Completer Impact and Effectiveness Data

Though Connecticut requires standardized testing of students at various points during their school years, CSDE does not share testing data with Schools of Education. Therefore, to demonstrate our completers' effectiveness and impact on student learning, the EPP analyzed a number of alternative data sources. We include data on completers' Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) to demonstrate students' academic growth as well as completers' edTPA, self-reported state teacher evaluations, K-12 student surveys and, previously, interviews and focus groups. Our findings, taken from multiple measures, suggest that our completers are effective and successfully impacting their students' learning and development. While we have convened annual focus groups, following the suggestions of our Advisory Council and based on the new approach to teacher evaluation in Connecticut, we are implementing a new approach for 2024 asking completers to share their Teacher Evaluation (TEVAL) data. We hope that the shared TEVAL data will be a rich source of both impact and effectiveness information from multiple perspectives. Data collection on TEVAL will begin Spring 2025 and include 2024-2025 data.

Student Teaching Evaluations: MAT Form D

All MAT candidates either Student Teach for a minimum of 50 days (10 weeks) or are hired as Teacher of Record under the ED 199 REC. Through either pathway, candidates are supported and assessed through conferences and a variety of observation instruments including Student Teaching Form D (Table 1.1; 1.2). The Form D is completed by candidates' Supervisors (Table 1.1) and Cooperating Teachers (Table 1.2) during Student Teaching in the final semester and assesses candidates on each of the 10 InTasc Standards. It was implemented in its present form with our 2019 cohort. In 2020, we conducted the following correlational analyses which were submitted with our Self-Study Report (SSR):

- Student Teaching Form D: Cooperating Teacher scores and University Supervisor scores
- Student Teaching Form D scores and Educator Disposition Assessment (EDA)
- EDA and edTPA task scores by degree level (4+1 and Graduate MAT) and cohort

When we examined relationships between Supervisor and Cooperating Teacher Form D scores, we found a strong, significant correlation between scores assigned by Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers ($r = 0.839$, $p<0.001$) that persisted when candidates were disaggregated by 4+1 ($r=0.766$, $p<0.001$) and GradMAT (0.944, $p<0.001$) tracks as well as by cohort year (data available upon request). Although at that time the Form D instrument had only been implemented for two cohorts, the findings suggest Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers assess candidates similarly.

When we examined the relationship between Internship EDA scores and Form D scores, we found moderate, significant correlations between EDA scores and Cooperating Teacher Form D scores ($r=0.382$, $p<0.05$) as well as between EDA scores and Supervisor Form D scores (0.382, $p<0.05$) among GradMAT candidates. An examination of the relationship between Form D scores and EDA *criterion* scores revealed significant correlations among 4+1 MAT candidates' Cooperating Teacher Form D scores and EDA *criterion* averages associated with oral communication ($r=0.235$, $p<0.05$) and professionalism ($r=0.254$, $p<0.05$). Among the GradMAT candidates, significant correlations between Cooperating Teacher Form D scores and EDA criterion scores emerged, including preparedness ($r=0.448$, $p=0.01$), appreciation and value of cultural and academic diversity ($r=0.612$, $p<0.01$), self-regulation ($r=0.470$, $p<0.01$), and social emotional learning ($r=0.384$, $p<0.05$). Similar correlations among GradMAT candidates were observed between EDA criterion scores and Supervisor Form D scores (data available upon request).

Finally, we examined the relationship between these EDA scores and edTPA outcomes among the 2019 cohort, for which there was the most complete edTPA data available at that time. We found EDA scores were significantly correlated with edTPA Planning Task ($r=0.424$, $p=0.005$), Assessment Task ($r=0.399$, $p<0.01$), and Average Rubric ($r=0.395$, $p=0.01$) scores for 4+1 MAT candidates.

Taken together, we believe that the Student Teaching Form D scores, (Table 1.1, 1.2; Measure 3) as well as data collected from EDA instrument (Measure 3) serves as a direct measure our candidates'

impact and effectiveness on student learning during Student Teaching, as well as a strong predictor of completers' impact and effectiveness on student learning as classroom teachers of record.

Completers' SLO Data

"At the heart of an SLO is a specific learning goal and a specific measure of student learning used to track progress toward that goal."[1] Surveys pertaining to SLOs and percentage of students meeting target, were designed by the EPP, vetted by the Advisory Board. Since Spring of 2018, these surveys have been sent to completers hired in CT, MA, NY, and NJ. In Spring 2018 and 2019, surveys were sent to completers from the 2017 and 2018 cohorts. In Spring 2020 and 2021, we reached out to 2014-2019 completer cohorts. Many agreed to submit their 2019-2021 SLO results, but due to challenges around COVID-19 closures, the data was incomplete. In Spring 2022, we initiated a new process whereby we planned to systematically reach out to the cohorts who graduated in the prior 2-4 years to ask for completer effectiveness data. The first round of that data was successfully collected and combined with the previously collected data (Table 1.3-1.5). In this way, data can be accumulated over time for future examination of trends. In 2023, we attempted to collect SLOs during the Focus Groups and, in the Focus Group invitation, asked participants to bring their SLOs to discuss but this approach yielded no results. Unfortunately, the 2024 Focus Group was not successfully convened.

Following the suggestions of our Advisory Council and based on the new approach to teacher evaluation in Connecticut, we are implementing a new approach for 2024 asking completers to share their Teacher Evaluation (TEVAL) data. We hope that the TEVAL data will be a rich source of both impact and effectiveness information from multiple perspectives. Data collection on TEVAL will begin Spring 2025 and will include 2024-2025 data and may also include 2023-24 data. We will continue identify strategies to collect graduates SLOs going forward and are hopeful that our new approach will provide a yield results which are more representative of proportions of completers from all program areas and tracks within the MAT.

Completers' student growth

Though results of various assessments were collected from 7 completers teaching at one of our urban PDS K-8 were presented in 2019 (Tables 1.19-1.33). We have since been unable to collect similar data from our completers but continue to explore strategies to work with our completers to collect Student Growth Data going forward. This includes following the suggestions of our Advisory to implement a new approach for 2024-25 asking completers to share their Teacher Evaluation (TEVAL) data. We hope that the TEVAL data will be a rich source of both impact and effectiveness information from multiple perspectives. Data collection on TEVAL will begin Spring 2025 and will include 2024-2025 data and may also include 2023-24 data.

Completers' mandated state teacher evaluations

Since Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) does not provide teacher evaluations or ratings, a sample of our 2017 cohort (from 4 states where completers are most often hired) self-reported ratings earned on state-mandated teacher evaluation during their first year of teaching are shared below. Given different focal criteria and levels to evaluate teachers (Table 1.6; 1.7) comparing ratings across states is not straightforward. Since 2022, we have been able to collect state teacher evaluations from our 2017-2023 cohorts predominantly from the four states in which our graduates are most often hired. This data reveals 98% of respondents (n=49) were rated in the top half of their state's scoring rubric. This data is presented below and we will continue to collect and accumulate teacher evaluation data in this manner going forward.

[1] https://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/communities/slo-targeting-growth.pdf

Completer Focus Groups

In June 2022 and June 2023, focus groups were convened with completers to gather data on completers' perceived impact on student learning. The Associate Dean facilitated the discussions. Responses from the focus groups were transcribed and coded based on InTASC Standards. A summary statement is included (page 9) as well as a tables (Table 1.8; 1.9) that articulate themes that emerged from completers in their responses. Based on findings from the focus groups, completers appear well prepared to differentiate instruction to support diverse K-12 learners across content areas and grade levels and, among Secondary completers, to use technology. While additional focus on SEL and ELL support was a recurring theme for future focus within our program in prior years, the responses from the focus groups suggest the EPP has successfully increased candidates' and completers' preparedness in these areas. The 2024 Focus Group was not successfully convened. We plan to convene the focus group again in Spring 2025 and again ask graduates to share or bring their SLO data as well as their TEVAL data. We will seek to increase the number of participants in 2025 in an effort to make up for the lack of data in 2024.

Completers' K-12 Student Surveys

The SOE and Advisory Board developed surveys (based on InTASC standards) for K-12 students. Through the surveys, K-12 students were asked to rate their teacher (an SOE completer, Table 1.10) on 10 items, with space for comments (Table 1.10). Student respondents were assured their individual responses would be kept confidential. Elementary and Secondary students rated all completers highly (Table 1.11 & 1.12). In 2022, with the support of our Advisory Board, the K-12 Student Surveys were revised and the InTASC aligned Elementary Student Survey was piloted in Spring 2023 with one our 2019 MAT who was teaching in a grade 6 classroom. The results of this survey (n=27) are presented below (Table 1.13). As a result of our success piloting this survey, we repeated the process for 2024 and collected student surveys from 5 Elementary and 2 Secondary completers in 2024, with responses from 122 Elementary and 31 Secondary students (Tables 1.14-1.16). We are currently engaged in data collection for 2024-25 and have at this time already collected responses from 2 Elementary graduates (36 student responses) and 2 Secondary graduates (102 student responses). We will continue this strategy going forward.

