CAEP ANNUAL REPORT: 2025

WESTERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY

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

*Note: Completer data reported in this review represents program completers who were granted degrees in spring/summer 2024and completed final practicum experience in spring/summer 2024

CAEP Accountability Measures AY 2023-2024

Measure 1: Initial Completer Effectiveness

The Connecticut State Department of Education does not provide EPPs TEAM data due to budget constraint. In 2024-2025, 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 2024 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 2025

Table 1: Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators Disaggregated by Evaluator: Spring 2024

Elementary Education (1-6) Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor Spring 2024																		
			Elementary Education (1-6) Key Indicators															
			University Supervisor (n=17)							Mentor (n=17)								
Domain	Element	Competency	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	10	7	0	3.41	0.49	0	0	9	8	0	3.47	0.50

Elementary Education (1-6)																
Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators																
Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor																
Spring 2024																

			Elementary Education (1-6) Key Indicators													
			University Supervisor (n=17)							Mentor (n=17)						
Domain	Element	Competency	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	0	13	4	0	3.24	0.42	0	0	14	3	0	3.18	0.38
3. Instruction for Active Learning	[3a.2]	Content accuracy	0	0	8	9	0	3.53	0.50	0	0	8	9	4	3.53	0.50
	[3a.3]	Content progression and level of challenge	0	0	11	6	0	3.35	0.48	0	1	11	5	0	3.24	0.55
Frequencies			0	0	42	26	0			0	1	42	25	0		
Percentage of Competencies Scored Below Standard			0.00%							0.00%						
Percentage of Competencies Scored Developing			.00%							0.01%						

			Elementary Education (1-6) Key Indicators													
			University Supervisor (n=17)							Mentor (n=17)						
Domain	Element	Competency	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
	Percentage of Competencies Scored Proficient		62%							62%						
	Percentage of Competencies Scored Exemplary		38%							37%						
	Spring 2023Mean		3.38							3.35						

Elementary Education (1-6)

Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators

Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor

Spring 2024

Overall Candidate Performance: University Supervisor and Mentor Elementary Education Key Indicators - Spring 2024

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

Overall Elementary 2024 Mean = 3.36

Table 2: Secondary Education (7-12) Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators Disaggregated by Evaluator: Spring 2024

- The Master of Arts in Teaching Program (MAT) placed candidates in Student Teaching in Spring 2024.

Domain	Element	Competency	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**														
		Biology	0	0	0	1	0	4.0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.0	0
		English	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	0.43	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	0.43
		Mathematics	0	0	1	0	0	3.0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.0	0
		Social Studies	0	0	2	0	0	3.0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.0	0
		World Languages, Spanish	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		MAT English	0	0	1	0	0	3.0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.0	0

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	4	0	0	3.0	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	0.43
		MAT Spanish	0	0	1	0	0	3.0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.0	0
		[2a.1] Totals	**0**	**0**	**12**	**2**	**0**	**3.17**		**0**	**1**	**8**	**5**	**0**	**3.14**	
	[2a.2]	**Content of lesson appropriate to sequence of lessons and appropriate level of challenge**														
		Biology	0	0	0	1	0	4.0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.0	0
		English	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	0.43	0	0	3	0	0	3.0	0
		Mathematics	0	0	1	0	0	3.0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.0	0
		Social Studies	0	0	2	0	0	3.0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.0	0

		Secondary Education													
		Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators													
		Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor													
		Spring 2024													
			Secondary Education Key Indicators by Program												
			University Supervisor							Mentor					
Domain	Element	Competency	Below Standard (Indicator Not Met)	Developing (Indicator Partially)	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully)	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation	Below Standard (Indicator Not Met)	Developing (Indicator Partially)	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully)	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation
		World Languages, Spanish	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		MAT English	0	0	1	0	0	3.0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.0	0
		MAT Social Studies	0	0	4	0	0	3.0	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	0.43
		MAT Spanish	0	1	0	0	0	2.0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.0	0
		[2a.2] Totals	**0**	**1**	**11**	**2**	**0**	**3.03**		**0**	**2**	**10**	**2**	**0**	**3.03**	
	[3a.2]	**Content accuracy**														
3. Instruction for Active Learning		**Biology**	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0
		English	0	0	4	0	0	3.0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.5	0.50
		Mathematics	0	1	0	0	0	2.0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.0	0

			Secondary Education													
			Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators													
			Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor													
			Spring 2024													
			Secondary Education Key Indicators by Program													
			University Supervisor							Mentor						
Domain	Element	Competency	Below Standard (Indicator Not Met)	Developing (Indicator Partially	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation	Below Standard (Indicator Not Met)	Developing (Indicator Partially	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation
		Social Studies	0	0	2	0	0	3.0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.0	0
		World Languages, Spanish	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		MAT English	0	0	0	1	0	4.0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.0	0
		MAT Social Studies	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	0.43	0	1	0	2	2	3.50	0.50
		MAT Spanish	0	0	1	0	0	3.0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0
		[3a.2] Totals	**0**	**1**	**10**	**3**	**0**	**3.03**		**0**	**2**	**6**	**5**	**0**	**3.14**	
	[3a.3]	Content progression and level of challenge														
		Biology	0	0	0	1	0	4.0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0
		English	0	0	4	0	0	3.0	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	0.43

Domain	Element	Competency	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

Secondary Education
Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators
Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor
Spring 2024

Secondary Education Key Indicators by Program

Domain	Element	Competency	Below Standard (Indicator Not Met)	Developing (Indicator Partially)	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully)	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation	Below Standard (Indicator Not Met)	Developing (Indicator Partially)	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully)	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation
		Mathematics	0	1	0	0	0	2.0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.0	0
		Social Studies	0	0	2	0	0	3.0	.0	0	0	2	0	0	3.0	0
		World Languages, Spanish	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.0	0
		MAT English	0	0	1	0	0	3.0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.0	0
		MAT Social Studies	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	0.43	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	0.43
		MAT Spanish	0	1	0	0	0	2.0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.0	0
		[3a.3] Totals	**0**	**3**	**10**	**1**	**0**	**2.46**		**0**	**2**	**9**	**3**	**0**	**2.81**	
		Frequencies	**0**	**5**	**43**	**8**	**0**			**0**	**7**	**33**	**13**	**0**		
		Percentage of Competencies Scored	**0.00%**							**0.00%**						

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
		Below Standard														
		Percentage of Competencies Scored Developing	.08%							.13%						
		Percentage of Competencies Scored Proficient	77%							62.26%						
		Percentage of Competencies Scored Exemplary	14%							24.52%						
		Spring 2024 Mean	2.92							3.03						

Secondary Education

Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators

Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor

Spring 2024

Overall Candidate Performance: University Supervisor and Mentor Secondary Education (7-12) Key Indicators – Spring 2024

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

Overall Secondary 2024 Mean = 2.97

Table 3: Health Education (K-12) Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators Disaggregated by Evaluator: Spring 2024

			Health Education (K-12) Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor Spring 2024													
			Health Education (K-12) Key Indicators													
			University Supervisor (n=2)							Mentor (n=2)						
Domain	Element	Competency	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	2	0	0	**3**	0	0	0	1	1	0	**3.50**	0.50
	[2a.2]	Content of lesson appropriate to sequence of lessons and appropriate level of challenge	0	0	1	1	0	**3.50**	0	0	0	1	1	0	**3.50**	0.50
3. Instruction for Active Learning	[3a.2]	Content accuracy	0	0	1	1	0	**3.50**	0	0	0	1	1	0	**3.50**	0.50
	[3a.3]	Content progression and level of challenge	0	0	1	1	0	**3.50**	0.43	0	0	1	1	0	**3.50**	0.50
		Frequencies	**0**	**0**	**5**	**3**	**0**			**0**	**0**	**4**	**4**	**0**		

