University of Pikeville
Patton College of Education

2021-2022 Case Study of Educator Preparation Program Impact for CAEP Standard R4

Table of Contents

2021-2022 Case Study of Educator Preparation Program Impact for CAEP Standard 4

Introduction

Each year, the Patton College of Education prepares a mixed-method case study to exam evidence to determine the impact that our initial teacher certification programs have on P-12 education related to completer effectiveness, satisfaction of employers, and satisfaction of completers according to CAEP Standard 4. Examining data from multiple measures enables us to determine what, if any, changes need to be made within our initial teacher certification programs.

In the Executive Summary of the publication, State of the States 2021: Teacher Preparation Policy (March 2021), Kate Walsh, et al, indicate, " With teacher quality as the most important in-school factor contributing to a child's academic success, policymakers simply cannot afford to ignore the critical issue of teacher preparation." While we are in the midst of change as policymakers work to address the nationwide teacher shortage, we must remain focused on our goal of preparing high-quality teachers who will positively impact P-12 student learning. Therefore, completing our self-study will provide the results to drive continuous improvement and help us meet this goal.

While our state does not currently provide us with the teacher effectiveness data that we need for our completers, we work closely with two of our surrounding districts who provide us with anonymous data related to the teaching effectiveness and the impact on P-12 learning for our completers. As a result, analysis of the data will help us strengthen our initial teacher undergraduate programs, which will benefit the schools, district, and P-12 students within our region. Consequently, these types of partnerships serve to benefit both P-12 schools and our initial teacher education programs.

We began completing case studies in 2018-2019, but the process has changed depending on the types of data that were available from the districts. Therefore, it is important to note that because we do not always receive the same data, we examine each study separately since we are collecting data from completers with one to three years' experience.

Our mindset in the Patton College of Education is one of continuous improvement through research-based practices, analyses of evidence, and the creation of next steps to reinforce our strengths and address our weaknesses. We are fortunate to be able to have developed the P-12 partnerships that provide us with the anonymous completer data to complete this self-study.

Purpose of the Study

1. To collect and analyze data to determine if our undergraduate 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 undergraduate 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 the 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 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 undergraduate teacher education programs (CAEP R5.4).

Methods

Participants

We received anonymous completer data related to impact on P-12 learning and completer effectiveness from one district, and data was shared by a completer from another district. However, due to the number of completers, only the anonymous completer data from the one district are being analyzed and reported for this case study. We chose not to include data shared by the completer from the other district due to the limited data. The data being analyzed and reported are from administrator walkthrough observations, summative evaluations, and MAP reading and math assessments during the 2021-2022 academic year.

Each year, the UPIKE Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness administers satisfaction surveys to our completers with one to three years of teaching experience and to school administrators where our completers with one to three years of experience are teaching. The completer satisfaction survey requests that the completers 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. The employer survey requests that the principals rate how well our completers who serve within their schools are able to meet the KTPS/InTASC Standards in P-12 classrooms. We analyzed the data from this year's employer and completer surveys for this study.

We also examined data related to the percentage of our 2021-2022 completers who met licensure requirements for teacher certification and employment data for our completers.

Procedures

Initially, we compiled the data to show the percentage of our 2021-2022 candidates who met licensure requirements and gained employment. Next, we gathered and analyzed the anonymous completer data related to teaching effectiveness and impact on P-12 learning that were provided by the district for completers with one-to-three years' experience. As an additional step, we examined the data from our employer and completer surveys because these instruments are aligned with the KTPS/InTASC Standards. Finally, we used the results to help determine next steps for improvement for our undergraduate teacher education programs.

Data Analysis and Results

Table 1

CAEP Accountability Measures 3 and 4
Initial Certification Teacher Education Programs

2022 Completers	
Candidacy Competency at Program Completion	
Preparation Program Grade Levels	**% Met Licensure Requirement for Teacher Certification**
7 Elementary	100%
4 Middle Grades	100%
1 Secondary	100%
2022 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**
12	100% (12/12)

All twelve of our 2022 completers met licensure requirements for teacher certification. This included meeting state-required benchmark scores on the Praxis Core Academic Skills for Educators and the Praxis Subject Assessments required within individual program areas to demonstrate content knowledge. Our completers also met benchmark scores on the Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching. Therefore, all twelve completers had the ability to be hired in teaching positions for which they were certified. In addition, according to our employment data, 100% of the 2022 completers were hired upon graduation as classroom teachers specific to their individual program licensure area. (See Table 1.)