Completer interviews

Prior to 2020, to examine how completers apply professional knowledge and skills in their teaching practices, a faculty member conducted one-on-one interviews with completers from 5 cohorts (Tables 1.17-1.18). Interviews were structured to explore completers' skills and knowledge as well as satisfaction with their preparation and support. Questions were tagged to InTASC standards. Completers detailed the ways in which they make learning experiences and content accessible and meaningful for students, how they use authentic and/or strategic assessment to support student learning and guide instructional practices, and the role of the EPP in developing these skills. Differentiation was widely cited as an important part of their experience in our program. Since overall findings were consistent with findings from focus groups and surveys, interviews were paused due to the time and resource intensive nature of collecting this data in order to focus our efforts on collecting data associated with SLO, Surveys, and Teacher Evaluations. We will re-visit Completer Interviews if SLO and Survey data collection become insufficient assessments and/or measures.

Trends and External Benchmarks

In the absence of publicly available state data, and the different metrics used to assess student learning by regional Schools of Education (SOEs), we are unable to make direct comparisons in student learning between our SOE and other regional SOEs. We instead present the scores on Student Teaching Form D, which are significantly correlated with EDA and edTPA scores. We also present self-reported

ratings earned on state-mandated teacher evaluation as shared by graduates from our 2017-2023 cohorts (Table 1.7) and observe that 98% of respondents were rated in the top half of their state's scoring rubric.

Through the original and newly piloted student surveys, we also observed that K-12 learners rated their teachers (our completers) highly, with some variation according to grade level and content area (Tables 1.11-1.13). Based on the most recent state teacher evaluation data and K-12 survey data, completers appear well prepared to support diverse K-12 learners across content areas and grade levels. These findings were triangulated and affirmed through completer interviews where the theme associated with differentiation emerged frequently and was widely cited as an important part of their experience at the SOE. A discussion of data, including student comments, is included below.

We also present graduates' individual goals and district goals as external benchmarks for Literacy and Math (Table 1.3-1.5) from 2017-2019 collected in 2022. We are pleased to report respondents constituted an approximately representative sample of EPP completers (1.3) and that on average, with the exception of Secondary candidates in 2018, the majority of SLOs were met or exceeded (1.5). Additionally, in most instances, more than half of students in classrooms met or exceeding these goals, particularly noteworthy given the large proportion of students classified as ELLs in these classrooms. The findings also suggest that our completers are successfully impacting their students' learning and development across grade levels and content areas.

These findings suggest to us that our completers are effective teachers and are well prepared to differentiate instruction to positively impact learning among diverse K-12 learners across content areas and grade levels as assessed through multiple measures.

Measure 1: Data Table Guide

Student Teaching Form D
1.1 MAT Candidates Assessed by Supervisor……..p. 6
1.2 MAT Candidates Assessed by Cooperating Teacher…..……p. 7

Completer Reported SLOs
1.3 SLO Goals by Completer Program Area…….……..……p. 8
1.4 SLO Goals Reported by 2017-2019 Completer……..…p. 8
1.5 Percent of SLO Goals Met…..……...p. 8

State Teacher Evaluations
1.6 Performance Levels Used in Four States ……..p. 9
1.7 Self-Reported Performance Level Rating ……p. 9

Completer Focus Groups
Completer Focus Groups Summary Statement…….p. 10
1.8 Completer Focus Groups Themes Table……p. 11
1.9 Completer Focus Groups Themes Table……p. 12

Completer Student Surveys
1.10 Background Information on Completers …… ……....p. 14
1.11 Statistics of Secondary Respondents (old)…….……p. 14
1.12 Statistics of Elementary Respondents (old)…….……..……..…..p. 15
1.13 Statistics of Elementary Respondents (revised pilot)……..…...…….…p. 16
1.14 Statistics of Elementary Respondents (new survey)……...……....p. 17
1.15 Statistics of Secondary Respondents (new survey)……...…...……...p. 19
1.16 K-12 Respondent Survey Themes Table……p. 21

Completer Interviews
Completer Interviews Summary Statement……...……..…p. 22
1.17 Interviewees by Cohort Year and Program Area……...…….....…p. 22
1.18 Interview Questions ……...…….....…p. 22

Impact on Student Learning and Development (2019 Data)
1.19 SLO Assessments Provided by Completers…….p. 24
1.20 Completer and Student Demographics …...……p. 24
1.21 Individual Goals and District Benchmarks at Posttest ...……...…….……p. 25
1.22 Kindergarten PSF Assessment ……...…….…….……...p. 26
1.23 Kindergarten BAS Assessment ……...……...…….…….……...p. 26
1.24 Kindergarten Letter Sounds ……...…….…….……...p. 27
1.25 Kindergarten CCSS Math ...……...…….…….……...p. 27
1.26 Second Grade BAS Assessment ……...…….……p. 28
1.27 Second Grade DSA Assessment ……...…….……p. 28
1.28 Second Grade CCSS Math...……...…….…….……...p. 28
1.29 Second Grade Math Fact Fluency……p. 28
1.30 Fourth Grade SRI.…….…….……..p. 29
1.31 Fourth Grade BAS …….……...……p. 29
1.32 Seventh & Eighth Grade Math Fluency……p. 30
1.33 Seventh & Eighth Grade RI Assessment……..……p. 30

Impacts on Student Learning Growth: Student Teaching Form D

Due to challenges associated with COVID-19, Form D data is not available for 2020 and 2021

Table 1.1. Student Teaching Form D Assessment of Completers by their Student Teaching Supervisors.

Student Teaching Form D Data: Evaluation by Supervisor						
	N	Total Possible	High Score	Low Score	Mean	Stdev
Elementary TaskStream Title						
Graduate MAT						
2017 ED 601 Form D Elementary Student Teaching Evaluation: Supervisor	12	3.00	3.00	1.77	2.85	0.37
2018 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	9	4.00	4.00	2.71	3.74	0.43
2019 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	9	4.00	4.00	3.73	3.92	0.11
2022 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	8	4.00	4.00	2.82	3.42	0.44
2023 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	8	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.59	0.38
4+1 MAT						
2017 ED 601 Form D Elementary Student Teaching Evaluation: Supervisor	26	3.00	3.00	2.68	2.96	0.09
2018 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	31	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.87	0.21
2019 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	30	4.00	4.00	3.12	3.86	0.23
2022 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	21	4.00	4.00	2.97	3.58	0.40
2023 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	41	4.00	4.00	2.76	3.52	0.41
Secondary Science						
2017 ED 601 Form D Student Teaching Evaluation: Supervisor Secondary Scienc	6	3.00	3.00	2.87	2.95	0.06
2018 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	2	4.00	3.70	3.43	3.57	0.19
2019 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	1	4.00	2.78	2.78	2.78	-
2022 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	7	4.00	3.82	3.09	3.35	0.24
2023 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	1	4.00	3.18	3.18	3.18	-
Secondary English						
2017 ED 601 Form D Student Teaching Evaluation: Supervisor Secondary Englisl	9	3.00	3.00	2.74	2.94	0.08
2018 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	2	4.00	4.00	3.98	3.99	0.01
2019 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	9	4.00	4.00	3.22	3.82	0.26
2022 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	6	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.33	0.44
2023 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	1	4.00	3.79	3.79	3.79	-
Secondary Social Studies						
2017 ED 601 Form D Student Teaching Supervisor Evaluation Supervisor Second	7	3.00	3.00	2.81	2.91	0.09
2018 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	2	4.00	4.00	3.88	3.94	0.08
2019 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	10	4.00	4.00	2.60	3.58	0.37
2022 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	8	4.00	3.70	2.61	3.19	0.42
2023 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	6	4.00	3.73	2.55	3.06	0.39
Secondary Math						
2017 ED 601 Form D Student Teaching Evaluation Supervisor Secondary Mather	8	3.00	3.00	2.74	3.90	0.12
2018 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	6	4.00	3.90	3.32	3.64	0.22
2019 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	10	4.00	4.00	2.76	3.66	0.43
2022 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	3	4.00	3.15	2.91	3.06	0.13
2023 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	4	4.00	3.27	2.88	3.06	0.18
Secondary Spanish						
2017 ED 601 Form D Student Teaching Evaluation: Supervisor Secondary Spanis	2	3.00	3.00	2.61	2.81	0.19
2018 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	2	4.00	3.73	3.63	3.68	0.07
2019 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	3	4.00	3.73	3.39	3.55	0.17
2022 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	-	-	-	-	-	-
2023 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	-	-	-	-	-	-
EPP Wide						
Graduate MAT						
2017 ED 601 Form D Elementary Student Teaching Evaluation Supervisor	21	3.00	3.00	1.77	2.88	0.26
2018 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	14	4.00	4.00	2.71	3.76	0.47
2019 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	20	4.00	4.00	3.39	3.82	0.19
2022 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	18	4.00	4.00	2.82	3.35	0.39
2023 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	10	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.58	0.36
4+1 MAT						
2017 ED 601 Form D Elementary Student Teaching Evaluation Supervisor	52	3.00	3.00	2.61	2.94	0.18
2018 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	40	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.83	0.24
2019 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	52	4.00	4.00	2.60	3.75	0.36
2022 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	35	4.00	4.00	2.61	3.44	0.42
2023 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	51	4.00	4.00	2.55	3.43	0.43