			Health Education (K-12) Key Indicators														
			University Supervisor (n=2)							Mentor (n=2)							
Domain	Element	Competency	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
	Percentage of Competencies Scored Below Standard		0.00%							0.00%						
	Percentage of Competencies Scored Developing		0.00%							0.00%						
	Percentage of Competencies Scored Proficient		62.5%							50%						
	Percentage of Competencies Scored Exemplary		37.5%							50%						
	Spring 2024 Mean		3.37							3.50						
Overall Candidate Performance: University Supervisor and Mentor Elementary Education Key Indicators - Spring 2024																

Health Education (K-12)

Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators

Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor

Spring 2024

			Health Education (K-12) Key Indicators														
			University Supervisor (n=2)							Mentor (n=2)							
Domain	Element	Competency	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
Health Education (K-12) Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor Spring 2024																	
Percentage Passing (Developing, Proficient, and Exemplary) = 100% Overall Health Ed GPA Mean = 3.43																	

2025 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 27 Program Completers				
Program	*n*	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	1	In Progress	In Progress	Not started	Not started	Not started	Completed
Elementary Education	9	Completed	Completed	Completed	Completed	Completed	Completed
Secondary Education	6	In Progress	6 Completed	4 in Progress 2 Not Started	1 In Progress 5 Completed	5 Completed 1 Not Started	6 Completed
Secondary Education	5	Completed	Completed	Completed	Completed	Completed	Completed
Health Education	2	In Progress	Completed	In Progress	Completed	Completed	Completed
Heath Education	2	Completed	Completed	Completed	Completed	Completed	Completed

Results: In spring 2025, Danbury school district collected data on 27completers who started the TEAM program, 59%completers have finished it and 41% 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, 4 Assessment and 5 Professional Responsibility. The module that was most frequently in progress was Module 2 Planning.

Satisfaction of Employers of AY 2023-2024 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 2025, the survey polled employers of AY 2023-2024 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 2023-2024 there were a total of 31 initial program completers. Of the 16 elementary education majors, 13 (81%) responded to the Completer Survey with 3 giving us the names of their employers. Two of the 3 employers (75%) polled then responded to the Employer Survey; of the 8 Secondary Education Majors, 7 (87%) responded to the Completer Survey with 4 giving us the names of their employers; 2 of the 4 employers (50%) responded to the Employer Survey; of the 2 Health Education completers, 1 (50%) responded to the Completer. However, the one Health Education completer did not work in the certification area and therefore an employer survey could not be sent. Of the 5 MAT Secondary Education completers, 2 (40%) responded to survey giving the names of their employers; 1 of the 2 employers responded (50%). Furthermore, two employers of the undergraduate secondary education program and one employer of a MAT Secondary Education program joined the focus group. All programs except for the Health Education program met the 20% survey return benchmark.

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 except for 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 three cohort years revealed a consistent rate of responding on the part of the employers surveyed. Tables 3-7 below report results from the AY 2023-2024 Employer Surveys. Comparisons of Employer Survey ratings for the past three cohorts of completers (AY2020-2021, AY 2021-2022, 2023-2024) reveal consistent employer satisfaction levels. The mean rating for Elementary Education majors across the 13 performance indicators for the AY 2020-2021 cohort, 2.73, and slightly lower for AY 2021-2022 cohort at 2.38. The mean for the AY 2023-2024 Elementary Education survey was slightly higher at 2.53. 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 2.60, 2.88, and 2.63 respectively. Comparisons of Health Education Program ratings were not possible because an employer survey was not possible this year as no completer was hired in the field of certification. 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 2023-2024 completers: Elementary Education (2 responders)

WCSU Employer Survey			
Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
AY2023-2024	1.Integrates appropriate standards into instruction	2.5	(2-3)
	2. Adapts instruction to diverse students.	2.0	(2)
	3. Adapts instruction to differences in learning.	2.0	(2)
	4. Motivates students to learn	3.0	(3)
	5 Facilitates critical thinking	3.0	(3)

WCSU Employer Survey			
Academic Year	**Content Indicator**	**Mean**	**Range**
	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	2.0	(2)
	9. Assesses student learning	2.5	(2-3)
	10. Engages in reflective thinking during the entire instructional cycle	2.5	(2-3)
	11. Collaborates well with peers	3.0	(3)
	12. Creates effective learning environments	3.0	(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: 2.53			

Table 6 Results of CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey of AY 2023-2024 completers: Secondary Education (2 respondents)

WCSU Employer Survey			
Academic Year	**Content Indicator**	**Mean**	**Range**
AY 2023-2024	1.Integrates appropriate standards into instruction	3.0	(3)
	2. Adapts instruction to diverse students.	2.5	(2-3)

WCSU Employer Survey			
Academic Year	**Content Indicator**	**Mean**	**Range**
	3. Adapts instruction to differences in learning.	3.0	(3)
	4. Facilitates critical thinking, problem solving and /or other higher-level thinking	2.5	(2-3)
	5. Motivates students to learn	2.5	(2-3)
	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	2.0	(2)
	10. Engages in reflective thinking during the entire instructional cycle	2.5	(2-3)
	11. Collaborates well with peers	3.0	(3)
	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	2.5	(2-3)
	15. Reaches employment milestones	2.5	(2-3)
Overall Mean: 2.63			

Table 7. Results of CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey of AY 2023-2024 completers: MAT Secondary Education (1 respondent)

WCSU Employer Survey			
Academic Year	**Content Indicator**	**Mean**	**Range**
AY2023-2024	1.Integrates appropriate standards into instruction	3.0	(3)
	2. Adapts instruction to diverse students.	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	2.0	(2)
	8. Interacts well with parents and community members	2.0	(2)
	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)
	12. Creates effective learning environments	2.0	(2)
	13. Behaves in accordance with professional ethics	3.0	(3)
	14. Effectively integrates technology into their instruction	3.0	(3)
	15. Reaches employment milestones	3.0	(3)
Overall Mean: 2.86			

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 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 2023-2024 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 were used for the employers of advanced program completers. There were five MSED in the Literacy and Language Arts Program with 3 completing the survey (60%) with all 3 identifying their employer. Of the 3 identified employers, 2 responded to the survey (75%). There were 3 completers in the MSED Special Education program, and one completer responded with employer information. The one MSED Special Education employer responded to the survey (100%). The 092 Certificate in Intermediate Administration and Supervision had 5 completers in 2024 with 4/5 providing employer information. Two of the four employers of the 092 Certificate in Intermediate Administration and Supervision responded to the survey (50%). A focus group interview was held consisting of employers of programs to supplement the findings (see Appendix).

Results

The two employers who responded to the survey from the MS Literacy & Language Arts Employer rated the majority of indicators as Proficient with a mean of 3.3. This rating was slightly higher than the mean of 3.0 for AY 2022-2023. The one employer who responded to the MSED Special Education Employer Survey rated the completer as exemplary across all indicators. The limited data for this year's cohort does not allow for comparisons across previous cohorts. The two employers who rated the 092 Certificate in Intermediate Administration and Supervision scored completers as either Proficient or Exemplary across all indicators for a mean of 3.87. This high rating was consistent with the AY 2021-2022 092 Certificate in Intermediate Administration and Supervision Employer survey mean of 3.5. This data was supplemented with an advanced program focus group employer session.

