Indicators | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | University Supervisor (n=4) | | | | | | | Mentor (n=3) | | | | | | |
| | | | 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 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3.33 | 0.47 |
| | [2a.2] | Content of lesson appropriate to sequence of lessons and appropriate level of challenge | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3.33 | 0.47 |
| 3. Instruction for Active Learning | [3a.2] | Content accuracy | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3.33 | 0.47 |
| | [3a.3] | Content progression and level of challenge | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2.75 | 0.43 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0.82 |
| Frequencies | | | 0 | 1 | 16 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 0 | | |

Health Education (K-12)
Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators
Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor
Spring 2023

| Domain | Element | Competency | Health Education (K-12) Key Indicators | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|------------|---|---|---|---|-----|------|--------------------|---|---|---|---|-----|------|--------------------|
| | | | University Supervisor (n=4) | | | | | | | Mentor (n=3) | | | | | | |
| | | | 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 |
| <i>Percentage of Competencies Scored Below Standard</i> | | | 0.00% | | | | | | | 0.00% | | | | | | |
| <i>Percentage of Competencies Scored Developing</i> | | | .05% | | | | | | | 0.08% | | | | | | |
| <i>Percentage of Competencies Scored Proficient</i> | | | 94% | | | | | | | 58% | | | | | | |
| <i>Percentage of Competencies Scored Exemplary</i> | | | 0% | | | | | | | 33% | | | | | | |
| <i>Spring 2023 Mean</i> | | | 2.93 | | | | | | | 3.24 | | | | | | |

Health Education (K-12)

Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators

Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor

Spring 2023

| Domain | Element | Competency | Health Education (K-12) Key Indicators | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|------------|---|---|---|---|-----|------|--------------------|---|---|---|---|-----|------|--------------------|
| | | | University Supervisor (n=4) | | | | | | | Mentor (n=3) | | | | | | |
| | | | 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 |
| <p>Overall Candidate Performance: University Supervisor and Mentor Elementary Education Key Indicators - Spring 2023</p> <p>Percentage Passing (Developing, Proficient, and Exemplary) = 100%</p> <p>Overall Elementary 2023 Mean = 3.08</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

2024 Danbury Public School District TEAM Data Report on WCSU Completers

Descriptions and Procedures

At this time, Connecticut legislation explicitly prohibits the linking of any state student-testing database with state educator databases, thereby precluding the use of value-added methodologies for the evaluation of teacher performance based on student achievement. In September 2018, the CSDE presented to CAEP for consideration a proposal describing an alternative methodology for meeting CAEP standard 4 requirements. Specifically, the CSDE proposed that Connecticut EPPs report impact data from the Teacher and Education Mentoring (TEAM) program, Connecticut’s two-year induction program. TEAM requires beginning teachers to complete instructional modules in the areas of (1) Classroom Management and Environment; (2) Planning; (3) Instruction; (4) Student Assessment; and (5) Professional Responsibility. Each module requires

beginning teachers to analyze the impact of practice on student learning from multiple data sources (e.g., student Page 2 of 2) Connecticut State Department of Education work/classroom assessments, state student achievement testing), with the Student Assessment module requiring an even deeper dive into assessment literacy. Performance profiles are used to identify module goals and module criteria are used by trained reviewers to evaluate module success. Beginning teachers must successfully complete TEAM to advance from an Initial Educator Certificate to a Provisional Educator Certificate. CAEP consultant Gary Railsback reviewed the full proposal, and during a September 2018 conference call, approved Connecticut moving forward with the proposal for meeting CAEP standard 4 requirements.

The TEAM program is composed of 5 modules:

1. Classroom environment
2. Planning
3. Instruction
4. Assessment
5. Professional responsibility

Table 4: Danbury Public Schools District-WCSU Program Completers TEAM Data

| Danbury Public Schools District-WCSU Program Completers TEAM Data | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| 24 Program Completers | | | | | | | |
| Program | <i>n</i> | TEAM Year | Module 1 | Module 2 | Module 3 | Module 4 | Module 5 |
| Elementary Education | 2 | In Progress | Completed | In Progress | Completed | Completed | Completed |
| Elementary Education | 8 | Completed | Completed | Completed | Completed | Completed | Completed |
| Secondary Education | 10 | In Progress | 9 Completed 1 in Progress | 2 in Progress 8 Not Started | 4 In Progress 1 Completed 5 Not Started | 1 In Progress 2 Completed 7 Not Started | 10 Completed |
| Secondary Education | 3 | Completed | Completed | Completed | Completed | Completed | Completed |
| Health Education | 1 | In Progress | Completed | Not Started | Completed | Not Started | Completed |
| Overall Candidate Performance: Danbury Public Schools District-WCSU Program Completers TEAM Data | | | | | | | |
| In Progress: 13/24=54% | | | | | | | |
| Completed: 11/24= 46% | | | | | | | |

Results: In spring 2024, we collected data on 24 completers who started the TEAM program, 46% completers have finished it and 54% are still in the process of completing it. We consider that completing the TEAM training provides enough evidence on our completers having positive impact on students' learning since that is the core part of the reflection of each of the modules. Data indicates that the most completed modules are the following: Modules 1 Student Engagement, 3 Instruction for Active Learning, and 5 Professional Responsibility. The module that was most frequently in progress was Module 4 Assessment.

Satisfaction of Employers of AY 2022-2023 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 2024, the survey polled employers of AY 2022-2023 completers from the Elementary Education, Secondary Education, MAT Secondary Education, and Health Education initial programs. Names of employers were obtained from program completers who responded to the Alumni Survey. Follow-up emails were sent to employers as well as phone calls to increase the 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 2022-2023 there were a total of 38 initial program completers. Of the 17 elementary education majors, 9 (52%) responded to the Completer Survey with 8 giving us the names of their employers. Two of the 8 employers (25%) polled then responded to the Employer Survey; of the 14 Secondary Education Majors, 7 (50%) responded to the Completer Survey with 3 giving us the names of their employers; 1 of the 3 employers (33%) responded to the Employer Survey; of the 4 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. Of the 5 MAT Secondary Education completers, 2 (40%) responded to survey giving the names of their employers; 0 of the 2 employers responded despite numerous phone calls and emails. However, a secondary education program employer did join the focus group to provide feedback. All programs with the exception of the MAT Secondary Education program met the 20% survey return benchmark.

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 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 5 Results of CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey of AY 2022-2023 completers: Elementary Education (2 responders)

| WCSU Employer Survey | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|-------------|--------------|
| Academic Year | Content Indicator | Mean | Range |
| AY2022-2023 | 1.Integrates appropriate standards into instruction | 3.0 | (3) |
| | 2. Adapts instruction to diverse students and differences in learning. | 3.0 | (3) |
| | 3. Adapts instruction to differences in learning. | 3.0 | (3) |
| | 4. Motivates students to learn | 3.0 | (3) |
| | 5 Facilitates critical thinking | 3.0 | (3) |
| | 6. Communicates well with students. | 3.0 | (3) |
| | 7. Effectively applies classroom management practices | 2.5 | (2-3) |
| | 8. Interacts well with parents and community members | 2.5 | (2-3) |
| | 9. Assesses student learning | 3.0 | (3) |
| | 10. Engages in reflective thinking during the entire instructional cycle | 3.0 | (3) |
| | 11. Collaborates well with peers | 3.0 | (3) |

| WCSU Employer Survey | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|-------------|--------------|
| Academic Year | Content Indicator | Mean | Range |
| | 12. Creates effective learning environments | 2.5 | (2-3) |
| | 13. Behaves in accordance with professional ethics | 3.0 | (3) |
| | 14. Effectively integrates technology into their instruction | 3.0 | (3) |
| | 15. Reaches employment milestones | 2.0 | (2) |
| Overall Mean: 2.83 | | | |

