

**University of Pikeville
Patton College of Education**

**2019-2020 Case Study of Educator Preparation
Program Impact for CAEP Standard 4**

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Purpose of the Study	3
Methods	3
Participants	3
Procedures	4
Data Analysis and Results	4
Discussion of Findings and Implications for Improvement	11
Continuous Improvement Efforts	12
Reference	13

2019-2020 Case Study of Educator Preparation Program Impact for CAEP Standard 4

Introduction

After completing mixed-method case studies in 2017-2018 and 2018-2019, the Patton College of Education chose to continue this method to help determine the impact of our initial certification teacher education programs on P-12 education related to CAEP Standard 4. We will examine multiple measures to assess completers' teaching effectiveness, impact on P-12 learning, and satisfaction of their preparation program as well as employer satisfaction of the program preparation of our completers.

According to Opper, "Teachers matter more to student achievement than any other aspect of schooling" (2019, p. 1). Therefore, we must determine the quality of our teacher education programs in preparing our completers for P-12 classroom. We selected the case study method since the state does not provide us data for our completers. In the past, we had gotten data from the Kentucky Teacher Internship Program (KTIP) for our completers who were first-year intern teachers; however, the KTIP is no longer being implemented due to the lack of funding.

We are currently working with surrounding school districts to share data for our completers related to teaching effectiveness and impact on P-12 learning. Two P-12 school districts have agreed to provide us with this data if we provide them with the names of our completers who are employed there. We began this work last year; therefore, our 2019-2020 Case Study parallels the 2018-2019 Case Study in that we analyze similar sets of data. We are looking forward to working with the districts on this mutually beneficial partnership, which will provide us with completer data to help us strengthen our teacher education programs. Strengthening our teacher education programs will, in turn, result in well-trained, high-quality teachers ready to assume teaching positions within the districts.

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 who had been teaching from one to three years.

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 analyzed data related to the percentage of our 2019-2020 completers who met licensure requirements for teacher certification and the employment data of our completers.

Procedures

After determining the percentage of 2019-2020 candidates who met licensure requirements, we compiled the data that were shared with us by the school/districts, realizing that the data would most likely be different because it was provided from two different districts. However, we welcomed the diversity of the data and felt that multiple types of data would help us to make a more accurate determination as to the quality of our teacher education programs.

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 2019-2020 completers met licensure requirements for teacher certification. This included meeting benchmark scores on the Praxis Core Academic Skills for Educators and the Praxis Subject Assessments required within their individual program areas to demonstrate content knowledge. They also met benchmark scores on the Praxis Principles of Teaching and Learning (PLT), which is an assessment of foundational pedagogical knowledge expected of new teachers.

2019-2020 Completers	
Preparation Program Grade Levels	% Met Licensure Requirement for Teacher Certification
6 Elementary	100%
4 Middle Grades	100%
2 Secondary	100%

Data from P-12 School Districts

The first set of data that we were provided by the districts for completers with one to three years of experience resulted from 2019-2020 administrator observations compiled from multiple walkthroughs within the classrooms of twelve of our completers with one to three years of experience (CAEP 4.2). The instrument was co-developed by education professionals at the district level and focused on the following assessed areas: 1) learning targets posted and reviewed with students (KTPS/InTASC *Instructional Practice*), 2) authentic engagement in learning (KTPS/InTASC the *Learner and Learning* and *Instructional Practice*), 3) higher level questioning (KTPS/InTASC the *Learner and Learning* and *Instructional Practice*), 4) assessment strategies (KTPS/InTASC *Instructional Practice*), 5) student feedback (KTPS/InTASC the *Learner and Learning* and *Instructional Practice*), 6)

technology use (KTPS/InTASC the *Learner and Learning* and *Instructional Practice*), 7) classroom environment (KTPS/InTASC the *Learner and Learning*) along with an overall rating. The instrument included a specific rubric for each assessed area ranging from possible ratings of 0 to 3 with three being the highest rating possible.