Table 8 CAEP Advanced Programs MSED Literacy & Language Arts Employer Survey AY 2023-2024 (2 Respondents)

	CAEP Advanced Programs Employer Survey 2024		
Academic Year	**Content Indicator**	**Mean**	**Range**
2023-2024	1. Integrates appropriate standards into instruction.	3.0	(3)
	2. Adapts instruction to diverse students.	3.5	(3-4)
	3. Adapts instruction to differences in learning.	3.5	(3-4)
	4. Facilitates critical thinking, problem solving and /or other higher-level thinking.	3.5	(3-4)
	5. Motivates students to learn.	3.5	(3-4)
	6. Communicates well with students.	3.5	(3-4)
	7. Applies classroom management practices	3.0	(2-4)
	8. Interacts well with parents and community members.	3.5	(3-4)
	9. Assesses student learning.	3.0	(3)
	10. Grows professionally through reflection.	3.0	(3)
	11. Collaborates well with peers.	3.5	(3-4)
	12. Creates effective learning environments.	3.5	(3-4)
	13. Uses professional ethics.	4.0	(4)
	14. Integrates technology into their instruction.	3.0	(3)
	15. Reaches employment milestones (i.e., promotion, tenure) at rates comparable to graduates of other teacher preparation programs.	2.5	(2-3)
Overall Mean=3.3			

Table 9. CAEP Advanced Programs MSED Special Education Employer Survey AY 2023-2024 (1 Respondent)

	CAEP Advanced Programs Employer Survey 2024		
Academic Year	**Content Indicator**	**Mean**	**Range**
2023-2024	1. Integrates appropriate standards into instruction.	4.0	(4)
	2. Adapts instruction to diverse students.	4.0	(4)
	3. Adapts instruction to differences in learning.	4.0	(4)
	4. Facilitates critical thinking, problem solving and /or other higher-level thinking.	4.0	(4)
	5. Motivates students to learn.	4.0	(4)
	6. Communicates well with students.	4.0	(4)
	7. Applies classroom management practices	4.0	(4)
	8. Interacts well with parents and community members.	4.0	(4)
	9. Assesses student learning.	4.0	(4)
	10. Grows professionally through reflection.	4.0	(4)
	11. Collaborates well with peers.	4.0	(4)
	12. Creates effective learning environments.	4.0	(4)
	13. Uses professional ethics.	4.0	(4)
	14. Integrates technology into their instruction.	4.0	(4)
	15. Reaches employment milestones (i.e., promotion, tenure) at rates comparable to graduates of other teacher preparation programs.	4.0	(4)

CAEP Advanced Programs Employer Survey 2024			
Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
	Overall Mean=4.0		

Table 10. CAEP Advanced Programs 092 Intermediate Administration and Supervision Employer Survey AY 2023-2024 (2 Respondents)

CAEP Advanced Programs Employer Survey 2024			
Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
2023-2024	1. The administrator/educational leader: Is able to develop, articulate, implement, and steward a vision characterized by respect for students, their families, and community.	4.0	(4)
	2. The administrator/educational leader: Is able to plan for appropriate curriculum and instruction at the school and/or district level.	4.0	(4)
	3. The administrator/educational leader: Is able to monitor curriculum and instruction at the school and/or district level.	4.0	(4)
	4. The administrator/educational leader: Is able to manage school and/or district-based operations.	3.5	(3-4)
	5. The administrator/educational leader: Is able to manage school and/or district-based resources and budgets.	3.5	(3-4)
	6. The administrator/educational leader: Is able to manage, interpret and use data for school improvement.	4.0	(4)
	7. The administrator/educational leader: Is able to manage building and/or district scheduling.	3.5	(3-4)
	8. The administrator/educational leader: Collaborates effectively with faculty, parents, and community members.	4.0	(4)

CAEP Advanced Programs Employer Survey 2024			
Academic Year	**Content Indicator**	**Mean**	**Range**
	9. The administrator/educational leader: Acts ethically demonstrating integrity and fairness.	4.0	(4)
	10. The administrator/educational leader: Is able to use problem-solving to formulate sound strategies to deal with educational dilemmas.	4.0	(34)
	11. The administrator/educational leader: Is able to advocate for the diverse needs of students, parents, and faculty.	4.0	(4)
	12. The administrator/educational leader: Is able to create a school climate and culture that facilitates the growth and development of all students.	4.0	(4)
Overall Mean=3.87			

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.

- Initial program completers rated their classroom management preparation at a satisfactory level which was an improvement.

- The mean scores for the MSED in Literacy and Language Arts program, MSED Special Education and the 092 Certificate in Intermediate Administration and Supervision continues to indicate employer satisfaction with means ranging from 3.3 to 4.0.

Areas of Improvement

- Relative weaknesses (mean ratings of 2 out of 3) for the Elementary Education program completers were in the areas of developing online learning expectations, collaborating with special educators, and communicating with parents/community members.

- Relative weaknesses (mean ratings of 2.14 out of 3) for the Secondary Education program completers was in the area of developing online learning expectations.

- 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 2023-2024 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 2025 survey polled AY 2023-2024 program completers of all initial programs. The survey was sent to 16 Elementary Education completers, 8 Secondary Education completers, 2 Health Education completers, and 5 M.A.T. Secondary Education completers.

Results

Of the 16 AY 2023-2024 Elementary Education completers, 13 returned the survey for a response rate of 81%; of the 8 AY 2023-2024 Secondary Education completers, 7 returned the survey for a response rate of 87%; 50% of the Health Education completers returned the survey, with 2/5 MAT Secondary Education program completers responding for a 40% response rate. These response rates are at or above the CAEP minimum requirements, and they are similar to response rates obtained for the AY 2022-2023 cohort of completers that were reported in the 2024 Annual Report (52% for Elementary Education completers and 50% for Secondary Education completers, 100% for Health Education, 75% for MAT Secondary 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 2023-2024 Elementary Education, Secondary Education, Health Education, and MAT Secondary Education program completers were 2.45, 2.60, 2.65 and 2.5 respectively. The survey results for Elementary Education, Secondary Education and MAT Secondary Education program completers improved from AY 2022-2023 results of 2.01, 1.63, and 1.1. The Health Education program completers survey results remained stable at 2.65, slightly lower than the 2.95 from the previous cohort. 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, AY 2022-2023 Secondary Education survey mean of 1.63 was significantly lower than the 2.62 rating in AY 2020-21. It should be noted that the Secondary Education and MAT Secondary programs experienced a turnover of coordinators partly due to budget cuts at the university which resulted in lower means. In Fall 2023, a new Secondary Education and MAT Secondary Education coordinator was appointed which resulted in more positive results. The revisions to the Health Education program continue to improve completers' satisfaction with an overall 2.65 rating. The 2023 Health Education program completers rated the program highly at 2.96 which was a significant improvement from 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 which resulted in a low satisfaction rating of 1.1 for the AY 2022-2023 cohort. However, the trend has improved with cohort AY 2023-2024 as they rated the preparation on a satisfactory level with a mean of 2.5. AY 2023-2024 Initial completers also reported satisfaction with their preparation regarding classroom management practices, collaborating with peers and coordinating with special education teachers, as well as development of school leadership which were consistently the lowest rated indicators for previous cohorts. The EPP has made changes to course syllabi such as including modules on classroom management in the student teaching seminar and also simulations of IEP meetings in EPY 405 Introduction to Special Education.

