

**University of Pikeville  
Patton College of  
Education**

**2024-2025 Case Study of Educator Preparation  
Program Impact for CAEP Standard R4**

**Completed in 2025-2026**

# Table of Contents

- Introduction ..... 3
  - Purpose of the Study ..... 4
- Methods ..... 4
  - Participants ..... 4
  - Procedures ..... 4
  - Data Analysis and Results..... 5
- Discussion of Findings and Implications for Improvement .....17
  - Continuous Improvement Efforts..... 18
- Reference ..... 22

## 2024-2025 Case Study of Educator Preparation Program Impact for CAEP Standard R4

### Introduction

The Patton College of Education completes an in-depth yearly case study to examine completer data related to teaching effectiveness and impact on P-12 learning. We also analyze both completer and employer satisfaction data during the case study process to provide additional evidence for R4. Therefore, the yearly case study involves the analyses of completer data from multiple sources to assess the efficacy of our initial teacher certification programs and to use the results to drive continuous improvement efforts. The completion of the case study provides us with valuable insight as we move forward to meet the learning needs of our education students and to promote the success of our teacher education programs.

The Executive Summary from the extensive report, *Evaluating and Improving Teacher Preparation Program (2025)* states, “In addition to examining TPP [teacher preparation program] features, there has been a significant emphasis in recent years on **outcome measures** that attempt to gauge TPP graduates’ preparedness, entry, and retention in teaching; ability to engage in effective practice; and influence in raising student achievement” (p. 20). We believe the time and effort that we spend completing our yearly case study is beneficial in helping us determine the preparedness of our completers to positively impact P-12 student learning. In addition, the findings of the case study help guide needed changes as we strive to provide high-quality teacher preparation programs that result in well-trained teachers.

The Executive Summary from *Evaluating and Improving Teacher Preparation (2025)* goes on to say, “Program coherence and alignment rest within well-defined standards and a strong common understanding of high-quality teaching that is grounded in the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of human learning and development, including the cultural foundations of learning” (Feature 1, p. 14). All of our assessment measures are aligned to the Kentucky Teacher Performance/InTASC Standards, and the Clinical I and II Teacher Performance Assessments are also aligned to the *Kentucky Framework for Teaching*, which was adapted for Kentucky from the research-based *Danielson Framework for Teaching*.

It is a priority to evaluate our instructional program through the preparedness of our completers, but we do not receive completer data from our state. To address this issue, we have developed close partnerships with our surrounding school districts that provide us with anonymous data to help us evaluate the preparedness of our completers related to teaching effectiveness and impact on P-12 learning. Accordingly, the completion of our yearly case study has supported our continuous improvement endeavors. We completed our first case study in 2018-2019; however, the process has evolved as we have made adjustments based on the availability of anonymous data. As a result, we ask that each case study be looked at independently. However, it should also be noted that we have used the same basic processes for each case study, and we have conducted each case study for the same basic purposes, which is to improve our initial certification teacher education programs.

The Patton College of Education focuses on continuous improvement, which includes the analyses of numerous sources of data, and this case study is an integral part of that process. We genuinely appreciate the partnerships that we have with our P-12 districts and schools to help us assess the effectiveness of our initial teacher certification programs in preparing our completers for P-12 schools and classrooms.

### **Purpose of the Study**

1. To collect and analyze data to determine if our initial certification teacher education program completers effectively contribute to P-12 student-learning growth (CAEP R4.1).
2. To collect and analyze data to determine if our initial certification teacher education program completers apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve (CAEP R4.1)
3. To collect and analyze data to determine if employers are satisfied with our completers' preparation for their assigned responsibilities in working with diverse P-12 students and their families (CAEP R4.2).
4. To collect and analyze data to determine if our completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they encounter on the job and that their preparation was effective (CAEP R4.3).
5. To use the case study results for the continuous improvement of our initial certification teacher education programs (CAEP R5.4).

## **Methods**

### **Participants**

Completers with up to three years of teaching experience were included in this case study. Since data analyses includes data from completers from the previous three years, we do not formally make comparisons of data from past case studies other than the process of looking for ongoing trends in the data. Thus, because data collection and analyses are from completers over a three-year period, each case study is separate and focuses mainly on the analyses of data gathered during each academic year.

We had eighteen initial certification teacher education program completers in 2024-2025, and all eighteen completers met criteria for state licensure. All eighteen completers successfully finished the teacher certification process and became certified teachers.

### **Procedures**

First, we analyzed the data from our 2024-2025 completers to determine candidate competency at program completion and successive employment in teaching jobs relevant to their teacher preparation program. This process was completed by using the percentage of completers who met teacher licensure requirements within their certification areas and were employed as classroom teachers.

Second, we examined the anonymous completer data provided by the districts for completers with up to three years of teaching experience. The anonymous data resulted from summative evaluations from two school districts that hire our completers. Although the data were gathered during the 2024-2025 academic year, it included data from our completers with one to three years of teaching experience, which included our 2022, 2023, and 2024 completers. Data from the 2025 completers could not be included in this step because they were not teaching during the 2024-2025 academic year. In addition, the anonymous data were obtained from completers at the elementary, middle, and secondary levels and across multiple content areas.

