

# CAEP ANNUAL REPORT: 2026

---

WESTERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY

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

## CAEP Accountability Measures AY 2024-2025

### 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 2025

Domain	Element	Competency	Elementary Education (1-6) Key Indicators													
			University Supervisor (n=13)							Mentor (n=13)						
			Below Standard (Indicator Not Met) - 1	Developing (Indicator Partially Met) - 2	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully Met)* - 4	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation	Below Standard (Indicator Not Met) - 1	Developing (Indicator Partially Met) - 2	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully Met)* - 4	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation
2. Planning for Active Learning	[2a.1]	Content of lesson plan is aligned with standards	0	0	9	4	0	3.31	0.46	0	0	10	3	0	3.23	0.42
	[2a.2]	Content of lesson appropriate to sequence of lessons and appropriate level of challenge	0	0	12	1	0	3.08	0.27	0	0	12	1	0	3.08	0.27
	[3a.2]	Content accuracy	0	0	8	5	0	3.38	0.49	0	1	8	4	0	3.23	0.58

Domain	Element	Competency	Elementary Education (1-6) Key Indicators													
			University Supervisor (n=13)							Mentor (n=13)						
			Below Standard (Indicator Not Met) - 1	Developing (Indicator Partially Met) - 2	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully Met)* - 4	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation	Below Standard (Indicator Not Met) - 1	Developing (Indicator Partially Met) - 2	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully Met)* - 4	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation
<b>3. Instruction for Active Learning</b>	<b>[3a.3]</b>	<b>Content progression and level of challenge</b>	0	0	13	0	0	3.00	0.00	0	0	12	1	0	3.08	0.27
<b>Frequencies</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>		
<i>Percentage of Competencies Scored Below Standard</i>			<b>0.00%</b>							<b>0.00%</b>						
<i>Percentage of Competencies Scored Developing</i>			<b>.00%</b>							<b>0.01%</b>						
<i>Percentage of Competencies Scored Proficient</i>			<b>80%</b>							<b>80%</b>						
<i>Percentage of Competencies Scored Exemplary</i>			<b>20%</b>							<b>19%</b>						
<i>Spring 2023 Mean</i>			<b>3.19</b>							<b>3.15</b>						
<b>Overall Candidate Performance: University Supervisor and Mentor Elementary Education Key Indicators - Spring 2025</b> <b>Percentage Passing (Developing, Proficient, and Exemplary) = 100%</b>																

Domain	Element	Competency	Elementary Education (1-6) Key Indicators											
			University Supervisor (n=13)						Mentor (n=13)					
			Below Standard (Indicator Not Met) - 1	Developing (Indicator Partially Met) - 2	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully Met)* - 4	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation	Below Standard (Indicator Not Met) - 1	Developing (Indicator Partially Met) - 2	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully Met)* - 4	N/A
<b>Overall Elementary Education 2025 Mean = 3.17</b>														

Table 2. Secondary Education (7-12) Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators Disaggregated by Evaluator: Spring 2025

Undergraduate (UG) Secondary Education Program (7-12) Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor Spring 2025																
Domain	Element	Competency	UG Secondary Education (7-12) Key Indicators													
			University Supervisor (n=8)							Mentor (n=8)						
			Below Standard (Indicator Not Met) - 1	Developing (Indicator Partially Met) - 2	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully Met)* - 4	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation	Below Standard (Indicator Not Met) - 1	Developing (Indicator Partially Met) - 2	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully Met)* - 4	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation
2. Planning for Active Learning	[2a.1]	Content of lesson plan is aligned with standards	0	0	5	3	0	3.38	0.48	0	0	4	4	0	3.50	0.50
	[2a.2]	Content of lesson appropriate to sequence of lessons and appropriate level of challenge	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	0.00	0	0	7	1	0	3.12	0.33
3. Instruction for Active Learning	[3a.2]	Content accuracy	0	1	5	2	0	3.12	0.60	0	1	5	2	0	3.12	0.60
	[3a.3]	Content progression and level of challenge	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	0.00	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	0.00

**Undergraduate (UG) Secondary Education Program (7-12)**  
**Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators**  
**Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor**  
**Spring 2025**