Table 6 Results of CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey of AY 2022-2023 completers: Secondary Education (1 respondent)

| WCSU Employer Survey | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|-------------|--------------|
| Academic Year | Content Indicator | Mean | Range |
| AY 2022-2023 | 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 | 3.0 | (3) |
| | 4. Motivates students to learn | 2.0 | (2) |
| | 5. Communicates well with students. | 3.0 | (3) |
| | 6. Effectively applies classroom management practices | 3.0 | (3.0) |
| | 7. Interacts well with parents and community members | 3.0 | (3) |

| WCSU Employer Survey | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|-------------|--------------|
| Academic Year | Content Indicator | Mean | Range |
| | 8. Assesses student learning | 2.0 | (2) |
| | 9. Engages in reflective thinking during the entire instructional cycle | 2.0 | (2) |
| | 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 | 2.0 | (2) |
| Overall Mean: 2.46 | | | |

Table 7. Results of CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey of AY 2022-2023 completers: Health Education (1 respondent)

| WCSU Employer Survey | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|-------------|--------------|
| Academic Year | Content Indicator | Mean | Range |
| AY2022-2023 | 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) |

| WCSU Employer Survey | | | |
|--------------------------|---|------|-------|
| Academic Year | Content Indicator | Mean | Range |
| | 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 | | | |

AY 2023-2024 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 usually permitted by school districts due to union regulations and therefore the EPP focused on case studies, 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. In AY 2023-2024 completers from the Elementary Education and Health Education programs participated in the impact on student learning component of the case study. By 2027, all programs will be represented in the impact on student learning component for the accreditation review. The case study quantitative data component reviewing impact on student learning is presented in Measure 1 and the qualitative data from the focus group interview is presented in Measure 2.

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: Individual interviews with case study participants and Focus Groups (Completer and Employer) (4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4): Qualitative data were collected in the form of individual and 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

Individual case study participants submitted demographic data on their students, and pre/post assessment unit data. Alumni surveys were sent to all initial and advanced program completers. Completers’ responses were followed up with employer surveys.

Results of Case 1: Elementary Education Completer

- a. **Description of Participant:** Nadine (pseudonym), an African American Elementary Education completer, completed her degree in May 2022 and works as a reading interventionist in a diverse elementary charter school in an urban city in Connecticut. She teaches first grade students and submitted pre/post assessment data for one intervention group which consisted of 5 diverse students. The intervention group consisted of two boys and three girls. Two students were African American, and three were Hispanic.
- b. **Description of Curriculum:** The elementary school uses Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words (SIPPS). “[SIPPS®](#) is a research-based foundational skills program proven to help both new and striving readers in grades K–12, including English learners and students identified with dyslexia.”

Nadine implemented a learning segment that included lessons 21-25 which ended in a review session. The lessons are pasted below which focused on phonological awareness and phonics. Each lesson followed the same sequence of focusing on phonological awareness first, followed by blending exercises, then encoding of phonograms, and concluding with decoding reading passages.

| | | |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Lesson 21 | Lesson 22 | Lesson 23 |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>1. Teacher will have student(s) Segment and blend 3 letter words: oral blending of had</p> <p>2. Segmentation of ran</p> | <p>2. Teacher will have student(s) Segment and blend 3 letter words: oral blending of had</p> <p>Segmentation of ran</p> | <p>1. Teacher will have student(s) Segment and blend 3 letter words: oral blending of him</p> <p>2. Segmentation of fun</p> |
| <p>Teacher will write on the board and read words chorally/spell with students of a <u>Mixed word list</u>: fan, tin, hit, hat, him, tan, has</p> | <p>Teacher will write on the board and read/spell words chorally with students of a <u>Mixed word list</u>: Fan, hat, hit, hits, fat, has, ham, tan</p> | <p>Teacher will write on the board and read/spell words chorally with students of a <u>Mixed word list</u>: us, fuss, fan, fun, fit, fits, hum, tan</p> |
| <p>3. Introduction of sight words: wasn't</p> | <p>3. Introduction of sight spelling sentence: "It was cold outside, but it <u>wasn't</u> raining."</p> <p>4. Students will write a sentence on their guided</p> | <p>3. Introduction of sight spelling sentence: "Please get down from the tree."</p> <p>4. Students will write a sentence on their guided spelling sheet provided by the teacher. Using</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | <p>spelling sheet provided by the teacher. Using decodable words. Students will read the sentence together.</p> | <p>decodable words. Students will read the sentence together.</p> |
| <p>5. Students will write a sentence on their guided spelling sheet provided by the teacher. Using decodable words. Sentence diction: "She has it"</p> | <p>5. Students will read mini decodables with and answer the questions about the story with the teacher/ "The Fan and the Hat"</p> | <p>5. Students will read mini decodables with and answer the questions about the story with the teacher/ "Sam <u>and</u> His Hat"</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Lesson 24 | Lesson 25 | Review |
| <p>1. Teacher will have student(s) Segment and blend 3 letter</p> | <p>1. Teacher will have student(s) Segment and blend 3 letter</p> | <p>1. Teacher will review sight words from mixed list 2. Teacher will</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>words: oral blending of fad, ha,d hid, kick</p> <p>2. Segmentation of sad, had, fit, miss, did, dad</p> | <p>words: oral blending of rub, suck, cut, back, cab</p> <p>2. Segmentation of cat, cut, duck, kick, tack, tuck</p> | <p>review decodable words: fad, had, hid, kick, cat, cut, duck, kick, tack, tuck</p> <p>3. Review letter sound cards: s, t, n, m, a_, i_, r, f, u</p> |
| <p>4. Review letter sound cards: s, t, n, m, a_, i_, r, f, u, h</p> <p>5. And Teacher will write on the board and read words chorally/spell with students of a <u>Mixed word list:</u> fan, fans, fit, fits, run, runs, fast, tin</p> <p>6. Introducing sight words: Saw (I saw my friend in the</p> | <p>Review letter sound cards: s, t, n, m, a_, i_, r, f, u, h</p> <p>And Teacher will write on the board and read/spell words chorally with students of a <u>Mixed word list:</u> sad, mad, mud, sun, did, didn't</p> <p>8. Introducing sight words: My (I saw my friend in the park) then review old sight words (fan, my, me, saw,</p> | <p>4. <u>Mixed word list:</u> us, fuss, fan, fun, fit, fits, hum, tan, sad, mad, mud, sun, did, didn't</p> <p>Read any decodables from previous lessons: The Ant in the mud, ann is it, sam and his fat, and others from the reproducibles stories.</p> <p>Next Steps:</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>park) then review old sight words (fan, saw, where, was,..)</p> <p>7. Guided spelling on whiteboard (fit, hat, He runs.) and reading decodables</p> | <p>where, was,..)</p> <p>9. Reading decodable stories: “The Ant in the Mud”</p> <p>10. Guided spelling on whiteboard (mud, mad, He was sad) and reading decodables</p> | <p>5. Next day progress monitor via DIBELS</p> <p>6. Decide to move on to next lesson or not</p> <p>7. Progress Monitor Mastery test after lesson 30.</p> |
|--|--|---|

- c. Pre/Post Assessment Data: The EPP utilized the CAEP Initial Programs Impact on Student Learning assessment which is utilized in the undergraduate program in the senior year (see Appendix). It is based upon the edTPA assessment task which requires candidates to focus on analysis of assessment data to impact student learning. To accommodate completers’ busy schedules, this analysis was done through a virtual discussion on Zoom using the question prompts.

