

University of Pikeville  
Patton College of Education

2020-2021 Case Study of Educator Preparation  
Program Impact for CAEP Standard 4

Introduction ..... 3  
    Purpose of the Study..... 3  
Methods..... 3  
    Participants..... 3  
    Procedures..... 4  
    Data Analysis and Results ..... 4  
Discussion of Findings and Implications for Improvement..... 12  
    Continuous Improvement Efforts..... 13  
Reference.....15



The UPIKE Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness administered satisfaction surveys to our completers with one to three years of teaching experience and to school administrators where our completers were teaching. The satisfaction surveys asked the completers to 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, and the employers are asked to rate how well our completers who work within their schools are able to meet the KTPS/InTASC Standards within the P-12 classrooms.

In addition, we analyzed data related to the percentage of our 2020-2021 completers who met licensure requirements for teacher certification and the employment data of our completers.

#### Procedures

First, we determined the percentage of 2020

*Data from P-12 School Districts*

One set of data provided by a single district resulted from administrator walkthrough observations completed in 2020-2021 for completers with one to three years of experience (CAEP 4.2). The instrument was co-

that the completers included in this data set are demonstrating effective teaching practices within their P-12 classrooms (CAEP 4.2).

The next data set was 2020-2021 summative evaluation data









|                               |      |     |      |
|-------------------------------|------|-----|------|
| c) Advance the profession.    |      |     |      |
| Exceptionally/Fully Prepared  | 100% | 91% | 100% |
| Partially Prepared/Unprepared | 0    | 9   | 0    |

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

Prepared by the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness, June

Finally, we analyzed data from the Completer Satisfaction Evaluation. This survey-type instrument is administered annually by the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness at the University of Pikeville (CAEP 4.4). The rating scale for the Completer Satisfaction Evaluation includes level 1 (*unprepared*), 2 (*partially prepared*), 3 (*fully prepared*), and 4 (*exceptionally prepared*) related to how well our completers perceive that their preparation program prepared them to meet the KTPS/InTASC Standards.

As presented in our 2018-

|                               |     |   |   |    |
|-------------------------------|-----|---|---|----|
| Partially Prepared/Unprepared | 100 | 0 | 4 | 11 |
|-------------------------------|-----|---|---|----|

|   |      |      |      |
|---|------|------|------|
| Standard 9. <b>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. | 3.00 | 3.78 | 3.64 |
| Exceptionally/Fully Prepared  | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Partially Prepared/Unprepared   | 0    | 0    | 0    |
| Standard 10. <b>Leadership and collaboration.</b> The teacher shall seek appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to:<br>d) Take responsibility for student learning;<br>e) Collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth; and<br>f) Advance the profession.  | 4.00 | 3.74 | 3.56 |
| Exceptionally/Fully Prepared  | 100% | 100% | 96%  |
| Partially Prepared/Unprepared   | 0    | 0    | 4    |

### Discussion of Findings and Implications for Improvement

The 2020



based on a four-point scale with four being the highest possible rating, we decided to target scores below 3.5 as areas for improvement.

#### Next Steps

- We will continue to use common lesson plan and peer teaching rubrics in all 200 and 300 level courses that require these activities. We will compile and track pre-candidate data so that we can address the identified areas of growth to prepare students for Clinical I.
- Teacher candidates will demonstrate understanding of equitable access to learning for every student and will demonstrate understanding of the differences among standards, curriculum, and high-quality instructional resources.
- Teacher candidates will be able to navigate the <https://kystandards.org/> website and will use the standards resources, general resources, and content area resources to effectively plan and implement P-12 instruction using the Explicit Instruction Model and aligned with the Kentucky Academic Standards.
- Teacher candidates at both the undergraduate and graduate levels will demonstrate that they can plan and teach lessons that incorporate differentiation to meet the needs of diverse learners, higher-level questioning, student use of technology, and a variety of high-quality instructional resources (HQIRs) that go beyond the textbook.

## Reference

- D. Goldhaber (2016, February 3). In schools, teacher quality matters most. *Education Next*, 16(2).  
<https://www.educationnext.org/in-schools-teacher-quality-matters-most-coleman/>