

**University of Pikeville  
Patton College of Education**

**2020-2021 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..... 12**
  - Continuous Improvement Efforts..... 13
- Reference.....15**

## 2020-2021 Case Study of Educator Preparation Program Impact for CAEP Standard 4

### Introduction

The Patton College of Education completes a yearly mixed-method case study to help determine the impact of our initial certification teacher education programs on P-12 education related to CAEP Standard 4. We study data from multiple measures to determine completers' impact on P-12 learning, teaching effectiveness, and satisfaction of their teacher preparation programs as well as employer satisfaction of the preparation of our completers.

After exploring research on teacher quality, Goldhaber (2016) concludes that "the main way that schools affect student outcomes is through the quality of their teachers" (para. 16). Therefore, the importance of having a high-quality teacher preparation program cannot be overstated. We chose the case study method because the state does not provide us with all the data that we need to determine the teaching effectiveness of our completers.

We collaborate with surrounding school districts to share anonymous 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 the anonymous data from our completers who serve as P-12 teachers within the districts. In turn, our analysis of the data will help us strengthen our teacher education programs in training P-12 teachers. Therefore, this partnership benefits both the P-12 schools and the Education Preparation Provider (EPP). We began partnering with the school districts three years ago, so the case study process has evolved. We requested an additional set of data from daily walk-through observations both last year and this year; hence, the two case studies are parallel. Since we gather and analyze data for completers who graduated from our teacher education programs within one to three years, we consider each case study independently.

We are striving to continuously improve our teacher education programs through program evaluation and the development of next steps for improvement. The partnerships that we have with our districts are critical pieces for us to be able to accomplish this goal.

### 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, 4.4).
3. To use the resulting data for continuous improvement of the undergraduate teacher education programs (CAEP 5.4).

### Methods

#### Participants

We began reaching out to the P-12 schools/districts two years earlier, and one district and one school from another district provided us with anonymous 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. Therefore, we received data from two different districts.

The UPIKE 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. The satisfaction surveys asked the completers to rate how well their teacher preparation programs prepared them to meet the Kentucky Teacher Performance Standards (KTPS), which are congruent to the InTASC Standards, within their P-12 classrooms, and the employers are asked to rate how well our completers who work within their schools are able to meet the KTPS/InTASC Standards within the P-12 classrooms.

In addition, we analyzed data related to the percentage of our 2020-2021 completers who met licensure requirements for teacher certification and the employment data of our completers.

### Procedures

First, we determined the percentage of 2020-2021 candidates who met licensure requirements. Then, we compiled the data that were shared with us by the school and district. We were aware that the data would look different coming from two separate districts just as it was the prior year. However, we appreciated the multiplicity of data and believed that multiple types of data would prove most helpful in evaluating the quality of our teacher education programs.

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

### Data Analysis and Results

**CAEP Reporting Measure 6  
Ability of Completers to Meet Licensing (certification) and Any Additional State Requirements  
Initial Certification Teacher Education Programs**

<b>2021 Completers</b>	
<b>Preparation Program Grade Levels</b>	<b>% Met Licensure Requirement for Teacher Certification</b>
8 Elementary	100%
5 Middle Grades	80%
1 Secondary	100%

Thirteen of the fourteen 2021 completers met licensure requirements for teacher certification. All completers met state-required benchmark scores on the Praxis Core Academic Skills for Educators. One completer did not meet state-required benchmark scores on the Praxis Subject Assessments required within individual program areas. All completers met benchmark scores on the Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching. Due to repercussions from the pandemic and online testing difficulty, we approved a waiver to allow candidates to be admitted to the teacher education program without passing all the required tests. Candidates must meet all criteria for certification.

### Data from P-12 School Districts

One set of data provided by a single district resulted from administrator walkthrough observations completed in 2020-2021 for 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 possible rating.