Data from P-12 School Districts

The data set below was provided by a single district and resulted from administrator walkthrough observations completed in 2021-2022 for completers with one to three years of experience (CAEP R4.1). Table 1 displays the data by year of completion, and Table 2 displays all three years combined. Nine of the seventeen completers taught at the elementary level, five at the middle grades level, and three at the secondary level.

The instrument was co-developed by education professionals at the district level and provided data related to the following indicators: 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 specific rating descriptors for each assessed indicator ranging from 0 to 3.

Table 2

Walkthrough Observation Data for Completers Collected During the 2021-2022 Academic Year By Year of Completion							
2019 Completers	**Learning Targets**	**Authentic Engagement**	**Higher Level Questions**	**Assessment Strategies**	**Student Feedback**	**Technology Use**	**Classroom Environment**
Completer 1	2.6	2.3	1.8	2.2	2.1	1.0	2.5
Completer 2	2.6	2.6	3.0	2.6	3.0	1.7	3.0
Completer 3	2.4	2.7	1.8	2.1	2.5	1.4	2.8
Completer 4	2.8	2.8	2.2	2.5	2.6	1.6	3.0
Completer 5	2.3	2.5	1.3	2.8	2.3	1.0	3.0
Completer 6	2.3	2.3	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0
2019 Completer Averages by Indicators	**2.5**	**2.5**	**2.2**	**2.5**	**2.6**	**1.5**	**2.9**
2020 Completers	**Learning Targets**	**Authentic Engagement**	**Higher Level Questions**	**Assessment Strategies**	**Student Feedback**	**Technology Use**	**Classroom Environment**
Completer 7	2.5	2.5	1.3	2.3	2.3	1.0	3.0
Completer 8	2.0	3.0	1.6	2.6	2.6	2.0	3.0
Completer 9	2.8	2.8	2.3	2.8	3.0	1.5	3.0
Completer 10	2.3	2.6	2.5	2.5	3.0	2.3	3.0
Completer 11	3.0	3.0	2.6	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0
Completer 12	0.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	3.0
Completer 13	3.0	2.9	2.7	2.7	2.6	1.6	3.0
2020 Completer Averages by Indicators	**2.2**	**2.7**	**2.1**	**2.7**	**2.8**	**1.6**	**3.0**
2021 Completers	**Learning Targets**	**Authentic Engagement**	**Higher Level Questions**	**Assessment Strategies**	**Student Feedback**	**Technology Use**	**Classroom Environment**
Completer 14	3.0	2.5	0.0	2.0	3.0	0.0	2.0
Completer 15	1.5	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0
Completer 16	2.0	2.3	1.8	2.0	2.0	1.5	3.0
Completer 17	2.0	2.3	2.0	2.0	2.6	1.7	2.6
2021 Completer Averages by Indicators	**2.1**	**2.3**	**1.4**	**2.0**	**2.7**	**1.3**	**2.4**

Table 3

Combined 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 Averages by Completer**

Completer 1	2.6	2.3	1.8	2.2	2.1	1.0	2.5	2.1
Completer 2	2.6	2.6	3.0	2.6	3.0	1.7	3.0	2.6
Completer 3	2.4	2.7	1.8	2.1	2.5	1.4	2.8	2.2
Completer 4	2.8	2.8	2.2	2.5	2.6	1.6	3.0	2.5
Completer 5	2.3	2.5	1.3	2.8	2.3	1.0	3.0	2.2
Completer 6	2.3	2.3	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.7
Completer 7	2.5	2.5	1.3	2.3	2.3	1.0	3.0	2.1
Completer 8	2.0	3.0	1.6	2.6	2.6	2.0	3.0	2.4
Completer 9	2.8	2.8	2.3	2.8	3.0	1.5	3.0	2.6
Completer 10	2.3	2.6	2.5	2.5	3.0	2.3	3.0	2.6
Completer 11	3.0	3.0	2.6	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.8
Completer 12	0.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	3.0	2.0
Completer 13	3.0	2.9	2.7	2.7	2.6	1.6	3.0	2.6
Completer 14	3.0	2.5	0.0	2.0	3.0	0.0	2.0	1.8
Completer 15	1.5	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.1
Completer 16	2.0	2.3	1.8	2.0	2.0	1.5	3.0	2.1
Completer 17	2.0	2.3	2.0	2.0	2.6	1.7	2.6	2.2
Total Averages by Indicators	2.3	2.5	2.0	2.5	2.7	1.5	2.8	

