

**University of Pikeville
Patton College of Education**

**2018-2019 Case Study of Educator Preparation
Program Impact for CAEP Standard 4**

Table of Contents

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Introduction | 3 |
| Purpose of the Study..... | 3 |
| Methods | 4 |
| Participants | 4 |
| Procedures..... | 4 |
| Data Analysis and Results..... | 4 |
| Discussion of Findings and Implications for Improvement | 11 |
| Continuous Improvement Efforts | 12 |
| Reference | 14 |

2018-2019 Case Study of Educator Preparation Program Impact for CAEP Standard 4

Introduction

After completing a case study to help determine the quality of the initial certification teacher education programs in 2017-2018, the University of Pikeville Patton College of Education chose to continue the case study method for 2018-2019 to help determine the quality of the undergraduate teacher education programs (UTEP) through the performance of program completers. For the purpose of this study, we used multiple measures to determine program impact as required by CAEP Standard 4 by examining data related to completers' teaching effectiveness and impact on P-12 learning, satisfaction of employers, and satisfaction of completers relative to their preparation program. The case study method was chosen since the state does not provide this data for EPPs. The Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board New Teacher Survey no longer provides data for EPPs for first-year intern teachers through the Kentucky Teacher Internship Program (KTIPE), which is no longer being implemented due to the lack of funding.

According to Tucker and Strange, "Years of research on teacher quality support the fact that effective teachers not only make students feel good about school and learning, but also that their work actually results in increased student achievement," (p. 1). The main goal of our EPP is to train high quality teachers who are prepared to meet the professional teaching standards within P-12 classrooms. Therefore, to help gauge the quality of our undergraduate teacher education programs, the Patton College of Education collects both qualitative and quantitative data from their program completers and analyzes the data to make needed improvements.

Completing case studies to help determine program effectiveness is still relatively new for us, so we are trying to determine the best way to collect data to achieve our purposes. For last year's case study, we worked directly with completers. For this year's case study, we contacted P-12 schools/districts and asked them to share data with us to help determine the effectiveness of our undergraduate teacher preparation programs as stated in our next steps from the previous case study. We provided the schools/districts with the names of our completers with one to three years of teaching experience, and assured them that the data collection would not entail identifying any of the completers. We explained to them that our main goal is to continue the mutually beneficial partnerships with them and to use the resulting data to improve our preparation programs. We hope to accomplish this goal through the development of well-trained, highly effective completers who meet the KTPS/InTASC Standards and who are ready to assume teaching positions within P-12 schools.

Purpose of the Study

1. To collect and analyze data to demonstrate undergraduate teacher education program completers' teaching effectiveness and impact on P-12 learning (CAEP 4.1, 4.2).
2. To collect and analyze data to demonstrate both completer and employer satisfaction with the teacher preparation programs (CAEP 4.3, 4.3).

3. To use the resulting data for continuous improvement of the undergraduate teacher education programs (CAEP 5.4).

Methods

Participants

We reached out to P-12 schools/districts, and two districts provided us with data related to teaching effectiveness (Summative Evaluation Data) and impact on P-12 learning (MAP Test scores) for our completers with one to three years of experience.

Our Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness administered satisfaction surveys to our completers with one to three years of teaching experience and to school administrators where our completers were teaching.

We also looked at the percentage of our 2018-2019 completers who met state licensure requirements for teacher certification and the employment data of our completers.

Procedures

After determining the percentage of completers who met state licensure requirement, we compiled the data that were shared with us by the school/districts. At the beginning of the study, we realized that the data would be diverse because it was provided from two different districts.

Next, we analyzed the data and used the results to help determine next steps for improvement for our undergraduate teacher education programs.