Next, we looked at the anonymous reading data resulting from the MAP test from students being taught by our completers with one-to-three years of experience in one of the districts who shared the anonymous data. To analyze this data, we made comparisons between student scores in reading from the beginning of the year (fall) to the end of the year (spring).

After examining the MAP data, we analyzed our employer satisfaction data. Our employer satisfaction evaluation is aligned specifically to the KTPS/InTASC Standards; therefore, the data that reflected completer performance related to *instructional practice* and *knowledge of content* was considered an additional source of data to demonstrate the teaching effectiveness of our completers. In addition, we analyzed our completer satisfaction data to help determine completer perceptions related to the preparedness for their job responsibilities in P-12 classrooms.

Finally, we used the results of our case study to help us establish next steps for continuous improvement, which is our top priority. We created a yearly Goal Action Plan (GAP) that directs the continuous improvement efforts for our teacher preparation programs. We monitor the implementation of the GAP through regular progress reports from our faculty leads identified in our plan.

## **Data Analysis and Results**

### ***Data to Demonstrate Candidate Competency and Employment at Program Completion***

All eighteen of our 2025 completers met licensure requirements for teacher certification in Kentucky. Therefore, all eighteen completers successfully met state-required benchmark scores on the Praxis Core Academic Skills for Educators and/or the ACT in reading, writing, and mathematics. In addition, all eighteen demonstrated the required content knowledge by meeting state-required benchmark scores on the Praxis Subject Assessments for their certification areas. Finally, all eighteen completers demonstrated pedagogical knowledge by meeting state-required benchmark scores on the Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching. Therefore, all eighteen completers were qualified to be employed in teaching positions for which they were certified. Approximately 89% of our completers were employed as classroom teachers upon graduation. (See Table 1 below.)

Table 1

2025 Completers Candidacy Competency at Program Completion	
Preparation Program Grade Levels	% Met Licensure Requirement for Teacher Certification
9 Elementary	100%
5 Middle Grades	100%
4 Secondary	100%
2025 Completer Employment Data Ability of Completers to be Hired in Education Positions for Which They Have Prepared	
# Completers	% Employed Upon Graduation as Classroom Teachers in the Trained Program Areas
16	89% (16/18)

#### ***Completer Data from P-12 for CAEP Standard R4.1***

**Anonymous Summative Evaluation Data.** Anonymous summative evaluation data for eighteen of our completers with one to three years of teaching experience are demonstrated below in Table 2. Anonymous data were collected during the 2024-2025 academic year. Approximately 50% of the data were from completers who taught at the elementary level, 33% from completers who taught at the middle grades level, and 17% from completers who taught at the secondary level. Of the middle grades completers, two were reported as teachers of science, two as teachers of social studies, and two as teachers of math. Of the secondary completers, one was reported as a teacher of English and two as teachers of social studies. Therefore, the summative evaluation data reflected a wide range of content areas and grade levels although the content areas are not identified in the table below due to the limited number of completers in certain content areas and data reporting limitations strictly adhered to by the districts and the Patton College of Education.

Although there were slight differences in the teacher evaluation instruments from multiple districts, the possible ratings were the same: 1) *ineffective*, 2) *developing*, 3) *accomplished*, or 4) *exemplary*. The instruments were aligned with the *Kentucky Framework for Teaching (KyFFT)*, a research-based document adapted for Kentucky from the *Danielson Framework for Teaching*. The areas of evaluation included *planning/preparation*, *learning environment*, *instruction*, and *professionalism*. The completers with one-to-three years of experience were evaluated according to the district's Certified Evaluation Plan by the school administrators. Each district is required to complete yearly Certified Evaluation Training to support reliability of data. Thus, although the data were anonymous and not tracked to specific completers, the

data provided both a valid and reliable means for us to help determine the teaching effectiveness of our completers.

**Table 2**

Completers	Grade Level and Content	Summative Evaluation Overall Ratings
Completer 1	Middle Grades	Accomplished
Completer 2	Middle Grades	Accomplished
Completer 3	Elementary	Exemplary
Completer 4	Elementary	Developing
Completer 5	Elementary	Exemplary
Completer 6	Elementary	Exemplary
Completer 7	Elementary	Accomplished
Completer 8	Secondary	Exemplary
Completer 9	Middle Grades	Accomplished
Completer 10	Elementary	Exemplary
Completer 11	Elementary	Accomplished
Completer 12	Middle Grades	Developing
Completer 13	Middle Grades	Accomplished
Completer 14	Middle Grades	Exemplary
Completer 15	Elementary	Accomplished
Completer 16	Secondary	Developing
Completer 17	Secondary	Accomplished
Completer 18	Elementary	Exemplary

