

AIMS report 2022 (20-21 data/completers)

CAEP Annual Reporting Measures

The Council for the Accreditation of Education Preparation (CAEP) has several annual reporting measures used to help inform the public on performance outcomes and program impact of the teacher education program. McPherson College had an accreditation visit in Fall 2021 and, consequently, only reports on four of the measures this year. The four measures for the undergraduate program with the data are listed below.

Measure 1

Completer effectiveness and Impact on P-12 learning and development (R4.1)

The EPP asked four recent completers to participate in the case study. Two agreed. Both completers submitted pre-/post-test data (below).

Class Averages	Pre-test % correct	Post-test % correct	change
Completer A	54.3	85.7	31.4
Completer B	8.0	74.6	66.6
Overall average	31.8	84.2	52.4

Kansas is one of the states where sharing state assessment and other sorts of data is against regulation. Consequently, the type of data presented above is the primary data we are able to gather. The data above is part of the data collected in a three part case study.

In addition to having recent completers submit pre-/post-test scores, these same completers were observed by a faculty member using the standard student teacher observation form (the Kansas Clinical Assessment Tool) and they participated in a focus group conversation. Other elements of the case study are described in Annual Assessment Measure 2, below.

Indicators of teaching effectiveness

Narrative Description of Completer Observations

The observation tool (the K-CAT) is directly aligned to the 10 InTASC Standards (which are nearly identical to the Kansas Professional Education Standards). There are 45 indicators on the K-CAT. Not all are observable in a 30 minute classroom observation. Results of the observation using the K-CAT show that completers were at the target or exemplary rating in all areas that were observed. Due to the nature of the assessment tool and a one-time observation, it is not possible to observe all indicators found on the assessment. For example, it is not possible to verify the completers' ability to work with other professionals in a 30-minute observation.

Since there were only two completers observed, it is impossible to draw any generalizable conclusions. However, based on the brief observations, these two completers seem to have relative strengths in awareness of individual learner differences and creating a positive learning environment for those learners. Based on the observation form data, there did not appear to be areas of weakness. But as mentioned earlier, it was not possible to observe all indicators identified on the assessment in one 30-minute observation session. Further observation would likely reveal more data and possible weaknesses.

The third component of this case study is the focus group discussion with the two completers. The completers were asked a series of questions focusing on personal strengths and weaknesses as well as strengths, weaknesses, and areas of improvement of the EPP.

These candidates described a personal teaching strength as lesson planning. When asked about their comfort level work with diverse learners, both indicated general satisfaction with their preparation. Another area of strength they identified was building positive interactions with students.

Both candidates indicated that classroom management and managing individual behaviors were areas of personal concerns. When asked, they indicated that they were taught things about classroom management, but it is difficult to put into action until you have a classroom of your own. Both completers a desire to have learned more about trauma informed education. Trauma Informed teaching is being used in most, if not all, school buildings and new completers need this information. Both completers also mentioned a desire for more practicum experiences.

Measure 2

Satisfaction of employers (R4.2) and stakeholder involvement (R5.3)

The most recent survey administered in spring 2022 included employers of completers from 2020-21 (first year teachers) and 2018-19 (third year teachers). From the employers of 2020-21 completers, five responses were received from a total of 6 surveys distributed for a response rate of 83.3%. Four of 10 employers of completers from 2018-19 responded for a 40% response rate. Overall, there was a 56.25% response rate with nine of 16 employers responding.

Employers of completers were asked to reply to *how well prepared they felt the completer was for your first year of teaching* in the following categories. Scale of 1 (not at all prepared) to 7 (very well prepared)

	Employers of 20-21 grads n=5/6 83.3%	Employers of 18-19 grads n=4/10 40%	all grads n=9/16 56.25%
Overall	5.6	6	5.78
Understanding developmental differences	6	5.25	5.67
Working with special needs/gifted	5.4	5.25	5.33
Working with low income students	6	5.75	5.89
Working with diverse students	5.6	5	5.33
Working with students with trauma	5.4	5.75	5.56
Creating a positive learning environment	6	6	6
Classroom management	5.4	5.5	5.44
Student engagement and motivation	5.6	6	5.78
Content knowledge in my field	5.4	6	5.67
Engages students with content	5	5.25	5.11
Use of student assessments for data	5	5	5
Analyzes student data to inform teaching	5	4.75	4.89
Lesson planning	5.4	5.75	5.56
Unit planning	5.2	5.75	5.44
Uses variety of teaching/learning strategies	5	5.75	5.33
Teacher use of technology for instruction	5.4	5	5.22
Student use of technology for learning	5.4	4.75	5.11
Ethical practice	6.6	6.25	6.44
Professional growth	6.2	6	6.11
Communication with families	5.2	5.25	5.22
Dealing with conflicts: adults	5.8	5.75	5.78
Dealing with conflicts: children	5.8	6	5.89
	5.54	5.55	5.55

Data analysis. Average employer ratings of 20-21 completers range from 5.0 to 6.6 which indicates above average performance in all areas. Of the five sets of data for 20-21 completers, two received the highest overall rating of seven. The lowest overall rating received was a rating of 4 for one candidate. The two remaining candidates received an overall rating of 5. This data supports that the educator preparation program is effectively preparing teachers for their first year of teaching, however weaknesses in certain subsets of the data could be improved upon.