Data Analysis and Results

All of our 2018-2019 completers met state licensure requirements and attained teacher certification by meeting all criteria, including passing the Praxis Academic Skills for Educators, Praxis Subject Assessments required for individual program areas, and the Praxis Principles of Teaching and Learning (PLT).

| 2018-2019 Completers | |
|-----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| Preparation Program Grade Levels | % Met Licensure Requirement for Teacher Certification |
| 11 Elementary | 100% |
| 3 Middle Grades | 100% |
| 4 Secondary | 100% |

We compiled data from completers from three summative teacher evaluations that occurred during the 2018-2019 academic year provided by one of the school districts (CAEP 4.2). We requested the evaluation data for completers who had been teaching from one to three years and provided the names of our completers who were employed within the district. No identifying information was provided for the three evaluations. The summative evaluation process included ratings for four performance measures and an overall rating. The identified ratings were *ineffective*, *developing*, *accomplished*, and *exemplary*. To substantiate the validity of the summative evaluation instrument, the rubric levels are congruent to the *Kentucky Framework for Teaching* (KyFFT), a research-based document adapted from the *Danielson Framework for Teaching*. The document is aligned with the KTPS/InTASC Standards, and the four assessment areas from the summative evaluation are aligned with the KTPS/InTASC general categories of the *Learner and Learning*, *Instructional Practice*, and *Professional Responsibility*.

| Completer Summative Evaluation Data Collected During the 2018-2019 Academic Year (District 1) | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Performance Measures | Planning (Aligns with KTPS/InTASC Instructional Practice) | Environment (Aligns with KTPS/InTASC Learner and Learning) | Instruction (Aligns with KTPS/InTASC Instructional Practice) | Professionalism (Aligns with KTPS/InTASC Professional Responsibility) | Overall Rating |
| Completer 1 | Exemplary | Exemplary | Exemplary | Exemplary | Exemplary |
| Completer 2 | Exemplary | Exemplary | Exemplary | Exemplary | Exemplary |
| Completer 3 | Exemplary | Accomplished | Exemplary | Exemplary | Exemplary |

The summative evaluation data from the three elementary-level completers demonstrated a high level of teaching effectiveness with all ratings at the *exemplary* level with the exception of one rating at the *accomplished* level for classroom environment.

In addition, another district shared summative evaluation data for five of our completers, reported anonymously. One completer was at the elementary level and four were at the middle grades level. In this district, summative evaluations are completed yearly, and the possible ratings include: *ineffective*, *developing*, *accomplished*, or *exemplary*. The rubric levels are congruent to the KyFFT, which was adapted from the research-based *Danielson Framework for Teaching*, and the document is aligned with the KTPS/InTASC Standards. The evaluation instrument is used as part of the district-wide Certified Evaluation Plan (CEP). All administrators and faculty receive yearly update trainings for the CEP to increase the reliability of the resulting data.

| Completer Summative Evaluation Data Collected During the 2018-2019 Academic Year (District 2) | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Completers | Overall Ratings |
| | |

| | |
|--------------------|--------------|
| Completer 1 | Accomplished |
| Completer 2 | Exemplary |
| Completer 3 | Accomplished |
| Completer 4 | Exemplary |
| Completer 5 | Accomplished |

Of the five completers with summative evaluation data, three received ratings of *accomplished* and two received ratings of *exemplary*. Therefore, anonymous data from two separate districts indicate that a total of eight completers with one to three years of experience received summative evaluation ratings of either accomplished or exemplary.

The next set of data was results from P-12 students' Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) testing (CAEP 4.1). The MAP Test is a nationally normed test from the Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA). The district provided the MAP data from the fall and spring in both reading and mathematics for twelve of our completers who were P-12 classroom teachers with one-to three years of experience. Of the twelve completers, six taught at the elementary level, four taught at the middle grades level, and two taught at the secondary level. P-12 student data for math were available for eight of the completers, and P-12 student data for reading were available for nine of the completers due to the contents that they taught.

| Comparison of 2018-2019 Beginning-of-the-Year (Fall) to End-of-the-Year (Spring) P-12 MAP Testing in Reading and Math for Completers | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Math | |
| # Completers with Available Data | 8 |
| % Completers with Increases in MAP Mathematics Scores from Fall to Spring | 88% |
| % Completers with Static Mathematics Scores (= or < 2%) from Fall to Spring | 12% |
| % Completers with Decreases in MAP Mathematics Scores from Fall to Spring | 0% |
| Reading | |
| # Completers with Available Data | 9 |
| % Completers with Increases in MAP Reading Scores from Fall to Spring | 67% |
| % Completers with Static Reading Scores (= or < 2%) from Fall to Spring | 0% |
| % Completers with Decreases in MAP Reading Scores (>2%) from Fall to Spring | 33% |

Note: Percentages are rounded.