The anonymous summative evaluation data (Table 2) showed that 0% of our completers with one-to-three years of experience scored at the *ineffective* level while approximately 17% were rated at the *developing* level, approximately 44% at the *accomplished* level, and approximately 39% at the *exemplary* level. Therefore, approximately 83% of the eighteen completers with one-to-three years of teaching experience were rated as either *accomplished* or *exemplary* on their summative evaluations. As stated earlier, the summative evaluations are aligned with the research-based *Kentucky Framework for Teaching*. The evaluations are completed by school administrators who have received update training on the Certified Evaluation Plan Process; therefore, we concluded that based on the summative evaluation data, our completers demonstrated teaching effectiveness related to *planning/preparation, the learning environment, instruction, and professionalism*. (CAEP R4.1)

**Anonymous Walkthrough Data.** For the 2024-2025 academic year, we were able to obtain anonymous walkthrough data for sixteen completers with one-to-three years of experience. The walkthrough evaluation instrument was co-developed by administrators at the district level and focused on the following areas of teaching:

- learning targets posted and reviewed with students (KTPS/InTASC *Instructional Practice*)
- authentic engagement in learning (KTPS/InTASC the *Learner and Learning* and *Instructional Practice*)
- higher level questioning (KTPS/InTASC the *Learner and Learning* and *Instructional Practice*)
- assessment strategies (KTPS/InTASC *Instructional Practice*)
- student feedback (KTPS/InTASC the *Learner and Learning* and *Instructional Practice*)
- technology use (KTPS/InTASC the *Learner and Learning* and *Instructional Practice*)
- classroom environment (KTPS/InTASC the *Learner and Learning*) along with an overall rating

The instrument contained a rubric for each with ratings that ranged from levels 0 to 3 with level 3 being the highest possible rating. This data is particularly helpful in determining the teaching effectiveness of our completers as school administrators complete their walkthrough observations of classroom teachers. Table 3 shows the average ratings for each area for all sixteen completers and the overall average ratings for each area.

Data analysis demonstrated average ratings ranging from 2.5 to 2.9 in six of the seven areas, and *classroom environment* received the highest average rating of 2.9 from a possible 3.0. The average rating for *technology use* was 1.7, which was the lowest rating. Based on the results, our sixteen completers with one-to-three years demonstrated effective teaching skills related to posting and reviewing *learning targets* with students, *authentically engaging students in learning*, using *higher level questions*, using effective *assessment strategies*, providing *student feedback*, and creating an effective *classroom environment*. While *technology use* was the lowest average rating at 1.7 from a possible rating of 3.0, five of the sixteen completers received ratings of 2.0 or higher, and no completer received an average rating below 1.2. However, we will target *technology use* as an area of growth for our instructional program.

**Table 3**

Completers	Learning Targets	Authentic Engagement	Higher Level Questions	Assessment Strategies	Student Feedback	Technology Use	Classroom Environment
Completer 1	2.4	2.6	2.4	2.6	2.7	1.5	3.0
Completer 2	2.5	2.6	2.2	2.4	2.7	2.1	2.9
Completer 3	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.8	2.9	1.6	3.0
Completer 4	2.7	3.0	2.7	3.0	3.0	1.7	3.0
Completer 5	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.8	1.6	2.9
Completer 6	2.8	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.8	1.8	3.0
Completer 7	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0
Completer 8	2.5	2.6	2.1	2.4	2.7	2.2	2.9
Completer 9	2.4	2.1	1.9	1.8	2.1	1.2	3.0
Completer 10	2.7	2.6	2.3	2.7	2.8	1.5	3.0

Completer 11	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0
Completer 12	2.1	2.7	2.6	1.9	2.4	1.8	2.8
Completer 13	2.5	2.3	2.2	2.1	2.8	1.3	3.0
Completer 14	2.4	2.2	1.6	2.1	2.2	1.4	2.7
Completer 15	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0
Completer 16	1.9	2.2	2.0	2.1	2.5	1.6	2.9
<b>Average Ratings</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>2.9</b>

**Anonymous Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) Assessment Data.** Table 4 demonstrates overall P-12 student data from the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) Assessment in Reading. The MAP is a nationally normed assessment from the Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA). It was administered three times during the academic year by one of the school districts to determine learning progress in reading. All shared data were anonymous and did not identify any P-12 students of our completers. Fourteen of our completers from 2022, 2023, and 2024 were included in this part of our study.

**Table 4**

<b>Comparison of 2024-2025 Beginning-of-the-Year (Fall) to End-of-the-Year (Spring) P-12 MAP Testing in Reading for Completors from 2022, 2023, and 2024</b>	
<b>Reading</b>	
# Completors with Available MAP Reading Data	14
% Completors with Increases in MAP Reading Scores from Fall to Spring	93%
% Completors with No Change in MAP Reading Scores from Fall to Spring	0%
% Completors with Decreases in MAP Reading Scores from Fall to Spring	7%

Note: Percentages are rounded.

Reading data from the MAP test indicate that approximately 93% of our completors experienced increases in the percentage of students who met or exceeded benchmark scores while approximately 7% experienced decreases in the percentage of students who met or exceeded benchmark scores from fall to spring. Therefore, based on the anonymous 2024-2025 MAP test data in reading, we surmised that approximately 93% of our completors who were included in this part of the study positively impacted P-12 student learning.