Table 11. CAEP Initial Programs Completer Survey AY 2023-2024

Table 11a. CAEP Initial Programs Alumni Survey: Elementary Education AY 2023-2024 Program Completers (13 respondents)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
2024 ELEM ED	1. Integrate appropriate professional and educational standards.	2.38	(2-3)
	2. Identify and adapt instruction to diverse student learners.	2.38	(2-3)
	3. Adapt instruction to diverse student learning.	2.53	(2-3)
	4. Facilitate student critical thinking, problem solving and higher order thinking skills.	2.61	(2-3)
	5. Encourage and motivate all students to learn.	2.61	(2-3)
	6. Create effective learning environments.	2.61	(2-3)
	7. Integrate technology into classroom instruction.	2.30	(2-3)
	8. Effectively communicate with students through both oral and written modes.	2.61	(2-3)
	9. Grow professionally through reflection.	2.53	(2-3)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
	10. Appropriately apply effective classroom management practices.	2.53	(2-3)
	11. Effectively interact with students, teachers, parents, and community members.	2.0	(1-3)
	12. Understand human development as it relates to the teaching-learning process.	2.0	(2)
	13. Demonstrate appropriate ethical and professional behavior.	2.53	(2-3)
	14. Develop sensitivity and respect for the needs and feelings of all students.	2.53	(2-3)
	15. Recognize both how the organization of the district and school can affect the individual teacher.	2.07	(2-3)
	16. Develop classroom and school leadership.	2.07	(2-3)
	17. Develop a positive disposition toward students.	2.69	(2-3)
	18. Collaborate with peers and coordinate instruction with special education teachers.	1.84	(1-2)
	19.Develop quality instructional units.	2.07	(2-3)
	20. Appropriately select and use a wide variety of instructional strategies, resource materials, and media.	2.69	(2-3)
	21. Implement, interpret and use student performance assessments for effective instruction.	2.0	(2)
	22. Use individual, small group and large group instructional arrangements.	2.09	(2-3)
	23. Develop online learning expectations for students.	1.84	(1-2)
Overall Mean: 2.23			

Table 11.b CAEP Initial Programs Alumni Survey Secondary Education AY 2023-2024 Program Completers (7 Respondents)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
2024 SEC ED	1. Integrate appropriate professional and educational standards.	2.85	(2-3)
	2. Identify and adapt instruction to diverse student learners.	2.42	(2-3)
	3. Adapt instruction to diverse student learning.	2.57	(2-3)
	4. Facilitate student critical thinking, problem solving and higher order thinking skills.	2.85	(2-3)
	5. Encourage and motivate all students to learn.	2.57	(2-3)
	6. Create effective learning environments.	2.85	(2-3)
	7. Integrate technology into classroom instruction.	2.57	(2-3)
	8. Effectively communicate with students through both oral and written modes.	2.85	(2-3)
	9. Grow professionally through reflection.	2.85	(2-3)
	10. Appropriately apply effective classroom management practices.	2.28	(2-3)
	11. Effectively interact with students, teachers, parents, and community members.	2.57	(2-3)
	12. Understand human development as it relates to the teaching-learning process.	2.57	(2-3)
	13. Demonstrate appropriate ethical and professional behavior.	2.85	(2-3)
	14. Develop sensitivity and respect for the needs and feelings of all students.	2.85	(2-3)
	15. Recognize both how the organization of the district and school can affect the individual teacher.	2.28	(2-3)
	16. Develop classroom and school leadership.	2.28	(2-3)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
	17. Develop a positive disposition toward students.	2.85	(2-3)
	18. Collaborate with peers and coordinate instruction with special education teachers.	2.57	(2-3)
	19.Develop quality instructional units.	2.57	(2-3)
	20. Appropriately select and use a wide variety of instructional strategies, resource materials, and media.	2.57	(2-3)
	21. Implement, interpret and use student performance assessments for effective instruction.	2.57	(2-3)
	22. Use individual, small group and large group instructional arrangements.	2.57	(2-3)
	23. Develop online learning expectations for students.	2.14	(2-3)
Overall Mean: 2.54			

Table 11.c. CAEP Initial Programs Alumni Survey: Health Education 2024 Program Completers (1 Respondents)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
2024 Health Education	1. Integrate appropriate professional and educational standards.	4.0	(4)
	2. Identify and adapt instruction to diverse student learners.	4.0	(4)
	3. Adapt instruction to diverse student learning.	4.0	(4)
	4. Facilitate student critical thinking, problem solving and higher order thinking skills.	3.0	(3)
	5. Encourage and motivate all students to learn.	2.0	(2)
	6. Create effective learning environments.	3.0	(3)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
	7. Integrate technology into classroom instruction.	1.0	(1)
	8. Effectively communicate with students through both oral and written modes.	1.0	(1)
	9. Grow professionally through reflection.	3.0	(3)
	10. Appropriately apply effective classroom management practices.	3.0	(3)
	11. Effectively interact with students, teachers, parents, 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.	4.0	(4)
	14. Develop sensitivity and respect for the needs and feelings of all students.	3.0	(3)
	15. Recognize both how the organization of the district and school can affect the individual teacher.	3.0	(3)
	16. Develop classroom and school leadership.	3.0	(3)
	17. Develop a positive disposition toward students.	4.0	(4)
	18. Collaborate with peers and coordinate instruction with special education teachers.	2.0	(2)
	19.Develop quality instructional units.	3.0	(3)
	20. Appropriately select and use a wide variety of instructional strategies, resource materials, and media.	2.0	(2)
	21. Implement, interpret and use student performance assessments for effective instruction.	3.0	(3)
	22. Use individual, small group and large group instructional arrangements.	4.0	(4)
	23. Develop online learning expectations for students.	0.0	(0)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
Overall Mean: 2.65			

Table 11.d. CAEP Initial Programs Alumni Survey: MAT Secondary Education 2024 Program Completers (2 Respondents)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
2024 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.	2	(2)
	5. Encourage and motivate all students to learn.	1.5	(1-2)
	6. Create effective learning environments.	2.0	(2)
	7. Integrate technology into classroom instruction.	3.0	(3)
	8. Effectively communicate with students through both oral and written modes.	2.0	(2)
	9. Grow professionally through reflection.	2.5	(2-3)
	10. Appropriately apply effective classroom management practices.	1.5	(1-2)
	11. Effectively interact with students, teachers, parents, and community members.	2.5	(2-3)
	12. Understand human development as it relates to the teaching-learning process.	2.0	(2)
	13. Demonstrate appropriate ethical and professional behavior.	2.5	(2-3)
	14. Develop sensitivity and respect for the needs and feelings of all students.	2.5	(2-3)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
	15. Recognize both how the organization of the district and school can affect the individual teacher.	2.0	(2)
	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.	1.5	(1-2)
	20. Appropriately select and use a wide variety of instructional strategies, resource materials, and media.	2.5	(2-3)
	21. Implement, interpret and use student performance assessments for effective instruction.	2.0	(2)
	22. Use individual, small group and large group instructional arrangements.	2.5	(2-3)
	23. Develop online learning expectations for students.	1.5	(1-2)
Overall Mean: 2.0			

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

Strengths

- AY 2023-2024BS in Education candidates, on average, rated many indicators as S*atisfactory* or above.

- Marked improvement in MAT Secondary Education completers' satisfaction with rating of 2.0 from 1.1 previous cohort.

- Health Education program completers satisfactory ratings continue trend from AY 2022-2023 findings.

- All initial programs had completer survey data whereas in the AY 2022-2023 cohort, no MAT Secondary Education completers rated the program.

- AY 2023-2024 BS Completers' satisfaction with their preparation regarding classroom management improved from the previous two cohorts with all programs rating it satisfactory.

Areas of Improvement

- Relative low ratings for the areas of**;** *Collaborate with peers and coordinate instruction with special education teachers and develop classroom/school leadership.*

- Relative low ratings in the MAT Secondary Education program survey for preparation in classroom management, developing quality units, and developing online learning expectations for students.

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

- Coordinate with special education course instructors on opportunities to collaborate with special educators in the field.

- Continue to monitor implementation of classroom management modules in initial programs.

- Continue to monitor Secondary/MAT program coordination and implementation of curriculum.

CAEP Advanced Programs AY 2023-2024 Completer Satisfaction

Descriptions and Procedures

In 2025 the CAEP Advanced Programs Completer Survey was sent to a total of 13 2023-2024 program completers (5 of whom were graduated from the MSED Literacy and Language Arts program, and 3 from the MSED Special Education Program, and 5 from the 092 Certificate in Intermediate Administration and Supervision). Follow-up phone calls and text messages were also made to attempt to increase response rates.