According to the analysis of 2018-2019 MAP data for math and reading from our completers, 88% demonstrated increases in the percentage of P-12 students scoring at or above benchmark in math and 67% in reading from beginning-of-the-year fall testing to end-of-the-year spring testing. MAP scores for P-12 students taught by 12% of our completers remained static in math. Approximately 33% of the completers experienced decreases in MAP reading scores.

While we do not have any additional data to help us further analyze what impacted the increases or decreases, slightly more than two-thirds of our completers taught P-12 students who demonstrated improved reading scores and 88% improved math scores as measured by MAP tests, which provides evidence of completer impact on P-12 learning.

The next set of data that we analyzed related to employer satisfaction (CAEP 4.2). The Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness at the University of Pikeville administers the Employer Satisfaction Evaluation yearly to school administrators who have completers employed as classroom teachers within their P-12 schools. We had administered the survey-type instrument for several years, but we revised it in 2017 to align it with the KTPS/InTASC Standards. The instrument was co-developed and circulated among a panel of experts to establish the content validity through the Lawshe Method. Since our main goal is to train well-qualified preservice teachers, we revised our Employer Satisfaction Evaluation to address how well the employers felt that our teacher preparation program prepared completers to meet the KTPS/InTASC Standards within P-12 classrooms. While our Employer Satisfaction Evaluation data help us determine whether employers are satisfied with our teacher preparation programs, the data also provide additional information relative to teaching effectiveness since it completely aligns to the KTPS/InTASC Standards.

The rating scale for the Employer Satisfaction Evaluation are level 1 (*unprepared*), 2 (*partially prepared*), 3 (*fully prepared*), and 4 (*exceptionally prepared*) related to how well employers perceive that the preparation program prepared our completers to meet the KTPS/InTASC Standards within P-12 classrooms.

| Employer Satisfaction Evaluation Average Ratings for How Well the Program Prepared Completers to Meet the KTPS/InTASC Standards | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| | Survey Administered Spring Response Rate | 2018 78% | 2019 50% |
| The Learner and Learning | | 3.06 | 3.72 |
| Standard 1. Learner development. The teacher shall understand how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and shall design and shall implement developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences. | | 3.17 | 3.67 |
| | Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared | 100% 0 | 100% 0 |
| Standard 2. Learning differences. The teacher shall use the understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards. | | 2.83 | 3.67 |
| | Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared | 83% 17 | 83% 17 |
| Standard 3. Learning environments. The teacher shall work with others to create environments that: a) Support individual and collaborative learning; and b) Encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation. | | 3.17 | 3.83 |
| | Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared | 100% 0 | 100% 0 |
| Content Knowledge | | 3.08 | 3.80 |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <p>Standard 4. Content knowledge. The teacher shall:</p> <p>a) Understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline he or she teaches; and</p> <p>b) Create learning experiences that make these aspects of the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared</p> | <p>3.17</p> <p>100% 0</p> | <p>3.80</p> <p>100% 0</p> |
| <p>Standard 5. Application of content. The teacher shall understand how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared</p> | <p>3.00</p> <p>83% 17</p> | <p>3.80</p> <p>100% 0</p> |
| Instructional Practice | | |
| <p>Standard 6. Assessment. The teacher shall understand and use multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the educator's and learner's decision making.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared</p> | <p>3.00</p> <p>83% 17</p> | <p>3.60</p> <p>100% 0</p> |
| <p>Standard 7. Planning for instruction. The teacher shall plan instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared</p> | <p>3.17</p> <p>100% 0</p> | <p>3.80</p> <p>100% 0</p> |
| <p>Standard 8. Instructional strategies. The teacher shall understand and use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared</p> | <p>4.00</p> <p>83% 17</p> | <p>3.80</p> <p>100% 0</p> |
| Professional Responsibility | | |
| <p>Standard 9. Professional learning and ethical practice. The teacher shall engage in ongoing professional learning, shall use evidence to continually evaluate his or her practice, particularly the effects of his or her choices and actions on others, such as learners, families, other professionals, and the community, and shall adapt practice to meet the needs of each learner.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared</p> | <p>3.33</p> <p>100% 0</p> | <p>4.00</p> <p>100% 0</p> |
| <p>Standard 10. Leadership and collaboration. The teacher shall seek appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to:</p> <p>a) Take responsibility for student learning;</p> <p>b) Collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth; and</p> <p>c) Advance the profession.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared</p> | <p>3.17</p> <p>100% 0</p> | <p>4.00</p> <p>100% 0</p> |