Although all walkthrough data was collected during the 2020-2021 academic year, we looked at the completer data by year of completion. The 2019 and 2020 completers received higher ratings than the 2021 completers for all indicators except student feedback, and the 2020 completer were rated the highest at 2.8 for this indictor. We believe that having the additional one to two years of teaching experience for the 2019 and 2020 completers is reflected in these average ratings. Teachers have had more time to grow professionally and improve relative to the indicators from the walkthrough observation instrument.

When looking at the combined walkthrough data, the total average ratings for six of the indicators were between 2.0 and 2.8 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 P-12 students are not using technology, and the teacher is the primary user. A level 2 indicates that P-12 students use technology to solve problems; therefore, an average rating of 1.5 indicates that P-12 student use of technology was observed for about half of the completers during walkthrough observations. The average rating for classroom environment was 2.8 and a 2.5 for authentic engagement. Learning targets demonstrated an average rating of 2.3 and student feedback an average ratings of 2.7. The average rating for higher level questions was 2.0, and assessment strategies averaged 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 R4.1).

The next data set reflects 2021-2022 summative evaluation data from sixteen completers with one to three years of experience. Nine of the sixteen completers taught at the elementary level, five at the middle grades level, and two at the secondary level. One of the completers had no summative data. The possible ratings on the evaluation instrument include: 1) *ineffective*, 2) *developing*, 3) *accomplished*, or 4) *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 Kentucky Teacher Performance Standards (KTPS), which are congruent to the InTASC Standards. The summative evaluation instrument is part of the district-wide Certified Evaluation Plan approved by the state, and update training is provided yearly for all teachers and administrators to increase reliability of the data.

Table 4

Completer Summative Evaluation Data Collected During the 2021-2022 Academic Year	
Completers	Overall Ratings
Completer 1	Exemplary
Completer 2	Accomplished
Completer 3	No Summative Data
Completer 4	Accomplished
Completer 5	Accomplished
Completer 6	Accomplished
Completer 7	Accomplished
Completer 8	Accomplished
Completer 9	Accomplished
Completer 10	Exemplary
Completer 11	Exemplary
Completer 12	Accomplished
Completer 13	Accomplished
Completer 14	Developing
Completer 15	Accomplished
Completer 16	Accomplished
Completer 17	Accomplished

Of the sixteen completers who had available data, approximately 19% scored at the *exemplary* level, and 75% scored at the *accomplished* level. One completer (6%) scored at the *developing* level. We had no completers who scored at the *ineffective* level. Therefore, summative evaluation data from the sixteen completers with one to three years of experience demonstrate effective teaching practices within their P-12 classrooms (CAEP R4.1).

The next data set resulted from P-12 students' Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) testing (CAEP R4.1). The MAP Test, a nationally normed test from the Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA), is given three times yearly to elementary and middle grades students within one of the districts to measure learning progress and standards mastery in reading and math.   All data sharing was anonymous and did not identify any P-12 students.

Nine completers from this data set taught at the elementary level, and five taught at the middle grade level. We received anonymous data from the 2021-2022 academic year, which compared the first administration of the MAP test in the fall with the last administration in the spring. (See Table 5.) One completer had MAP scores from only the end of the year in math and reading. Therefore, there was no comparative data, and we did not include this completer's results in our analysis.

Table 5

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	
Math	
# Completers with Available Data	13
% Completers with Increases in MAP Mathematics Scores from Fall to Spring	62%
% Completers with Static Mathematics Scores (= or < 2%) from Fall to Spring	0%
% Completers with Decreases in MAP Mathematics Scores from Fall to Spring	38%
Reading	
# Completers with Available Data	13
% Completers with Increases in MAP Reading Scores from Fall to Spring	31%
% Completers with Static Reading Scores (= or < 2%) from Fall to Spring	0%
% Completers with Decreases in MAP Reading Scores (>2%) from Fall to Spring	69%

Note: *Percentages are rounded.*

Data showed that eight (62%) of the thirteen completers' P-12 students experienced increases in MAP scores in mathematics when comparing fall to spring MAP testing administrations. In addition, four (31%) of our completers' P-12 students experienced increases in MAP reading scores from fall to spring. Five (38%) of the thirteen completers' P-12 students demonstrated decreases in math, and nine (69%) experienced decreases in reading as demonstrated by MAP scores. In summary, approximately 62% of our completers' P-12 students saw increases in MAP math scores as well as 31% for reading.