.Table 1.2. Student Teaching Form D Assessment of Completers by their Cooperating Teachers.

Student Teaching Form D Data: Evaluation by Cooperating Teacher						
TaskStream Rubric Title	N	Total Possible	High Score	Low Score	Mean	Stdev
Elementary						
Graduate MAT						
2017 ED 601 Form D Elementary Student Teaching Evaluation Cooperating Teacher	12	3.00	3.00	1.84	2.83	0.34
2018 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	9	4.00	4.00	2.61	3.70	0.47
2019 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	9	4.00	4.00	3.73	3.92	0.10
2022 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	8	4.00	4.00	2.85	3.47	0.42
2023 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	9	4.00	4.00	2.97	3.46	0.39
4+1 MAT						
2017 ED 601 Form D Elementary Student Teaching Evaluation Cooperating Teacher	26	3.00	3.00	2.65	2.94	0.11
2018 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	31	4.00	4.00	3.32	3.87	0.17
2019 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	29	4.00	4.00	3.41	3.90	0.16
2022 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	17	4.00	4.00	3.21	3.68	0.27
2023 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	37	4.00	4.00	2.67	3.42	0.39
Secondary Science						
2017 ED 601 Form D Student Teaching Evaluation Cooperating Teacher Secondary S	6	3.00	3.00	2.81	2.95	0.07
2018 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	2	4.00	3.68	3.59	3.64	0.06
2019 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	1	4.00	2.54	-	-	-
2022 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	5	4.00	3.70	3.00	3.26	0.27
2023 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	1	4.00	3.15	-	-	-
Secondary English						
2017 ED 601 Form D Student Teaching Evaluation Cooperating Teacher Secondary E	9	3.00	3.00	2.06	2.84	0.30
2018 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	2	4.00	3.93	3.90	3.92	0.02
2019 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	9	4.00	4.00	2.54	3.73	0.48
2022 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	6	4.00	3.39	3.00	3.12	0.14
2023 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	2	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	0.00
Secondary Social Studies						
2017 ED 601 Form D Student Teaching Evaluation Cooperating Teacher Secondary H	7	3.00	3.00	2.72	2.91	0.12
2018 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	2	4.00	4.00	3.68	3.84	0.22
2019 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	9	4.00	4.00	2.30	3.59	0.55
2022 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	4	4.00	3.70	2.61	3.19	0.42
2023 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	9	4.00	3.82	2.45	3.22	0.38
Secondary Math						
2017 ED 601 Form D Student Teaching Evaluation Cooperating Teacher Secondary M	8	3.00	3.00	2.77	2.89	0.39
2018 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	6	4.00	4.00	3.24	3.78	0.29
2019 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	10	4.00	4.00	2.85	3.76	0.10
2022 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	5	4.00	3.70	3.15	3.30	0.22
2023 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	4	4.00	3.97	2.82	3.39	0.49
Secondary Spanish						
2017 ED 601 Form D Student Teaching Evaluation Cooperating Teacher Secondary S	4	3.00	2.94	2.71	2.82	0.11
2018 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	2	4.00	3.83	3.66	3.75	0.12
2019 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	3	4.00	3.83	3.10	3.50	0.37
2022 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	1	4.00	3.91	-	-	-
2023 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	-	-	-	-	-	-
EPP Wide						
Graduate MAT						
2017 ED 601 Form D Elementary Student Teaching Evaluation Cooperating Teacher	20	3.00	3.00	1.84	2.86	0.31
2018 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	14	4.00	4.00	2.61	3.74	0.47
2019 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	19	4.00	4.00	3.10	3.83	0.22
2022 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	19	4.00	4.00	2.85	3.44	0.38
2023 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	13	4.00	4.00	2.97	3.57	0.38
4+1 MAT						
2017 ED 601 Form D Elementary Student Teaching Evaluation Cooperating Teacher	52	3.00	3.00	2.06	2.91	0.28
2018 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	40	4.00	4.00	3.24	3.85	0.19
2019 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	51	4.00	4.00	2.30	3.77	0.39
2022 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	27	4.00	4.00	2.88	3.47	0.34
2023 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	49	4.00	4.00	2.45	3.36	0.40

Completer Reported SLOs

1.3. Self-Reported Student Learning Outcomes by Completer Program Area as of Fall 2022.

	2017 (n = 17)	2018 (n = 11)	2019 (n=1)
Elementary program	64.7%	81.8%	100%
Secondary program			
English	11.8%	0%	
Math	11.8%	18.2%	
History	5.9%	0%	
Biology	5.9%	0%	

SLO Goals as Reported by Completers

Table 1.4. Percent of SLO Goals Reported by 2017-2019 Completers as of Fall 2022.

	2017	2018	2019
	N	N	N
Elementary			
ELA	6	7	1
Math	8	3	
All Elementary SLOs	14	10	1
Secondary			
English	2	0	
Math	2	2	
History	1	0	
Biology	1	0	
All Secondary SLOs	6	2	

Table 1.5. Percent of SLO Goals Met as Reported by 2017 - 2019 Completers as of Fall 2022.

	2017		2018		2019	
	Did Not Meet	Met or Exceeded	Did Not Meet	Met or Exceeded	Did Not Meet	Met or Exceeded
Elementary						
ELA	16.67%	83.33%	28.6%	71.4%	0%	100%
Math	37.5%	62.5%	33.3%	66.6%		
All Elementary SLOs	28.57%	71.43%	30.0%	70.0%	0%	100%
Secondary						
English	50%	50%				
Math	50%	50%	50%	50%		
History	0%	100%				
Biology	0%	100%				
All Secondary SLOs	33.33%	66.67%	50%	50%		

Self-Reported State Teacher Evaluation

Table 1.6. Self-Reported State Teacher Evaluation: Performance Level Labels Used in Four States

	Performance Levels			
State	1	2	3	4
Connecticut	Below standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
New York	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly effective
New Jersey	Ineffective	Partially effective	Effective	Highly effective
Massachusetts	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
California	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
Canada	Emerging	Developing	Proficient	Distinguished

Table 1.7. Self-Reported State Teacher Evaluation: Self-Reported Performance Level Rating (Respondents from 2017-2023 cohorts as of 2024)

		Performance Level Rating			
		1	2	3	4
Connecticut (SEED)	Completers	0%	0%	71.9%	28.1%
(n = 32)	State[a]	-	-	-	-
New Jersey (ACHIEVE)	Completers	0%	0%	100%	0%
(n = 5)	State[c]	0.1%	1.0%	60.90%	38.0%
New York (Teacher Evaluation and Development System)	Completers	0%	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%
(n = 4)	State[a]	-	-	-	-
Massachusetts (MMSEE)	Completers	0%	0%	17%	83%
(n = 6)	State[b]	-	-	-	-
California	Completers	0%	0%	0%	100%
(n=1)					
Canada	Completers	0%	0%	0%	100%
(n=1)					
Percent at Performance Level (n=49)		0%	2.0%	63.3%	34.7%

a. Comparison data not available for CT or NY
b. MA provides average scores on their summative (1-4) but not on the formative (1=5) rating scale.
c. Statewide all 2016-2017 NJ teachers. https://www.nj.gov/education/AchieveNJ/resources/201516EducatorEvaluationImplementationReport.pdf

Focus Group: Completer Effectiveness and Impact

In Summer 2018, a sample of 2017 completers (N=7) from elementary, secondary, urban, and suburban schools volunteered to participate in a focus group. In Summer 2019, a second focus group was convened (N=9) from various cohorts who teach at the same urban K-8 school (91% URM; 54.7% ELL).