Scale: 1 = Unprepared, 2 = Partially Prepared, 3 = Fully Prepared, 4 = Exceptionally Prepared

Prepared by the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness, June 2020

We included data from both the Spring 2018 and Spring 2019 administrations of the Employer Satisfaction Evaluations for comparison. (Please see the Employer Satisfaction Evaluation Results for three cycles of data.) The response rate was 78% in 2018 and 50% in 2019; both response rates were acceptable. In 2018, average ratings for the preparedness of our completers to meet the KTPS/InTASC Standards within the Learner and Learning category were 3.06 in 2018 and 3.72 in 2019. For the Content Knowledge, the average preparedness ratings were 3.08 in 2018 and 3.80 in 2019. For the standards within the KTPS/InTASC category of Instructional Practice, the ratings were 3.06 in 2018 and 3.73 in 2019 while the average preparedness ratings for Professional Responsibility were 3.25 in 2018 and 4.0 in 2019. The only average rating below a 3.0 was for Standard 2: Learning Differences, which was 2.83 in 2018. Therefore, although the average rating for Standard 2 was close to a level 3 in 2018 (*fully prepared*), approximately 17% of the responses indicated partially prepared.

As part of our employer satisfaction data set, we also analyzed our completer employment data for 2018-2019. For this data set, we identify any employment milestones or leadership roles assumed by our completers.

| 2018-2019 Completer Employment and Retention Data | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| # Completers | % Employed Upon Graduation as Classroom Teachers in the Trained Program Areas |
| 18 | 89% (16/18) |
| Employment Milestones and Leadership Roles for Completers | |
| 2018-2019 Completers | There are no employment milestones or leadership roles to report because our completers are just beginning their teaching careers. |
| 2017-2018 Completers with Leadership Roles Assumed in 2018-2019 | <p>Elementary Completer: County Nearpod Team Member, Elementary School Girls Basketball Coach</p> <p>Middle Grades Completer: Mathematics Department Chair, Site-Based Council Member, HS Golf and Track Coach, Assistant HS Softball Coach, Middle School Academic Team Coach</p> |

Note: Percentages are rounded for employment and job retention data.

Approximately 89% of our teacher education program completers in 2019 were hired as classroom teachers within a few months of graduation. One completer was employed as an admissions counselor at a University; therefore, she was employed in an education-related field. Two of our 2018 completers assumed leadership roles in 2018-2019.