Results

Three MSED Literacy and Language Arts completers responded for a return rate of 60%. One MSED Special Education program completer responded to the survey for a return rate of 33%. All five 092 Certificate in Intermediate Administration and responded to the survey for a return rate of 100%. The 2024 survey response rates are at or above the CAEP minimum requirements, and they are like response rates obtained for the AY 2022-2023 cohort of advanced program completers.

Results of the Alumni Survey filled out by 2023-2024 completers are summarized in Tables 10-12. Rubric response options ranged from "2" *Satisfactory* to "4" *Well above satisfactory*. Examination of Table 10 reveals that the overall mean of the responses of the AY 2023-2024 MSED in Literacy and Language Arts to the completer survey across the 23 indicators was 2.60. This was higher than the overall mean of 2.05 reported last year and the mean of 2.01 obtained from the AY 2019-AY2020 MSED Literacy completers. Examination of Table 11 reveals that the overall mean of the responses for the AY 2023-2024 was 4.0 (1 completer). This rating is similar to AY 2021-2022 MSED in Special Education completer survey mean of 2.91, and a rating of 2.30 reported for AY 2020-2021. These results must be interpreted with caution given the small number of respondents. Examination of Table 12 reveals that the overall responses of the AY 2023-2024 092 Certificate in Intermediate Administration and Supervision

program survey was 3.61 with 100% responding. This was similar to AY 2021-2022 092 Certificate in Intermediate Administration and Supervision program survey mean of 3.60.

Table 12a. CAEP Advanced Programs Alumni Survey: MSED in Literacy and Language Arts 20234 Program Completers (3 Respondents)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
2024 MSED LIT	1. Integrate appropriate professional and educational standards.	3.0	(2-4)
	2. Identify and adapt instruction to diverse student learners.	2.67	(1-4)
	3. Adapt instruction to diverse student learning.	2.67	(1-4)
	4. Facilitate student critical thinking, problem solving and higher order thinking skills.	2.67	(1-4)
	5. Encourage and motivate all students to learn.	3.0	(2-4)
	6. Create effective learning environments.	3.33	(2-4)
	7. Integrate technology into classroom instruction.	2.33	(1-4)
	8. Effectively communicate with students through both oral and written modes.	3.0	(2-4)
	9. Grow professionally through reflection.	2.33	(1-4)
	10. Appropriately apply effective classroom management practices.	2.33	(1-4)
	11. Effectively interact with students, teachers, parent, and community members.	2.66	(2-4)
	12. Understand human development as it relates to the teaching-learning process.	2.33	(1-4)
	13. Demonstrate appropriate ethical and professional behavior.	2.66	(2-4)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
	14. Develop sensitivity and respect for the needs and feelings of all students.	3.0	(2-4)
	15. Recognize both how the organization of the district and school can affect the individual teacher.	2.66	(2-4)
	16. Develop classroom and school leadership.	2.0	(0-4)
	17. Develop a positive disposition toward students.	3.0	(2-4)
	18. Collaborate with peers and coordinate instruction with special education teachers.	2.66	(2-4)
	19.Develop quality instructional units.	2.0	(2)
	20. Appropriately select and use a wide variety of instructional strategies, resource materials, and media.	2.66	(1-4)
	21. Implement, interpret and use student performance assessments for effective instruction.	3.33	(3-4)
	22. Use individual, small group and large group instructional arrangements.	2.66	(2-4)
	23. Develop online learning expectations for students.	2.33	(1-4)
Overall Mean: 2.60			

Table 12b. CAEP Advanced Programs Alumni Survey: MSED Special Education 2024 Program Completers (1 Respondent)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
2024 MSED SPED	1. Integrate appropriate professional and educational standards.	4.0	(4)
	2. Identify and adapt instruction to diverse student learners.	4.0	(4)
	3. Adapt instruction to diverse student learning.	4.0	(4)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
	4. Facilitate student critical thinking, problem solving and higher order thinking skills.	4.0	(4)
	5. Encourage and motivate all students to learn.	4.0	(4)
	6. Create effective learning environments.	4.0	(4)
	7. Integrate technology into classroom instruction.	4.0	(4)
	8. Effectively communicate with students through both oral and written modes.	4.0	(4)
	9. Grow professionally through reflection.	4.0	(4)
	10. Appropriately apply effective classroom management practices.	4.0	(4)
	11. Effectively interact with students, teachers, parents, and community members.	4.0	(4)
	12. Understand human development as it relates to the teaching-learning process.	4.0	(4)
	13. Demonstrate appropriate ethical and professional behavior.	4.0	(4)
	14. Develop sensitivity and respect for the needs and feelings of all students.	4.0	(4)
	15. Recognize both how the organization of the district and school can affect the individual teacher.	4.0	(4)
	16. Develop classroom and school leadership.	4.0	(4)
	17. Develop a positive disposition toward students.	4.0	(4)
	18. Collaborate with peers and coordinate instruction with special education teachers.	4.0	(4)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
	19.Develop quality instructional units.	4.0	(4)
	20. Appropriately select and use a wide variety of instructional strategies, resource materials, and media.	4.0	(4)
	21. Implement, interpret and use student performance assessments for effective instruction.	4.0	(4)
	22. Use individual, small group and large group instructional arrangements.	4.0	(4)
	23. Develop online learning expectations for students.	4.00	(4)
Overall Mean: 4.0			

Table 12c. CAEP Advanced Programs Alumni Survey: 092 Program Completers (5 Respondents)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
	1. The 092 program prepared me to undertake the duties and responsibilities of an instructional leader.	3.6	(3-4)
	2. The 092 program prepared me to lead and motivate others.	3.6	(3-4)
	3. The 092 program prepared me to work collaboratively with teachers and other administrators.	3.6	(3-4)
2024 092 Program	4. The 092 program prepared me to communicate effectively with students, parents/guardians.	3.6	(3-4)
	5. The 092 program prepared me to communicate effectively with community stakeholders.	3.6	(3-4)
	6. The 092 program prepared me to give effective instructional feedback to teachers.	3.6	(3-4)

Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
	7. The 092 program prepared me to plan, develop, and adjust services to meet the needs of diverse learners.	3.6	(3-4)
	8. The 092 program prepared me to utilize relevant technologies.	3.6	(3-4)
	9. The 092 program prepared me to manage, interpret and use data for school improvement.	3.8	(3-4)
	10. The 092 program prepared me in the areas of professional, state and institutional standard and ethics.	3.6	(3-4)
	11. The 092 program prepared me in the areas of problem-solving and decision-making.	3.6	(3-4)
	12. The 092 program prepared me for state licensure examinations.	3.6	(3-4)
Overall Mean: 3.61			

Analysis (Strengths/Areas for Improvement) for the CAEP Advanced Programs

Strengths

- All advanced program completers rated their preparation satisfactory across all indicators.

- The highest mean ratings of 3.0-4.0 were observed in a number of areas rated by the 092 Certificate in Intermediate Administration and Supervision program survey.

Areas of Improvement

- There were no identified areas of weakness in the advanced programs as all indicators were rated at either *Satisfactory* or *Proficient*.

Action Plan for the CAEP Advanced 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.

<u>Case Study of Initial Completers: Analysis of Focus Group Data</u>

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

- All initial candidates commented on the value of their fieldwork experiences in Danbury and Bethel public schools and noted the diversity of the student body.
- All initial candidates noted the need to have more coursework on classroom management.
- Initial candidates requested more specific program planning on completion of certification exams.
- 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 using artificial intelligence in the schools.

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

- Work with instructors of initial candidates on a curriculum map regarding artificial intelligence.
- Implement coursework in ED 206 and student teaching seminars on classroom management, specifically challenging behaviors.
- Continue to monitor advisement on certification exams and timetable to complete them.