Participants in the first group included 2 completers in ELA, 3 in Elementary, and 2 in Secondary Science. When asked how they ensure inclusive learning environments that enable learners to meet high standards, completers discussed various approaches to differentiation including small groups, strategic pairing, the importance of supporting "leveled" groups according to students' needs, and specific supports for ELLs and students with special needs. Participants also shared their experiences and perspectives on the importance of approaching differentiation from a socio-emotional lens to support students' emotional and academic development.

Unprompted, 71.4% of participants described incorporating technology into their teaching (e.g., Google Classroom, Listenwise, Plickers, simulations). Participants who did not spontaneously discuss technology were Elementary teachers whose reflections focused on their use of Total Physical Response (TPR) in the classroom to engage learners and deepen students' understanding of content.

In Summer 2022, we convened a volunteer focus group of 2018 and 2020 completers (n=7), all from our Elementary program area. In Sumer 2023, we convened a volunteer focus group of 3 MAT completers, two from 2020 and one from 2021 cohorts. In all focus groups, the participants were asked the same questions as the 2018 focus group. When asked how they ensure inclusive learning environments that enable learners to meet high standards, completers again discussed various approaches to differentiation including small groups, strategic pairing, partner and half-partner work, the importance of supporting "leveled" groups according to students' needs, as identified from assessment data, and specific supports for ELLs and students with special needs. Participants also shared a variety of strategies for supporting students' social-emotional learning, which has been increasingly since the 2020-2021 academic year. Additionally, significant themes that emerged again this year was providing students choices in how they approach their learning and increasing students' self-efficacy, but creating a wide variety of opportunities for students to engage in self-assessment strategies across content areas. Completers noted that this approach not only helped students identify areas of success and areas where growth was needed, but also increased student buy-in, by meaningfully engaging students in their own learning and growth. Technology was a common through-thread for supporting students and is being leveraged across content areas through scaffolded activities, dual language programs, and increased options for choice in accessing content and modality. Completers also highlighted their role in helping students become critical consumers of online information and responsible users of technology and, in the 2023 Focus group, have begun discussing Artificial Intelligence (AI) with their students.

While participants in the 2018 focus groups identified differentiation as an area where they could have benefited from additional support during their time in the EPP and highlighted the need for SEL strategies to support students, this was not found to be true in the 2022 or 2023 focus groups. Participants in the 2022 and 2023 focus groups were able to articulate a wide variety of ways they have successfully incorporated differentiation and SEL supports into their teaching practices. Indeed, these two themes were highlighted throughout the discussions. While only a small sample, we are pleased to know we are continuing to support our candidates in developing skills based on implementing feedback from prior years' focus groups.

Unfortunately, the 2024 Focus Group was not successfully convened. We plan to convene the focus group again in Spring 2025 and again ask graduates to share or bring their SLO data as well as their TEVAL data. We will seek to increase the number of participants in 2025 in an effort to make up for the lack of data in 2024.

Table 1.8 Themes identified from 2022 Focus Group Reponses.

Section 1: Learner & Learning	**Respondent 1**	**Respondent 2**	**Respondent 3**	**Respondent 4**
Can you give an example of a lesson you designed and implemented that was both a developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experience for your learners?	rigor in content, student choice in what to focus on within a topic and how to access the material - increased student ownership	approach rigor by building up background knowledge, working on texts above grade level by building up background knowledge, working across content areas	trauma informed teaching practices, SEL is build into the curriculum, guided inquiry discussions, connecting SEL in school to real world events to help the kids process traumatic news events in developmentally appropriate ways using SEL curriculum	additional supports in writing were needed post-pandemic, building in student choice, access to resources that were developmentally appropriate so students could build background skills, technology scaffolds to support all learners (including especially ELLs)
Tell us how you ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.	student choice, self assessment, make better choices for themselves, revieing preassessment data, varying levels of challenge in student tasks (on same sheet so kids choose and teachers guide),	offer audio (different ways to access material) providing choice gives students opportunities to learn who they are as learners and eventually begin using the supports that are best suited to them. 'half partners' where they work independently next to someone (to bounce ideas)	many gaps in student learning from covid, wide ranges of reading levels, flexible groupings for readings, student tracking their own progress was motivating	80% ELL in classroom, small groups, lots of catch up from covid
Tell us about how you integrate individual and collaborative learning into your classroom.	choice in work, choice in partner (when possible/appropriate), choice to work alone or with a partner, students will often redirect themselves if they find working with friends isn't successful	grouping (work independently, half partner, partner, or group) in writing work with a group for part of it and independently for other parts	centers, choice of activities, multi modal learning,	collaborative work with younger kids doesn't always work as well as it might with older kids, but they do work together a lot in literacy and math, 2nd grade is in a tough position from 2 years of pandemic learning
Section 2: Content Knowledge	**Respondent 1**	**Respondent 2**	**Respondent 3**	**Respondent 4**
Explain how you make content meaningful for your students.	connecting the work to students (putting their names into math problems), focusing on the 'why' of learning and the impacts on people around them and the world, connecting it to what's going on outside themselves	encouraging kids to reflect on themselves and their skills (in writing) before diving into the content to build skills to make it personally meaningful. UBD approach to teaching, backwards mapping with the kids,	giving real world examples in math, the why around why they are learning certain skills (connecting fractions to cooking or decimals to money, etc.)	hands on work with younger kids, connecting across content (social studies and science with butterflies and maps),
How do you know that your students have mastered the content you teach?	create criterial charts with the students around success criteria, self assessment, pair assessment, teacher assessment, compare against success criteria	student self assessment, student checking in on their own growth, mini conferences with kids, review notes in books, listen in on book club discussions,	noticing students supporting their friends, giving students opportunities to 'teach' the class, even asking the question provides an indication of who is feeling confident to teach that material	end of unit assessments, progress monitoring, observation, conferring with students on success criteria, etc.
How do you encourage critical thinking in any of the content areas you teach?	building self-efficacy, setting high standards	critical reading through text analysis (symbolism, etc.)	using texts to build critical thinking skills	asking lots of questions "what do you think…" "how would you do something" instead of directing them what to do next
Section 3: Instructional Practice	**Respondent 1**	**Respondent 2**	**Respondent 3**	**Respondent 4**
Give an example of how you use assessment to guide your decision-making.	to guide groupings, prepare stations, identifying who needs support and how much	informs small group work and groupings	grouping, grouping across classrooms (also preparation for middle school)	use it to inform grouping and what is available in centers work
Tell us about one of your best instructional strategies that you use to improve student learning.	different settings with the whole group, small group, partners, independent to boost student engagement	QTA - Question the author strategies, increases student buy in	made a YouTube channel during pandemic that she continues to use because they can use it for additional support and learning especially at home	manipulatives and Elkonin boxes
How do you use technology to improve student engagement and learning?	one-to-one with laptops, adobe spark, epic, audio books, teaching research skills to identify credible sources, teaching videos, intervention math program, google suite for collaboration	virtual notebooks, speech to text, makes thinking visible, google slides, podcasts,	*(no response to this question)*	reading choice board, imagine learning, epic, Spanish language materials, boom cards for math,
Section 4: Professional Responsibility	**Respondent 1**	**Respondent 2**	**Respondent 3**	**Respondent 4**
Can you share any opportunities you have taken to engage in professional growth to improve teaching and learning?	Online Coaching offered through district at University of Pittsburgh, engaging in coaching cycles, PD, volunteered to review curriculum for CSDE.	Online Coaching offered through district at University of Pittsburgh, UDL and trauma informed practice PD, Summer pathways program	PD around new math programs (first year teacher)	AVMR course, Phonological awareness training,
Tell us about a time you collaborated with colleagues, or other school professionals to improve instructional practice.	weekly meetings with math and literacy coach, Grade level team meetings often, collaborating around curriculum units and lesson planning	coaching cycles, coaching meetings, co-teaching	observations of teaching from in the school, sit in on team members lessons, across grade levels, opportunities to observe different teaching styles and classroom management strategies	coaching cycles with math or literacy coach, collaborative planning times (twice weekly) once for reading and once for math
Tell us about one time you modeled ethical behavior for your students or colleagues.	morning meetings is an important part of the day for modeling ethical behavior and discussing strategies around issues that come up (on playground, how to have problem solving conversations, etc.)	high levels of student frustration this year, modeling ethical behavior through emotional regulation, practicing breathing, mindfulness when feeling frustrated or overwhelmed	teachers felt like 2021-2022 was the hardest year, even harder than 2020-2021, lots of behavioral issues, teaching students responsible citizenship especially around technology and internet usage, engaging in civil discourse even when people disagree	helping students identify the impacts of tone and mood when having discussions because they've not been able to practice that after almost two years of online school, modeling interactions and 'how things should look' when another teacher is in the room

Table 1.9 Themes identified from 2023 Focus Group Reponses.