The district that provided the data advised us to view the scores in the context of the impact that the pandemic had on P-12 learning as students were adjusting to being back in school. Consequently, we are taking this information into account regarding our completers' impact on P-12 learning.

Next, Employer Satisfaction Evaluation data was analyzed to help determine if employers were satisfied with the preparation of the teachers who were employed within their schools (CAEP R4.2). The Patton College of Education uses 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 schools. Our goal is to prepare highly qualified candidates who are ready to meet the professional teacher standards within P-12 classrooms. Therefore, the Employer Satisfaction Evaluation instrument asks that school principals respond to how well they perceive our completers are prepared to meet the KTPS/InTASC Standards within their schools and classrooms. 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 2022 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 simplify data analysis. The response rate was 62% in 2020, and it increased to 67% in 2022. In 2021, 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 3.72 and 3.13 in 2022. For *Content Knowledge*, the average preparedness rating was 3.68 in 2021 and 3.24 in 2022. For the standards within the KTPS/InTASC category of *Instructional Practice*, the average rating was 3.61 in 2021 and 3.18 in 2022. The average preparedness rating for *Professional Responsibility* was 3.63 in 2021 and 3.16 in 2022. Therefore, the 2022 average ratings for the four categories ranged from 3.13 to 3.24 on a 4-point scale. No standard received an average rating below 3.0 in 2022. Thus, data demonstrated that 74% or higher of the employers who participated in the survey rated our completers as being either *exceptionally* or *fully prepared* to meet the KTPS/InTASC Standards in their P-12 classrooms. (See Table 7.)

Table 6

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

Survey Administered Spring	2020	2021	2022
Response Rate	62%	63%	67%
The Learner and Learning	**3.44**	**3.72**	**3.13**
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.	**3.36**	**3.68**	**3.20**
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	91%	95%	80%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	9	5	20
Standard 2. Learning differences. The teacher shall use the understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.	**3.50**	**3.74**	**3.15**
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	95%	100%	75%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	5	0	25
Standard 3. Learning environments. The teacher shall work with others to create environments that: 　a) Support individual and collaborative learning; and 　b) Encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.	**3.45**	**3.74**	**3.05**
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	95%	100%	80%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	5	0	20
Content Knowledge	**3.39**	**3.68**	**3.24**
Standard 4. Content knowledge. The teacher shall: 　a) Understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline he or she teaches; and 　b) Create learning experiences that make these aspects of the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.	**3.41**	**3.74**	**3.26**
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	91%	100%	74%

	2020	2021	2022
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	9	0	26
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.	**3.36**	**3.63**	**3.21**
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	91%	95%	79%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	9	5	21
Instructional Practice	**3.41**	**3.61**	**3.18**
Standard 6. Assessment. The teacher shall understand and use multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the educator's and learner's decision making.	**3.36**	**3.47**	**3.11**
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	95%	95%	74%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	5	5	26
Survey Administered Spring	2020	2021	2022
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.	**3.41**	**3.74**	**3.16**
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	87%	100%	79%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	13	0	21
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.	**3.45**	**3.63**	**3.26**
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	91%	100%	84%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	9	0	16
Professional Responsibility	**3.43**	**3.63**	**3.16**
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.	**3.45**	**3.74**	**3.16**
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	91%	100%	79%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	9	0	21
Standard 10. Leadership and collaboration. The teacher shall seek appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to: 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.	**3.41**	**3.53**	**3.16**
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared	91%	100%	79%
Partially Prepared/Unprepared	9	0	21

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

Lastly, we examined data from the Completer Satisfaction Evaluation, which is a survey-type instrument that is administered annually by the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness at the University of Pikeville (CAEP R4.3). The possible ratings for the Completer Satisfaction Evaluation include level 1 (*unprepared*), 2 (*partially prepared*), 3 (*fully prepared*), and 4 (*exceptionally prepared*), which reflect how well our completers perceive that their preparation program prepared them to meet the KTPS/InTASC Standards within their schools and classrooms.