Domain	Element	Competency	UG Secondary Education (7-12) Key Indicators												
			University Supervisor (n=8)						Mentor (n=8)						
			Below Standard (Indicator Not Met) - 1	Developing (Indicator Partially Met) - 2	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully Met)* - 4	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation	Below Standard (Indicator Not Met) - 1	Developing (Indicator Partially Met) - 2	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully Met)* - 4	N/A	Mean
<b>Frequencies</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3.12</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3.18</b>	
<i>Percentage of Competencies Scored Below Standard</i>		<b>0.00%</b>						<b>0.00%</b>							
<i>Percentage of Competencies Scored Developing</i>		<b>.03%</b>						<b>0.03%</b>							
<i>Percentage of Competencies Scored Proficient</i>		<b>50%</b>						<b>75%</b>							
<i>Percentage of Competencies Scored Exemplary</i>		<b>19%</b>						<b>21%</b>							
<i>Spring 2025 Mean</i>		<b>3.19</b>						<b>3.15</b>							

**Undergraduate (UG) Secondary Education Program (7-12)**  
**Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators**  
**Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor**  
**Spring 2025**

Domain	Element	Competency	UG Secondary Education (7-12) Key Indicators											
			University Supervisor (n=8)						Mentor (n=8)					
			Below Standard (Indicator Not Met) - 1	Developing (Indicator Partially Met) - 2	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully Met)* - 4	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation	Below Standard (Indicator Not Met) - 1	Developing (Indicator Partially Met) - 2	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully Met)* - 4	N/A

**Overall Candidate Performance: University Supervisor and Mentor UG Secondary Education Key Indicators - Spring 2025**

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

**Overall UG Secondary Education 2025 Mean = 3.15**

- The Master of Arts in Teaching Program (MAT) placed candidates in Student Teaching in Spring 2025.

<b>MAT Secondary Education Program (7-12)</b> <b>Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators</b> <b>Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor</b> <b>Spring 2025</b>																
Domain	Element	Competency	MAT Secondary Education (7-12) Key Indicators													
			University Supervisor (n=7)							Mentor (n=5)						
			Below Standard (Indicator Not Met) - 1	Developing (Indicator Partially Met) - 2	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully Met)* - 4	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation	Below Standard (Indicator Not Met) - 1	Developing (Indicator Partially Met) - 2	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully Met)* - 4	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation
2. Planning for Active Learning	[2a.1]	Content of lesson plan is aligned with standards	0	0	5	2	0	3.29	0.45	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	0.49
	[2a.2]	Content of lesson appropriate to sequence of lessons and appropriate level of challenge	0	0	6	1	0	3.14	0.35	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	0.00
3. Instruction for Active Learning	[3a.2]	Content accuracy	0	2	3	2	0	3.00	0.76	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	0.40
	[3a.3]	Content progression and level of challenge	0	1	7	0	0	2.86	0.35	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	0.00
Frequencies			0	3	21	5	0	3.07		0	0	17	3	0	3.15	

**MAT Secondary Education Program (7-12)**  
**Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators**  
**Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor**  
**Spring 2025**

Domain	Element	Competency	MAT Secondary Education (7-12) Key Indicators												
			University Supervisor (n=7)							Mentor (n=5)					
			Below Standard (Indicator Not Met) - 1	Developing (Indicator Partially Met) - 2	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully Met)* - 4	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation	Below Standard (Indicator Not Met) - 1	Developing (Indicator Partially Met) - 2	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully Met)* - 4	N/A	Mean
		<i>Percentage of Competencies Scored Below Standard</i>	0.00%							0.00%					
		<i>Percentage of Competencies Scored Developing</i>	10%							0.00%					
		<i>Percentage of Competencies Scored Proficient</i>	73%							85%					
		<i>Percentage of Competencies Scored Exemplary</i>	17%							15%					
		<i>Spring 2025 Mean</i>	3.07							3.15					

**Overall Candidate Performance: University Supervisor and Mentor MAT Secondary Education Key Indicators - Spring 2025**

**MAT Secondary Education Program (7-12)**  
**Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators**  
**Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor**  
**Spring 2025**

Domain	Element	Competency	MAT Secondary Education (7-12) Key Indicators											
			University Supervisor (n=7)						Mentor (n=5)					
			Below Standard (Indicator Not Met) - 1	Developing (Indicator Partially Met) - 2	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully Met)* - 4	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation	Below Standard (Indicator Not Met) - 1	Developing (Indicator Partially Met) - 2	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully Met)* - 4	N/A
<b>Percentage Passing (Developing, Proficient, and Exemplary) = 100%</b>														
<b>Overall MAT Secondary Education 2025 Mean = 3.11</b>														

*Note:* MAT Secondary Education Candidates who are working in districts under a Durational Shortage Certification are only assigned to a university supervisor.