Pre-Assessment Data: The five students were tested on the letter/sounds, blending exercises and sight words that were in the learning segment. The following chart represents the results:

| Pre-Assessment Data | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|----------|-------------|
| Student | Letter Sound Recognition | Blending | Sight Words |
| Student A | 10/11 | 4/5 | 3/12 |
| Student B | 11/11 | 5/5 | 3/12 |
| Student C | 11/11 | 5/5 | 2/12 |
| Student D | 11/11 | 5/5 | 9/12 |
| Student E | 11/11 | 5/5 | 11/12 |

Post-Assessment Data:

| Post-Assessment Data | | | |
|----------------------|--------------------------|----------|-------------|
| Student | Letter Sound Recognition | Blending | Sight Words |
| Student A | 11/11 | 5/5 | 5/12 |
| Student B | 11/11 | 5/5 | 6/12 |
| Student C | 11/11 | 5/5 | 6/12 |
| Student D | 11/11 | 5/5 | 11/12 |
| Student E | 11/11 | 5/5 | 12/12 |

- d. Discussion of Impact on Student Learning: Nadine reflected on the discussion prompts and provided the following responses.
- **Strengths/Needs:** Nadine’s analysis of the presented data was that the students’ phonological awareness was developing well, especially letter-sound recognition, and blending. She reflected that processing of sight words continues to be a struggle, especially as the terms become more difficult. Nadine opined that her experience of teaching first graders has shown that many first graders struggle with sight words.
 - **Focus Students:** Nadine commented that the students in the intervention group did not have documented special needs, nor were they classified as multilingual. However, one student did struggle with processing and therefore Nadine spent additional time with her to ensure that she was engaged in the lesson. She also discussed another student who just needed to feel more confident in her literacy skills to improve.
 - **Instructional Strategies:** Nadine discussed how she has been focusing on the sight words since that is an area for improvement for the intervention group. Lessons now include weekly sight word bingo, interactive games using sight words, and Nadine assigns homework to review the words during the week. In addition, she asks parents to go on the sight word portal to keep practicing the words at home.
 - **Misconceptions:** Nadine responded to the prompt on whether students had any misconceptions by stating that a few were still confused about consonant digraphs and were trying to sound out the individual letters. She also reported that students continue to confuse look/like sight words.
 - **Feedback to Guide Learning:** Nadine usually uses oral feedback and especially focuses on motivating them to try. As struggling readers, it is challenging to keep them motivated to engage in the lesson. Nadine has been with the group since September, and she has seen growth since the beginning of the academic year and one student is exiting the intervention program.

- Using Assessment to Inform Instruction: Based on her data analysis, one student will be exiting the intervention, and the other students will be re-evaluated and then progress monitored for improvement, to see if they need to move to another intervention group.
- e. Analysis of Impact on Student Learning: The CAEP Initial Programs EPY 405 Impact on Student Learning rubric was used to assess Nadine’s reflection on pre/post student data and learners’ needs. Nadine was scored as proficient in her analysis of student learning as she focused on students’ strengths/ areas for improvement and was able to discern the needs of individual students. She also scored on the proficient level on providing feedback to students and its analysis as she described the feedback given to students who were struggling with sight words and whether it was effective to improve their progress. Nadine also met the proficient performance level on her use of assessment results to inform instruction as she discussed next steps based on the data and how to improve their sight word recognition which continues to be an area of concern for three students. Analysis of students’ use of academic language was scored as not applicable as this element pertains specifically to the edTPA and this learning segment was not designed to align with that assessment.
In Nadine’s junior year at the university, she was assessed on the same assignment and rubric. In that baseline assessment data, she scored Developing on all elements, so growth has occurred across all rubric elements. Nadine is currently enrolled in our literacy specialist graduate program and therefore her knowledge of phonological awareness has improved and therefore this may partially account for her marked improvement. In her residency year, Nadine completed a year-long internship in a Danbury school where she was immersed in their reading program and intervention practices. She is also an interventionist for her charter school and therefore is applying her pedagogical knowledge daily in practice.

Results of Case 2: Health Education Completer

- a. Description of Participant: John (pseudonym), a Caucasian Health Education completer, completed his degree in May 2022 and is in his first year of teaching in the largest public high school in Connecticut. It consists of 3,603 students, of which 61% are Hispanic with 28% multilingual learners. It is in an urban city in Fairfield County, Connecticut. John teaches health education and provided pre/post benchmark assessments that are required by the district. In the Fall 2023 course that is the focus of this study, there were approximately 60% Hispanic students, 10% Caucasian, 10% African American, and 20% other.
- b. Description of Curriculum: This large, urban high school implements prescribed health education curricula that all teachers must follow. In Fall 2023, John taught Health I to primarily freshmen at the high school. The course is open to students in grades 9 through 12, however the majority (approximately 80%) were freshmen. The course focuses on the following topics: Triangle of Health (physical, mental, spiritual wellness), Stress factors and coping strategies, depression, suicide prevention, and the impact of alcohol and drug use. Students in the course are required to do a research project on a drug of their choice and its impact on health.
- c. Pre/Post Assessment Data: The EPP utilized the CAEP Initial Programs Impact on Student Learning assessment which is utilized in the undergraduate program in the senior year (see Appendix). It is based upon the edTPA assessment task which requires candidates to focus

on analysis of assessment data to impact student learning. To accommodate completers' busy schedules, this analysis was done through a virtual discussion on Zoom using the question prompts.

Pre-Assessment Data: Pre-assessment data on the Health 1 course benchmark assessment was presented for 24 students. The following chart represents the results:

| Pre-Assessment Data | | |
|---------------------|--------------|------------------------|
| Raw Score | Score Range | Percentage of Students |
| 1. 80 / 80 | 20 and below | 8% |
| 2.80 / 80 | 20 to 30 | 12% |
| 3.78 / 80 | 30 to 40 | 8% |
| 4.77 / 80 | 40 to 50 | 8% |
| 5.77 / 80 | 50 to 60 | 12% |
| 6. 76 / 80 | 60 to 70 | 17% |
| 7.74 / 80 | 70 to 80 | 25% |
| 8.73 / 80 | 80 to 90 | 8% |
| 9.69 / 80 | 90 to 100 | |
| 10.65 / 80 | | |
| 11.65 / 80 | | |
| 12.62 / 80 | | |
| 13.59 / 80 | | |
| 14.56 / 80 | | |
| 15.53 / 80 | | |
| 16.48 / 80 | | |
| 17.40 / 80 | | |
| 18.36 / 80 | | |
| 19.35 / 80 | | |
| 20.24 / 80 | | |
| 21.21 / 80 | | |
| 22.20 / 80 | | |
| 23.18 / 80 | | |
| 24. 8 / 80 | | |

Post-Assessment Data:

| Post Assessment Data | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Raw Score | Score Range | Percentage of Students |
| 1.79 / 80 | 20 and below | 0 |
| 2.78 / 80 | | |
| 3.78 / 80 | | |
| 4.78 / 80 | | |
| 5.78 / 80 | | |
| 6.78 / 80 | | |
| 7.78 / 80 | 20 to 30 | 0 |
| 8.78 / 80 | 30 to 40 | 0 |
| 9.78 / 80 | 40 to 50 | 0 |
| 10.78 / 80 | 50 to 60 | 0 |
| 11.78 / 80 | 60 to 70 | 0 |
| 12.78 / 80 | 70 to 80 | 100% |
| 13.78 / 80 | 80 to 90 90 to 100 | 0 |
| 14.77 / 80 | | |
| 15.77 / 80 | | |
| 16.77 / 80 | | |
| 17.75 / 80 | | |
| 18.75 / 80 | | |
| 19.75 / 80 | | |
| 20.75 / 80 | | |
| 21.73 / 80 | | |
| 22.71 / 80 | | |
| 23.71 / 80 | | |
| 24.70 / 80 | | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | |
|--|--|--|

- d. Discussion of Impact on Student Learning: John reflected on the discussion prompts and provided the following responses.
- Strengths/Needs: John’s analysis of students’ performance was that in the beginning of the course, students struggled with the concepts of physical, mental, and spiritual wellness. The health triangle is the foundational concept of the course as all subsequent topics are aligned with either physical, mental, or spiritual wellness. He noted that by the end of the course they did grasp the central concept of the health triangle. John also noted that the students didn’t understand that there was something called ‘good stress’ and how they might use it. Another difficult concept to grasp for his students was the difference between risk factors for suicide and warning signs of suicide.