#### **Completer Data Related to Employer Satisfaction for CAEP Standard R4.2**

**Employer Satisfaction Evaluation Data.** Next, we analyzed employer satisfaction evaluation data. Data shown in Table 5 below resulted from surveys administered in 2023, 2024, and 2025. While we did make data comparisons among the three years of data, our analysis primarily focused on the 2025 survey results. The response rates were 87% in 2023, 62% in 2024, and 68% in 2025. Approximately 52% of the responses were from employers at the elementary level, 30% were from the middle level, and 19% were from employers at the secondary level for the 2025 survey; therefore, results were from employers across all grade

levels. Because our subgroups were so small for the middle and secondary content areas, it was not possible for us to relate the data to specific content areas. Overall, the employer satisfaction data for most of the standards demonstrated only minor fluctuations for the past three years with a slight dip from 2023 to 2024 and a slight increase from 2024 to 2025 for employer satisfaction with completer preparedness to meet the KTPS/InTASC Standards in their P-12 schools and classrooms. We believe that the relative stability of the data reflects the consistency of our instructional program.

Our employer satisfaction survey instrument was fully aligned with the KTPS/InTASC Standards and resulted in precise data related to how well the employers perceive that our completers were prepared for their job responsibilities relative to the following areas: 1) *Learner and Learning*, 2) *Content Knowledge*, 3) *Instructional Practice*, and 4) *Professional Responsibilities*. Therefore, we use the data to determine both employer satisfaction as well as teaching effectiveness for specific indicators.

Detailed directions for completing the survey are provided for the employers to help ensure reliable data. To complete the 2025 survey, we asked employers to rate the completers' preparedness using the ratings of *exceptionally prepared* (exemplary-level 4), *fully prepared* (accomplished-level 3), *partially prepared* (developing-level 2), or *unprepared* (ineffective-level 1). Thus, completers were rated on a scale of 1-4 with 4 being the highest possible rating.

While the survey data demonstrated employer satisfaction, we strongly believe that since this instrument is fully aligned with the KTPS/InTASC Standards, the ratings related to specific standards can also provide us with data related to teaching effectiveness. Employer satisfaction average ratings for preparedness to implement KTPS/InTASC Standards 1 and 3 for the *Learner and Learning* demonstrated increases from 2024 to 2025 and remained static for KTPS/InTASC Standard 2. All average ratings for standards 1-3 were above 3.0 on a 4-point scale with standard 1 receiving an average rating of 3.33, standard 2 an average rating of 3.30, and standard 4 a rating of 3.48 in 2025. For the 2025 survey, approximately 89% of the employers who responded to the survey rated the preparedness of our completers as either *exceptionally* and *fully prepared* to meet standards 1 and 2, and 96% rated the same for standard 3. Therefore, based on the survey responses, the majority of employers who responded to the survey were satisfied that our completers were well prepared to meet KTPS/InTASC Standards 1-3 in their P-12 classrooms.

The employer satisfaction average ratings for preparedness to meet KTPS/InTASC Standards 4 and 5 related to *Content Knowledge* increased from 2024 to 2025. For the 2025 survey, the average rating for standard 4 was 3.41 and 3.30 for standard 5. In addition, approximately 89% of the employers who responded to the survey rated the preparedness of our completers as either *exceptionally* or *fully prepared* to meet standard 4 while approximately 85% rated our completers at the same level for Standard 5. Therefore, based on survey responses, the majority of employers who responded to the survey were satisfied that our completers were well prepared to meet KTPS/InTASC Standards 4 and 5 in their P-12 classrooms.

Employer satisfaction average ratings for completer preparedness to meet KTPS/InTASC Standards 6, 7, and 8 related to *Instructional Practice* increased from 2024 to 2025. For the

2025 survey, average ratings were 3.15 for standard 6, 3.26 for standard 7, and 3.19 for standard 8. In addition, approximately 81% of the employers who responded to the survey indicated that our completers were either *exceptionally* or *fully prepared* to meet standards 6 and 7, and 78% reported the same for standard 8. Therefore, based on the survey responses, the majority of employers who responded to the survey indicated their satisfaction related to the preparedness of our completers to meet standards 6, 7, and 8 in their P-12 classrooms.

Employer satisfaction average ratings for completer preparedness related to KTPS/InTASC Standards 9 and 10 related to *Professional Responsibility* increased from 2024 to 2025. According to the 2025 survey results, the average rating for preparedness to meet standard 9 was 3.59, and for standard 10, it was 3.41. In addition, approximately 96% of the employers indicated that our completers were either *exceptionally* or *fully prepared* to meet standard 9, and 86% reported the same for standard 10. Therefore, based on the survey responses, the majority of employers who responded to the survey were satisfied that our completers were well prepared to meet standards 9 and 10 in their P-12 schools and classrooms.

Overall, average ratings for the 2025 survey from employers showed from 78% to 96% of employers indicated that our completers were *exceptionally* or *fully prepared* to meet all 10 KTPS/InTASC Standards in their P-12 schools and classrooms. Preparedness for KTPS/InTASC Standard 9 related to professional learning and ethical practice received the highest average rating and the lowest average rating was for KTPS/InTASC Standard 8 related to *instructional strategies*. However, even for the standard 8, approximately 78% of the employers who responded to the survey rated our completers as exceptionally or fully prepared to meet this standard. Therefore, average ratings were high across all standards.