Section 1: Learner & Learning	**Respondent 1 (Secondary Science)**	**Respondent 2 (4th Grade)**	**Respondent 3 (Secondary English)**
Can you give an example of a lesson you designed and implemented that was both a developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experience for your learners?	Giving students opportunities in class to engage in group work and research (online, using books, etc) to engage in learning - completer found supporting students this way leads to deeper more lasting learning	Giving students choice in the classroom, supporting students to complete the project/research in class so it is student driven (as opposed to parent driven) with opportunities for extending challenge for high performing students and to have students with IEPs/504s work with resource teachers. Students learned more and developed confidence in themselves as learners	Giving students choice and support in an extended project that continues for the duration of the marking period. Guiding student learning in the project by setting parameters, but largely giving students the freedom to choose their own resources to develop their project around a book of their choosing.
Tell us how you ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.	Providing students opportunities to work alone or in groups, lots of hands on laboratory activities, emphasizing process over product	Giving students a goal but giving choices in how they achieve that and how they demonstrate understanding, " not just having one roadmap for everybody but letting them pick their own way"; group work that is strategic, being mindful in how students are grouped	Giving students choice in their reading material, providing translated reading for emerging bilinguals, providing a range of levels of reading materials, students choosing reading at their level instead of being assigned a reading level reduces the 'stigma' of who is getting an easy or hard book which enhances inclusivity in the classroom.
Tell us about how you integrate individual and collaborative learning into your classroom.	Assigning different roles to studnets for a collaborative project helps support individual learning (each student is responsible for their part/role in the project) and collaboration (they have to work togethter effectivelly to complete the project)	providing lots of opportunitites for peer review, students can give or ask for feedback, book clubs where "sometimes it's leveled and sometimes it's the same book, but they all have kind of a different job within the book group....But they're all doing the same thing, they're all in a book club, and they have the same project, or whatever it may be, the same assignment, but they're using different texts."	when taking on challenging texts, encouraging group work to map out the text/essay, group/volunteer reading, assigning people as characters for plays
Section 2: Content Knowledge	**Respondent 1**	**Respondent 2**	**Respondent 3**
Explain how you make content meaningful for your students.	taking a project basic approach to science, everything has a hands-on approach, play around and have fun so having that major project and then encompassing how each part of the science and the curriculum touches upon each part of the project helps them learn the content and still have fun and engage in	Getting to know the students, finding out their interests, their hobby sports, it changes with each year, how much support a class might need, what their interests are, that their needs are, adapting the content to that	choosing texts that are culturally relevent to students, encouraing students to choose texts that interest them or that are relevent to current events, their cultural backgrounds, their families, etc
How do you know that your students have mastered the content you teach?	studnets abilities to explain what they have done and how is more informative than multiple choice or pen/paper tests, when they can explain it or apply it in a different context that is an indicator they have mastered it	When students talk about a topic or concept or make connections to it later or apply it to their day to day then I know that they really grasp the concept	If they are using the concepts/vocabulary/etc in their own writing
How do you encourage critical thinking in any of the content areas you teach?		Asking questions in large group settings so all students can hear the answers to help them make connections, asking students to talk about why they agree or disagree and to explain their thinking, prompting questions, sentence starters, are helpful for this age	using argumentative writing is introduced to them, asking students to take a stance on something, comparing their choice to their peers, using evidence to support their position
Section 3: Instructional Practice	**Respondent 1**	**Respondent 2**	**Respondent 3**
Give an example of how you use assessment to guide your decision-making.		assessments help me figure out my next steps for teaching, using assessments to help determine if you need to reteach a whole lesson or just part, also considering the students and whether they would benefit from a mental break and so doing the reteach (or finishing the lesson) the next day	I use assessments and responses from assessments to determine whether I need to adjust the lesson or revisit something from the lesson that they didn't get the first time as much as hoped
Tell us about one of your best instructional strategies that you use to improve student learning.		group work and strategic grouping - sometimes it's a group of students who need support and sometimes mixing groups of different levels so they can support each other	pairs work, they can support each other, there's some accountability, large groups at this age are too chaotic but pairs work well
How do you use technology to improve student engagement and learning?		using one-on-one laptops for centers (math, social studies), having students create simple presentations using Google slides,	Google slides, Newsela, one-on-one laptops

Table 1.9 Themes identified from 2023 Focus Group Reponses ctd…

Section 4: Professional Responsibility	**Respondent 1**	**Respondent 2**	**Respondent 3**
Can you share any opportunities you have taken to engage in professional growth to improve teaching and learning?		the virtual, comprehensive Orton-Gillingham course this year. So that was February and March. It was a 6-week course twice a week for 3 hours	a lot of workshops on social emotional learning. So SEL stuff other than that, I mean, just talking to the other teacher's kind of in my team in my grade level. I'm the youngest there by like 20 years. So, they've taught me a lot. using other teachers around you to kind of make sure you're doing the right thing."
Tell us about a time you collaborated with colleagues, or other school professionals to improve instructional practice.		collaborating with teachers across grade levels so 4th grades can help 2nd graders with a project or older grades can help fourth grades, book buddies with kindergartners, etc	Collaborating across content areas (ELA and social studies) around various non-fiction historical texts
Tell us about one time you modeled ethical behavior for your students or colleagues.		doing scenario practice with students (drawing cards from a deck and talking through 'what would you do if' scenarios) pertaining to friendships, bulllying, etc	discussing plagarism, talking about it in a real context, applying it to financial implications (literary theft, music theft, etc) and relating it to AI in writing
Section 5: Final Thoughts	**Respondent 1**	**Respondent 2**	**Respondent 3**
Of the topics we covered, which is the most important to you and why?		learner and learning. It is important because you know content and instructional practice, anyone can write a lesson plan but until you're in the classroom....Making decisions in a split second. Having it play out in front of you, the choices you make and...I know what these kids can do. I know what they're capable of, or what they might need help with. But once you're a teacher and you have the kids, you know exactly what their learning styles are like. It's easier to...revolve your lessons around the kids to make sure that they're getting most of the experience.	I really like the question about making sure content is meaningful to your students and kind of tying it into cultural relevance because it is such a prominent thing in my school. That's something that I feel like I've had the most say in kind of changing for next year and it seems like that's something people have wanted to do within the school for a while, but there hasn't been someone to do it. So, I am proud or happy to be taking the lead on that.
Is there anything else you would like to share that will help us ascertain your impact on student learning and growth?			Given where I'm working now...It's an urban school district and I grew up in a suburban wealthy kind of area and I'm teaching the exact opposite. So, you know, really focusing on, you know why a student might be having a bad day, or you know I can't really expect too much from this kid on this type of day. You know, taking all those things into consideration is kind of like, almost the most important thing in making sure that I'm able to teach and ...the students can feel welcome.

K-12 Student Surveys (unrevised – pre 2023)

Table 1.10. Background Information on Completers* Who Distributed Student Surveys

Completer ID	Grade/s Completer Currently Teaches and Discipline (if applicable)	Year Graduated from QU	Number of Students Completing the Survey	Number of Students Identified as English Learners	Number of Students with IEPs/504s
Abigail	Kindergarten	2014	37	33	NA
Molly	Kindergarten	2017	18	14	IEP=4/504=1
Lynn	Kindergarten	2017	17	NA	IEP=1
Celia	Second grade	2014	25	12	IEP=4
Sasha	Third grade	2018	20	0	IEP=2
Julie	Fourth grade	2018	19	5	IEP=1/504=3
Naomi	Fourth grade	2017	18	18	IEP=4
Amy	Fourth/Fifth grade	2019	17	0	IEP=1
Serena	Fifth grade	2015	21	NA	NA
Valerie	Middle School English	2015	66	"most"	504=12
Gina	High School Spanish	2018	62	NA	NA
Vonetta	High School History	2014	16	0	IEP=1