Walkthrough Observation Data for Completers Collected During the 2020-2021 Academic Year								
Completers	Learning Targets	Authentic Engagement	Higher Level Questions	Assessment Strategies	Student Feedback	Technology Use	Classroom Environment	Total
Completer 1	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	2.0
Completer 2	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.8	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.8
Completer 3	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	3.0	2.6
Completer 4	2.5	3.0	2.5	1.5	2.5	1.5	3.0	2.4
Completer 5	3.0	2.0	1.0	2.3	3.0	1.0	3.0	2.2
Completer 6	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.9
Completer 7	3.0	2.6	2.0	2.6	2.6	2.0	3.0	2.5
Completer 8	2.3	3.0	2.5	2.6	2.6	2.3	3.0	2.6
Completer 9	3.0	2.3	2.0	2.6	2.0	1.7	3.0	2.4
Completer 10	1.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	3.0	2.1
Completer 11	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.6	3.0	3.0	2.9
Completer 12	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	3.0	2.7
Completer 13	3.0	3.0	3.0		3.0	1.0	3.0	2.7
Completer 14	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.8	1.8	3.0	2.6
Average Ratings	2.7	2.8	2.5	2.6	2.7	1.5	2.9	2.5

Nine of the fourteen completers taught at the elementary level, four at the middle grades level, and one at the secondary level. Average ratings for six of the assessed areas were between 2.5 and 2.9 on a three-point scale. The only average rating below 2.0 was a 1.5 for technology use. According to the walkthrough rubric, a level 1 indicates that students are not using technology and the teacher is the primary user. A level 2 indicates that students use technology to solve problems; therefore, an average rating of 1.5 indicates that about student use of technology was observed for about half of the completers. The average rating for classroom environment was 2.9 and a 2.8 for authentic engagement. Both learning targets and student feedback demonstrated average ratings of 2.7 while higher level questioning was 2.5. Therefore, the data from the administrator walkthroughs indicates

that the completers included in this data set are demonstrating effective teaching practices within their P-12 classrooms (CAEP 4.2).

The next data set was 2020-2021 summative evaluation data from twelve completers with one to three years of experience. Six of the completers were teaching at the elementary level, five at the middle level, and one at the secondary level. In this district, summative evaluations are completed yearly. The evaluation instrument includes ratings of *ineffective*, *developing*, *accomplished*, or *exemplary*. The rubric ratings are aligned with 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 2020-2021 Academic Year	
Completers	Overall Ratings
Completer 1	Accomplished
Completer 2	Exemplary
Completer 3	Accomplished
Completer 4	Accomplished
Completer 5	Exemplary
Completer 6	Exemplary
Completer 7	Developing
Completer 8	Exemplary
Completer 9	Accomplished
Completer 10	Accomplished
Completer 11	Accomplished
Completer 12	Accomplished

Twenty-five percent of our completers scored at the *exemplary* level, and 58% scored at the *accomplished* level. One completer (8%) scored at the *developing* level. None of our completers scored at the *ineffective* level. Therefore, summative evaluation data from the twelve completers with one to three years of experience demonstrate effective teaching practices within their P-12 classrooms (CAEP 4.2).

The next data set resulted 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. All data sharing was anonymous and did not identify any P-12 students.

Five completers taught at the elementary level and five at the middle grades level for math. Four completers taught at the elementary level and one at the middle grades level in reading. The data that we received were from the 2020-2021 academic year compared the first administration of the MAP test in the fall with the last administration in the spring. (See table below.)

<b>Comparison of 2020-2021 Beginning-of-the-Year (Fall) to End-of-the-Year (Spring) P-12 MAP Testing in Reading and Math for Completers</b>	
<b>Math</b>	
# Completers with Available Data	10
% Completers with Increases in MAP Mathematics Scores from Fall to Spring	30%
% Completers with Static Mathematics Scores (= or < 2%) from Fall to Spring	30%
% Completers with Decreases in MAP Mathematics Scores from Fall to Spring	40%
<b>Reading</b>	
# Completers with Available Data	5
% Completers with Increases in MAP Reading Scores from Fall to Spring	40%
% Completers with Static Reading Scores (= or < 2%) from Fall to Spring	20%
% Completers with Decreases in MAP Reading Scores (>2%) from Fall to Spring	40%

Note: Percentages are rounded.

Data showed that two (30%) of the nine completers' P-12 students experienced increases in MAP scores in mathematics when comparing fall to spring MAP testing results. In addition, seven (40%) of our completers' P-12 students experienced increases in MAP reading scores from fall to spring. MAP math scores remained static for three completers in math, and four completers taught P-12 students who experienced decreases in math. There were two completers' P-12 students who experienced decreases for the percentage of students scoring at or above the benchmark score in reading.

As a general note, the district cautioned us to view the scores in the context of the pandemic. Instruction was quickly pivoted online, which was not ideal for both students and teachers; therefore, we are not making any decisions about our completers' impact on P-12 learning due to the ramifications of the pandemic.