We believe that the survey demonstrated not only employer satisfaction with the preparedness levels of our completers but the teaching effectiveness of our completers since the survey is aligned to the KTPS/InTASC Standards, specifically for standards 1-8 related to the *learner and learning, content knowledge, and instructional practice*. If our completers were not demonstrating knowledge in the identified areas, then it would seem illogical that their employers would indicate their satisfaction levels with our completers as *exceptionally* or *fully prepared* to meet those standards within their P-12 classroom.

**Table 5**

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

Survey Administered Spring	2023	2024	2025
Response Rate	87%	62%	68%
<b>The Learner and Learning</b>	<b>3.27</b>	<b>3.24</b>	<b>3.37</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,	<b>3.25</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>3.33</b>

and physical areas, and shall design and shall implement developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.			
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	86%	86%	89%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	14%	14%	11%
<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>3.30</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>3.30</b>
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	100%	86%	89%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	0%	14%	11%
<b>Standard 3. 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.	<b>3.25</b>	<b>3.33</b>	<b>3.48</b>
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	86%	90%	96%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	14%	10%	4%
<b>Content Knowledge</b>	<b>3.23</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>3.35</b>
<b>Standard 4. Content knowledge.</b> 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.	<b>3.20</b>	<b>3.33</b>	<b>3.41</b>
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	86%	95%	89%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	14%	5%	11%
<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>3.25</b>	<b>3.05</b>	<b>3.30</b>
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	86%	81%	85%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	14%	19%	15%
<b>Instructional Practice</b>	<b>3.14</b>	<b>3.05</b>	<b>3.20</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>3.05</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>3.15</b>
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	71%	76%	81%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	29%	24%	19%
<b>Standard 7. Planning for instruction.</b> The teacher shall plan instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon	<b>3.15</b>	<b>3.10</b>	<b>3.26</b>

knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.			
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	71%	96%	81%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	29%	4%	11%
<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>3.23</b>	<b>3.05</b>	<b>3.19</b>
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	71%	81%	78%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	29%	19%	22%
<b>Professional Responsibility</b>	<b>3.45</b>	<b>3.29</b>	<b>3.50</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>3.45</b>	<b>3.29</b>	<b>3.59</b>
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	100%	95%	96%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	0%	5%	4%
<b>Standard 10. Leadership and collaboration.</b> The teacher shall seek appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Take responsibility for student learning;</li> <li>b) Collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth; and</li> <li>c) Advance the profession.</li> </ul>	<b>3.45</b>	<b>3.29</b>	<b>3.41</b>
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	100%	86%	89%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	0%	14%	11%

### **Completer Data Related to Completer Satisfaction for CAEP Standard R4.3**

**Completer Satisfaction Evaluation Data.** Completer satisfaction data were obtained through a survey that was sent to our completers with one-to-three years of experience during the 2023, 2024, and 2025 academic years. Table 6 displays the results of the survey for all three years. Approximately 59% of the completers who responded to the survey taught at the elementary level, 22% at the middle grades level, and 19% at the secondary level. Therefore, survey results were received from completers across all grade levels. Specific content areas cannot be identified due to the small numbers of completers at the middle grades and secondary levels.

The survey asked the completers to indicate their level of preparedness to meet the KTSP/InTASC Standards in their P-12 schools and classrooms using the following ratings: *exceptionally prepared* (exemplary-level 4), *fully prepared* (accomplished-level 3), *partially prepared* (developing-level 2), or *unprepared* (ineffective). The response rates were 71% in 2023, 60% in 2024, and 55% in 2025. The Patton College of Education strongly believes that we must prepare our teacher candidates to meet these standards; therefore, it was important to align the survey accordingly. There were only minor fluctuations over the past three years related to most of

the KTPS/InTASC Standards, which we believe indicated the consistency of our instructional program in preparing our preservice teachers to meet the standards.

Average ratings for KTPS/InTASC Standards 1-3 related to the *learner and learning* have been above 3.0 on a 4-point scale, with 4.0 being the highest possible rating, for the past three years. In addition, 96% of our completers who participated in the survey in 2025 responded that they were either *exceptionally or fully prepared* to meet standard 1, *learner development*. For standard 2, *learning differences*, 84% in 2024 and 85% in 2025 indicated preparation at the same level, and 100% of the respondents in both 2024 and 2025 indicated *exceptionally or fully prepared* for standard 3, *learning environments*. Percentages from the 2023 survey were slightly lower with 83%, 70%, and 91% respectively for being *exceptionally or fully prepared* to implement standards 1-3 within their classrooms. Although the percentages from 2023 were slightly lower, they still indicated strong satisfaction levels for our completers, and the slight increase that occurred in 2024 and 2025 provided support for our ongoing continuous improvement efforts.