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.

<u>2024-2025 (edTPA)</u>

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 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 13. 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 14: Summary: Practice edTPA Rubric Score Distribution for Elementary, Secondary Programs, Health Education Programs Jan-July 2024

edTPA EPP Performance Summary

January 2024-May 2024

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 13-Rubric Handbooks	2	33.0	3.3	3.3	3.0		2.8	3.0	2.5	2.0	1.8	2.0	1.8	3.3	2.0		2.3	12.3	11.3	9.3
World Language	2	33.0	3.3	3.3	3.0		2.8	3.0	2.5	2.0	1.8	2.0	1.8	3.3	2.0		2.3	12.3	11.3	9.3

	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	24	44.5	3.1	3.2	3.1	2.9	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.8	2.8	2.9	3.1	3.1	2.8	2.9	2.8	15.3	14.5	14.7
Health Education	2	43.5	3.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.5	16.0	16.0	11.5
K-12 Performing Arts	10	42.3	3.1	3.0	3.0	2.8	2.8	2.9	3.1	2.5	2.8	2.8	3.0	2.7	2.3	2.8	2.9	14.6	14.0	13.7
Secondary English-Language Arts	5	47.0	3.0	3.4	3.2	2.8	3.2	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.2	3.6	3.4	3.4	3.0	2.8	15.6	15.2	16.2
Secondary History/Social Studies	5	45.8	3.2	3.6	3.2	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.9	2.7	2.5	3.1	3.5	3.2	2.9	3.0	16.0	14.0	15.7
Secondary Mathematics	1	39.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	13.0	12.0	14.0
Secondary Science	1	55.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	19.0	17.0	19.0

	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	16	44.5	2.4	2.4	2.7	2.3	2.3	3.0	2.6	2.8	2.3	2.5	2.4	2.8	2.2	2.2	2.6	2.4	2.4	2.1	12.1	13.2	12.2
Elementary Education: Literacy with Mathematics Task 4	16	44.5	2.4	2.4	2.7	2.3	2.3	3.0	2.6	2.8	2.3	2.5	2.4	2.8	2.2	2.2	2.6	2.4	2.4	2.1	12.1	13.2	12.2

<u>Analysis of edTPA Portfolio Scores</u>

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, 33 for 13-Rubric Handbooks, and for 18-Rubric Handbooks it was 44.

edTPA Component Areas of Strength

- 1.How do the candidate's plans build students' abilities to…(content specific):

    o Overall, the majority of candidates scored at the Advanced level (mean of 3.0) in this competency.

    o The overall mean for this competency was 2.93, indicating an area of strength.

- 3.How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her students to justify instructional plans?

    o The overall mean for this competency was 2.93, indicating an area of strength.

- 4. How does the candidate identify, and support language demands associated with a key (content) learning task?

    o Overall, the majority of the candidates scored at the Proficient level (mean of 2.6).

- 6. How does the candidate demonstrate a positive learning environment that supports students' engagement in learning?

    o Overall, 100% of candidates scored at the Advanced level (mean of 3.0).

- 7. How does the candidate actively engage students in…(content specific):

    o Overall, most candidates scored at the Proficient level (mean of 2.7).

- 10. How does the candidate use evidence to evaluate and change teaching practice to meet students' varied learning needs?

    o Overall, majority of candidates scored at the Proficient level (mean of 2.4).

    o This competency was the lowest score indicator.

- 12. What type of feedback does the candidate provide to focus students?

    o Overall, 75% of candidates scored at the Advanced level (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?

    o The mean for this competency was 2.5.

    o The 2024 cohort scored at below the prior year's mean of 3.0.

edTPA Portfolio Areas of Improvement

- A mean under 2.0 is considered an overall area of improvement.

- All initial programs showed improvement from last year's cohort as no completer scored below 2.0 on any indicator.

Advanced Programs

Table 15. CAEP Advanced Literacy and Language Arts Program Practicum Evaluation: Summer 2024

CAEP Advanced Literacy and Language Arts Program Practicum Evaluation 2024							
Standard Elements **Reading/Literacy Specialist**	**Summer 2024 n=5**						
	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation
2.2 Candidates design, select, adapt, teach, and evaluate evidence-based instructional approaches, using both informational and narrative texts, to meet the literacy needs of whole class and groups of students in the academic disciplines and other subject areas, and when learning to read, write, listen, speak, view, or visually represent.	0	1	4	0	0	2.80	0.40
2.3 Candidates select, adapt, teach, and evaluate evidence-based, supplemental, and intervention approaches and programs; such instruction is explicit, intense, and provides adequate scaffolding to meet the literacy needs of individual and small groups of students, especially those who experience difficulty with reading and writing.	0	2	3	0	0	2.60	0.49
4.1 Candidates demonstrate knowledge of foundational theories about diverse learners, equity, and culturally responsive instruction.	0	0	5	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	5	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	2	3	0	0	2.60	0.49

CAEP Advanced Literacy and Language Arts Program Practicum Evaluation 2024							
Standard Elements **Reading/Literacy Specialist**	**Summer 2024** **n=5**						
	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation
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	4	1	0	3.20	0.40
5.3 Candidates integrate digital technologies into their literacy instruction in appropriate, safe, and effective ways and assist colleagues in these efforts.	0	2	2	1	0	3.20	0.75
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	5	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	1	3	1	0	3.0	0.63
Frequencies	**0**	**8**	**34**	**3**	**0**		
% Below Standard	**0.00%**						
% Developing	**18%**						
% Proficient	**76%**						
% Exemplary	**0.06%**						
Overall Mentor Mean by Cohort	**2.93**						
Literacy and Language Arts Program Practicum Evaluation (2024)							

CAEP Advanced Literacy and Language Arts Program Practicum Evaluation 2024							
Standard Elements **Reading/Literacy Specialist**	**Summer 2024** **n=5**						
	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation
100% Passing (Developing, Proficient, and Exemplary)							

Table 16 CAEP Advanced MSED Special Education Program Practicum Evaluation: Summer 2024

MSED in Special Education Practicum Assessment							
Rubric Element	**Summer 2024** **n= 3**						
	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	3	0	0	3.0	0.00

Rubric Element	Summer 2024 n= 3						
	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation
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	3	0	0	3.00	0.00
CEC 2.3 Beginning special education professionals know how to intervene safely and appropriately with individuals with exceptionalities in crisis.	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	0.00
CEC 3.2 Beginning special education professionals understand and use general and specialized content knowledge for teaching across curricular content areas to individualize learning for individuals with exceptionalities	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	0.00
CEC 3.3 Beginning special education professionals modify general and specialized curricula to make them accessible to individuals with exceptionalities.	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	0.00
CEC 4.3 Beginning special education professionals in collaboration with colleagues and families use multiple types of assessment	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	0.00

Rubric Element	Summer 2024 n= 3						
	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation
information in making decisions about individuals with exceptionalities.							
CEC 4.4 Beginning special education professionals engage individuals with exceptionalities to work toward quality learning and performance and provide feedback to guide them.	0	0	3	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	3	0	0	3.00	0.00
CEC 5.1 Beginning special education professionals consider individual abilities, interests, learning environments, and cultural and linguistic factors in the selection, development, and adaptation of learning experiences for individuals with exceptionalities.	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	0.00
CEC 5.2 Beginning special education professionals use technologies to support instructional	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	0.00

Rubric Element	Summer 2024 n= 3						
	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation
assessment, planning, and delivery for individuals with exceptionalities.							
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	3	0	0	3.00	0.00
CEC 5.7 Beginning special education professionals teach cross-disciplinary knowledge and skills such as critical thinking and problem solving to individuals with exceptionalities.	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	0.00
CEC 7.1 Beginning special education professionals use the theory and elements of effective collaboration.	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	0.00
CEC 7.2 Beginning special education professionals serve as a collaborative resource to colleagues.	0	0	3	0	0	3.0	0.00