Walkthrough Observation Data for Completers Collected During the 2019-2020 Academic Year								
Completers	Learning Targets	Authentic Engagement	Higher Level Questions	Assessment Strategies	Student Feedback	Technology Use	Classroom Environment	Total
Completer 1	2.4	2.4	2.0	2.2	2.4	0.8	2.8	2.1
Completer 2	2.8	2.6	2.5	2.9	2.9	1.4	3.0	2.6
Completer 3	2.8	2.6	2.4	2.2	2.8	1.6	3.0	2.5
Completer 4	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	2.1
Completer 5	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	2.1
Completer 6	2.5	2.8	3.0	2.8	3.0	1.0	3.0	2.6
Completer 7	2.3	2.7	2.7	2.7	3.0	2.3	3.0	2.7
Completer 8	2.0	2.8	1.5	2.0	2.3	1.7	3.0	2.2
Completer 9	2.8	2.7	2.3	2.3	2.9	2.1	3.0	2.6
Completer 10	2.5	2.8	2.3	2.3	2.8	1.6	3.0	2.5
Completer 11	3.0	2.8	2.0	2.0	3.0	1.5	3.0	2.5
Completer 12	2.7	2.2	2.0	2.2	2.6	1.3	3.0	2.3
Average Ratings	2.6	2.5	2.2	2.3	2.3	1.8	3.0	2.4

Six of the completers taught at the elementary level, four at the middle grades level, and two at the secondary level. Average ratings for six of the assessed areas were between 2.2 and 3.0. The only average rating below 2.0 was a 1.8 for technology use. The rubric for the technology section of the instrument states that “students use technology to solve problems” for a level 2; therefore, an average rating of 1.8 demonstrates that the majority of our completers are engaging their P-12 students in using technology for problem solving. For the indicators related to learning targets, nine completers received average ratings of 2.5 or higher. Eight completers were rated 2.5 or higher for authentic engagement. For higher level questioning and assessment strategies, all but one completer received average ratings of 2.0 or above in each assessed area. Eight completers were rated 2.5 or above for student feedback, and all received ratings of 2.5 or above for classroom environment. Total ratings for all twelve completers were between 2.1 and 2.7. Therefore, based on the data from walkthrough observations completed by school administrators, our completers are demonstrating teaching effectiveness within P-12 classrooms.

The next data set was 2019-2020 summative evaluation data for eight of our completers with one to three years of experience shared with us by a school district. We provided the names of our completers who were employed within the district, and the district provided us with their overall summative evaluation ratings. Four completers were teaching at the elementary level, three at the middle grades level, and one at the secondary level. Summative evaluations are completed yearly. The evaluation instrument includes ratings of *ineffective*, *developing*, *accomplished*, or *exemplary*. The rubric ratings are based on the *Kentucky Framework for Teaching*, which is a research-based

document adapted from the *Danielson Framework for Teaching* and aligned with the KTPS/InTASC Standards. The summative evaluation instrument is part of the district-wide Certified Evaluation Plan, and update training is provided yearly for all teachers and administrators to increase reliability of the data.

Completer Summative Evaluation Data Collected During the 2019-2020 Academic Year	
Completers	Overall Ratings
Completer 1	Accomplished
Completer 2	Accomplished
Completer 3	Exemplary
Completer 4	Exemplary
Completer 5	Developing
Completer 6	Accomplished
Completer 7	Accomplished
Completer 8	Exemplary

Three of the eight completers scored at the *exemplary* level, and four scored at the *accomplished* level on the summative evaluation. One completer scored at the developing level, but we did not have any completers scoring at the *ineffective* level.

The next data set provided by a school district was results from P-12 students' Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) testing (CAEP 4.1). The MAP Test, a nationally normed test from the Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA), is given three times yearly to P-12 students to measure learning progress and standards mastery in reading and math. Again, we provided the district with the names of our completers, and they shared the overall MAP data for the students taught by our completers with one to three years teaching experience. All data sharing was anonymous and did not identify any P-12 students. The data were from the same twelve completers that we received data from for the 2018-2019 Case Study; however, the P-12 students were different. Therefore, we did not make comparisons based on P-12 math and reading scores. Six completers taught at the elementary level, four at the middle grade level, and two at the secondary level. Math data for P-12 students were available for eight completers and reading data for nine completers, dependent upon the content taught. The data that we received were from the 2019-2020 academic year and compared the first administration of the MAP test in the fall with the last administration in the spring.

