Impact Measures (CAEP Standard 4)

1. Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component 4.1)

The University of Bridgeport’s Graduate School of Education (GSE) fell under the CAEP Standard IV Phase-In Timeline requiring only one data set for the 2018 self-study report as documented by CAEP for programs submitting in 2017. The state of Connecticut does not provide any student impact data to EPP’s in the state. Also note that the Spring 2020 data collection period was cut short due to the COVID 19 virus and schools being closed in mid-March, which limited the number of graduate observations.

Many states have implemented policy in the use of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) as a way to measure student growth and teacher effectiveness. The state of Connecticut has implemented such a policy, and all teachers must submit SLO goals to their administrators each spring as part of their yearly evaluations. Teachers are allowed to choose the best method for measuring their students’ growth in terms of their instruction. Teachers set initial goals for their students in October of each year. Then in February of each year they have the opportunity to revise these goals based on student progress thus far. Finally, in April of each year, teachers add their students’ final scores and analyze their yearly progress, at which time all data is submitted to their administrator. Our graduates involved in our focus group were asked to provide some form of student impact data on a purely voluntary basis. Only one out of two graduate participants in the focus group during the 2019-20 academic year provided various forms of student data. This voluntary data indicated that their students were indeed progressing in learning under their tutelage.

This Educator Preparation Program (EPP) requested the SLO student data from the graduate participants, but only a small number actually shared this data. Other student impact data sources are requested as well if SLO data cannot be shared such as DRA (Developmental Reading Assessment) growth scores or STAR reading growth scores.
The GSE graduates were observed by a faculty member and were asked to provide some form of student impact data on a purely voluntary basis. During the 2019-2020 academic year, two graduate participants were observed and included in the data collection, however, only one graduate (50%) provided student data which indicated that their students are learning under their tutelage. All graduate participant who shared student impact data with the EPP demonstrated evidence that their students’ assessment scores did increase over time, thus indicating effective student learning growth.

2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness (Component 4.2)

While conversations and collaborations are presently taking place between the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) and the Connecticut chapter of AACTE to create a “dashboard” for obtaining such graduate information, there is presently no vehicle for schools of education or any other organization to access this type of K-12 student data. The Graduate School of Education (GSE) is directly involved with these collaborative efforts in order to establish appropriate and effective data collection in the future.

Evaluating the effectiveness of a teacher candidate/graduate in the classroom is very complex and the Danielson Framework for Teaching (2013) provides an evaluation tool as a way to assess the performance task of teaching which uses a 4-level rubric. This is the evaluation the GSE uses for candidates during their final student teaching semester and so we have chosen to use it as a tool to evaluate the effectiveness of our graduates as well. The Framework is divided into 22 components clustered into four domains of teaching responsibility:

- Domain 1: Planning and Preparation
- Domain 2: The Classroom Environment
- Domain 3: Instruction
- Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities (not always observed in this data collection)

During the 2019-2020 academic year, the EPP implemented the classroom observation element of the graduate focus study in addition to the interview, graduate survey, and administrator survey. During this academic year we were able to recruit six graduates through ongoing relationships with faculty members, indicating a convenience sample. A total of six graduates participated (2 elementary, 1 secondary Social Studies, 3 music represented). Additional candidates were scheduled for observation, however, schools abruptly closed due to the COVID 19 pandemic.

During the 2019-20 academic year data collection cycle of the two graduates observed, 100% scored Proficient (level 3) or above in all categories on the Danielson rubric. The data reveal that some areas of strength for our graduates are creating a caring environment of respect and rapport with students (2a) with 100% scoring level 4 Distinguished, and also in Establishing a culture for learning (2b) with 50% scoring level 4 Distinguished. Two additional categories are knowledge of content and pedagogy (1a) and demonstrating flexibility/responsiveness (3e) with 100% scoring level 3 Proficient for both. This data demonstrates that these graduates have the ability to exceed expectations in the areas of establishing
a culturally sensitive environment, respecting all learners in an engaging environment and demonstrating highly professional content knowledge.

Some additional areas of strength as indicated by receiving all proficient or above (levels 3 Proficient) were knowledge of students, knowledge of resources, managing classroom procedures, managing student behavior, organizing physical space, and engaging students in learning (Danielson 1b, 1d, 2c, 2d, 2e, and 3c).

The two candidates that were observed in the spring of 2020 did not receive any scores below level 3 Proficient, so areas of improvement cannot be specifically highlighted from this data set.

3. Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones (Component 4.3)

The administrator survey was taken from the state created survey that was piloted and tested for validity and reliability. This survey asks the principals of our graduates working in the field how satisfied they are with the graduate’s teaching effectiveness and progress. It uses a 4.0 Likert scale (strongly agree-4, agree-3, disagree-2, strongly disagree-1).

In the 2019-20 academic year, a total of two graduates participated in the data collection. Neither of the two administrators completed the online survey, resulting in a 0% response rate. This can be attributed to the Government shut down in March 2020 due to the Covid-19 pandemic. School administrators had a great deal of stress moving instantly to no school and then online only school during this time period.

4. Satisfaction of completers (Component 4.4)

The Graduate/Completer Survey is an instrument involving a 4.0 Likert scale (strongly agree-4, agree-3, disagree-2, strongly disagree-1) used to collect data pertaining to completers perception of their preparation program as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job and that the preparation was effective. The survey also provides information on completers’ perceptions regarding their preparation for the use of research, technology, instructional planning, differentiation, and content knowledge.