- Focus Students: John noted that there are several multilingual learners in his class, and he allows them to use Google Translate for class materials. He also provides translated documents as well. There are often peers in the classroom that are bilingual, and John will ask them to explain the class expectations. Furthermore, if students had IEPs or a learning disability, John would work individually with them to highlight certain words in the text or put them in a small group for further support.
- Instructional Strategies: John used the spreadsheet on benchmark assessments to create small groups or one-on-one instruction for students struggling with sub-topics or concepts. He also sometimes paired struggling students with more advanced students as an additional support.
- Using Assessment to Inform Instruction: Based on his data analysis of benchmark assessment scores, John would form small groups or work individually with students until they grasped the central concepts of the course.

e. Analysis of Impact on Student Learning: The CAEP Initial Programs EPY 405 Impact on Student Learning rubric was used to assess John’s reflection on pre/post student data and learners’ needs. John was scored as proficient in her analysis of student learning as she focused on students’ strengths/ areas for improvement and was able to discern the needs of individual students. John also met the proficient performance level on his use of assessment results to inform instruction as he discussed forming small groups or individual tutoring sessions for struggling students. Analysis of students’ use of academic language was scored as not applicable as this element pertains specifically to the edTPA and this learning segment was not designed to align with that assessment. Also providing feedback to guide learning was also not applicable as the course was in the fall and John did not recall specific verbal or written feedback. In John’s junior year at the university, he was assessed on the same assignment and rubric. In that baseline assessment data, he scored Developing on all elements, so growth has occurred across all rubric elements. John is currently in his first year of full-time teaching at the high school level.

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 2024 Elementary Education
- CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey 2024 Secondary Education
- CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey 2024 Health Education
- CAEP Advanced Programs MSED Literacy & Language Arts Employer Survey 2024
- Employer Focus Group

As mentioned above, Tables 5 through 7 displayed in Measure 1 component reported the initial program employer surveys. The following tables report the Employer survey for the advanced programs.

Satisfaction of Employers of AY 2022-2023 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. There were three MSED in the Literacy and Language Arts Program with 2 completing the survey (66%) with both identifying their employer. Of the 2 identified employers, 1 responded to the survey (50%). There was one completer in the MSED Special Education program, however the survey was not returned and therefore employers were not able to be contacted. The 092 Certificate in Intermediate Administration and Supervision is run every two years and therefore there were no completers in 2023. The next cohort will be in May 2024. A focus group interview was held consisting of employers of programs to supplement the findings (see Appendix).

Results

Only one employer responded to the survey from the MS Literacy & Language Arts Employer with a rating of Proficient across all indicators. This data was supplemented with an advanced program focus group employer session. While the limited data for AY 2022-2023 is insufficient to determine patterns for the 2023 cohort, aggregate survey returns for the prior two cohorts of the MSED Literacy Language Arts program (4.0, 3.2) indicate a mean rating of Proficient denoting employers' satisfaction with completers' performances.

Table 8 CAEP Advanced Programs MSED Literacy & Language Arts Employer Survey AY 2022-2023(1 Respondent)

| CAEP Advanced Programs Employer Survey 2023 | | |
|--|--|-------------|
| Academic Year | Content Indicator | Mean |
| 2022-2023 | 1. Integrates appropriate standards into instruction. | 3.0 |
| | 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. | 3.0 |
| | 5. Motivates students to learn. | 3.0 |
| | 6. Communicates well with students. | 3.0 |

| CAEP Advanced Programs Employer Survey 2023 | | |
|--|---|------|
| Academic Year | Content Indicator | Mean |
| | 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. | 3.0 |
| | 12. Creates effective learning environments. | 3.0 |
| | 13. Uses professional ethics. | 3.0 |
| | 14. Integrates technology into their instruction. | 3.0 |
| | 15. Reaches employment milestones (i.e., promotion, tenure) at rates comparable to graduates of other teacher preparation programs. | 3.0 |
| Overall Mean=3.0 | | |

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.
- Most employers continued to rate completers' use of assessment data at a satisfactory level which is a sign of continuous improvement from cohorts previously.

- The mean scores for the MSED in Literacy and Language Arts program continues to indicate employer satisfaction in AY 2022-2023 at 3.0. and in AY 2021-2022 with a 4.0 mean.

Areas of Improvement

- Relative weaknesses (mean ratings of 2 out of 3) for the Elementary Education program completers were in the areas of applying classroom management and communicating with parents/community members.
- Relative weaknesses (mean ratings of 2 out of 3) for the Secondary Education program completers were in the areas of integrating standards in instruction, motivating students to learn, and integrating technology.
- The EPP must continue to make efforts to improve employer satisfaction survey response rates. Text messages 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 2022-2023 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 2024 survey polled AY 2022-2023 program completers of all initial programs. The survey was sent to 17 Elementary Education completers, 14 Secondary Education completers, 4 Health Education completers, and 5 M.A.T. Secondary Education completers.

Results

Of the 17 AY 2022-2023 Elementary Education completers, 9 returned the survey for a response rate of 52%; of the 12 AY 2022-2023 Secondary Education completers, 7 returned the survey for a response rate of 58%; 100% of the Health Education completers returned the survey, with 2/3 MAT Secondary Education program completers responding for a 75% response rate. These response rates are at or above the CAEP minimum requirements, and they are similar to response rates obtained for the AY 2021-2022 cohort of completers that were reported in the 2023 Annual Report (41% for Elementary Education completers and 28% for Secondary Education completers, 100% for Health Education).

Survey results can be found in Tables 9, 9.a, 9b, and 9.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 2022-2023 Elementary Education, Secondary Education, Health Education, and MAT Secondary Education program completers were 2.01, 1.63, 2.96 and 1.1, respectively. Comparisons can be made with the AY 2021-2022 completers in Elementary Education, Secondary Education and Health Education, where the overall means were 2.35, 2.62, and 47 respectively.

The Elementary Education program completers' satisfaction rating has remained consistent across all cohorts. While mean satisfaction ratings for the Secondary Education completers remained 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 2022-2023 Secondary Education survey mean of 1.63 is significantly lower than the 2.62 rating in AY 2020-21. It should be noted that the Secondary Education and MAT Secondary programs have experienced a turnover of coordinators partly due to budget cuts at the university. The 2023 Health Education program completers rated the program highly at 2.96 which was significantly higher than the .47 rating of the previous cohort. This improvement was partly due to the hiring of an adjunct consistent program coordinator. The MAT Secondary Education program has also experienced a turnover of program coordinators due to budget cuts and this has resulted in a low satisfaction rating of 1.1. Initial completers continued to report that applying classroom management practices, collaborating with peers and coordinating with special education teachers, as well as develop school leadership were the lowest rated indicators.

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 9. CAEP Initial Programs Completer Survey AY 2022-2023

Table 9a. CAEP Initial Programs Alumni Survey: Elementary Education AY 2022-2023 Program Completers (9 respondents)

| Academic Year | Content Indicator | Mean | Range |
|-----------------|--|------|-------|
| 2023 ELEM ED | 1. Integrate appropriate professional and educational standards. | 2 | (1-2) |
| | 2. Identify and adapt instruction to diverse student learners. | 2.88 | (2-3) |
| | 3. Adapt instruction to diverse student learning. | 2 | (1-3) |
| | 4. Facilitate student critical thinking, problem solving and higher order thinking skills. | 2.1 | (2-3) |
| | 5. Encourage and motivate all student to learn. | 2.2 | (2-3) |
| | 6. Create effective learning environments. | 2.1 | (1-3) |
| | 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 | (2-3) |
| | 9. Grow professionally through reflection. | 2.1 | (2-3) |
| | 10. Appropriately apply effective classroom management practices. | 1.77 | (0-3) |
| | 11. Effectively interact with students, teachers, parent, and community members. | 1.88 | (1-3) |
| | 12. Understand human development as it relates to the teaching-learning process. | 2 | (1-3) |
| | 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 | (1-3) |
| | 16. Develop classroom and school leadership. | 1.77 | (0-3) |
| | 17. Develop a positive disposition toward students. | 2.1 | (2-3) |
| | 18. Collaborate with peers and coordinate instruction with special education teachers. | 1.77 | (1-2) |
| | 19. Develop quality instructional units. | 1.88 | (1-3) |
| | 20. Appropriately select and use a wide variety of instructional strategies, resource materials, and media. | 2.1 | (2-3) |
| | 21. Implement, interpret and use student performance assessments for effective instruction. | 1.88 | (0-3) |
| | 22. Use individual, small group and large group instructional arrangements. | 2 | (1-3) |
| | 23. Develop online learning expectations for students. | 1.88 | (1-2) |

| Academic Year | Content Indicator | Mean | Range |
|--|-------------------|------|-------|
| Overall Mean: 2.01 down from 2.35 | | | |