Next, we analyzed data from the Completer Satisfaction Evaluations that are administered yearly by the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness at the University of Pikeville (CAEP 4.4). We had administered the survey-type instrument for several year, but we revised it in 2017 to align it with the KTPS/InTASC Standards. We circulated the document among a panel of experts and asked them to rate the survey items as *essential*, *useful but not essential*, and *not necessary* to establish content validity through the Lawshe Method. Again, our main goal is

to train well-qualified preservice who are prepared for P-12 classrooms; therefore, the instrument asks candidates to rate how well they feel that their preparation program prepared them to meet the KTPS/InTASC Standards within P-12 classrooms. The rating scale for the Completer Satisfaction Evaluation includes level 1 (*unprepared*), 2 (*partially prepared*), 3 (*fully prepared*), and 4 (*exceptionally prepared*) related to how well our completers perceive that their preparation program prepared them to meet the KTPS/InTASC Standards.

| Completer Satisfaction Evaluation Average Ratings for How Well the Program Prepared Them to Meet the KTPS/InTASC Standards | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| | Survey Administered Spring Response Rate | 2018 36% | 2019 6% |
| The Learner and Learning | | 3.25 | 2.33 |
| Standard 1. Learner development. The teacher shall understand how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and shall design and shall implement developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences. | | 3.25 | 3.00 |
| Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared | | 100% 0 | 100% 0 |
| Standard 2. Learning differences. The teacher shall use the understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards. | | 3.50 | 2.00 |
| Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared | | 100% 0 | 0% 100 |
| Standard 3. Learning environments. The teacher shall work with others to create environments that: a) Support individual and collaborative learning; and b) Encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self- motivation. | | 3.00 | 2.00 |
| Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared | | 100% 0 | 0% 100% |
| Content Knowledge | | 3.13 | 4.00 |
| Standard 4. Content knowledge. The teacher shall: a) Understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline he or she teaches; and b) Create learning experiences that make these aspects of the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content. | | 3.50 | 4.00 |
| Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared | | 100% 0 | 100% 0 |
| Standard 5. Application of content. The teacher shall understand how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues. | | 2.75 | 4.00 |
| Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared | | 75% 25 | 100% 0 |
| Instructional Practice | | 2.83 | 4.00 |
| Standard 6. Assessment. The teacher shall understand and use multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the educator's and learner's decision making. | | 3.50 | 4.00 |
| Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared | | 100% 0 | 100% 0 |

| | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| <p>Standard 7. Planning for instruction. The teacher shall plan instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.</p> | <p>2.50</p> | <p>4.00</p> |
| <p>Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared</p> | <p>50% 50</p> | <p>100% 0</p> |
| <p>Standard 8. Instructional strategies. The teacher shall understand and use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.</p> | <p>3.00</p> | <p>4.00</p> |
| <p>Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared</p> | <p>75% 25</p> | <p>100% 0</p> |
| <p>Professional Responsibility</p> | <p>3.25</p> | <p>3.50</p> |
| <p>Standard 9. Professional learning and ethical practice. The teacher shall engage in ongoing professional learning, shall use evidence to continually evaluate his or her practice, particularly the effects of his or her choices and actions on others, such as learners, families, other professionals, and the community, and shall adapt practice to meet the needs of each learner.</p> | <p>3.25</p> | <p>3.00</p> |
| <p>Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared</p> | <p>100% 0</p> | <p>100% 0</p> |
| <p>Standard 10. Leadership and collaboration. The teacher shall seek appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Take responsibility for student learning; b) Collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth; and c) Advance the profession. | <p>3.25</p> | <p>4.00</p> |
| <p>Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared</p> | <p>100% 0</p> | <p>100% 0</p> |

Scale: 1 = Unprepared, 2 = Partially Prepared, 3 = Fully Prepared, 4 = Exceptionally Prepared

Prepared by the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness, June 2020

The response rate was 36% in 2018, which was acceptable; however, in 2019, the response rate was 6%, which was unacceptable and statistically insignificant. Average ratings for 2018 completers indicate that their preparation programs *exceptionally or fully prepared* them to meet the KTPS/InTASC Standards within the category of the *Learner and Learning* with an average of 3.25 on a 4—point scale; *Content Knowledge* with an average rating of 3.13; *Instructional Practice* with an average rating of 2.83; and *Professional Responsibility* with an average rating of 3.25. KTPS/InTASC Standard 5: Application of Content and Standard 7: Planning for Instruction were the only standards in 2018 that received a rating lower than 3.0, and they were 2.5 and 2.75 respectively. Therefore, based on the data from the 2018 administration of the Completer Satisfaction Evaluation, our completers who participated in the evaluation perceive that their educator preparation programs prepared them to meet the KTPS/InTASC Standards within P-12 classrooms (Please see the Initial Completer Charts for three years of data).