*All completers were assigned pseudonyms

Table 1.11. Statistics of Student Surveys Responses from Secondary Completers

	Gina (HS Spanish) Mean (SD)	Valerie (MS English) Mean (SD)	Vonetta (HS History) Mean (SD)	Average Across Completers Mean (SD)
Item 1: My individual needs are met by my teacher	4.63***a (.61)	3.99 (.81)	4.69**b (.48)	4.35 (.77)
Item 2: My teacher frequently relates the content to something I already know	4.39*a (.71)	3.93 (1.13)	4.75**b (.45)	4.22 (.94)
Item 3: My teacher respects us and words with us to establish a positive and supportive learning environment	4.74*a (.44)	4.49 (.72)	4.94*b (.25)	4.65 (.59)
Item 4: My teacher encourages students to analyze ideas from diverse perspectives	3.98 (.93)	4.44**c (.69)	4.38 (.89)	4.23 (.85)
Item 5: My teacher uses clear and concise language to explain concepts and content	4.26 (.85)	4.46 (.76)	4.81*d (.40)	4.41 (.78)
Item 6: My teacher values a flexible learning environment where we are encouraged to explore and discover	4.34*e (.85)	3.95 (.85)	4.44 (.73)	4.17 (.86)
Item 7: My teacher use assessments that are fair and accurately represent student knowledge	4.66 (.65)	4.39 (.77)	4.94*b (.25)	4.57 (.70)
Item 8: I feel prepared when my teacher gives us a project or quiz at the end of a unit	4.56***a (.62)	3.87 (1.10)	4.88***b (.50)	4.28 (.94)
Item 9: My teacher does not always lecture, but plays a different role in each lesson	4.23 (.82)	3.90 (1.09)	4.38 (.72)	4.09 (.96)
Item 10: My teacher words collaboratively with my family to set goals	3.02 (.83)	3.44 (1.20)	3.25 (1.39)	3.24 (1.09)
	4.27 (.44)	4.13 (.52)	4.54 (.37)	4.24 (.49)

~p ≤ .10; *p ≤ .05; **p ≤ .01; *** p ≤ .001

a. To be interpreted that Gina's students rated her significantly higher than Valerie's students on that item.
b. To be interpreted that Vonetta's students rated her significantly higher than Valerie's students on that item.
c. Valerie's students rated her significantly higher than Gina's students on Item 4.
d. Vonetta's students rated her significantly higher than Gina's students on Item 5.
e. Gina's students rated her significantly higher than Valerie's students on Item 6.

Table 1.12. Statistics of Students Survey Responses from Elementary Completers

	Molly's Mean (SD)	Abigail's Mean (SD)	Lynn's Mean (SD)	Celia's Mean (SD)	Sasha's Mean (SD)	Amy's Mean (SD)	Julie's Mean (SD)	Naomi's Mean (SD)	Serena's Mean (SD)	Mean Overall (SD)
Grade level	K	K	K	2nd grade	3rd grade	4/5th grade	4th grade	4th grade	5th grade	
Item 1: My teacher gives me work that is challenging, but gives me the support I need to complete the task	5.00*** [a] (.00)	3.97 (.87)	5.00*** (.00)	4.92*** (.40)	4.55* (.83)	4.47 (.72)	4.95*** (.23)	4.72** (.67)	4.57* (.75)	4.62 (.71)
Item 2: My teacher gives many different kinds of activities to show what we know.	5.00*** [a] (.00)	4.22 (.75)	5.00*** (.00)	4.96*** (.20)	4.60 (.75)	4.77* (.56)	4.84** (.38)	4.72* (.46)	4.62 (.81)	4.70 (.61)
Item 3: I feel safe and respected in the classroom.	5.00*** [a] (.00)	4.30 (.74)	5.00** (.00)	4.88* (.60)	4.60 (.82)	4.83 (.39)	4.74 (.73)	4.44 (.70)	4.57 (.68)	4.67 (.66)
Item 4: We work in groups and by ourselves.	4.89 (.47)	4.51 (.69)	5.00*[a] (.00)	5.00* (.00)	4.65 (.93)	4.77 (.56)	4.95 (.23)	4.83 (.51)	5.00* (.00)	4.82 (.54)
Item 5: My teacher explains things in many different ways	5.00* [a] (.00)	4.38 (.79)	4.53 (.87)	4.80 (.58)	4.74 (.45)	4.59 (.62)	4.58 (1.01)	4.67 (.69)	4.71 (.56)	4.64 (.70)
Item 6: My teacher encourages the students to listen to other students' different ideas and opinions	4.77 (.66)	4.35 (.89)	5.00* (.00)	4.76 (.88)	4.80 (.41)	4.82 (.39)	4.90 (.32)	4.89 (.47)	4.43 (.93)	4.70 (.70)
Item 7: My teacher helps us practice talking to each other to explain our ideas and opinions.	5.00 (.00)	4.41 (.64)	5.00 (.00)	4.64 (1.11)	4.50 (.61)	4.53 (.72)	4.84 (.50)	4.33 (1.14)	4.43 (.81)	4.60 (.76)
Item 8: I feel prepared when my teacher gives us a project or quiz at the end of a unit.	5.00*** [b] (.00)	4.43 (.77)	4.77* (.66)	4.84** (.37)	4.75* (.55)	4.82** (.39)	4.74* (.81)	3.94 (1.30)	4.33 (.66)	4.60 (.74)
Item 9: When students are confused, my teacher changes the way he/she is teaching to help us understand better.	5.00*** [b] (.00)	4.73** (.61)	5.00*** (.00)	4.96*** (.20)	4.70* (.98)	4.71* (.59)	4.89*** (.32)	3.94 (1.43)	4.76** (.70)	4.75 (.72)
Item 10: My teacher communicates with my family often	4.94*** [c] (.24)	4.65*** (.63)	4.77*** (.66)	4.76 (.60)	4.70*** (.57)	4.47** (.80)	4.52*** (1.02)	4.33* (.91)	3.48 (1.12)	4.52 (.84)
Average Score Across Items	4.96 (.08)	4.40 (.43)	4.91 (.13)	4.85 (.23)	4.67 (.39)	4.68 (.24)	4.80 (.41)	4.48 (.40)	4.49 (.33)	4.66 (.38)

~ $p \leq .10$; * $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$

a. To be interpreted as this completer's mean student ratings on the item were significantly higher than Abigail's student ratings. All other significance levels on this item indicate a significantly higher score than Abigail on this item.

b. This completer's mean student ratings on this item were significantly higher than Naomi's student ratings; all other significance levels on this item indicate a significantly higher score than Naomi on this item.

c. This completer's mean student ratings on this item were significantly higher than Serena's student ratings; all other significance levels on this item indicate a significantly higher score than Naomi on this item.

2023 Pilot of Revised K-12 Student Survey

In 2022, as a result of many rounds of feedback and discussion with our Advisory Board, the InTASC aligned K-12 Student Surveys (for both Elementary and Secondary students) were revised. The Elementary Student Survey was piloted in Spring 2023 with one of our 2019 MAT graduates who was teaching in a grade 6 classroom.

Table 1.13 Statistics of Students Responses from Elementary Completers Revised Survey.

Elementary K-12 Survey Pilot (n=27; Grade 6)	Never	A little bit	Sometimes	A lot	Always	I don't know	Always/A lot/ Sometimes
1. My teacher helps me with my work when it is hard.	7.4%	0.0%	22.2%	40.7%	29.6%	n/a	92.6%
2. My teacher gives me many different kinds of activities (drawing, writing, building) so I can show what I know.	0.0%	11.1%	22.2%	48.1%	18.5%	n/a	88.9%
3. I feel safe and respected in my teacher's classroom.	0.0%	3.7%	14.8%	22.2%	59.3%	n/a	96.3%
4. In our class, I work with many different classmates.	0.0%	18.5%	18.5%	25.9%	37.0%	n/a	81.5%
5. My teacher shows me how to do things in many ways.	0.0%	11.1%	11.1%	37.0%	40.7%	n/a	88.9%
6. My teacher helps us listen to each other's thoughts and ideas.	0.0%	7.4%	11.1%	37.0%	44.4%	n/a	92.6%
7, In my class, we practice talking to each other and explaining our ideas.	3.7%	11.1%	25.9%	29.6%	29.6%	n/a	85.2%
8. When we have tests or projects, my teacher helps us feel ready.	0.0%	0.0%	18.5%	14.8%	66.7%	n /a	100.0%
9. When I am confused, my teacher takes time to help me understand.	0.0%	3.7%	11.1%	51.9%	33.3%	n/a	96.3%
10. My teacher and my family talk or send messages to each other.	3.7%	7.4%	14.8%	25.9%	11.1%	37.0%	51.9%

Survey responses were collected anonymously through Google Forms which students completed in their classrooms individually on their Chromebooks. The average time to completion was 3 minutes and 7 seconds. From the pilot, we observed that there were no significant outliers in survey response times. Together with the distribution of responses across all five Likert-scale options we believe that K-12 students are both taking time to read through, and respond honestly to, the survey questions. The proportions of response to the categories "Sometimes," "A lot," and "Always," was over 80% in all cases except item 10 where nearly 40% of students reported they did not know the answer. This suggests that the overwhelming majority of students report that their teacher is engaging in practices that support student learning around differentiation for instruction (Items 5, 9), differentiation for assessment (Items 2), make learning experiences and content accessible for students (Item 1, 2, 5, 8), grouping strategies for learning (Item 4), has effective classroom management skills (Items 3, 6, and 7), and communicates with families (Item 10).