Table 9.b CAEP Initial Programs Alumni Survey Secondary Education AY 2022-2023 Program Completers (7 Respondents)

| Academic Year | Content Indicator | Mean | Range |
|---------------|--|------|-------|
| 2023 SEC ED | 1. Integrate appropriate professional and educational standards. | 2.22 | (2-3) |
| | 2. Identify and adapt instruction to diverse student learners. | 1.7 | (0-3) |
| | 3. Adapt instruction to diverse student learning. | 1.7 | (0-3) |
| | 4. Facilitate student critical thinking, problem solving and higher order thinking skills. | 1.7 | (0-2) |
| | 5. Encourage and motivate all student to learn. | 1.7 | (0-2) |
| | 6. Create effective learning environments. | 1.7 | (0-2) |
| | 7. Integrate technology into classroom instruction. | 1.8 | (1-2) |
| | 8. Effectively communicate with students through both oral and written modes. | 1.8 | (0-3) |
| | 9. Grow professionally through reflection. | 2.2 | (0-3) |
| | 10. Appropriately apply effective classroom management practices. | 1.4 | (0.2) |
| | 11. Effectively interact with students, teachers, parent, and community members. | 1.5 | (0-2) |
| | 12. Understand human development as it relates to the teaching-learning process. | 1.7 | (0-2) |
| | 13. Demonstrate appropriate ethical and professional behavior. | 2 | (0-3) |
| | 14. Develop Sensitivity and Respect for the needs and feelings of all students. | 2 | (0-3) |

| Academic Year | Content Indicator | Mean | Range |
|---------------------------|---|------|-------|
| | 15. Recognize both how the organization of the district and school can affect the individual teacher. | 1.4 | (0-2) |
| | 16. Develop classroom and school leadership. | 1.5 | (0-2) |
| | 17. Develop a positive disposition toward students. | 1.5 | (0-2) |
| | 18. Collaborate with peers and coordinate instruction with special education teachers. | 1.2 | (0-2) |
| | 19. Develop quality instructional units. | 1.5 | (0-2) |
| | 20. Appropriately select and use a wide variety of instructional strategies, resource materials, and media. | 1.7 | (0-3) |
| | 21. Implement, interpret and use student performance assessments for effective instruction. | 1.7 | (0-2) |
| | 22. Use individual, small group and large group instructional arrangements. | 1.7 | (0-3) |
| | 23. Develop online learning expectations for students. | 1.2 | (0-2) |
| Overall Mean: 1.63 | | | |

Table 9.c. CAEP Initial Programs Alumni Survey: Health Education 2023 Program Completers (4 Respondents)

| Academic Year | Content Indicator | Mean | Range |
|------------------------------|---|------|-------|
| 2023 Health Education | 1. Integrate appropriate professional and educational standards. | 3.6 | (2-4) |
| | 2. Identify and adapt instruction to diverse student learners. | 3.6 | (2-4) |
| | 3. Adapt instruction to diverse student learning. | 3.6 | (2-4) |
| | 4. Facilitate student critical thinking, problem solving and higher order thinking skills. | 3.6 | (2-4) |
| | 5. Encourage and motivate all student to learn. | 3.6 | (2-4) |
| | 6. Create effective learning environments. | 3.6 | (2-4) |
| | 7. Integrate technology into classroom instruction. | 3.6 | (2-4) |
| | 8. Effectively communicate with students through both oral and written modes. | 3.2 | (0-4) |
| | 9. Grow professionally through reflection. | 3.4 | (1-4) |
| | 10. Appropriately apply effective classroom management practices. | 3.4 | (1-4) |
| | 11. Effectively interact with students, teachers, parent, and community members. | 2.4 | (0-3) |
| | 12. Understand human development as it relates to the teaching-learning process. | 3.2 | (0-4) |
| | 13. Demonstrate appropriate ethical and professional behavior. | 3.6 | (2-4) |
| | 14. Develop Sensitivity and Respect for the needs and feelings of all students. | 1.0 | (0-3) |
| | 15. Recognize both how the organization of the district and school can affect the individual teacher. | 3.2 | (0-4) |
| | 16. Develop classroom and school leadership. | 3.6 | (2-4) |

| Academic Year | Content Indicator | Mean | Range |
|---------------------------|---|------|-------|
| | 17. Develop a positive disposition toward students. | 3.6 | (2-4) |
| | 18. Collaborate with peers and coordinate instruction with special education teachers. | 3.2 | (0-4) |
| | 19. Develop quality instructional units. | 2.4 | (0-3) |
| | 20. Appropriately select and use a wide variety of instructional strategies, resource materials, and media. | 3.6 | (2-4) |
| | 21. Implement, interpret and use student performance assessments for effective instruction. | 2.6 | (1-3) |
| | 22. Use individual, small group and large group instructional arrangements. | 3.6 | (2-4) |
| | 23. Develop online learning expectations for students. | 3.2 | (0-4) |
| Overall Mean: 2.96 | | | |

Table 9.d. CAEP Initial Programs Alumni Survey: MAT Secondary Education 2023 Program Completers (2 Respondents)

| Academic Year | Content Indicator | Mean | Range |
|---------------------------------|--|------|-------|
| 2023 MAT Secondary Education | 1. Integrate appropriate professional and educational standards. | 2 | (2) |
| | 2. Identify and adapt instruction to diverse student learners. | 2 | (2) |
| | 3. Adapt instruction to diverse student learning. | 2 | (2) |
| | 4. Facilitate student critical thinking, problem solving and higher order thinking skills. | 0.5 | (0-1) |
| | 5. Encourage and motivate all student to learn. | 1.5 | (1-2) |

| Academic Year | Content Indicator | Mean | Range |
|---------------|---|------|-------|
| | 6. Create effective learning environments. | 0.5 | (0-1) |
| | 7. Integrate technology into classroom instruction. | 0.5 | (0-1) |
| | 8. Effectively communicate with students through both oral and written modes. | 0 | (0) |
| | 9. Grow professionally through reflection. | 1.5 | (0-3) |
| | 10. Appropriately apply effective classroom management practices. | 0 | (0) |
| | 11. Effectively interact with students, teachers, parent, and community members. | 1.5 | (1-2) |
| | 12. Understand human development as it relates to the teaching-learning process. | 2 | (2) |
| | 13. Demonstrate appropriate ethical and professional behavior. | 1 | (0-2) |
| | 14. Develop Sensitivity and Respect for the needs and feelings of all students. | 2 | (2) |
| | 15. Recognize both how the organization of the district and school can affect the individual teacher. | 0 | (0) |
| | 16. Develop classroom and school leadership. | 0 | (0) |
| | 17. Develop a positive disposition toward students. | 2 | (2) |
| | 18. Collaborate with peers and coordinate instruction with special education teachers. | 0 | (0) |
| | 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 | (2) |
| | 21. Implement, interpret and use student performance assessments for effective instruction. | 1 | (0-2) |

| Academic Year | Content Indicator | Mean | Range |
|--------------------------|---|------|-------|
| | 22. Use individual, small group and large group instructional arrangements. | 1 | (0-2) |
| | 23. Develop online learning expectations for students. | 1.5 | (1-2) |
| Overall Mean: 1.1 | | | |

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

Strengths

- AY 2022-2023 BS in Education candidates, on average, rated many indicators as *Satisfactory* or above.
- Marked improvement in Health Education completers' satisfaction with rating of 2.96 from .47 previous cohort.
- All initial programs had completer survey data whereas in the previous year, no MAT Secondary Education completers rated the program.

Areas of Improvement

- Relative low ratings for the areas of; *Collaborate with peers and coordinate instruction with special education teachers, applying classroom management practices and develop classroom/school leadership.*
- Significantly low 1.63 (Secondary Education) and 1.1 (MAT Secondary Education) mean survey responses.

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 Secondary/MAT program coordination and implementation of curriculum.

CAEP Advanced Programs AY 2022-2023 Completer Satisfaction

Descriptions and Procedures

In 2023 the CAEP Advanced Programs Completer Survey was sent to a total of 4 2022-2023 program completers (3 of whom were graduated from the MSED Literacy and Language Arts program, and 1 from the MSED Special Education Program, and 0 from the 092 Certificate in Intermediate Administration and Supervision as it is a bi-yearly program). Follow-up phone calls and text messages were also made to attempt to increase response rates.