Table 3. Health Education (K-12) Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators Disaggregated by Evaluator: Spring 2025

Health Education Program (K-12) Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor Spring 2025																
Domain	Element	Competency	Health Education (K-12) Key Indicators													
			University Supervisor (n=3)							Mentor (n=3)						
			Below Standard (Indicator Not Met) - 1	Developing (Indicator Partially Met) - 2	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully Met)* - 4	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation	Below Standard (Indicator Not Met) - 1	Developing (Indicator Partially Met) - 2	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully Met)* - 4	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation
2. Planning for Active Learning	[2a.1]	Content of lesson plan is aligned with standards	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	0.00	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	0.00
	[2a.2]	Content of lesson appropriate to sequence of lessons and appropriate level of challenge	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	0.00	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	0.00
3. Instruction for Active Learning	[3a.2]	Content accuracy	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	0.00	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	0.47
	[3a.3]	Content progression and level of challenge	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	0.00	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	0.00
Frequencies			0	0	12	0	0	3.00		0	0	11	1	0	3.08	

**Health Education Program (K-12)**

**Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators**

**Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor**

**Spring 2025**

Domain	Element	Competency	Health Education (K-12) Key Indicators											
			University Supervisor (n=3)						Mentor (n=3)					
			Below Standard (Indicator Not Met) - 1	Developing (Indicator Partially Met) - 2	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully Met)* - 4	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation	Below Standard (Indicator Not Met) - 1	Developing (Indicator Partially Met) - 2	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully Met)* - 4	N/A
		<i>Percentage of Competencies Scored Below Standard</i>	0.00%						0.00%					
		<i>Percentage of Competencies Scored Developing</i>	0%						0.00%					
		<i>Percentage of Competencies Scored Proficient</i>	100%						91%					
		<i>Percentage of Competencies Scored Exemplary</i>	0%						9%					
		<i>Spring 2025 Mean</i>	3.00						3.08					
<p align="center"><b>Overall Candidate Performance: University Supervisor and Mentor Health Education Key Indicators - Spring 2025</b></p> <p align="center"><b>Percentage Passing (Developing, Proficient, and Exemplary) = 100%</b></p>														

**Health Education Program (K-12)**

**Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) Final Evaluation Key Indicators**

**Disaggregated by Evaluator: University Supervisor and Mentor**

**Spring 2025**

Domain	Element	Competency	Health Education (K-12) Key Indicators												
			University Supervisor (n=3)							Mentor (n=3)					
			Below Standard (Indicator Not Met) - 1	Developing (Indicator Partially Met) - 2	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully Met)* - 4	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation	Below Standard (Indicator Not Met) - 1	Developing (Indicator Partially Met) - 2	Proficient (Indicator Fully Met) - 3	Exemplary (Indicator Fully Met)* - 4	N/A	Mean
<b>Overall Health Education 2025 Mean = 3.04</b>															

2026 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 2026 TEAM Data**

<b>Danbury Public Schools District-WCSU Program Completers TEAM Data</b>							
<b>33 Program Completers</b>							
<b>Program</b>	<b><i>n</i></b>	<b>TEAM Year</b>	<b>Module 1</b>	<b>Module 2</b>	<b>Module 3</b>	<b>Module 4</b>	<b>Module 5</b>
Elementary Education	2	In Progress	Completed	In Progress	Completed	Completed	Completed
Elementary Education	1	In Progress	Completed	Not started	In Progress	Not started	Completed
Elementary Education	10	Completed	Completed	Completed	Completed	Completed	Completed
Secondary Education	4	In Progress	4 Completed	1 in Progress 2 Not Started 1 Completed	3 In Progress 1 Completed	2 Completed 2 Not Started	3 Completed 1 Not Started
Secondary Education	14	Completed	Completed	Completed	Completed	Completed	Completed
Heath Education	2	Completed	Completed	Completed	Completed	Completed	Completed
<b>Overall Candidate Performance: Danbury Public Schools District-WCSU Program Completers TEAM Data</b>							
<b>In Progress: 7/33=21%</b>							
<b>Completed: 26/33= 79%</b>							

**Results:** In spring 2026, Danbury school district collected data on 33 completers who started the TEAM program. Analysis indicates that 79% of completers have finished the program and 21% are in progress. These results indicate that WCSU program completers are successfully progressing in the TEAM program as last spring 2025, 59% of completers at finished it with 41% still in process. 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 2024-2025 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 2026, 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 2024-2025 there were a total of 30 initial program completers. Of the 13 elementary education majors, 8 (62%) responded to the Completer Survey with 5 giving us the names of their employers. Three of the 5 employers (60%) polled then responded to the Employer Survey; of the 7 Secondary Education Majors, 2 (28%) responded to the Completer Survey with 2 giving us the names of their employers; 2 of the 2 employers (100%) responded to the Employer Survey; of the 3 Health Education completers, 2 (75%) responded to the completer survey with employer information. However, none of the employers responded and an interview was conducted with one of the largest employers of our health education completers. Of the 7 MAT Secondary Education completers, 5 (71%) responded to survey with 2 giving the names of their employers; 1 of the 2 employers responded (50%). An employer of the secondary education completers was also included in the focus group interviews.