For KTPS/InTASC Standards 4 and 5, related to *content knowledge*, 96% of the completers who responded to the survey in both 2024 and 2025 indicated that they felt either *exceptionally or fully prepared* to meet standard 4, *content knowledge*, which increased from 83% in 2023. Average ratings ranged from 3.30 in 2023 to 3.64 in 2024, and 3.52 in 2025. Again, ratings were based on a 4-point scale with 4.0 being the highest possible rating. 100% of the completers who responded to the completer satisfaction survey in 2025 indicated that they were *exceptionally or fully prepared* to meet standard 5, *application of content*, compared to 91% in 2023 and 92% in 2024.

For KTPS/InTASC Standards 6, 7, and 8, related to *instructional practice*, 89% of the completers who responded to the 2025 survey indicated that they were *exceptionally or fully prepared* to meet standard 6, *assessment*, in their P-12 classrooms compared to 96% in 2024 and 87% in 2023. Approximately 93% indicated that they were *exceptionally or fully prepared* to meet standard 7, *planning for instruction*, in 2025 compared to 96% in 2024 and 78% in 2023. Approximately 93% of the completers who responded to the survey reported that they were either *exceptionally or fully prepared* to meet standard 8, *instructional strategies*, in 2025 compared to 100% in 2024 and 91% in 2023. Overall average ratings for KTPS/InTASC Instructional Practice (standards 6, 7, and 8) were 3.24 in 2023, 3.56 in 2024, and 3.43 in 2025.

For KTPS/InTASC Standards 9 and 10, related to *professional responsibility*, approximately 85% of the completers who responded to the 2025 survey indicated that they were either *exceptionally or fully prepared* to meet standard 9, *professional learning and ethical practice*, in their schools and classrooms compared to 100% in both 2023 and 2024. Approximately 96% of the completers indicated that they were either *exceptionally or fully prepared* to meet standard 10, *leadership and collaboration*, compared to 100% in 2023 and 2024. Average ratings for KTPS/InTASC Professional Responsibility (standards 9 and 10) were 3.57 in 2023, 3.72 in 2024, and 3.52 in 2025.

Overall, the 2025 survey results demonstrated that from 85% to 100% of our completers were satisfied that their teacher preparation program prepared them to meet the KTPS/InTASC Standards in their classrooms and schools. In addition, the 2023 and 2024 survey data demonstrated similar results. Standard 2, *learning differences*, at 3.37 and standard 6, *assessment*, at 3.41 received the

lowest average ratings in 2025; however, the average completer satisfaction ratings remained high in those areas.

We strongly feel that training teachers to meet the KTPS/InTASC Standards is a vital part of our mission. Therefore, we gain valuable data to support our instructional program when our completers indicate satisfaction with their teacher preparation program in preparing them to meet those standards within their P-12 schools and classrooms. We plan to continue surveying our completers yearly to help drive our continuous improvement efforts as we strive to meet the learning needs of our teacher candidates.

**Table 6**

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

Survey Administered Spring	2023	2024	2025
Response Rate	71%	60%	55%
<b>The Learner and Learning</b>	<b>3.09</b>	<b>3.44</b>	<b>3.47</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>3.13</b>	<b>3.48</b>	<b>3.37</b>
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	83%	96%	93%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	17%	4%	7%
<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>2.83</b>	<b>3.32</b>	<b>3.37</b>
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	70%	84%	85%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	30%	16%	15%
<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>3.30</b>	<b>3.52</b>	<b>3.67</b>
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	91%	100%	100%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	9%	0%	0%
<b>Content Knowledge</b>	<b>3.28</b>	<b>3.54</b>	<b>3.52</b>
<b>Standard 4. Content knowledge.</b> The teacher shall:	<b>3.30</b>	<b>3.64</b>	<b>3.52</b>

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.			
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	83%	96%	96%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	17%	4%	4%
<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>3.26</b>	<b>3.44</b>	<b>3.52</b>
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	91%	92%	100%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	9%	8%	0%
<b>Instructional Practice</b>	<b>3.24</b>	<b>3.56</b>	<b>3.43</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>3.26</b>	<b>3.56</b>	<b>3.41</b>
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	87%	96%	89%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	13%	4%	11%
<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>3.17</b>	<b>3.52</b>	<b>3.41</b>
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	78%	96%	93%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	22%	4%	7%
<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>3.36</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>3.48</b>
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	91%	100%	93%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	9%	0%	7%
<b>Professional Responsibility</b>	<b>3.57</b>	<b>3.72</b>	<b>3.52</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>3.59</b>	<b>3.76</b>	<b>3.44</b>
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	100%	100%	85%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	0%	0%	15%
<b>Standard 10. Leadership and collaboration.</b> The teacher shall seek appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to:	<b>3.55</b>	<b>3.68</b>	<b>3.59</b>

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.			
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	100%	100%	96%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	0%	0%	4%

### Discussion of Findings and Implications for Improvement

Each academic year, the Patton College of Education completes an intensive analyses of available completer data. The 2024-2025 Case Study provided us with vital data to demonstrate how the EPP is meeting CAEP Standard R4 in addition to CAEP Standard R5 as we use the resulting data for the continuous improvement of our teacher preparation programs. To complete the 2024-2025 Case Study, we examined data from multiple assessment measures to help determine program impact for CAEP Standard R4, which includes R4.1 Completer Effectiveness, R4.2 Satisfaction of Employers, and R4.3 Satisfaction of Completers.