Results

Two MSED Literacy and Language Arts completers responded for a return rate of 75%. The one MSED Special Education program completer did not respond, despite numerous phone calls, emails, and text messages. There were no 092 Certificate in Intermediate Administration and Supervision program completers in 2023 as the program is bi-yearly. The 2023 survey response rates are at or above the CAEP minimum requirements, and they are like response rates obtained for the AY 2021-2022 cohort of advanced program completers.

Results of the Alumni Survey filled out by 2022-2023 completer are summarized in Table 10. 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 2022-2023 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 10. CAEP Advanced Programs Alumni Survey: MSED in Literacy and Language Arts 2023 Program Completers (2 Respondents)

| Academic Year | Content Indicator | Mean | Range |
|------------------|--|------|-------|
| 2023 MSED LIT | 1. Integrate appropriate professional and educational standards. | 2.0 | (2) |
| | 2. Identify and adapt instruction to diverse student learners. | 2.0 | (2) |
| | 3. Adapt instruction to diverse student learning. | 3.0 | (3) |
| | 4. Facilitate student critical thinking, problem solving and higher order thinking skills. | 2.0 | (3) |
| | 5. Encourage and motivate all student to learn. | 2.0 | (2) |
| | 6. Create effective learning environments. | 2.0 | (2) |
| | 7. Integrate technology into classroom instruction. | 2.0 | (2) |

| Academic Year | Content Indicator | Mean | Range |
|---------------|---|------|-------|
| | 8. Effectively communicate with students through both oral and written modes. | 2.0 | (2) |
| | 9. Grow professionally through reflection. | 3.0 | (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. | 2.0 | (2) |
| | 15. Recognize both how the organization of the district and school can affect the individual teacher. | 2.0 | (2.0) |
| | 16. Develop classroom and school leadership. | 2.0 | (2) |
| | 17. Develop a positive disposition toward students. | 2.0 | (2) |
| | 18. Collaborate with peers and coordinate instruction with special education teachers. | 2.0 | (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. | 2.0 | (2) |

| Academic Year | Content Indicator | Mean | Range |
|---------------------------|---|------|-------|
| | 22. Use individual, small group and large group instructional arrangements. | 2.0 | (2) |
| | 23. Develop online learning expectations for students. | 2.0 | (2) |
| Overall Mean: 2.05 | | | |

Analysis (Strengths/Areas for Improvement) for the Advanced MSED Programs in Literacy and Language Arts Program

Strengths

- All but two of the mean ratings given to items by AY2022-2023 program completers in MSED in Literacy and Language Arts were 2 or higher, suggesting overall average satisfaction with the program.
- The highest mean ratings of 3.0 were observed in a number of areas rated by the MSED Literacy and Language Arts Program completers, including ‘*Adapting instruction for diverse learners and Growing professionally through reflection*’.

Areas of Improvement

- There were no identified areas of weakness in the MSED Literacy and Language Arts program as all indicators were rated at either *Satisfactory* or *Proficient*.

Action Plan for the MSED Programs based on the Aggregate Data

- 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.

Case Study of Initial Completers: Analysis of Student Impact and Focus Group Data

The mixed method case study used both quantitative data in the form of a pre/post assessment on a unit of study from the school’s curriculum. An African American Elementary Education completer teaching at an urban charter school and a Caucasian Health Education program completer teaching at a large urban high school participated in that component of the study. Initial and advanced program completer focus groups were held to obtain further feedback on the completer survey results.

2022-2023 Completers: Analysis of Case Study Findings

Results: Analysis of focus group interviews of both initial and advanced candidates and employers indicate the following:

- Majority of initial and advanced candidates rated their programs positively. This finding is in alignment with employers who also rated our completers as competent.
- Initial and advanced candidates noted the impact of program faculty in exposing them to new research and content areas.
- Majority of initial candidates cited the value of fieldwork in Danbury public schools due to its diverse student population. However, they also noted the need to have more coursework on challenging student behaviors.
- Initial candidates requested more specific coursework on creating individual education plans for students with special needs.
- Majority of employers reported that our candidates were ready to use technology in the schools and were focused on building rapport with students. One employer suggested more work in communicating with families.

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

- Work with instructors of special education courses to implement more information on creating IEPs and communication with families.
- Implement coursework in ED 206 and student teaching seminars on classroom management, specifically challenging behaviors.
- Continue to monitor diverse placements in Danbury public schools.

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.

2022-2023 (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 |
| 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 2023

edTPA EPP Performance Summary

July 2022 - June 2023

Western Connecticut State University

| | 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 | 40 | 44.0 | 3.1 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 14.8 | 14.6 | 14.7 |
| Health Education | 4 | 42.5 | 3.0 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 3.3 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.0 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 14.5 | 15.0 | 13.0 |
| K-12 Performing Arts | 16 | 44.3 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 2.9 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 2.6 | 3.0 | 2.8 | 3.1 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 2.8 | 3.1 | 14.6 | 14.5 | 15.2 |
| Secondary English-Language Arts | 5 | 45.8 | 3.4 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 2.6 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 15.6 | 14.6 | 15.6 |
| Secondary History/Social Studies | 11 | 44.1 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 3.1 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 14.1 |
| Secondary Mathematics | 2 | 43.5 | 3.5 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 14.5 | 13.5 | 15.5 |
| Secondary Science | 2 | 39.5 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 13.0 | 13.0 | 13.5 |

| | 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 | 2 | 29.0 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 2.5 | | 2.0 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.5 | 1.5 | | 2.0 | 10.0 | 12.0 | 7.0 |
| World Language | 2 | 29.0 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 2.5 | | 2.0 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.5 | 1.5 | | 2.0 | 10.0 | 12.0 | 7.0 |

| | 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 | 19 | 46.7 | 2.3 | 2.4 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 2.1 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 3.3 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 2.4 | 2.8 | 2.3 | 12.3 | 13.3 | 13.6 |
| Elementary Education: Literacy with Mathematics Task 4 | 19 | 46.7 | 2.3 | 2.4 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 2.1 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 3.3 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 2.4 | 2.8 | 2.3 | 12.3 | 13.3 | 13.6 |

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

The edTPA Portfolio is designed to prepare our candidates for the workplace. 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 44, 29 for 13-Rubric Handbooks, and for 18-Rubric Handbooks it was 46.7

edTPA Component Areas of Strength

- 1. How do the candidate's plans build students' abilities to...(content specific):
 - Overall, 100% of 2023 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 2023 candidates scored at the Proficient level (mean of 2.9).
- 4. How does the candidate identify, and support language demands associated with a key (content) learning task?
 - Overall, 57% of candidates scored at the Proficient level (mean of 2.9).
- 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 3.1).
 - The mean score of 3.1 was slightly higher than last year's cohort.
- 7. How does the candidate actively engage students in...(content specific):
 - Overall, 75% of candidates scored at the Advanced level (mean of 3.0).

- This mean of 3.0 is similar to last year's cohort mean.
- 10. How does the candidate use evidence to evaluate and change teaching practice to meet students' varied learning needs?
 - Overall, 75% of candidates scored at the Proficient level (mean of 2.7).
 - The 2023 cohort scored slightly lower than the previous cohort mean of 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 3.1).
 - The 2023 cohort scored slightly above last year's mean of 3.0.
- 15. How does the candidate use the analysis of what students know and are able to do to plan next steps in instruction?
 - Overall, 75% of candidates scored at the Advanced level (mean of 3.0).
 - The 2023 cohort scored at the same level as the prior year with a mean of 3.0.

edTPA Portfolio Areas of Improvement

- A mean under 2.0 is considered an overall area of improvement.
- The two Secondary Education Spanish candidates scored at the emergent level for Task 3 Assessment with rubrics 12 at 13 at 1.5.