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 four cohort years revealed a consistent rate of responding on the part of the employers surveyed. Tables 5-7 below report results from the AY 2024-2025 Employer Surveys. Comparisons of Employer Survey ratings for the past four cohorts of completers (AY2020-2021, AY 2021-2022, 2023-2024, 2024-2025) 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 AY 2024-2025 cohort Elementary Education Employer Survey was slightly higher at 2.72. A rating of ‘3’ denotes completer proficiency thus suggesting that employers view WCSU completers with a high degree of satisfaction. Similarly, rating means for the four Secondary Education completer cohorts were 2.60, 2.88, 2.63, and 2.93 respectively. Comparisons of Health Education Program ratings were not possible because an employer survey was not possible this year as no employer responded to the survey. Given the small number of program completers and the small number of surveys completed by employers, results must be interpreted with caution. A focus group was held to supplement the findings, and results are reported in the Appendix.

Table 5. Results of CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey of AY 2024-2025 completers: Elementary Education (3 responders)

WCSU Employer Survey			
Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
AY2024-2025	1.Integrates appropriate standards into instruction	3.0	(3)
	2. Adapts instruction to diverse students.	2.6	(2-3)
	3. Adapts instruction to differences in learning.	2.6	(2-3)
	4. Motivates students to learn	3.0	(3)

WCSU Employer Survey			
Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
	5 Facilitates critical thinking	2.6	(2-3)
	6. Communicates well with students.	3.0	(3)
	7. Effectively applies classroom management practices	2.6	(2-3)
	8. Interacts well with parents and community members	2.6	(2-3)
	9. Assesses student learning	2.6	(2-3)
	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	3.0	(3)
	13. Behaves in accordance with professional ethics	3.0	(3)
	14. Effectively integrates technology into their instruction	2.3	(2-3)
	15. Reaches employment milestones	2.0	(2)
<b>Overall Mean: 2.72</b>			

*Note.* Rating Scale (1) Below Standard, (2) Developing, (3) Proficient, (4) Exemplary

Table 6. Results of CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey of AY 2024-2025 completers: Secondary Education (2 respondents)

WCSU Employer Survey			
Academic Year	Content Indicator	Mean	Range
AY 2024-2025	1.Integrates appropriate standards into instruction	3.0	(3)

**WCSU Employer Survey**

<b>Academic Year</b>	<b>Content Indicator</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Range</b>
	2. Adapts instruction to diverse students.	3.0	(3)
	3. Adapts instruction to differences in learning.	3.0	(3)
	4. Facilitates critical thinking, problem solving and /or other higher-level thinking	3.0	(3)
	5. Motivates students to learn	3.0	(3)
	6. Communicates well with students.	3.0	(3)
	7. Effectively applies classroom management practices	2.5	(2-3)
	8. Interacts well with parents and community members	3.0	(3)
	9. Assesses student learning	3.0	(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	3.0	(3)
<b>Overall Mean: 2.93</b>			

*Note.* Rating Scale (1) Below Standard, (2) Developing, (3) Proficient, (4) Exemplary

Table 7. Results of CAEP Initial Programs Employer Survey of AY 2024-2025 completers: MAT Secondary Education (1 respondent)

<b>WCSU Employer Survey</b>			
<b>Academic Year</b>	<b>Content Indicator</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Range</b>
AY2024-2025	1. Integrates appropriate standards into instruction	3.0	(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)
	6. Communicates well with students.	3.0	(3)
	7. Effectively applies classroom management practices	3.0	(3)
	8. Interacts well with parents and community members	3.0	(3)
	9. Assesses student learning	3.0	(3)
	10. Engages in reflective thinking during the entire instructional cycle	3.0	(3)
	11. Collaborates well with peers	3.0	(3)
	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	3.0	(3)
<b>Overall Mean: 2.86</b>			

Note. Note. Rating Scale (1) Below Standard, (2) Developing, (3) Proficient, (4) Exemplary