Comparison of 2019-2020 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	75%
% Completers with Static Mathematics Scores (= or < 2%) from Fall to Spring	25%
% 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	78%
% Completers with Static Reading Scores (= or < 2%) from Fall to Spring	0%
% Completers with Decreases in MAP Reading Scores (>2%) from Fall to Spring	22%

Note: Percentages are rounded.

Data showed that six (75%) of the eight completers' P-12 students experienced increases in MAP scores in mathematics when comparing fall to spring MAP testing results. In addition, seven (78%) of our completers' P-12 students experienced increases in MAP reading scores from fall to spring. MAP math scores remained static for two completers in math, and no completers taught P-12 students who experienced decreases in math. However, two completers' P-12 students experienced decreases for the percentage of students scoring at or above the benchmark score in reading. Therefore, based on the P-12 MAP scores, the majority of our completers with available data demonstrated a positive impact on P-12 learning as measured by MAP scores in reading and math.

Next, we analyzed survey data to help determine employee satisfaction (CAEP 4.3). The Employer Satisfaction Evaluation is a survey-type instrument administered yearly by the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness at the University of Pikeville to school administrators who have our completers teaching in their buildings. We had administered an employer satisfaction evaluation for several years; however, in 2017, we worked with our Teacher Education Committee and a panel of experts to align the instrument with the KTPS/InTASC Standards and to establish the content validity through the Lawshe Method. The top priority within our EPP is to train highly qualified candidates who are prepared to meet the professional teacher standards within P-12 classrooms. Therefore, the instrument asks school administrators to respond to how well they perceive that our completers are prepared to meet 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*). The resulting data help us determine employer satisfaction with the preparedness of our teacher preparation program completers; however, the data also indicate teaching effectiveness related to the KTPS/InTASC Standards.

Employer Satisfaction Evaluation Average Ratings for How Well the Program Prepared Completers to Meet the KTPS/InTASC Standards			
	Survey Administered Spring	2019	2020
	Response Rate	50%	62%
The Learner and Learning		3.72	3.44
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.		3.67	3.36
	Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	100%	91%
	Partially Prepared/Unprepared	0	9
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.		3.67	3.50
	Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	83%	95%
	Partially Prepared/Unprepared	17	5

<p>Standard 3. Learning environments. The teacher shall work with others to create environments that:</p> <p>a) Support individual and collaborative learning; and b) Encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.</p>	<p>3.83</p>	<p>3.45</p>
<p>Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared</p>	<p>100% 0</p>	<p>95% 5</p>
<p>Content Knowledge</p>		
<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 b) Create learning experiences that make these aspects of the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.</p>	<p>3.80</p>	<p>3.41</p>
<p>Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared</p>	<p>100% 0</p>	<p>91% 9</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>3.80</p>	<p>3.36</p>
<p>Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared</p>	<p>100% 0</p>	<p>91% 9</p>
<p>Instructional Practice</p>		
<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>3.60</p>	<p>3.36</p>
<p>Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared</p>	<p>100% 0</p>	<p>95% 5</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>3.80</p>	<p>3.41</p>
<p>Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared</p>	<p>100% 0</p>	<p>87% 13</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>3.80</p>	<p>3.45</p>
<p>Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared</p>	<p>100% 0</p>	<p>91% 9</p>
<p>Professional Responsibility</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>4.00</p>	<p>3.45</p>
<p>Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared</p>	<p>100% 0</p>	<p>91% 9</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; b) Collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth; and c) Advance the profession.</p>	<p>4.00</p>	<p>3.41</p>

	Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared	100% 0	91% 9
--	---	-----------	----------