There were only four sets of data for the completers from 2018-19. One candidate received an overall rating of 5, one received an overall rating of 6, and the remaining two received the highest possible overall rating of 7.

In general, employers were more pleased than displeased with completers. Creating a positive learning environment, ethical practice, and professional growth are rated as relative strengths of all completers. Using and analyzing assessment data to inform future teaching are seen as relative weaknesses for all completers. Technology use is rated low for 18-19 completers but is a relative strength for 20-21 completers which suggests the educator preparation program has made improvements in this area.

Both completers (case study data and completer survey) and employers (employer survey) identified creating a positive learning environment and working with diverse students as strengths. This confirms the EPP is effective in preparing candidates in these areas. Completers and employers also agree that analyzing student data is an area of weakness. The EPP should work to develop skills in analyzing data with future candidates.

Stakeholder involvement

A candidate focus group and the Teacher Education Advisory Board convened to evaluate and align the Candidate Dispositions rubric to CAEP standards. In addition, the Teacher Education Advisory Board met to conduct a Lawshe's analysis of the completer and employer survey which is administered annually in accordance with CAEP standards R4.2 and R4.3. The Teacher Education Advisory Board is comprised of the Teacher Education Board and other area educators. Specifically, all cooperating teachers and principals from buildings in which candidates were hosted during the year are invited to attend. Members of the Teacher Education Board include: The Department Chair, also serving as Unit Head; Faculty who teach half time or more in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction undergraduate courses; One representative from each Division of the College, including a representative of Social Science in addition to Department of Curriculum & Instruction faculty; Two candidates representing the McPherson College student body (One seeking endorsement in elementary education and one seeking endorsement in secondary education or at the K-12 level); one representative from area public schools, representing K-12 constituents; and the college Registrar, as the officer who finalizes graduation clearance and who serves on Educational Policies Committee and other area

Measure 3

Candidate competency at program completion (R3.3)

The following data are taken directly from the report shared with the Teacher Education Board at the annual February data retreat. These data are updated at the end of the spring semester and also shared with the Teacher Education Advisory Board. The KTWS and the KCAT serve as the summative student teaching assessments for the EPP. The Praxis (PLT and Content) exams are required for licensure in Kansas.

Kansas Teacher Work Sample/KTWS

FA2020	N=-4
< 45 (cut score)	2
Avg. Score	46.25
SP2021	N=11
< 45 (cut score)	2
Avg. Score	54.09

Candidates scoring below the 45 cut score must complete remediate those low areas until a passing score is achieved.

Kansas Clinical Assessment Tool/ K-CAT

K-CAT Final													
	Stand. 1	Stand. 2	Stand. 3	Stand. 4	Stand. 5	Stand. 6	Stand. 7	Stand. 8	Stand. 9	Stand. 10	COOP Scores	Super Scores	Total Avg
FA2020 n=5													
Avg. for Standard	3.1	2.9	3.1	3.05	2.93	3.16	3.06	2.93	3.1	2.96	3.25	2.81	3.03
SP2021 n=11													
Avg. for Standard	2.84	2.84	2.95	2.82	2.68	2.69	2.85	2.73	2.89	2.67	3.14	2.80	2.92
FA2021													
Avg. for Standard	2.44	2.5	2.6	2.45	2.4	2.48	2.52	2.55	2.5	2.56	2.86	2.50	2.68
aggregated avg.	2.793	2.7467	2.8833	2.773	2.67	2.7767	2.81	2.737	2.83	2.73	3.0853	2.702	2.87

FA2021 n=6

Praxis-PLT Test

Praxis PLT Scores			Gender				Race and Ethnicity									
Year	# Taking test	# Passing	Male		Female		Hisp/Lat.		White		Afr. American		Multi-Racial		Asian/Pac. Islander	
			n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
2016-2017	7	6	3	100.00%	4	75.00%	1	100.00%	6	83.33%	0		0		0	
2017-2018	11	10	3	100.00%	8	87.50%	1	100.00%	8	100.00%	2	50.00%	0		0	
2018-2019	10	10	1	100.00%	9	100.00%	0		8	100.00%	1	100.00%	1	100.00%	0	
2019-2020	11	11	2	100.00%	9	100.00%	0		10	100.00%	0		0		1	100.00%
2020-2021	9	8	3	67.00%	6	100.00%	1	100.00%	5	100.00%	2	50.00%	0		1	100.00%
FA2021	1	1	1	100.00%	0		0		1	100.00%	0		0		0	
Total	49	46	13		36		3		38		5		1		2	
Overall % Passing		93.88%		94.50%		92.50%		100.00%		97.22%		66.67%		100.00%		100.00%