The response rate was 52% in 2022, which decreased from 61% in both 2021 and 2022. The survey data demonstrated an average of 3.53 for the standards related to the *Learner and Learning* in 2021 compared to an average of 3.33 in 2022. For the standards related to *Content Knowledge*, the average was 3.74 in 2020, 3.60 in 2021, and 3.39 in 2022. Average ratings for *Instructional Practice* were 3.70 in 2020, 3.45 in 2021 and 3.39 in 2022. For the standards related to Professional Responsibility, the average was 3.76 in 2020, 3.60 in 2021 and 3.52 in 2022. All the ratings are based on a four-point scale with 4 being the highest possible rating. Although there was a slight decrease in ratings from 2021 to 2022, all ratings were at or above 3.0 for all standards, and the percentage of completers who indicated that they were *exceptionally* or *fully prepared* is at 82% or above for each standard. Therefore, most of our completers are satisfied with their educator preparation program. (See Table 7.)

Table 7

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

Survey Administered Spring	2020	2021	2022
Response Rate	61%	61%	52%
The Learner and Learning	**3.72**	**3.53**	**3.33**
Standard 1. Learner development. The teacher shall understand how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and shall design and shall implement developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.	**3.62**	**3.52**	**3.32**
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared	96% 4	100% 0	91% 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.	**3.70**	**3.44**	**3.32**
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared	100% 0	96% 4	91% 9
Standard 3. Learning environments. 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.	**3.83**	**3.64**	**3.36**
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared	100% 0	100% 0	86% 14

Content Knowledge	3.74	3.60	3.39
Standard 4. Content knowledge. 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.	3.74	3.64	3.59
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared	96% 4	100% 0	91% 9
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.	3.74	3.56	3.18
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared	96% 4	100% 0	82% 18
Instructional Practice	3.70	3.45	3.39
Standard 6. Assessment. The teacher shall understand and use multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the educator's and learner's decision making.	3.78	3.56	3.45
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared	100% 0	96% 4	95% 5
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.	3.61	3.36	3.27
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared	96% 4	92% 8	82% 18
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.	3.70	3.44	3.45
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared	100% 0	96% 4	91% 9
Professional Responsibility	3.76	3.60	3.52
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.	3.78	3.64	3.64
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared	100% 0	100% 0	95% 5
Standard 10. Leadership and collaboration. 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.	3.74	3.56	3.41
Exceptionally/Fully Prepared Partially Prepared/Unprepared	100% 0	96% 4	86% 14

Discussion of Findings and Implications for Improvement

The 2021-2022 Case Study investigated data from several measures to determine program impact for meeting CAEP Standard R4. All our completers met state requirements for certification, and this included passing the required Praxis exams to demonstrate both content and pedagogical knowledge. All fourteen 2022 completers were hired in teaching positions upon graduation.

Data from the 2022 Employer Satisfaction Evaluation demonstrated that average ratings for the four assessed areas—the *Learner and Learning*, *Content Knowledge*, *Instructional Practice*, and *Professional Responsibility*--ranged from 3.13 to 3.24 on a 4-point scale. The instrument is aligned with the KTPS/InTASC Standards, and no standard received an average rating below 3.0 in 2022. Thus, data demonstrated that 74% or higher of the employers who participated in the survey rated our completers as being either *exceptionally* or *fully prepared* to meet the KTPS/InTASC Standards in their P-12 classrooms. (See Table 7.)

Data from the 2022 Completer Satisfaction Evaluation demonstrated that average ratings for the four assessed areas—the *Learner and Learning*, *Content Knowledge*, *Instructional Practice*, and *Professional Responsibility*--ranged from 3.33 to 3.52 on a 4-point scale, and all ratings were at or above 3.0 for all standards. In addition, at least 82% of the completers who participated in the survey indicated that they are *exceptionally* or *fully prepared* for each standard.

Completer ratings from the walkthrough observations showed an average of 2.3 for learning targets, 2.5 for authentic engagement, 2.0 for higher level questioning, 2.5 for assessment strategies, 2.7 for student feedback, 1.5 for technology use, and 2.8 for classroom environment. Technology use was the only indicator rated below 2.0, and it was at a 1.5. A level 1 on the walkthrough instrument indicates that P-12 students are not using technology, and the teacher is the primary user while a level 2 indicates that P-12 students use technology to solve problems. Thus, an average rating of 1.5 indicates that P-12 student use of technology was observed for about half of the completers during walkthrough observations. This was similar to our findings from last year's data. While student use of technology is a growth area for our instructional program, overall data from administrator walkthroughs for our completers with one-to-three years' experience during the 2021-2022 academic year indicated that our completers are implementing effective teaching practices within their P-12 classrooms.