Rubric Element	Summer 2024 n= 3						
	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation
Frequencies	0	0	14	0	0		
% Below Standard	0%						
% Developing	0%.						
% Proficient	100%						
% Exemplary	0%						
Overall Mean by Cohort	3.0						
MSED in Special Education Practicum Assessment (Summer 2024) **100% Passing (Developing, Proficient, and Exemplary)**							

MSED in Special Education Practicum Assessment

Table 17 CAEP Advanced 092 Certification in Intermediate Administration and Supervision Practicum Evaluation: Spring 2024

CAEP Advanced 092 Certification in Intermediate Administration and Supervision Program **ED 665 Supervision of Teaching and Learning Assessment (University Supervisor)** **2024**							
Standard Elements **NELP**	Spring 2024 n=6						
	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation
1.3 Promotion and continual and sustainable school improvement (Professional Skills).	0	0	0	6	0	4.0	0.00
2.1 Sustainment of a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning (Professional Skills).	0	0	0	6	0	4.0	0.00
2.3 Development and supervision of the instructional and leadership capacity of school staff (Professional Skills)	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	0.37
4.1 Collaboration with faculty and community members (Professional Skills).	0	0	0	6	0	4.0	0.00
5.1 Ensuring that schools are accountable for every student's academic and social success (Professional Skills).	0	0	0	6	0	4.0	0.00
5.3 Safeguarding the values of democracy, equity, and diversity (Professional Knowledge).	0	0	0	6	0	4.0	0.00
Frequencies	**0**	**0**	**1**	**35**	**0**		
% Below Standard	**0.00%**						
% Developing	**0.00%**						

CAEP Advanced 092 Certification in Intermediate Administration and Supervision Program ED 665 Supervision of Teaching and Learning Assessment (University Supervisor) 2024								
Standard Elements **NELP**		Spring 2024 n=6						
		Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation
% Proficient		.03%						
% Exemplary		97%						
Overall Mentor Mean by Cohort		3.94						
092 Certificate in Administration and Supervision (2024) **100% Passing (Developing, Proficient, and Exemplary)**								

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

Overall Performance

- While the sample is small, the overall performance of the 13 advanced candidates in the MSED in Literacy and Language Arts as well as the MSED Special Education and 092 Certificate in Administration and Supervision programs, indicated that completers were at the proficient to exemplary level. There were no indicators rated below standard for any advanced program completer.

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 2022-23 is reported in the Table. In spring 2024, the Connecticut State Department of Education released an EPP data dashboard that reports AY 2019-23 employment data and persistence in employment for initial program completers.

Table 18. State-wide and WCSU Licensure Exams – Certification Pass Rates for AY 2019-2023 (Title II): Praxis and Foundations of Reading

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 2022-2023	43	34	79%	1,047	882	84%
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 19. CSDE EPP Data Dashboard 2019-2023

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 2022-2023	53%	NA	28%	69.4%	NA	38%
AY 2021-2022	61%	86%	44%	67.4%	92.6%	38.6%
AY 2020-2021	52%	91%	41%	68.6%	92.6%	39.3%
AY 2019-2020	39%	88%	18%	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 2022-2023 indicates that WCSU completers' pass rate was slightly lower at 79% compared to 86% for the state. In AY 2019-2022 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. In AY 2022-2023 53% of completers were hired in their first year with 38% employed in a hard to staff district. The percentage of completers employed in their second year remained stable at 92%.

Appendix: Initial & Advanced Programs Focus Groups

Case Study Initial Completers Focus Group

CAEP Completer Focus Group Transcript: 2024 Elementary Education Completer

March 19, 2025 at 1PM

Description: Due to scheduling conflicts, individual initial program completers were interviewed. This transcript is from the interview with a 2024 female, Caucasian Elementary Education program completer who is currently working as a substitute teacher in New York.

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

The most useful component of the program was the full year internship in the senior year. I especially use the knowledge of the curriculum that I gained now in substitute teaching. I know where the students should be at this point based upon what I saw last year in Danbury schools.

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

The program completer reported that personally she would have liked more guidelines for taking the Praxis such as certain courses. She waited until the end of the senior year and took three exams all at once and didn't pass them. She suggested putting the Praxis exams in certain courses so that they are spread out over the four years of the program.

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

The program completer stated that ED 431 Integrating Emerging Literacies was especially helpful, and she bookmarked many of the tools she learned in that class. Then during student teaching, she shared the tools with her cooperating teacher who didn't know about them.

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

Working in a district with so many bilingual students and parents really helped with her current position. During student teaching, there would be parent/teacher conferences and many of the parents didn't speak English. Her cooperating teacher showed her how to communicate with these parents through the use of visuals and other tools. Currently in her substitute teaching position there are a few multilingual learners and the experiences in Danbury fieldwork have helped her to communicate with them.

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

The program completer reported that Dr. Daria's class where they had to do group presentations every few weeks with different roles really helped to develop leadership skills. She also referenced Dr. Maida's Math lesson presentations as well as both experiences forced you to get out of your comfort zone and present in front of your peers.

Question #6 Anything else? The only recommendation would be to provide more guidance on Praxis exams.

CAEP Secondary Education Science Completer Focus Group Transcript B

Description: Due to scheduling conflicts, individual initial program completers were interviewed. This transcript is from the interview with a 2024 female, Caucasian Secondary Education Science program completer who is currently working as a middle school Science teacher in central Connecticut.

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

The Secondary Education Science program completer found student teaching to be the most useful part of her program for teaching biology, as it provided a realistic understanding of the teaching environment. She appreciated the hands-on experience and skills she gained, such as setting up interactive notebooks, which she now applies to her 7th-grade class. She also expressed a desire for more classroom management training, as she felt this area could have been better addressed in the program.

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

In the meeting, the Secondary Education Science program completer discussed her struggles with classroom management and the importance of having a plan in place. She suggested that exposing students to different classroom management styles and having them create their own plans could be beneficial. The program completer discussed how difficult it was to discern consequences for student behavior at the beginning of the school year. She felt it would help future teacher to have practice in planning all the components of a classroom management plan before student teaching.

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

The Secondary Education Science program completer was positive about her preparation for integrating technology in instruction. She cited the hands-on experience in student teaching with using ParentSquare and PowerSchool helped with her new job. The program completer also discussed how Dr. Hall introduced them to GoogleSuites which she uses in her classes as well. The only recommendation would be to practice on different types of Smartboards as her school doesn't have the same equipment as the one used in Bethel and it is difficult to figure out all the components.

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

The program completer rated the program highly for preparing candidates for diverse students and families. She noted how the differentiation section in the lesson plans that were required helped her to acquire a repertoire of strategies that she now uses. The program completer also praised the EPY 405 Mursion parent-teacher conference simulation as she just had parent-teacher conferences this week and felt well prepared due to the practice sessions in that class.

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

Similarly, the program completer was positive about the program's preparation to be a teacher/leader. She discussed how Dr. Hall asked them to present lessons to their peers and this helped her to get out of her comfort zone and prepare for student teaching. The program completer recommended doing similar exercises earlier in the program.

Question #6 Anything else?

The Secondary Education program completer recommended discussing managerial issues in the senior year such as dealing with the mounds of paperwork and other issues. She suggested having a first- or second-year teacher come and share how they survived the first two years of teaching in PDS.

CAEP-WCSU Initial Programs Employer Focus Group A

March 14, 2025

Zoom interview at 3:30 PM

Description: Due to myriad differences in the schedules of participants, the interviews were held in two sessions.
Participant: One female Secondary Education English Department Chair in central Connecticut who employs a female secondary education 2024 completer.
Transcript was generated through Zoom AI.