Next, we looked at the ability of our completers to be hired in education positions, which is related to CAEP Reporting Measure 7. In May 2021, we had fourteen completers. Of the fourteen completers, twelve (86%) were hired upon graduation as classroom teachers specific to their individual program licensure area. (See table below.)

**CAEP Reporting Measure 7  
Ability of Completers to be Hired in Education Positions  
Initial Certification Teacher Education Programs**

<b>2020-2021 Completer Employment and Retention Data</b>	
<b># Completers</b>	<b>% Employed Upon Graduation as Classroom Teachers in the Trained Program Areas</b>
14	86% (12/14)

Note: Percentages are rounded.

In addition, we analyzed Employer Satisfaction Evaluation data to help determine if employers were satisfied with the preparation of the teachers who were employed within their schools (CAEP 4.3). We use 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. It is the goal of our EPP to prepare highly qualified candidates who are ready to meet the professional teacher standards within P-12 classrooms. Thus, the Employer Satisfaction Evaluation instrument requests that school administrators respond to how well they perceive 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*).

For the purpose of this case study, data from the Spring 2021 administration of the Employer Satisfaction Evaluation were compared to data from the prior two years to determine growth. Data from this survey are compiled by the University Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness. Responses for levels 1 and 2 (unprepared and partially prepared) and levels 3 and 4 (fully and exceptionally prepared) are combined to facilitate data analysis. The response rate was 62% in 2020 and 63% in 2021. These percentages increased from 50% in 2019. 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, and this increased to 3.72 in 2021. For *Content Knowledge*, the average preparedness rating was 3.39 in 2020, and this increased to 3.68 in 2021. For the standards within the KTPS/InTASC category of *Instructional Practice*, the average rating was 3.41 in 2020 and 3.61 in 2021. The average preparedness rating for *Professional Responsibility* was 3.43 in 2020 and 3.63 in 2021. Therefore, the average ratings for the four categories ranged from 3.61 to 3.72 on a 4-point scale, and no standard received an average rating below 3.61 in 2021. Therefore, data demonstrate that at least 95% of the employers rate our completers as being either exceptionally or fully prepared to meet the KTPS/InTASC Standards in their P-12 classrooms. (See table below.)

**Patton College of Education University of Pikeville  
Teacher Education Program  
Employer Satisfaction Evaluation**

Survey Administered Spring	2019	2020	2021
Number of Responses	6	18	19
Response Rate	50%	62%	63%
<b>The Learner and Learning</b>	<b>3.72</b>	<b>3.44</b>	<b>3.72</b>
Standard 1. <b>Learner development.</b> 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	3.68
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	100%	91%	95%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	0	9	5
Standard 2. <b>Learning differences.</b> 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	3.74
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	83%	95%	100%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	17	5	0
Standard 3. <b>Learning environments.</b> 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.	3.83	3.45	3.74

	Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	100%	95%	100%
	Partially Prepared/Unprepared	0	5	0
<b>Content Knowledge</b>		<b>3.80</b>	<b>3.39</b>	<b>3.68</b>
Standard 4. <b>Content knowledge.</b> The teacher shall:				
a)	Understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline he or she teaches; and	3.80	3.41	3.74
b)	Create learning experiences that make these aspects of the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.			
	Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	100%	91%	100%
	Partially Prepared/Unprepared	0	9	0
Standard 5. <b>Application of content.</b> 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.				
	Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	100%	91%	95%
	Partially Prepared/Unprepared	0	9	5
<b>Instructional Practice</b>		<b>3.73</b>	<b>3.41</b>	<b>3.61</b>
Standard 6. <b>Assessment.</b> 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.				
	Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	100%	95%	95%
	Partially Prepared/Unprepared	0	5	5
	Survey Administered Spring	2019	2020	2021
Standard 7. <b>Planning for instruction.</b> 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.				
	Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	100%	87%	100%
	Partially Prepared/Unprepared	0	13	0
Standard 8. <b>Instructional strategies.</b> 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.				
	Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	100%	91%	100%
	Partially Prepared/Unprepared	0	9	0
<b>Professional Responsibility</b>		<b>4.00</b>	<b>3.43</b>	<b>3.63</b>
Standard 9. <b>Professional learning and ethical practice.</b> 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.				
	Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	100%	91%	100%
	Partially Prepared/Unprepared	0	9	0
Standard 10. <b>Leadership and collaboration.</b> The teacher shall seek appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to:				
a)	Take responsibility for student learning;	4.00	3.41	3.53
b)	Collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth; and			

c) Advance the profession.			
	Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	100%	91%
	Partially Prepared/Unprepared	0	9

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

Prepared by the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness, June

Finally, we analyzed data from the Completer Satisfaction Evaluation. This survey-type instrument is administered annually by the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness at the University of Pikeville (CAEP 4.4). 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.