First, all eighteen of our 2025 completers met state licensure requirements for teacher certification and were certified to teach at the grade specific levels and content areas in which they were prepared. In addition, 89% secured teaching positions upon graduation (see Table 1).

To determine completer effectiveness for R4.1, we analyzed anonymous summative evaluation data (see Table 2) from eighteen completers with one-to-three years of experience across all grade bands—elementary, middle, and secondary—and from multiple content areas. Since this was anonymous data, it was not connected to specific completers, schools, or content areas; however, we do know that they completed their teacher preparation programs at the University of Pikeville. The anonymous summative evaluation data provided confirmation that our completers were demonstrating effective teaching practices within their P-12 schools and classrooms as approximately 83% of the eighteen completers were rated as *accomplished* or *exemplary* on their summative evaluations. In addition, anonymous data from daily walkthroughs (see Table 3) supported the premise that our completers are demonstrating the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions to positively impact P-12 student learning. Therefore, both sources of data provide evidence that we are meeting CAEP R4.1 Completer Effectiveness.

Anonymous data from the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) Assessment in reading from the students of our completers with one-to-three years of experience revealed that 93% of the fourteen completers' P-12 students demonstrated growth in the percentage of students meeting benchmark scores in reading in the spring MAP Assessment administration compared to scores in the previous fall (see Table 4). Therefore, the MAP reading data indicated that our completers are positively impacting P-12 student learning in reading to further substantiate CAEP R4.1 Completer Effectiveness.

Responses from the Employer Satisfaction Evaluation (see Table 5) were received from employers at all grade levels. From 78% to 96% of the employers who responded to the 2025 survey indicated satisfaction that our completers were *exceptionally or fully prepared* to meet all ten of the KTPS/InTASC Standards in their P-12 schools and classrooms to demonstrate evidence for CAEP R4.2. In addition, the high average ratings for the KTPS/InTASC *Learner and Learning, Content Knowledge, and Instructional Practices* validated that our completers demonstrated effective teaching practice and positively impacted P-12 student learning growth as additional evidence for CAEP R4.1.

Finally, responses from the Completer Satisfaction Evaluation (see Table 6) were received from completers across all grade levels. Approximately 85% to 100% of our completers who responded to the 2025 survey indicated satisfaction that they were *exceptionally or fully prepared* to meet all ten of the KTPS/InTASC Standards in their P-12 schools and classrooms to provide evidence for CAEP R4.3.

### Continuous Improvement Efforts

Continuous improvement in the Patton College of Education is a systematic process as we analyze our student and program data, identify strengths and areas of growth, and develop next steps for improvement. The yearly case study that we complete provides us with important data to determine program impact (CAEP R4), and our continuous improvement efforts support CAEP R5. Since our state does not provide us with any data to determine completer effectiveness, we have developed partnerships with some of the school districts where our completers obtain teaching jobs. These partnerships enable us access to anonymous completer data that cannot be connected to specific completers or their schools. The data are vital for us as we evaluate our teacher education programs.

The results of our 2024-2025 Case Study to determine program impact related to completer effectiveness (R4.1), satisfaction of employers (R4.2), and satisfaction of completers (R4.3), provide evidence that our teacher education programs at the elementary, middle grades, and secondary levels are training effective teachers for P-12 classrooms.

Based on our data analyzes from multiple data sources for this case study, we identified the following targeted areas for growth:

1. Anonymous data that resulted from principal walkthroughs from the P-12 classrooms of our completers indicated **technology use** as a growth area for our instructional program.
2. Approximately 78% of employers who completed the 2025 employer satisfaction survey indicated that our completers with one-to three years of experience were *exceptionally or fully prepared* to meet **KTPS/InTASC Standard 8. Instructional Strategies** in their classrooms; however, 22% reported that our completers were *partially prepared or unprepared* to do so. The 2023 survey demonstrated that 71% of the employers who responded to the survey indicated that our completers were *exceptionally or fully prepared* to meet standard 8 in their P-12 classrooms while 81% indicated the same for the 2024 survey. Therefore, this was designated as a targeted growth area.
3. Approximately 81% of employers who completed the 2025 employer satisfaction survey reported that our completers with one-to-three years of experience were *exceptionally or fully prepared* to meet **KTPS/InTASC Standard 6. Assessment** in their P-12 classrooms;

however, 19% indicated that our completers were *partially prepared* or *unprepared* to do so. The results from the 2023 survey showed that 71% of the employers felt that our completers were *exceptionally* or *fully prepared* to meet standard 6 in their P-12 classrooms while 76% of the employers indicated the same in 2024. Therefore, this was designated as a targeted growth area.