2024 Revised Elementary Student Survey

Survey responses were collected anonymously through Google Forms which students completed in their classrooms individually on their Chromebooks. The average time to completion for this set of surveys initially appeared to be 37 minutes and 22 seconds. However, a closer examination of the data reveals this was due to one participant who started the survey on a Monday and concluded the survey on a Wednesday (44 hours to 'complete') and two students who completed the survey in 23 or 27 minutes. Once these outliers were removed from the time to completion calculation, we find that on average students completed the survey in 6 minutes and 7 seconds. Taken with the distribution of responses across all five Likert-scale options, we believe Elementary students were taking time to read through, and respond honestly to, the survey questions.

Table 1.14 Statistics of Students Responses from Elementary Completers Revised Survey.

MAT Elementary Completers N=5	Cohort Year	N	Never	A little bit	Sometimes	A lot	Always	I don't know
1. My teacher helps me with my work when it is hard.	2019	71	2.8%	5.6%	28.2%	31.0%	32.4%	n/a
	2020							n/a
	2021	14	7.1%	14.3%	50.0%	7.1%	21.4%	n/a
	2022	37	0.0%	0.0%	18.9%	32.4%	48.6%	n/a
	2023							n/a
	Total	122	2.5%	4.9%	27.9%	28.7%	36.1%	n/a
2. My teacher gives me many different kinds of activities drawing, writing, building so I can show what I know.	2019	71	2.8%	9.9%	19.7%	40.8%	26.8%	n/a
	2020							n/a
	2021	14	0.0%	21.4%	21.4%	42.9%	14.3%	n/a
	2022	37	0.0%	10.8%	48.6%	16.2%	24.3%	n/a
	2023							n/a
	Total	122	1.6%	11.5%	28.7%	33.6%	24.6%	n/a
3. I feel safe and respected in my teacher's classroom.	2019	71	0.0%	1.4%	5.6%	18.3%	73.2%	n/a
	2020							n/a
	2021	14	0.0%	0.0%	28.6%	21.4%	50.0%	n/a
	2022	37	0.0%	0.0%	5.4%	21.6%	73.0%	n/a
	2023							n/a
	Total	122	0.0%	0.8%	8.2%	19.7%	70.5%	n/a
4. In our class, I work with many different classmates.	2019	71	0.0%	7.0%	28.2%	26.8%	38.0%	n/a
	2020							n/a
	2021	14	0.0%	28.6%	28.6%	28.6%	14.3%	n/a
	2022	37	0.0%	0.0%	37.8%	45.9%	16.2%	n/a
	2023							n/a
	Total	122	0.0%	7.4%	31.1%	32.8%	28.7%	n/a
5. My teacher shows me how to do things in many ways.	2019	71	0.0%	5.6%	12.7%	38.0%	40.8%	n/a
	2020							n/a
	2021	14	0.0%	14.3%	50.0%	14.3%	21.4%	n/a
	2022	37	0.0%	2.7%	5.4%	43.2%	48.6%	n/a
	2023							n/a
	Total	122	0.0%	5.7%	14.8%	36.9%	41.0%	n/a

6. My teacher helps us listen to each other's thoughts and ideas.	2019	71	0.0%	5.6%	4.2%	32.4%	56.3%	n/a
	2020							n/a
	2021	14	0.0%	14.3%	35.7%	28.6%	21.4%	n/a
	2022	37	0.0%	0.0%	8.1%	27.0%	64.9%	n/a
	2023							n/a
	Total	122	0.0%	4.9%	9.0%	30.3%	54.9%	n/a
7. In my class, we practice talking to each other and explaining our ideas.	2019	71	1.4%	4.2%	23.9%	40.8%	26.8%	n/a
	2020							n/a
	2021	14	14.3%	21.4%	7.1%	35.7%	21.4%	n/a
	2022	37	0.0%	0.0%	5.4%	43.2%	51.4%	n/a
	2023							n/a
	Total	122	2.5%	4.9%	16.4%	41.0%	33.6%	n/a
8. When we have tests or projects, my teacher helps us feel ready.	2019	71	0.0%	2.8%	7.0%	22.5%	64.8%	n/a
	2020							n/a
	2021	14	0.0%	0.0%	21.4%	14.3%	64.3%	n/a
	2022	37	0.0%	0.0%	10.8%	21.6%	67.6%	n/a
	2023							n/a
	Total	122	0.0%	1.6%	9.8%	21.3%	65.6%	n/a
9. When I am confused, my teacher takes time to help me understand.	2019	71	0.0%	4.2%	5.6%	39.4%	50.7%	n/a
	2020							n/a
	2021	14	0.0%	14.3%	50.0%	35.7%	0.0%	n/a
	2022	37	0.0%	2.7%	10.8%	40.5%	45.9%	n/a
	2023							n/a
	Total	122	0.0%	4.9%	12.3%	39.3%	43.4%	n/a
10. My teacher and my family talk or send messages to each other.	2019	71	2.8%	11.3%	22.5%	12.7%	14.1%	36.6%
	2020							
	2021	14	0.0%	35.7%	35.7%	0.0%	7.1%	21.4%
	2022	37	8.1%	16.2%	13.5%	8.1%	32.4%	21.6%
	2023							
	Total	122	4.1%	15.6%	21.3%	9.8%	18.9%	30.3%

The proportions of response to the categories “Sometimes,” “A lot,” and “Always,” was over 85% in all for MAT graduates from the 2019 and 2022 cohorts, except item 10 where 21-36% of students reported they did not know the answer. This suggests that the overwhelming majority of students report that their teacher is engaging in practices that support student learning around differentiation for instruction (Items 5, 9), differentiation for assessment (Items 2), make learning experiences and content accessible for students (Item 1, 2, 5, 8), grouping strategies for learning (Item 4), has effective classroom management skills (Items 3, 6, and 7), and communicates with families (Item 10). However, we noticed that the MAT graduate from the 2021 cohort had 21-36% of students reporting “Never” or “A little bit” for items 1, 2, 4, and 7. Focus groups convened with the 2021 cohort indicate differentiation and strategies for making learning and content accessible for students was reported as being a strong component of the program. We will continue to collect this data going forward so that we can seek trends in cohorts over time to better understand our graduates impact and effectiveness on Elementary learners.

2024 Revised Secondary Student Survey

Survey responses were collected anonymously through Google Forms which students completed in their classrooms individually on their Chromebooks. The average time to completion for this data set initially appeared to be 45 minutes and 47 seconds. However, a closer examination revealed this was due to one participant starting the survey on Tuesday and concluding it on Wednesday (22 hours). Once this outlier was removed from the time to completion calculation, we found that on average students completed the survey in 2 minutes and 47 seconds, which is consistent with the timing of the initial pilot. Taken with the distribution of responses across all five Likert-scale options, we believe Secondary students were taking time to read through, and respond honestly to, the survey questions.

Table 1.15 Statistics of Students Responses from Secondary Completers Revised Survey.

