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CAEP Annual Reporting Measures 2023

(2021-2022 Academic Year)

**Measure 1: Completer Effectiveness**

D&E Completers are (a) effectively able to contribute to P-12 student-learning growth, and (b) apply P-12 classrooms the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve.

Data for this measure is currently under development and not yet available due to staffing changes and related issues. The EPP will conduct a case study in which completers from 2021-2022 will be asked to self-report measures related to student growth and professional evaluations. It is anticipated that the data will be made public by August 2024.

**Measure 2: Employer Satisfaction**

Data from this measure is currently unavailable due to the reliance on voluntary participation in the survey. No responses were able to be collected in relation to completers from the 2021-2022 academic year.

Traditionally the EPP uses the Supervisors Satisfaction Survey from the North Dakota State University along with the Exit Survey and the Transition to Teaching. NExT supports accreditation and program approval at both the state and national level through their alignment with both InTASC and CAEP accreditation standards. The items in the surveys are aligned with the InTASC standards, and therefore, support the state program approval and CAEP standard 1.1. In particular, the Supervisor Survey results provide strong evidence for CAEP standard 4.3. The NExT surveys meet validity and reliability standards.

Employers were asked to complete the survey regarding the D&E graduate completing his/her first year of teaching. The completion of the survey was voluntary. The indicators were taken from the NExT North Dakota University Survey.

The EPP intends to continue to use this survey for data collection for the 2022-2023 academic year.

**Measure 3: Candidate Competency at Program Completion**

The EPP uses the PPAT and CPAST to measure candidate competency at program completion. Results from each assessment are analyzed and compared to find common areas of strengths and weaknesses.

**PPAT**

As indicated in the West Virginia Board of Education (WVBE) Policy 5100, candidates completing a WVBE-approved teacher education program for any professional educator license must past a performance assessment. In the fall of 2016, our teacher education program adopted the Praxis Performance Assessment Test (PPAT) a national normed performance assessment instrument that has multiple means of measuring a candidate’s performance and impact. Our candidates have regularly met or exceeded the qualifying score for the PPAT.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year** | **Number of Completers** | **PPAT Pass Rate %** | **Passing Score** | **Average Score** |
| 2021-2022 | 10 | 100% | 40 | 44.2 |
| 2020-2021 | 5 | 100% | 40 | 45.4 |
| 2019-2020 | 8 | 100% | 38 | 45 |
| 2019-2018 | 9 | 100% | 36 | 42 |

**CPAST**

Data was collected by cooperating teachers, teacher candidates, and college supervisors using the Valid and Reliable Instruments for Educator Preparation Programs (VARI-EPP) Candidate Preserve Assessment of Student Teaching (CPAST). This provides triangulation between the observations of the cooperating teacher and the college supervisor with a self-assessment from the student-teacher. CPAST is a formative and summative assessment during the student teaching practicum.

Candidates were rated by their cooperating teacher, college supervisor, and by self-evaluation. The CPAST Form is intended to accurately reflect the student teacher’s performance at the middle and end of the student teaching experience and provide formative feedback to the student-teacher.

CPAST averages were calculated from: Exceeds Expectations = 3 points; Meets Expectations = 2 points; Emerging 1 point; Does Not Meet Expectations (0 points).

**Summary**

Overall, completers scored at “Meets Expectations” or “Exceed Expectations” in almost all categories for each Pedagogical area: Planning for Instruction and assessment; Instructional Delivery; Assessment; and Analysis of Teaching. The only areas completers had at midterm as “meets expectations” was Safe and Respectful Learning Environment (1.75) and Data-Guided Instruction (1.75). However, by the final evaluation completers “Exceeded Expectations” when creating a Safe and Respectful Learning Environment (3.0) and “Meets Expectations” for Data-Guided Instruction (2.75).

**Reflection**

In reviewing the data, completers showed growth in pedagogy and dispositions from midterm to final. In any area, a student-teacher received a consensus score of “0” or “1” additional support was provided from the cooperating teacher and college supervisor. Support was provided in the area by providing the student-teacher with further readings, best practice articles, post-conference discussions, suggestions on the area for improvement, and more opportunities for the student teacher to demonstrate competence. A co-teaching model was implemented to support the student-teacher in some cases. Two areas of Pedagogy that scored lower than other areas were assessment and analysis of teaching.

In the next academic year, the EPP will review the curriculum and clinical experiences to address assessment practices and analysis of teaching. Additionally, the design and rotation of courses will be analyzed to support scaffolding and critical assessment skills within the classroom. The required methods courses will be reviewed to address connections to research and theory.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2021-22** **Completers** | **CPAST** | | **Midterm**  **Mean** | **Final**  **Mean** |
| **Pedagogy: Planning for Instruction and Assessment** | | | |
| A | Focus for Learning: Standards and Objectives/Targets | 2.75 | 2.75 |
| B | Materials and Resources | 3 | 3 |
| C | Assessment of P-12 Learning | 2.25 | 3 |
| D | Differentiated Methods | 2.75 | 3 |
| **Pedagogy: Instructional Delivery** | | | |
| E | Learning Target and Directions | 3 | 3 |
| F | Critical Thinking | 2 | 2.5 |
| G | Checking for Understanding and Adjusting Instruction through Formative Assessment | 2.5 | 3 |
| H | Digital Tools and Resources | 3 | 2.75 |
| I | Safe and Respectful Learning Environment | 1.75 | 3 |
| **Pedagogy: Assessment** | | | |
| J | Data-Guided Instruction | 1.75 | 2.5 |
| K | Feedback to Learners | 2.5 | 2.75 |
| L | Assessment Techniques | 2.25 | 3 |
| **Pedagogy: Analysis of Teaching** | | | |
| M | Connections to Research and Theory | 2 | 2.75 |
| **Disposition: Professional Commitment and Behaviors** | | | |
| N | Participates in Professional Development | 2.5 | 3 |
| O | Demonstrates Effective Communication with Parents or Legal Guardians | 3 | 3 |
| P | Demonstrates Punctuality | 3 | 3 |
| Q | Meets Deadlines and Obligations | 2.75 | 3 |
| **Disposition: Professional Relationships** | | | |
| R | Preparation | 3 | 3 |
| S | Collaboration | 3 | 3 |
| T | Advocacy to Meet the Needs of Learners or for the Teaching Profession | 2.5 | 3 |
| **Disposition: Critical Thinking and Reflective Practice** | | | |
| U | Responds Positively to Constructive Criticism | 3 | 3 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Midterm**  **Mean** | **Final**  **Mean** |
| **Pedagogy** | 2.46 | 2.84 |
| **Dispositions** | 2.60 | 2.9 |

**Measure 4: Ability of Completers to be hired**

The following table provides employment rates of our completers which demonstrates that our candidates can meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements in order to become employed. The program goal is that all graduates be employed in their licensure area or enrolled in graduate school within six months following graduation.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year** | **Job Placement Rate** | **Graduate School Rate** | **Other** |
| 2021-2022 | 100% |  |  |
| 2020-2021 | 100% |  |  |
| 2019-2020 | 87.5% | 0% | 12% military |
| 2019-2018 | 88.89% | 0% |  |