

## WCSU 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
<b>Frequencies</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>		
<i>Percentage of Competencies Scored Below Standard</i>			<b>0.00%</b>							<b>0.00%</b>						
<i>Percentage of Competencies Scored</i>			<b>.02%</b>							<b>0.02%</b>						

**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]	<b>Content of lesson plan is aligned with standards</b>														
		<b>Chemistry</b>	0	0	1	0	0	3.0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.0	0
		<b>English</b>	0	0	2	0	0	3.0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.0	0
		<b>Mathematics</b>	0	0	2	0	0	3.0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.0	0
		<b>Social Studies</b>	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
		<b>World Languages, Spanish</b>	0	0	1	0	0	3.0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.0	0
		<b>MAT Biology</b>	0	0	1	0	0	3.0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.0	0
		<b>MAT English</b>	0	0	2	0	0	3.0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.0	0
		<b>MAT Social Studies</b>	0	0	2	0	0	3.0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.0	0
		<b>MAT Spanish</b>	0	0	1	0	0	3.0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.0	0
		<b>[2a.1] Totals</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3.0</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3.10</b>	
	<b>[2a.2]</b>	<b>Content of lesson appropriate to sequence of lessons and appropriate level of challenge</b>														
		<b>Chemistry</b>	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
		<b>English</b>	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	0
		<b>Mathematics</b>	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	0
		<b>Social Studies</b>	0	1	6	0	0	2.86	0.35	0	1	5	0	0	2.83	0.37
		<b>World Languages, Spanish</b>	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0
		<b>MAT Biology</b>	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0
		<b>MAT English</b>	0	0	1	1	0	3.5	0.50	0	0	1	1	0	3.5	0.50
		<b>MAT Social Studies</b>	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	0
		<b>MAT Spanish</b>	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	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
		<b>[2a.2] Totals</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3.26</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3.25</b>	
<b>3. Instruction for Active Learning</b>	<b>[3a.2]</b>	<b>Content accuracy</b>														
		<b>Chemistry</b>	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0
		<b>English</b>	0	0	1	1	0	3.5	0.50	0	0	1	1	0	3.5	0.50
		<b>Mathematics</b>	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	0
		<b>Social Studies</b>	0	0	4	3	0	3.43	0.49	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	0.47
		<b>World Languages, Spanish</b>	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.0	0
		<b>MAT Biology</b>	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.0	0
	<b>MAT English</b>	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
		<b>MAT Social Studies</b>	0	0	1	1	0	3.5	0.50	0	1	0	1	0	3	1.0
		<b>MAT Spanish</b>	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0
		<b>[3a.2] Totals</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3.50</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3.48</b>	
	<b>[3a.3]</b>	<b>Content progression and level of challenge</b>														
		<b>Chemistry</b>	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0
		<b>English</b>	0	1	1	0	0	2.5	.50	0	1	1	0	0	2.5	.50
		<b>Mathematics</b>	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	0
		<b>Social Studies</b>	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
		<b>World Languages, Spanish</b>	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0
		<b>MAT Biology</b>	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0
		<b>MAT Social Studies</b>	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	0
		<b>MAT Spanish</b>	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0
		<b>[3a.3] Totals</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3.04</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3.29</b>	
<b>Frequencies</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>0</b>		
<b>Percentage of Competencies Scored Below Standard</b>			<b>0.00%</b>							<b>0.00%</b>						

**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

<b>Health Education (K-12)</b> <b>Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators</b> <b>Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor</b> <b>Spring 2023</b>																
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><b>Overall Candidate Performance: University Supervisor and Mentor Elementary Education Key Indicators - Spring 2023</b></p> <p><b>Percentage Passing (Developing, Proficient, and Exemplary) = 100%</b></p> <p><b>Overall Elementary 2023 Mean = 3.08</b></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**

<b>Danbury Public Schools District-WCSU Program Completers TEAM Data</b>							
<b>24 Program Completers</b>							
<b>Program</b>	<b><i>n</i></b>	<b>TEAM Year</b>	<b>Module 1</b>	<b>Module 2</b>	<b>Module 3</b>	<b>Module 4</b>	<b>Module 5</b>
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
<b>Overall Candidate Performance: Danbury Public Schools District-WCSU Program Completers TEAM Data</b>							
<b>In Progress: 13/24=54%</b>							
<b>Completed: 11/24= 46%</b>							

**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)

<b>WCSU Employer Survey</b>			
<b>Academic Year</b>	<b>Content Indicator</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Range</b>
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)



<b>WCSU Employer Survey</b>			
<b>Academic Year</b>	<b>Content Indicator</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Range</b>
	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)
<b>Overall Mean: 2.83</b>			

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

<b>WCSU Employer Survey</b>			
<b>Academic Year</b>	<b>Content Indicator</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Range</b>
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)

<b>WCSU Employer Survey</b>			
<b>Academic Year</b>	<b>Content Indicator</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Range</b>
	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)
<b>Overall Mean: 2.46</b>			

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

<b>WCSU Employer Survey</b>			
<b>Academic Year</b>	<b>Content Indicator</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Range</b>
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)
<b>Overall Mean: 3.0</b>			

### **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 <b>had</b></p> <p>2. Segmentation of <b>ran</b></p>	<p>2. Teacher will have student(s) Segment and blend 3 letter words: oral blending of <b>had</b></p> <p>Segmentation of <b>ran</b></p>	<p>1. Teacher will have student(s) Segment and blend 3 letter words: oral blending of <b>him</b></p> <p>2. Segmentation of <b>fun</b></p>
<p>Teacher will write on the board and read words chorally/spell with students of a <b><u>Mixed word list</u></b>: fan, tin, hit, hat, him, tan, has</p>	<p>Teacher will write on the board and read/spell words chorally with students of a <b><u>Mixed word list</u></b>: 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 <b><u>Mixed word list</u></b>: us, fuss, fan, fun, fit, fits, hum, tan</p>
<p>3. Introduction of sight words: <b>wasn't</b></p>	<p>3. Introduction of sight spelling sentence: "<b>It was cold outside, but it <u>wasn't</u> raining.</b>"</p> <p>4. Students will write a sentence on their guided</p>	<p>3. Introduction of sight spelling sentence: "<b>Please get down from the tree.</b>"</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: <b>"She has it"</b></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 <b>fad, ha,d hid, kick</b></p> <p>2. Segmentation of <b>sad, had, fit, miss, did, dad</b></p>	<p>words: oral blending of <b>rub, suck, cut, back, cab</b></p> <p>2. Segmentation of <b>cat, cut, duck, kick, tack, tuck</b></p>	<p>review decodable words: <b>fad, had, hid, kick, cat, cut, duck, kick, tack, tuck</b></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 <b><u>Mixed word list:</u></b> 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 <b><u>Mixed word list:</u></b> 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. <b><u>Mixed word list:</u></b> 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>

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

- 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	20 to 30	0
3.78 / 80	30 to 40	0
4.78 / 80	40 to 50	0
5.78 / 80	50 to 60	0
6.78 / 80	60 to 70	0
7.78 / 80	70 to 80	100%
8.78 / 80	80 to 90	0
9.78 / 80	90 to 100	
10.78 / 80		
11.78 / 80		
12.78 / 80		
13.78 / 80		
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.