Although this survey is completed by our graduates who are already professionally teaching in the field, it provides great insight into the strengths of our program as well as reveals areas in which we can improve.

In the 2019-20 academic year, fifty percent of the two graduates (1 of 2) who participated in the Focus Study completed the graduate survey. Areas of strength for our programs as indicated by the graduate was that our programs prepared them to Use state or district curriculum frameworks to guide planning and instruction (Question 5) and Plan for differentiated instruction, including modifications and accommodations in anticipation of student learning needs (Question 6) with group means of 4.0 on both. An additional topic that scored higher means than others identifying program strengths was
Understand and uphold professional ethics (Code of Professional Responsibility) (Question 30) (4.0 mean). Differentiated instruction is an area of strength that is consistent with other data collected in the graduate observations as well as the exit survey. Also, all candidates receive a specific seminar on Ethics and Professional Responsibility at the start of their program, so they are well versed in this important area.

Both candidates received all scores of 3 (proficient) and 4 (exceeds) on the Danielson rubric, so no deficit areas were reported. We can always reflect on areas that we believe could use improvement, so we will continue to work on areas where candidates showed weakness last year and continue to address them. Areas that were recently indicated as could use improvement were in managing challenging student behavior (Question 9) and understanding and implementing a scientific research-based intervention strategy (Question 19). All teacher education candidates receive instruction on classroom management within their program, however, this is one area that generally most novice teachers struggle with once they begin their actual teaching careers and we plan to continue to find creative ways to address this topic to build candidates’ confidence in their implementation of strategies once they graduate and enter the teaching field.

Both of the graduate participants were also interviewed. The interview data reveal some common themes as stated by our recent graduates. First, all of the graduates stated positively that they overall felt very prepared for their professional teaching assignments as a result of our programs. Second, they all stated that the GSE provided them with varying teaching strategies in order to meet the needs of all learners. Third, they stated that the GSE prepared them to adequately use technology in the classroom. Finally, the candidates felt positively that the GSE prepared them well to engage and contribute effectively to a professional learning community as one stated, "I feel I learned the most during Internship and Student Teaching..." and the other stated, "I learned the most during my internship!"

The unique Internship experience in the UB School of Education gives candidates a year of experience working in a school prior to student teaching as they complete the program. During this experience they become part of the school culture as they are present every day all day.

While all the comments were positive on an overall basis, there was a comment from a graduate about data-driven decision making suggesting improvement. The graduate indicated that they felt they did not learn much about data-driven decision making for designing instruction. This is an area where we need to improve.

Review of this data over the past couple of years has provided keen insight into our programs. Our graduates demonstrate that they are effective teachers where their students are experiencing learning growth and their administrators are pleased with their performance in their first years of teaching. While all of the survey data was positive, we can still identify areas where we could improve in our programs, one such area is revealed by the data was in utilizing data-driven decision making for designing instruction based off student assessments (question 5). We will continue to provide support and instruction on student and classroom management in the future. While we have a focus on this topic within our programs, candidates may not connect to the vocabulary or language. Data-based decision making is addressed as they learn about tasks 3 & 4 of the edTPA, but they may not be connecting to the terminology.
One huge and impactful change that went into effect in academic year (2018-19) was the Connecticut State mandated implementation of the edTPA performance assessment requirement during student teaching for teacher certification. During the pilot year, (2018-19), all candidates were required to submit the edTPA portfolio during student teaching, but with no official cut score. In the fall of 2019, a cut score was enforced by the state which is 37 for secondary and 44 for elementary. The implementation of the edTPA has required a great deal of change within our programs, with needed training for impacted faculty, field supervisors, cooperating teachers, and most importantly imbedding the edTPA concepts within the coursework. This recent mandate has consumed much of our agenda items for the past 24 months in preparation for this change. As a result of all the trainings and preparation, our candidates have performed well with 80% or greater of candidates receiving acceptable scores on their first attempt during the fall 2019 semester. The elementary candidates outscored the CT state average of 51.3 with an institution average score of 51.79 in Fall 2019. The institution average for the secondary candidates was slightly below the CT state average. This major implementation was considered a huge success at our EPP. The Spring 2020 data collection was majorly impacted by COVID-19 as candidates were allowed to waive this requirement for certification for this particular semester.

Our EPP shares data with our partners at both the biannual Education Council meeting held each semester as well as at the Supervisor Training sessions held each semester. The above edTPA pilot data was presented to partners as well as our minority recruitment data. During these meetings, our partners and stakeholders also have the opportunity to provide us with feedback regarding our programs. The School of Education Teacher Prep committee meets monthly during each semester (typically 3 times) to review candidate data and strategize ways to improve our programs as a result.

**Outcome Measures**

5. Graduation Rates (initial)

➢ 95% of candidates graduate from our programs. Those who do not finish, usually personally select to opt out of the certification program and finish with only the Master’s degree.

6. Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements; Title II (initial levels)

➢ 100% of Teacher Education Program completers who applied for Connecticut (CT) Initial Certification earned the CT Teaching Certificate.

7. Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared (initial levels)

➢ 91% of completers since 2018 are employed in education or education-related positions.
8. Student loan default rates and other consumer information (initial)

- University of Bridgeport’s overall student loan default rate in 2018 was 7.2%.
  * The UB School of Education is a graduate only program. Most (76%) of our candidates participate in the Internship Program where full tuition remission is offered.

- TEACH CT website offers a review of Connecticut Teacher Preparation programs with a direct pathway to the application process which our EPP is a participant. https://connecticut.teach.org/programs/university-bridgeport