Advanced Programs

Table 13. CAEP Advanced Literacy and Language Arts Program Practicum Evaluation: Summer 2023

| CAEP Advanced Literacy and Language Arts Program Practicum Evaluation 2023 | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----|------|-----------------------|
| Standard Elements Reading/Literacy Specialist | Summer 2023 n=3 | | | | | | |
| | 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 | 3 | 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 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3.0 | 0.00 |
| 4.1 Candidates demonstrate knowledge of foundational theories about diverse learners, equity, and culturally responsive instruction. | 0 | 0 | 3 | 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 | 3 | 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 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.3 | 0.47 |
| 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 | 3 | 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 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3.0 | 0.00 |

**CAEP Advanced Literacy and Language Arts Program
Practicum Evaluation
2023**

| Standard Elements Reading/Literacy Specialist | Summer 2023 n=3 | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|------------|------------|-----------|----------|------|-----------------------|
| | Below Standard | Developing | Proficient | Exemplary | N/A | Mean | Standard Deviation |
| 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 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3.0 | 0.00 |
| 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 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3.0 | 0.00 |
| Frequencies | 0 | 1 | 30 | 0 | 0 | | |
| % Below Standard | 0.00% | | | | | | |
| % Developing | 3% | | | | | | |
| % Proficient | 97% | | | | | | |
| % Exemplary | 0.00% | | | | | | |
| Overall Mentor Mean by Cohort | 3.22 | | | | | | |
| Literacy and Language Arts Program Practicum Evaluation (2023) 100% Passing (Developing, Proficient, and Exemplary) | | | | | | | |

Table 14 CAEP Advanced MSED Special Education Program Practicum Evaluation: Summer 2023

| MSED in Special Education Practicum Assessment: | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| Rubric Element | Summer 2023 n= 1 | | | | | | |
| | 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 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.0 | 0.00 |
| 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 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 0.00 |
| CEC 2.3 Beginning special education professionals know how to intervene safely and appropriately with individuals with exceptionalities in crisis. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 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 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 0.00 |

MSED in Special Education Practicum Assessment:

| Rubric Element | Summer 2023 n= 1 | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----|------|--------------------|
| | 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 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 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 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 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 | 1 | 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 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 0.00 |
| CEC 5.1 Beginning special education professionals consider individual abilities, interests, | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 0.00 |

MSED in Special Education Practicum Assessment:

| Rubric Element | Summer 2023 n= 1 | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----|------|--------------------|
| | 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 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4.00 | 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 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 0.00 |
| CEC 7.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.0 | 0.00 |

| MSED in Special Education Practicum Assessment: | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| Rubric Element | Summer 2023 | | | | | | |
| | n= 1 | | | | | | |
| | 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 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4.0 | 0.00 |
| Frequencies | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 0 | | |
| % Below Standard | 0% | | | | | | |
| % Developing | 0%. | | | | | | |
| % Proficient | 20% | | | | | | |
| % Exemplary | 80% | | | | | | |
| Overall Mean by Cohort | 3.6 | | | | | | |
| MSED in Special Education Practicum Assessment (Summer 2023) | | | | | | | |
| 100% Passing (Developing, Proficient, and Exemplary) | | | | | | | |

Analysis (Strengths/Areas for Improvement) for the Advanced Programs based on the Practicum Scores

Overall Performance

- While the sample is small, the overall performance of the 4 advanced candidates in both the MSED in Literacy and Language Arts as well as the MSED Special Education programs, indicated that completers were at the proficient to exemplary level. The one completer in the MSED Special Education program scored at the exemplary level for 8/12 indicators. There were no indicators rated below standard for either program.

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

The EPP uses the Title II pass rates to compare the performance of WCSU Initial program completers with those throughout the state. Title II data is one year behind the CAEP reporting year and therefore the cohort for AY 2021-22 is reported in the Table. In spring 2024, the Connecticut State Department of Education released an EPP data dashboard that reports AY 2019-22 employment data and persistence in employment for initial program completers.

Table 15. State-wide and WCSU Licensure Exams – Pass Rates for AY 2019-2022 (Title II)

| Cohort Year | WCSU Number Taking Assessment | WCSU Number Passing Assessment | WCSU Institutional Pass Rate | State Number Taking Assessment | State Number Passing Assessment | State Passing Rate |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---------------------------|
| AY 2021-2022 | 42 | 36 | 86% | 1,212 | 1,014 | 84% |
| AY 2020-2021 | 38 | 30 | 79% | 1304 | 1074 | 82% |
| AY 2019-2020 | 37 | 33 | 89% | 1285 | 1099 | 86% |

Table 16. CSDE EPP Data Dashboard 2019-2022

| Cohort Year | WCSU Percentage Employed in First Year | WCSU Percentage Employed in Second Year | WCSU Percentage Employed in Hard to Staff District | State Percentage Employed in First Year | State Percentage Employed in Second Year | State Percentage Employed in Hard to Staff District |
|--------------------|---|--|---|--|---|--|
| AY 2021-2022 | 36% | NA | 25% | 67.4% | NA | 38.6% |
| AY 2020-2021 | 23% | 91% | 18% | 68.6% | 92.6% | 39.3% |
| AY 2019-2020 | 17% | 88% | 8% | 64% | 92.3% | 30.7% |

*CSDE only reports completers working in Connecticut. It does not report completers working in private schools or other states.

Analysis (Strengths/Areas for Improvement) for Ability of Completers to be Hired.

Overall Performance

- Analysis of the State-wide and WCSU licensure pass rates for AY 2019-2022 indicates that WCSU completers are comparable with other completers in the state. The passing rates for AY 2020-2021 were slightly lower for both state-wide and WCSU than previous years. This is due to the effects of COVID-19 during that academic year. The passing rates for the following year when instruction came back on campus were slightly higher.
- Analysis of employment data indicates that WCSU completers' employment was lower than the state-wide data. WCSU is located on the border of New York and New Jersey and therefore we have many students that are employed out of state and not counted in this report. However, it should be noted that in AY 2021-2022, the rate of completers hired in their first year reached its highest percentage at 36% as well as those hired in a hard to staff district (25%).

Appendix: Initial & Advanced Programs Focus Groups

Case Study Initial Completers Focus Group

March 13, 2024, via Zoom at 4PM

Description: A virtual feedback meeting was held to obtain further information on the initial programs and areas for improvement.

Three Participants all teaching in Fairfield County:

- Female Interdisciplinary Elementary Education B.S. 2023 graduate working as a sixth grade STEM teacher
- Female Health Education BS 2023 Elementary Education B.S. graduate working as a first grade teacher
- Female Secondary Education Biology BS 2023 graduate working as a high school biology teacher

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

Elementary Education program completers reported that the year-long residency program really helped them to see how the curriculum is implemented across the academic year. They also commented that being placed in fieldwork and residency in Danbury public schools prepared them for the diverse classroom. One Elementary Education program completing working as a sixth grade STEM teacher noted that her strong instruction in pedagogy and STEM enabled her to obtain her current position. She commented that the hiring board were impressed with her knowledge of the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) which she attributed to Dr. Harry Rosvally's science courses. The Secondary Education program completer also noted the year-long senior year experience of the Professional Development Semester in the fall and then student teaching in the spring helped her to be prepared for her first year of teaching. One Elementary Education participant reported that the Mursion simulations were helpful in learning how to think quickly in the moment, while another participant felt that not all simulations gave adequate feedback and suggested more experience as a substitute teacher. This participant noted that she worked as a substitute teacher during COVID-19 and this experience was the most beneficial to experience the reality of the classroom. Lastly, participants shared that another strength of the program was the faculty. The two elementary education participants discussed the value of having Dr. Mead as a bridge between the district and WCSU. They discussed how the seminars were a valuable time to vent with Dr. Mead and she would listen to resolve the issue as she demonstrated restorative justice sessions for them. The Secondary Education participant discussed a similar experience with Dr. Davila in her student teaching seminar.

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

Respondents wanted more experience working in special education, specifically understanding Individual Education Plans (IEP) as they are now required to be a part of PPT meetings. They also suggested holding simulated PPT meetings as they felt they were not prepared to engage in these critical meetings. One Elementary Education participant suggested that in their literacy methods classes, they adapt lessons from the new ARC curriculum in Danbury and then implement them with their classes. She remarked that they had to do that project for Dr. Maida's math courses, and she felt really prepared to do that in her position now. Participants also shared that working in Danbury exposed them to a lot of diverse students, however they didn't feel prepared to adapt instruction for multilingual learners. For example, one participant reported that she has several new sixth

graders in her class that don't speak any English. A third area for improvement was classroom management. Participants shared that while they had a simulation early in the program, they needed more preparation for specific interventions for students with emotional behavior issues or challenging behaviors. The Secondary Education participant reported that she did not feel prepared to teach science as her class ran as an independent study, and therefore they hardly met which led to not knowing the NGSS. She suggested creating a STEM methods class for the science and math secondary education majors as there are usually only a few and STEM uses both areas.