Praxis-Content Tests

Content Test Scores				2017-2018		2018-2019		2019-2020		2020-2021		Fall 2021			
Content Area	Cut Score	Mean Score	Overall pass Rate	Pass Rate	Average Score	Pass Rate	Average Score	Pass Rate	Average Score	Pass Rate	Average Score	Pass Rate	Average Score		
Elementary, K-6															
Elementary Educ.	153	168.5	96%	5/5=100%	167	7/7=100%	170	6/7=86%		7/7=100%					
CKT Soc. St.	157	171	100%					7/7=100%	167	7/7=100%	175				
CKT Science	150	172.5	100%					7/7=100%	177	7/7=100%	168				
CKT Read/LA	159	171	100%					7/7=100%	173	7/7=100%	169				
CKT Math	147	164.5	100%					6/6=100%	163	7/7=100%	166				
Secondary 6-12															
Biology	150	156	100%	1/1=100%	154	1/1=100%	158								
Chemistry	152	149	0%			0/0=0%	149								
English/Lang. Arts	162	167	100%	1/1=100%	157			1/1=100%	177						
History/Gov.	158	164	100%					1/1=100%	164						
Math	152														
Speech/Theatre	148														
PK-12															
Art	160	171	100%			1/1=100%	171								
Health	153	161	100%							1/1=100%	161				
Music	152	153.5	100%	1/1=100%	155	1/1=100%	152								
Physical Education	148	151.8	87.50%	2/2=100%	153	1/1=100%	152	2/2=100%	154	1/2=50%	147	1/1=100%	153		
Spanish	165	165	100%	1/1=100%	165										
ESOL	149	160	100%			1/1=100%	160								
				verall Pass Rate 42/44=95		11/11=100%		12/12=100%		10/11=91%		9/10=90%		1/1=100%	

**note: One student in 19-20 has taken and passed all ELED sections of the Praxis Content except has not attempted the math.

The candidate not passing the chemistry exam is 2018-19 was trained in biology but attempted the chemistry exam in an attempt to add the licensure area by test only.

Praxis CONTENT Scores		Gender				Race and Ethnicity							Major						
Year	# Taking test	# Passing	Male		Female		Hisp/Lat.		White		Afr. American		Multi-Racial	Asian/Pac. Islander	Elem. Ed.		Non ELED		
			n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
2016-2017	7	7	3	100%	4	100.00%	1	100.00%	6	100.00%	0	0	0	0	3	100.00%	4	100.00%	
2017-2018	11	10	3	100%	8	87.50%	1	100.00%	8	100.00%	2	50.00%	0	0	5	100.00%	6	83.33%	
2018-2019	10	10	1	100%	9	100.00%	0		7	100.00%	2	100.00%	1	100.00%	7	100.00%	3	100.00%	
2019-2020	11	10	2	100%	9	89.00%	0		10	100.00%	0	0	0	1	0.00%	7	86.00%	4	100.00%
2020-2021	10	9	4	75%	6	100.00%	1	100.00%	5	100.00%	3	67.00%	0	1	100.00%	7	100.00%	3	67.00%
FA 2021	1	1	1	100%	0		0		1	100.00%	0	0	0	0	0		1	100.00%	
Total	50	47	14		36		3		37		7	1	2	29		21			
Overall % Passing		94			96		95		100		100	72	100	50		97		92	

** Note: In 20-21 one student is represented twice in two content areas.

Measure 4

Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have been prepared.

Employment milestones: Ten of twelve completers from 2018-19 (three years after graduation) who were employed in education following completion continue teaching. This represents an 83.3% persistence rate.

Completer Date	N= completed	Employed in education		Employed out of education		Unknown	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
AY 2015-16	16	13	81.3%	1	6.3%	2	12.5%

AY 2016-17	11	8	72.7%	1	9.1%	2	18.2%
AY 2017-18	12	9	75.0%		0.0%	3	25.0%
AY 2018-19	13	12	92.3%	1	0.0%	0	7.7%
AY 2019-20	15	14	93.3%	1	6.7%	0	0.0%
AY 2020-21	16	10	62.5%	4	25.0%	2	12.5%
total	83	66	79.5%	8	9.6%	9	10.8%