4. Approximately 85% of our completers who responded to the 2025 survey indicated that they were *exceptionally* or *fully prepared* to meet **KTPS/InTASC Standard 2. Learning Differences** in their P-12 classrooms; however, 15% indicated that they were *partially prepared* or *unprepared* to do so. The results from the 2023 survey showed that 70% of the completers felt *exceptionally* or *fully prepared* to meet standard 2 in their P-12 classrooms while the 2024 survey demonstrated the same for 84% of the completers who responded to the survey. Therefore, this was designated as a targeted growth area.
5. Approximately 85% of our completers who responded to the 2025 survey indicated that they were *exceptionally* or *fully prepared* to meet **KTPS/InTASC Standard 9. Professional Learning and Ethical Practice** in their P-12 schools and classrooms; however, 15% indicated that they were *partially prepared* or *unprepared* to do so. Both the 2023 and 2024 survey results showed that 100% of the completers indicated that they were *exceptionally* or *fully prepared* to meet standard 9 in their P-12 schools and classrooms. Therefore, this was designated as a targeted growth area.

### **Next Steps**

After participation in our yearly comprehensive data analyses and triangulating data from multiple sources, we developed the following next steps for implementation to address our areas of growth: (Note: *The complete list of next steps based on our comprehensive data review are included in our 2025-2026 PCOE Goal Action Plan (GAP). We monitor our progress in the implementation of our next steps throughout the academic year and update our GAP yearly.*)

- Next Steps
  - **Provide learning activities that give teacher candidates opportunities to plan instruction that integrates technology applications (Targeted Growth Area #1; GAP 1.2)**
    - Provide lesson plans in EDU 205 and other EDU courses as appropriate and have small groups of students explore new educational technologies that can be effectively used to teach the lesson.
    - Work with education students in planning and peer teaching to integrate more opportunities for P-12 student use of technology applications.
  - **Provide learning activities that target the development of education students' creativity and critical thinking skills to enable them to effectively plan for instruction, actively engage students in learning, and utilize a variety of instructional strategies to meet the learning needs of P-12 students (Targeted Growth Area #2; GAP 1.2):**
    - Develop structured questioning techniques and conduct practice sessions
    - Implement a peer questioning protocol during discussions to improve relevant

- question-asking
- Create more cross-disciplinary assignments that require student exploration across content areas
- Discuss a common practice in education (can be specific to content in methods courses), and have students explain how they would change the practice to enhance learning
- Integrate divergent thinking tasks in which students:
  - ❖ Provide learning activities with restrictions (e.g., design a lesson with no worksheets or other written materials)
  - ❖ Visually organize instructional strategies for teaching various content areas
- **Refine the assessment process for candidates enrolled in Clinical II: Student Teaching (Targeted Growth Area #3; GAP 1.6):**
  - Revise the Clinical II Teacher Performance Task G related to P-12 student assessment to require teacher candidates to report how they use ongoing progress monitoring of P-12 student performance (in addition to pre and post assessments) to drive instruction.
  - For the Exit Conference and Summative Evaluation, a brief description of what each performance level would look like in a P-12 learning environment will be added to help clarify the expectations for the evaluators (collaborating teachers and University Supervisor). We will use the Lawshe Method with a panel of experts to establish the content validity of the rubric addition and will pilot the revised rubric with teacher candidates to determine if the additional information helped clarify expectations.
- **Improve instruction related to the role of P-12 classroom teachers and special needs students (Targeted Growth Area #4; GAP 1.1):**
  - Provide learning experiences in 400-level courses (e.g., role playing, classroom scenarios, case studies, etc.) that will help teacher candidates understand how to interpret an IEP and how to complete the referral process for P-12 students who potentially need special services.
  - Utilize current P-12 teachers who provide special education services as collaborators in the instructional process (e.g., class speakers, online collaboration, co-planning of instruction).
  - Provide instruction to ensure that teacher candidates understand how to use progress monitoring tools (EDU 300, EDU 310, EDU 316, EDU 320, EDU 321, EDU 402, EDU 404):
    - ❖ Tool selection
    - ❖ Data collection
    - ❖ Data analysis
    - ❖ Support structures
    - ❖ Technology integration
    - ❖ In Progress

- **Increase student understanding of professional ethics and regulations (Targeted Growth Area #5; GAP 1.3):**
  - Embed ethical case studies across the education curriculum when appropriate before admission to Clinical I.
  - Design simulations of professional scenarios requiring ethical decision-making in education courses before admission to Clinical I.
  - Incorporate instruction that reviews existing policies, licensing regulations, and professional codes of ethics such as the Kentucky Professional Code of Ethics and the [Model Code of Ethics for Educators \(MCEE\)](#).

### ***Implementation and Monitoring***

Implementation and monitoring of our next steps will be done through the progress monitoring of our Goal Action Plan. Our faculty who are assigned as leads will report on our implementation progress at our regular PCOE meetings conducted throughout the academic year. An end-of-the year report will help drive our continuous improvement efforts and the development of our next year's Goal Action Plan.

## Reference

National Academy of Education. (2025). Evaluating and Improving Teacher Preparation Programs: Executive Summary. K. M. Zeichner, L. Darling-Hammond, A. I. Berman, D. Dong, & G. Sykes (Eds.). National Academy of Education.