Question # 1: How prepared was the WCSU program completer to enter the classroom as compared to completers from other programs?
The discussion focused on evaluating a program completer's performance and preparedness for teaching. The Department Chair indicated that the completer's performance is comparable to other beginning teachers, with similar challenges and learning curves.

Question # 2: How prepared was the WCSU program completer to meet the needs of diverse students?
Regarding preparation for diverse classrooms, the Department Chair suggested that all new teachers face a learning curve in meeting diverse student needs, especially in high school English where course levels vary. She recommended that preparation programs, including Western's, could improve by preparing candidates to focus more on supporting high-need students while maintaining grade-level expectations.

Question # 3: How prepared was the WCSU program completer to use technology in instruction?
The Department Chair discussed the program's effectiveness in preparing teachers for technology use in education. She noted that her district is now considering reducing technology use, particularly for freshmen, and reintroducing notebooking as a way to improve student comprehension and track thinking. She mentioned research that supports the brain-hand connection in writing for better comprehension. The Department Chair emphasized the importance of finding a balance between technology use and traditional methods in education. She shared her experience of implementing a program that worked well in elementary and middle schools and planned to expand it to the freshman class. The Department Chair also emphasized the importance of instilling a mindset of adaptability and flexibility in new teachers, and the value of making thinking visible in classrooms.

Question #4: How prepared was the WCSU program completer to work with diverse families?
The Department Chair discussed the effectiveness of the program in preparing secondary education English candidates to work with diverse families. She reported that the WCSU program completer was prepared to work with diverse families.

Question # 5: Is there anything else you would like the program to know about teacher preparation?
The Department Chair discussed the importance of shifting the thinking of what a teacher is, particularly in relation to the "sage on the stage" approach. She emphasized the need for teachers to design engaging, academically rigorous tasks and to be quiet, allowing students to work independently. She also discussed the value of giving students multiple opportunities to experience different teaching methods.

Description: Due to myriad differences in the schedules of participants, the interviews were held in two sessions.
Participant: One male Director of STEM K-12 in central Connecticut who employs a female, 2024 Secondary Education Biology completer. Transcript was generated through Zoom AI.

Question # 1: How prepared was the WCSU program completer to enter the classroom as compared to completers from other programs?
The Director of STEM, a secondary education biology department supervisor, shared his experience with hiring candidates for middle school science positions, noting the challenges of finding suitable candidates for urban settings. He praised the WCSU program completer for her understanding of their students and clientele, as well as her success in her position.

Question # 2: How prepared was the WCSU program completer to meet the needs of diverse students?
The Director of STEM praised the WCSU program completer's strong science knowledge, work ethic, and ability to make science relatable to students. He noted her success in connecting with students on a personal level, which has positively impacted their learning. The Director of STEM reported that the program completer often has lunch with her students to get to know them on a personal level which has helped with overall classroom management. Director of STEM also highlighted Haley's proficiency with technology, including AI, and her ability to use it effectively in her teaching.

Question # 3: How prepared was the WCSU program completer to use technology in instruction?
The Director of STEM also highlighted the program completer's proficiency with technology, including AI, and her ability to use it effectively in her teaching. He suggested a blend of both electronic and physical methods for learning. He also mentioned the use of an app called ParentSquare for communication with families, and the practice of team leads addressing concerns about specific students to avoid overwhelming parents.

Question #4: How prepared was the WCSU program completer to work with diverse families?
The Director of STEM discussed the use of an app called ParentSquare for communication with families, and the practice of team leads addressing concerns about specific students to avoid overwhelming parents. He reported that the principal has not indicated that the program completer is having any difficulties communicating with parents.

Question # 5: Is there anything else you would like the program to know about teacher preparation?
The Director of STEM discussed the importance of classroom management skills for secondary education candidates. He emphasized the need for candidates to gain experience in both suburban and urban settings, with a focus on urban settings where students may need more support. The Director of STEM emphasized the importance of educators starting the school year with a clear understanding of the training and routine procedures. He noted that student teachers often benefit from seeing these processes from the beginning and that many completers had student teaching in the spring and did not see how to establish these procedures.

CAEP-WCSU Advanced Program Employer Focus Group A

March 20, 2025 at 10:30 AM via Zoom

Description: Participant: One Caucasian female elementary administrator of a charter school in a large urban district in Fairfield County, CT who employs one African-American, female MSED Literacy and Language program completer as an interventionist.

Question # 1: How prepared was the WCSU program completer to enter the classroom as compared to completers from other programs?
The administrator noted the growth of the MSED Literacy and Language Arts completer during her time at WCSU. She reported that her knowledge regarding literacy interventions was acceptable by the completion of the program.

Question # 2: How prepared was the WCSU program completer to meet the needs of diverse students?
The administrator noted that the WCSU program completer had previous employment at a Horizons site which developed her skills working with diverse students. She reported that this led to the completer's strong understanding of the needs of diverse students which is applied to her work as an interventionist. The administrator reported that the WCSU program completer has a good relationship with her diverse students.

Question # 3: How prepared was the WCSU program completer to use technology in instruction?
The administrator noted a minimum amount of technology is used in the WCSU program completer's interventionist role. However, she reported that the WCSU program completer is adept at using the University of Florida Intervention program's technology resources that accompany the intervention curriculum materials.

Question #4: How prepared was the WCSU program completer to work with diverse families?
The administrator reported that the WCSU program completer had limited interaction with families in her role as an interventionist. However, the program completer reported the completer's willingness to participate in parent/teacher conferences and communicated with parents on particular issues.

Question # 5: Is there anything else you would like the program to know about teacher preparation?
The one area for improvement would be classroom management as there were some issues regarding this when the WCSU program completer first began her work as an interventionist.

CAEP-WCSU Advanced Program Employer Focus Group B

March 20, 2025 at 10:30 AM via Zoom

Description: Participant: One Caucasian female middle school administrator in a large urban district in Fairfield County, CT who employs one MAT Secondary Education program completer and one 092 Certificate in Intermediate Administration and Supervision program completer.

Question # 1: How prepared was the WCSU program completer to enter the classroom as compared to completers from other programs?
The middle school administrator reported that both WCSU program completers (MAT Secondary Education and 092 Certificate in Administration and Supervision) were comparable to completers from other programs. Her evaluation of their preparedness for teaching and leadership was positive, noting that a lot also depends on the individual candidate to have the desire to improve.

Question # 2: How prepared was the WCSU program completer to meet the needs of diverse students?
The middle school administrator expressed confidence in the program's ability to prepare students for success, particularly in urban districts. She noted that both program completers did not reflect any implicit biases towards diverse students and were open to the myriad cultures present in the urban middle school.

Question # 3: How prepared was the WCSU program completer to use technology in instruction?
The employer participant discussed the trend of students being distracted by technology, particularly in secondary education. She noted that while technology can be useful for individualized instruction in math and reading, it often leads to students being less proficient in typing and writing skills. She reported that her school is shifting the view of technology in education, emphasizing the importance of face-to-face interaction and collaboration. However, the middle school administrator noted that both program completers were prepared to integrate technology in their respective roles of teaching and leadership.

Question #4: How prepared was the WCSU program completer to work with diverse families?
The middle school administrator reported that no issues were reported to her regarding the program completers' abilities to work with diverse families. She noted the cultural and linguistic responsiveness framework that the school uses to value middle school students' home culture and language and to offer a bridge to school language and culture. The administrator noted that this framework has increased student engagement in her school.

Question # 5: Is there anything else you would like the program to know about teacher preparation?
The employer participant encouraged WCSU to ensure that program completers are ready to work with artificial intelligence as that is increasingly important for both teachers and students. She suggested creating a micro credential in artificial intelligence across initial and advanced programs.