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 different platforms during Residency II. The Secondary Education participant noted that teachers in her new school said that applications taught at WCSU like Nearpod and Kahoot are outdated and not used in their school.

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. However, they reiterated the need to learn more about IEPs and PPT meetings. One Elementary Education participant reported that she needed more preparation in how to do accommodations and modifications. She also discussed the need to learn how to work with families that are experiencing trauma, or severe poverty, or other challenging issues.

Question # 5 How did the program prepare you to be a teacher/school leader?

An Elementary Education participant noted that the rigorous program, especially in Residency, helped her to cope with the workload of the first year. She reported that some new teachers in her building were struggling as they didn't have the same level of preparation. Participants also noted how faculty who were passionate about their subject area awakened a desire to pursue further study and mentioned Dr Rosvally for STEM, Dr. Maida for Math, and Pam Dalton for literacy. In fact, one participant shared that Dr. Rosvally's class opened several career pathways besides classroom teaching such a curriculum director for STEM.

Anything Else?

All participants voiced their displeasure with having to do the edTPA and wished that the class that prepared them for it could have been used for other topics.

Case Study Advanced Completers Focus Group

March 22, 2024 at 11AM via Zoom

Description: A virtual feedback meeting was held to obtain further information on the advanced programs and areas for improvement. One 2023 female, Caucasian MSED in Literacy and Language Arts advanced program completer participated in the interview. She works as a literacy interventionist in Litchfield County, CT.

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

The MSED Literacy and Language Arts program focused on the science of reading and its foundational skills which was really helpful in my position as a literacy interventionist. It also focused on literacy coaching which we don't have in the district as there aren't literacy coaches. So now when I sit in on PLC meetings, I use what I learned about the implementation of the science of reading to help my colleagues with the new state curriculum. Previously, I was a fifth-grade teacher, so the program helped me to focus on becoming a literacy leader in the school.

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

I would suggest more interaction with peers in the program, which is not the fault of the program, just the result of COVID and being online. Since my district doesn't have literacy coaches, I would have loved to visit another district or school to observe it in a real setting.

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

The program introduced me to new programs that I hadn't used before in my career such as Virtual Wilson or the University of Florida's phonics digital program which I now use in my school. It opened up to me new tools that I brought to our tech department for implementation in the school and helped me to see how to take away barriers to learning through technology.

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

The program emphasized ensuring that all students see themselves represented in the literature used in the school which is so important. It also focused on instructional strategies for English Language Learners (ELLs) to make literacy accessible as well as quality instruction for all students.

Question # 5 How did the program prepare you to be a teacher/school leader?

I came into the program as an Elementary school teacher and the program helped me to see how to be a literacy leader or curriculum director, which I am very interested in for the future. I enjoyed the course on Education law and the other course materials that focused on how to lead colleagues to become more reflective practitioners. It also emphasized how to be intentional with reflection and being open to new research and seeking it.

CAEP-WCSU Employer Focus Group A

March 14, 2024

Zoom interview at 1PM

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

Participant: One male middle school principal in Fairfield County CT who employs two secondary education completers from separate cohorts. One completer is a male 8th grade Math teacher, and the other is a 2023 Secondary Education English teacher working as a substitute for a maternity leave.

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

The principal shared that he appreciated that WCSU undergraduates have a traditional longer period of preparation as he finds them better prepared than a shorter time of preparation that some programs use. He discussed one completer from another cohort that went from 5th grade to 8th grade Math class which was a huge leap in curriculum and methods. Yet he was able to adjust quickly, and the principal felt that this successful transition was due to the foundation he received at WCSU. The principal rated the completers' preparation at WCSU as 100% comparable to other programs in the area.

Question # 2: How prepared was the WCSU program completer to meet the needs of diverse students?

Also, since the Math completer had experience with Danbury's school district, he has been able to adapt to the needs of the district's level of diversity which is mostly learning needs rather than ethnicity. The 2023 Secondary Education English completer has also been able to adapt lessons for the needs of diverse learners.

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

The principal reported that both completers were doing an outstanding job of integrating technology in their instruction. His school uses one-to one Chromebooks and both completers integrate the devices well in their lessons. He reported that platforms change quickly, and he finds that the younger teachers because they grew up with technology can adjust quickly. In fact, sometimes the younger teachers bring suggestions of different platforms that they have investigated online.

Question #4: How prepared was the WCSU program completer to work with diverse families?

The principal noted that the male 8th grade Math completer was extremely comfortable working and conversing with parents. The 2023 Secondary Education English completer did not participate in report card meetings as she began the leave replacement after that event. However, she hasn't had any issues with communications sent home since the beginning of her teaching at the school.

Question # 5: Is there anything else you would like the program to know about teacher preparation?

The principal suggested preparing the candidates to prepare a well-written resume for a position and practice for district/school interviews. He mentioned that he has offered workshops in that preparation for other universities. The principal did not report any weaknesses in the WCSU

program based upon his experiences working with student teachers and new hires. He noted that WCSU student teachers and completers are strong in writing lesson plans and understanding curriculum which is a great strength.

CAEP-WCSU Employer Focus Group B

March 22, 2024, at 10:30 AM via Zoom

Description: Participant: One female elementary school principal in Litchfield County CT who employs two education completers from separate cohorts. One completer is a female Elementary Education 2023 initial completer, and the other is a 2023 MSED Literacy and Language Arts completer working as an interventionist. During the interview, the principal reported that the Elementary Education completer was employed during the fall semester as support personnel and her contract ended this spring semester.

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

The principal reported that both the initial and advanced completers were well prepared for their roles in her school. She noted that the initial Elementary Education completer was confident in her role from day one and was not fearful as some new teachers might be in that situation. The principal also reported that the advanced literacy program completer shared the research she was learning about in the literacy program with the principal and the staff at professional development meetings so the whole school benefited from her preparation.

Question # 2: How prepared was the WCSU program completer to meet the needs of diverse students?

The principal responded that both completers were very prepared to meet the needs of diverse students. She discussed how the Elementary Education program completer focused on building rapport with her students while still keeping the expectations for behavior. The principal noted that this was different from novice teachers that come to her school from other districts as often they want to be the student's friend rather than their teacher. The principal also discussed how the advanced literacy program completer demonstrates a leadership role when it comes to meeting the needs of diverse students. She reported on a recent incident where the advanced completer observed that a student of poverty needed to be eligible for reduced lunch benefits due to the situation at home. The advanced completer worked with a multilingual teacher to help the student's family fill out the required forms so that the request for a reduced lunch would be granted. The principal also noted that the advanced literacy completer has to frequently communicate with diverse families in her role as an interventionist.

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

The principal discussed the technology in their school which is one to one device, Google suite, and assistive technology. She reported that both the initial and advanced completer were well prepared to integrate technology.

Question #4: How prepared was the WCSU program completer to work with diverse families?

The principal noted that since the initial Elementary Education completer was hired for a short-term support position, she did not communicate or meet with families as that is assigned to the classroom teacher. However, the advanced literacy program completer regularly communicates with

diverse families as an interventionist. She noted that the advanced literacy program completer ensures that all communication is sent home in the parent/guardian's first language.

Question # 5: Is there anything else you would like the program to know about teacher preparation?

The principal responded that the completers were well prepared. She also observed as an adjunct in the special education program at WCSU, that candidates are able to overcome all difficulties and to manage communication which is key. After prompting by the interviewer on any issues on the horizon that the EPP should focus on, the principal identified working with families as a key issue. She reported that families are becoming more defensive and that is intimidating for a beginning teacher. She suggested working with candidates to train them to communicate to families that they work as a team for the benefit of the child which defuses situations.