Anonymous summative evaluation data showed that approximately 94% of the sixteen completers who had available data scored at the *accomplished* level or higher. No completer scored at the *ineffective* level, and one scored at the *developing* level. Therefore, summative evaluation data for our completers with one-to-three years' experience indicate that our completers are demonstrating effective teaching practices in their P-12 classrooms.

Anonymous MAP data showed that eight (62%) of the thirteen completers' P-12 students experienced increases in MAP scores in mathematics when comparing fall to spring MAP testing administrations during the 2020-2021 academic year. Also, four (31%) of our completers' P-12 students experienced increases in MAP reading scores from fall to spring. Five (38%) of the thirteen completers' P-12 students demonstrated decreases in math, and nine (69%) experienced decreases in reading as demonstrated by MAP scores. In summary, approximately 62% of our completers' P-12 students saw increases in MAP math scores as well as 31% for reading.

The district that provided the anonymous data that was analyzed for this case study advised us to view the data in the context of the impact that the pandemic had on P-12 learning as students were adjusting to being back in school. Consequently, we are taking this information into account regarding our completers' teaching effectiveness and impact on P-12 learning.

Continuous Improvement Efforts

Continuous improvement efforts are ongoing in the PCOE, and we use the results from this study to help determine completer effectiveness and program impact. Because we receive no data from the state regarding completer effectiveness, we will continue to work with our districts and our completers.

We identified the following areas for growth:

- From the administrator walkthrough data, technology use was the only indicator that received a rating below 2.0 on a three-point scale.
- Only 31% of our completers saw increases in MAP reading scores from the fall to spring for their P-12 students while 62% saw increases in MAP math scores.
- Employers rated our completers lowest in the area of *assessment* related to KTPS/InTASC Standard 6. Although the average rating was 3.11 on a four-point scale, approximately 26% were rated as *partially prepared*.
- Completers rated *application of content* related to KTPS/InTASC Standard 5 as the lowest area of preparedness. Again, the average rating was 3.18 on a four-point scales, but approximately 18% rated themselves as *partially prepared* related to this standard.

Based on our data analysis, we identified the following next steps. A more comprehensive plan can be found in our PCOE Goal Action Plan, which we update yearly.

- o Next Steps
  - ▪ We will provide authentic teaching experiences for our undergraduate pre-candidates and candidates through our P-12 model classroom. Education faculty will utilize the model classroom for most of our education courses so that pre-candidates and candidates will participate in more authentic teaching experiences (i.e., interactive whiteboard, flexible grouping, center rotations, etc.). The model classroom will help us better prepare our teacher candidates for P-12 classrooms.

  - ▪ Education faculty will integrate the core concepts of creating a balanced system of assessment into instruction, using the Model Curriculum Framework as a guide. Teacher candidates will demonstrate understanding of the following through course assessments:
    - Formative assessment
    - Learning goals and success criteria
    - Evidence of student learning
    - Interpreting evidence of student learning
    - Acting on evidence of student learning
      -KDE Model Curriculum Framework, May 2021

- Pre-candidates and candidates will use the research-based Explicit Instruction Model when planning and presenting P-12 instruction. They will understand the importance of using a research-based model of instruction to positive student outcomes.

- Education faculty will explicitly instruct teacher candidates how to meet the learning needs of individual students through differentiation, modifications, and accommodations where appropriate. Teacher candidates must demonstrate proficiency through planning and presenting P-12 instruction to meet the individual learning needs of students before they can successfully exit the TEP.

- Education faculty will explicitly instruct teacher candidates to:
    - Develop higher-level questions for P-12 instruction
    - Integrate student use of technology in instruction
    - Identify HQIRs
        - Why they are needed
        - What does the research say?

Reference

K. Walsh, et al (2021, March). State of the states: Teacher preparation policy. NCTQ. Retrieved from
https://www.nctq.org/publications/State-of-the-States-2021:-Teacher-Preparation-Policy