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

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

We analyzed data from the Spring 2020 administration of the Employer Satisfaction Evaluation but included the 2019 results for comparison. This data is compiled by the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness. Responses are combined for levels 1 and 2 (unprepared and partially prepared) and for levels 3 and 4 (fully and exceptionally prepared) to facilitate data analysis. (Please see the Employer Satisfaction Evaluation Results for three cycles of data.) The response rate was 50% in 2019 but increased to 62% in 2020. In 2020, average principal ratings for the preparedness of our completers to meet the KTPS/InTASC Standards within P-12 classrooms for the *Learner and Learning* category was 3.44. For *Content Knowledge*, the average preparedness rating was 3.39. For the standards within the KTPS/InTASC category of *Instructional Practice*, the average rating was 3.41 while the average preparedness rating for *Professional Responsibility* was 3.43. Therefore, the average ratings for the four categories ranged from 3.39 to 3.44 on a 4-point scale. In addition, no standard received an average rating below 3.36, indicating that at least 91% of the principals who responded to the survey indicated that our completers were fully or exceptionally prepared to meet the KTPS/InTASC standards within P-12 classrooms

As part of our employer satisfaction data set, we also analyzed completer employment data for 2019-2020.

2019-2020 Completer Employment and Retention Data	
# Completors	% Employed Upon Graduation as Classroom Teachers in the Trained Program Areas
12	92% (11/12)
Employment Milestone and Leadership Roles for Completors	
2019-2020 Completors	There are no employment milestones or leadership roles to report because our completors are just beginning their teaching careers.
2018-2019 Completors with Leadership Roles Assumed in 2019-2020	Elementary Completer - Contact for Virtual Learning Math Consultant K-2 Elementary Completer - Kindness Club Leader, Middle School Girls Basketball Coach, Varsity Girls Basketball Assistant Coach

Note: Percentages are rounded.

Approximately 92% of our 2019 teacher education program completers were hired within a few months of graduation and assumed classroom teaching positions in Fall 2020. One of our completers took an education related job as a coach in higher education. We will continue to track employment data for our completers.

The next set of data that we analyzed was the Completer Satisfaction Evaluation that is 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. Again, our main goal is to train well-qualified preservice teachers who are prepared for P-12 classrooms; therefore, in 2017, we revised our Completer Satisfaction Evaluation to address how well the completers felt that their preparation program

prepared them for meeting the KTPS/InTASC Standards within P-12 classrooms and, therefore, positively impacting P-12 learning.

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	2019 6%	2020 61%
The Learner and Learning		2.33	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.		3.00	3.62
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared		100%	96%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared		0	4
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.		2.00	3.70
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared		0%	100%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared		100	0
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.		2.00	3.83
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared		0%	100%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared		100	0
Content Knowledge		4.00	3.74
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.		4.00	3.74
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared		100%	96%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared		0	4
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.		4.00	3.74
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared		100%	96%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared		0	4
Instructional Practice		4.00	3.70
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.		4.00	3.78
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared		100%	100%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared		0	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>4.00</p>	<p>3.61</p>	
<p>Exceptionally/Fully Prepared</p> <p>Partially Prepared/Unprepared</p>	<p>100%</p> <p>0</p>	<p>96%</p> <p>4</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>4.00</p>	<p>3.70</p>	
<p>Exceptionally/Fully Prepared</p> <p>Partially Prepared/Unprepared</p>	<p>100%</p> <p>0</p>	<p>100%</p> <p>0</p>	
Professional Responsibility		3.50	3.76
<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>3.00</p>	<p>3.78</p>	
<p>Exceptionally/Fully Prepared</p> <p>Partially Prepared/Unprepared</p>	<p>100%</p> <p>0</p>	<p>100%</p> <p>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>4.00</p>	<p>3.74</p>	
<p>Exceptionally/Fully Prepared</p> <p>Partially Prepared/Unprepared</p>	<p>100%</p> <p>0</p>	<p>100%</p> <p>0</p>	

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

Prepared by the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness, June

As presented in our 2018-2019 case study, the response rate for the Completer Satisfaction Evaluation was 6% in 2019, which was unacceptable. As a result, increasing the response rate was identified as an area of improvement for 2019-2020. Therefore, in 2020, the response rate increased significantly to 61%. The 2020 data showed an average of 3.72 for the *Learner and Learning*, 3.74 for *Content Knowledge*, 3.70 for *Instructional Practice*, and 3.76 for *Professional Responsibility*. *Fully prepared* is a level 3 and *exceptionally prepared* is a level 4; therefore, our completers indicated that their teacher preparation program *fully* or *partially prepared* for meeting the KTPS/InTASC Standards within P-12 classrooms.