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% and remained at 61% in 2021. The survey data showed an average of 3.72 for the standards related to the *Learner and Learning* in 2020 and an average of 3.53 in 2021. For the standards related to *Content Knowledge*, the average was 3.74 in 2020 and 3.60 in 2021. Average ratings for *Instructional Practice* were 3.70 in 2020 and 3.45 in 2021. For the standards related to Professional Responsibility, the average was 3.76 in 2020 and 3.60 in 2021. All the ratings are based on a 4-point scale with 4 being the highest possible rating. Although there was a slight decrease in ratings from 2020 to 2021, all ratings were at or above 3.36 for all standards, which indicates the satisfaction of our completer with their educator preparation program.

**Patton College of Education University of Pikeville  
Teacher Education Program  
Completer Satisfaction Evaluation**

Survey Administered Spring	2019	2020	2021
Number of Responses	1	23	25
Response Rate	6%	61%	61%
<b>The Learner and Learning</b>	<b>2.33</b>	<b>3.72</b>	<b>3.53</b>
<b>Standard 1. Learner development.</b> 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.	<b>3.00</b>	<b>3.62</b>	<b>3.52</b>
	Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	100%	96%
	Partially Prepared/Unprepared	0	4
<b>Standard 2. Learning differences.</b> 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.	<b>2.00</b>	<b>3.70</b>	<b>3.44</b>
	Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	0%	100%
			96%

Partially Prepared/Unprepared	100	0	4
<b>Standard 3. Learning environments.</b> The teacher shall work with others to create environments that: c) Support individual and collaborative learning; and d) Encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.	<b>2.00</b>	<b>3.83</b>	<b>3.64</b>
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	0%	100%	100%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	100	0	0
<b>Content Knowledge</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>3.74</b>	<b>3.60</b>
<b>Standard 4. Content knowledge.</b> The teacher shall: c) Understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline he or she teaches; and d) Create learning experiences that make these aspects of the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.	<b>4.00</b>	<b>3.74</b>	<b>3.64</b>
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	100%	96%	100%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	0	4	0
<b>Standard 5. Application of content.</b> 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.	<b>4.00</b>	<b>3.74</b>	<b>3.56</b>
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	100%	96%	100%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	0	4	0
<b>Instructional Practice</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>3.70</b>	<b>3.45</b>
<b>Standard 6. Assessment.</b> 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.	<b>4.00</b>	<b>3.78</b>	<b>3.56</b>
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	100%	100%	96%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	0	0	4
<b>Standard 7. Planning for instruction.</b> 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.	<b>4.00</b>	<b>3.61</b>	<b>3.36</b>
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	100%	96%	92%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	0	4	8
<b>Standard 8. Instructional strategies.</b> 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.	<b>4.00</b>	<b>3.70</b>	<b>3.44</b>
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	100%	100%	96%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	0	0	4
<b>Professional Responsibility</b>	<b>3.50</b>	<b>3.76</b>	<b>3.60</b>

<b>Standard 9. Professional learning and ethical practice.</b> 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.	<b>3.00</b>	<b>3.78</b>	<b>3.64</b>
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	100%	100%	100%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	0	0	0
<b>Standard 10. Leadership and collaboration.</b> The teacher shall seek appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to: d) Take responsibility for student learning; e) Collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth; and f) Advance the profession.	<b>4.00</b>	<b>3.74</b>	<b>3.56</b>
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	100%	100%	96%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	0	0	4

### Discussion of Findings and Implications for Improvement

The 2020-2021 Case Study examines data from multiple measure to determine program impact for meeting CAEP Standard 4. All our completers except one middle grades candidate met state requirements for certification, and this included passing required Praxis exams to demonstrate both content and pedagogical knowledge. Completer data shared by the school districts included overall MAP average scores in reading and mathematics as well as summative evaluation data, which were analyzed to determine teaching effectiveness and impact on P-12 student learning. Approximately 30% of the P-12 students taught by our completers demonstrated average score improvements in MAP math scores, and 40% demonstrated average score improvements in MAP reading. Conversely, 40% in both MAP math and reading showed average score declines. The school districts cautioned us to analyze this data while keeping in mind that this was not a normal year due to the pandemic.