Due to the response rate for the 2019 Completer Satisfaction Evaluation, the resulting data was statistically insignificant. Completer response rates is an area for improvement for our EPP, and we will address completer response rates in our next steps for improvement.

Discussion of Findings and Implications for Improvement

The data included in this 2018-2019 case study related to completers' teaching effectiveness and impact on P-12 learning, employer satisfaction, and completer satisfaction demonstrate the quality of our undergraduate teacher preparation programs (CAEP Standard 4). Summative evaluation data for our program completers reflect exemplary or accomplished ratings for all assessed areas, which are aligned with the KTPS/InTASC Standards. P-12 MAP scores in reading and math from students taught by our completers demonstrate that 67% experienced an increase in the percentage of students who scored at or above the benchmark scores in reading and 88% in math. Approximately 89% of our 2019 completers were hired following graduation, which demonstrates that principals and site-based councils have confidence in our teacher preparation programs. Only one completer chose to take a job as an admissions counselor at a University instead of pursuing a P-12 teaching position.

Average ratings of preparedness from both the 2018 and 2019 Employer Satisfaction Evaluation ranged from 3.06 to 4.0 on a four-point scale, which indicates that employers perceive that our teacher education programs fully or exceptionally prepared our completers to meet the KTPS/InTASC Standards within P-12 classrooms. Average ratings for the 2018 Completer Satisfaction Evaluation were from 2.83 to 3.0 demonstrating that our completers perceive that their teacher preparation programs prepared them to meet the KTPS/InTASC Standards within P-12 classrooms. Average ratings from 2019 ranged from 3.0 to 4.0; however, only 6% of the completers responded to the survey; therefore, the data is not significant.

Continuous Improvement Efforts

We completed this case study to determine the teaching effectiveness and impact on P-12 learning of our teacher education program completers and to use the resulting data for continuous improvement efforts. As a result of the case study, we identified the following areas and next steps for improvement:

- The response rate from the Completer Satisfaction Evaluation was unacceptable in 2019 because only 6% of our completers responded.
 - Next Steps
 - Send reminder emails to completers once the evaluation link is sent. Most of them are practicing P-12 teachers, and it is easy to overlook emails. When the deadline date is approaching for submission of the Completer Satisfaction Evaluation, then we will send reminder emails to those who have not submitted to help them remember to complete the evaluation.
- The average response ratings from the 2018 Completer Satisfaction Evaluation for Standards 5: Application of Content and Standard 7: Planning of Instruction were below 3.0. Although the average ratings were 2.5 for Standard 5 and 2.75 for Standard 7, we are targeting these as areas for improvement.
 - Next Steps

- It was discovered that all education faculty were not using the lesson plan template from the now nonoperational Kentucky Teacher Internship Program (KTIP) within the education courses that require pre-candidates to plan instruction and peer teach. We require candidates to use this template in Clinical I and II; therefore, in Clinical I, we were having to teach candidates how to plan instruction using the KTIP lesson plan template. In Fall 2019, we will begin using a common lesson plan template from the KTIP and common rubrics for lesson planning and peer teaching in all education courses that require these activities to prepare candidates for the teacher performance assessments in Clinical I and II.
- Require well-planned learning activities and projects that can be implemented within P-12 classrooms in 200 and 300-level courses to develop candidates' abilities to connect concepts and use differing perspectives as they are learning to apply content knowledge.

Reference

Tucker, P. D. & Stronge, J. H. (2005). *Linking teacher evaluation and student learning*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Accessed at <http://www.ascd.org/publications/books/104136/chapters/The-Power-of-an-Effective-Teacher-and-Why-We-Should-Assess-It.aspx>