Discussion of Findings and Implications for Improvement

This 2019-2020 Case Study analyzes data from multiple measure to determine program impact for meeting CAEP Standard 4. All of our completers met state requirements for certification, which included passing required Praxis exams to demonstrate both content and pedagogical knowledge. The completer data shared by school districts, which included summative evaluation data and MAP scores in reading and math, help demonstrate both teaching effectiveness and impact on P-12 learning. Approximately 88% of our completers' experienced an increase in the percentage of P-12 students scoring at or above benchmark on the MAP Test in math and 75% in reading. Summative

evaluation data from eight of our completers demonstrated one *developing*, four *accomplished*, and three *exemplary* ratings. No *ineffective* ratings were received by the eight completers. In addition, the employer satisfaction surveys demonstrated that principals are satisfied that our teacher preparation programs prepare candidates to meet the KTPS/InTASC Standards within P-12 classrooms, which relates to both teaching effectiveness and employer satisfaction. Average ratings for each of the four KTPS/InTASC categories ranged from 3.72 to 4.0, which indicate that principals were satisfied that completers were fully or exceptionally prepared. Furthermore, 83% of our 2019 completers were hired following graduation in May, which demonstrates that principals and school councils have confidence in our teacher preparation programs. Average ratings for the 2020 Completer Satisfaction Evaluation ranged from 3.72 to 3.76 for the four KTPS/InTASC categories, with 61% of the completers responding to the survey. In addition, 2020 results demonstrated that no standard was rated below 3.62, which indicated that our completers were satisfied that their preparation programs *fully or exceptionally prepared* them to implement the KTPS/InTASC Standards within P-12 classrooms.

The multiple sources of data presented in this case study provide evidence to support the positive impact of our teacher education programs through the teaching effectiveness and impact on P-12 learning of our completers, employer satisfaction with the completers' preparation programs, and completer satisfaction with their preparation programs.

Continuous Improvement Efforts

As we move toward continuous improvement of our teacher education programs, it is vital that we have data to determine our completers' teaching effectiveness and impact on P-12 learning. As stated earlier, our state no longer provides EPPs data for first-year teachers because the Kentucky Internship Program is no longer funded. Therefore, an area of improvement will be to continue to work with the school districts to share data from our completers. We have made good progress in this area, but our goal is for the process to be systematic with regular data updates.

Results from the next steps identified in the 2018-2019 Case Study and other identified areas for improvement include:

- We will continue to work on increasing survey response rates. The 2019 response rate for our Completer Satisfaction Evaluation was only 6%. After we identified this as an area for improvement, the response rate increased to 61% in 2020.
 - Next Steps
 - Continue to send reminder emails to completers asking them to please complete the Completer Satisfaction Evaluation. Our Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness administers this survey, so when our completers receive the link, they might not recognize the purpose. Therefore, sending reminder emails from education improved the response rate significantly. We will continue to do this.
- The 2018 average response rates for the 2018 Completer Satisfaction Evaluation were below 3.0 for Standards 5 and 7; however, 2020 results show an average ratings of 3.74 for Standard 5 and 3.61 for Standard 7. Standard 7: Planning for Instruction was identified as an area for improvement for 2019-2020.
 - Next Steps

- We will continue to use common lesson plan and peer teaching rubrics in all 200 and 300 level courses that require these activities. We will compile and track pre-candidate data so that we can address the identified areas of growth to prepare students for Clinical I.

Reference

Opper, I. M. (2019). Teachers matter: Understanding teachers' impact on student achievement. RAND Corporation. Accessed at *Linking teacher evaluation and student learning*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Accessed at <https://www.rand.org/education-and-labor/projects/measuring-teacher-effectiveness/teachers-matter.html>