Summative evaluation data from twelve of our completers demonstrated one *developing*, seven *accomplished*, and four *exemplary* ratings. No *ineffective* ratings were received by the twelve completers. Walk through observation data showed an average of 2.7 for learning targets, 2.8 for authentic engagement, 2.5 for higher level questioning, 2.6 for assessment, 2.7 for student feedback, 1.5 for technology use, and 2.9 for classroom environment. The walk-through observation ratings were based on a 3-point scale with 3 being the highest possible rating. The only rating below 2.5 was the average rating of 1.5 for technology use. We have recently made some instructional changes to EDU 205 Technology in Education, which is required of all education students. Hopefully, we will see an increase in the average rating for technology use based upon these changes. Therefore, both summative evaluation data and walk-through observation data demonstrate the teaching effectiveness of our completers.

Data from the Employer Satisfaction Evaluation (survey) indicate that most principals are satisfied that our teacher preparation programs prepare our completers to meet the KTPS/InTASC

Standards within P-12 classrooms. Also, employer satisfaction data provide additional support to demonstrate the teaching effectiveness of our completers since the instrument is aligned to the KTPS/InTASC Standards. In 2021, we had a 63% response rate on this survey. Average ratings for each of the four KTPS/InTASC categories ranged from 3.61 to 3.72 on a four-point scale with four being the highest possible rating, which indicated that most principals were satisfied that completers were *fully or exceptionally prepared*. In addition, 86% of our 2021 completers were hired following graduation in May, which reveals that principals and school councils have confidence in our teacher preparation programs in preparing teacher education candidates for teaching P-12 teaching.

In 2021, we had a 61% response rate for our Completer Satisfaction Evaluation (survey). Average ratings for the 2021 Completer Satisfaction Evaluation ranged from 3.45 to 3.60 on a four-point scale for the four KTPS/InTASC categories, which indicated that most completers believed that our teacher education programs *exceptionally or fully prepared* them for their P-12 teaching jobs.

Thus, the data analysis supported the premise that our completers teach effectively and positively impact P-12 learning. In addition, completer and employer data indicate satisfaction with our teacher preparation programs.

### **Continuous Improvement Efforts**

Using the results from our 2020-2021 Case Study to determine our completers' teaching effectiveness and impact on P-12 learning as well as completer and employer satisfaction, we focused on developing next steps for improvement. Since we receive no data from our state for first-year teachers, we will continue the work with our partner schools and districts to obtain data from our completers who have been teaching from one to three year. As evidenced in our 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 Case Studies, we have made adequate progress in this area, but we realize that there is more work to accomplish in this area.

Results from the next steps identified in the 2019-2020 Case Study and additional areas identified by the results from our 2020-2021 Case Study were used to develop our next steps. A general overview of our next steps is given here, but a more detailed plan can be found in our Goal Action Plan, which we update yearly.

- We will continue working to increase 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 and 2021.
  - 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 a reminder email from education improved the response rate significantly. We will continue to do this.
- The average ratings for the Completer Satisfaction Evaluations were 3.61 in 2020 and 3.36 in 2021 for Standard 7: *Planning for Instruction*. In addition, the average rating for Standard 8: *Instructional Strategies* was 3.44. Although these ratings were

based on a four-point scale with four being the highest possible rating, we decided to target scores below 3.5 as areas for improvement.

▪ 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.
- Teacher candidates will demonstrate understanding of equitable access to learning for every student and will demonstrate understanding of the differences among standards, curriculum, and high-quality instructional resources.
- Teacher candidates will be able to navigate the <https://kystandards.org/> website and will use the standards resources, general resources, and content area resources to effectively plan and implement P-12 instruction using the Explicit Instruction Model and aligned with the Kentucky Academic Standards.
- Teacher candidates at both the undergraduate and graduate levels will demonstrate that they can plan and teach lessons that incorporate differentiation to meet the needs of diverse learners, higher-level questioning, student use of technology, and a variety of high-quality instructional resources (HQIRs) that go beyond the textbook.
- We will provide authentic teaching experiences for our pre-candidates and candidates through our P-12 model classroom.

## Reference

- D. Goldhaber (2016, February 3). In schools, teacher quality matters most. *Education Next*, 16(2).  
<https://www.educationnext.org/in-schools-teacher-quality-matters-most-coleman/>