MAT Secondary N = 2	Cohort Year	N	Disagree	Kind of Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Kind of Agree	Agree	I don't know
1.My individual learning needs are met by my teacher.	2019	14	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	85.7%	n/a
	2020							n/a
	2021							n/a
	2022	17	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%	11.8%	82.4%	n/a
	2023							n/a
	Total	31	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	12.9%	83.9%	n/a
2. My teacher frequently relates the content to something I already know.	2019	14	0.0%	7.1%	42.9%	14.3%	35.7%	n/a
	2020							n/a
	2021							n/a
	2022	17	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%	41.2%	52.9%	n/a
	2023							n/a
	Total	31	0.0%	3.2%	22.6%	29.0%	45.2%	n/a
3. My teacher respects us and works with us to establish a positive and supportive learning environment.	2019	14	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	n/a
	2020							n/a
	2021							n/a
	2022	17	0.0%	0.0%	11.8%	0.0%	88.2%	n/a
	2023							n/a
	Total	31	0.0%	0.0%	6.5%	0.0%	93.5%	n/a
4. My teacher encourages students to analyze ideas from diverse perspectives.	2019	14	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	21.4%	78.6%	n/a
	2020							n/a
	2021							n/a
	2022	17	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%	17.6%	76.5%	n/a
	2023							n/a
	Total	31	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	19.4%	77.4%	n/a
5. My teacher uses clear and concise language to explain concepts and content.	2019	14	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	21.4%	78.6%	n/a
	2020							n/a
	2021							n/a
	2022	17	0.0%	0.0%	11.8%	23.5%	64.7%	n/a
	2023							n/a
	Total	31	0.0%	0.0%	6.5%	22.6%	71.0%	n/a

6. My teacher creates a flexible learning environment where we are encouraged to explore and discover.	2019	14	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	85.7%	n/a
	2020							n/a
	2021							n/a
	2022	17	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%	17.6%	76.5%	n/a
	2023							n/a
	Total	31	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	16.1%	80.6%	n/a
7. My teacher uses assessments where I can show what I know.	2019	14	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	85.7%	n/a
	2020							n/a
	2021							n/a
	2022	17	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%	17.6%	76.5%	n/a
	2023							n/a
	Total	31	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	16.1%	80.6%	n/a
8. I feel prepared when my teacher gives us a project or quiz at the end of a unit.	2019	14	0.0%	7.1%	7.1%	14.3%	71.4%	n/a
	2020							n/a
	2021							n/a
	2022	17	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	29.4%	70.6%	n/a
	2023							n/a
	Total	31	0.0%	3.2%	3.2%	22.6%	71.0%	n/a
9. My teacher does not only lecture; they use different strategies when teaching.	2019	14	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	42.9%	57.1%	n/a
	2020							n/a
	2021							n/a
	2022	17	0.0%	11.8%	17.6%	17.6%	52.9%	n/a
	2023							n/a
	Total	31	0.0%	6.5%	9.7%	29.0%	54.8%	n/a
10. My teacher works collaboratively with my family to set goals.	2019	14	7.1%	7.1%	28.6%	14.3%	21.4%	21.4%
	2020							
	2021							
	2022	17	17.6%	5.9%	23.5%	0.0%	23.5%	29.4%
	2023							
	Total	31	12.9%	6.5%	25.8%	6.5%	22.6%	25.8%

The proportions of response to the categories “Kind of Agree” or “Agree” ranged from 85-100% in all cases, except item 2 for the 2019 graduate where only 50% marked “Kind of Agree” or “Agree” and Item 9 where only 70% marked “Kind of Agree” or “Agree” for the 2022 graduate. Additionally, we see in Item 10 only 23-36% of students responded with “Kind of Agree” or “Agree,” while 21-29% of students reported they did not know the answer, and 14-23% indicated “Disagree” or “Kind of Disagree”. This suggests that, like our Elementary completers, the overwhelming majority of students report that their teacher is engaging in practices that support student learning around differentiation for instruction (Items 5, 9), differentiation for assessment (Items 2), make learning experiences and content accessible for students (Item 1, 2, 5, 8), grouping strategies for learning (Item 4), has effective classroom management skills (Items 3, 6, and 7), and communicates with families (Item 10). However, we also conclude that one graduate may engage it lecture and the other may not connect content to students’ every day experience as often as hoped. We will continue to collect this data going forward so that we can seek trends in cohorts over time to better understand our graduates impact and effectiveness on Secondary learners.

Table 1.16 Themes of Students Comments from Revised K-12 Student Surveys.

K-12 Student Survey Themes from Comments		Elementary (n=74)	Secondary (n=14)
Positive Comments	Helpful (General)	9.5%	7.1%
	Helpful (Content/Assessment Related)	9.5%	7.1%
	Kind/Nice Person	27.0%	7.1%
	Funny	14.9%	0.0%
	Great/Awesome/Best Teacher	29.7%	92.9%
	Love them	8.1%	7.1%
	Supportive/ Encouraging (General)	6.8%	0.0%
	Supportive/ Encouraging (Content Related)	4.1%	7.1%
	Learn a Lot/Teach Well	8.1%	14.3%
	Role Model	2.7%	0.0%
	Attractive/Well Dressed	5.4%	0.0%
Negative Comments	Is Unfair	2.7%	0.0%

The comments collected from the K-12 Student surveys were in response to the open-ended question which reads “Please write anything else you want to share with us about your teacher. While only 60.6% of Elementary respondents and 45.2% of Secondary respondents provided comments, the comments are overwhelmingly positive which students indicating our graduates are helpful and encouraging/supportive, both generally and in terms of content and that they are kind, teach well, and are a superlative teacher. We noticed that one student found their teacher to be unfair. Without additional information, we cannot delve further into that comment, but we will look for trends within the data for additional constructive feedback. We cannot help but notice that while the proportion of students indicating the graduate is “Funny” or “Kind” or “Well Dressed” decreases from Elementary to Secondary respondents, the proportion of respondents indicating the teacher is the “Best” or “Teaches Well” increases from Elementary to Secondary. We believe this may suggest that as students grow in experience throughout their K-12 years, they are better able to judge the quality of a teacher against that of their other current and previous teachers and therefore focus less on personal characteristics in their reporting.

Completer Interviews from 2014-2019 Cohorts

Completer Interviews Summary Statement

To examine how completers apply professional knowledge and skills in their teaching practices, an EPP faculty member conducted one-on-one interviews with completers from 5 cohorts (Table 4.2.d.1). Interviews were structured to explore completers' skills and knowledge as well as satisfaction with EPP preparation and support. Questions were tagged to InTASC standards (4.2.d.2). One theme that emerged from reviewing the interviews was the variety of strategies for differentiation in the classroom and differentiation was widely cited as an important part of their EPP experience. Consistent with our observations from surveys, supporting ELLs and classroom management emerged as areas where the EPP can enhance support. Completers also detailed the ways in which they make learning experiences and content accessible and meaningful for students, how they use authentic and/or strategic assessment to support student learning and guide instructional practices, and the role of the EPP in developing these skills. Overall, findings were consistent with themes that emerged from focus groups and surveys.

1.17 Completer Interviewees (n) by Cohort Year and Program Area

Cohort	2014	2015	2017	2018	2019	Total
Elementary	2	0	3	2	1	8
Secondary	1	1	0	1	0	3
Total	3	1	3	3	1	11

1.18 Completer Interview Questions

INTERVIEW WITH: ***Completer Name***

Program Area and Cohort Year

1) Tell me about the goals & content of the classes where you distributed the student surveys.
2) Can you tell me a little bit about your students? Is there a different makeup of students in different classes? In what ways?
3) Now I am going to ask you some questions that are related to the questions you were asked on the survey, covering topics ranging from differentiation and classroom climate.
4) I would love to hear a little bit about what you do in your classes to foster a supportive learning climate. *InTASC: Standard 3*
5) How do you differentiate instruction to meet the needs of each student? *InTASC Standard 2*
5a) Where did you learn this?
5b) Were there any specific classes or experiences from QU that supported acquisition of that skill?
5c) Were there specific things QU could do better to prepare you to do this?

6) Tell me a little about your approach to instruction… *InTASC Standards 1, 5 & 7*
6a) How do you make content meaningful for students? *InTASC Standard 8*
6b) Can you give me an example of a lesson you designed and implemented that supported students' agency or autonomy? *InTASC Standards 2 & 8*
6c) Where did you learn to do this
6d) Were there specific classes or experiences from QU that supported acquisition of that skill?
6e) Were there specific things that QU could do better to prepare you to do this?
7) Tell me how you assess your students' learning? *InTASC Standard 6*
7b) How do you use assessment to guide your decision making? Can you give me examples? *InTASC Standard 6*
7c) Where did you learn how to do this?
7d) Were there any specific classes or experiences that supported acquisition of that skill?
7c) Were there specific things QU could do better to prepare you to do this?
8) Talk about how you make meaningful home-school connections. *InTASC Standard 10*
8a) Are there ways that you collaborate with families to help set goals for students? *InTASC Standard 10*
8b) Where did you learn to do this?
8c) Were there any specific classes or experiences from QU that taught you how to do this?
8d) Were there specific things QU could do better to do this?
9) Is there anything else you would like to share with me?

Data from 2019 Focus Group - SLO Assessment Descriptions

Table 1.19. Student Growth: SLO Assessments Provided by Completers

Literacy Assessments	**Math Assessments**
Phoneme Segmentation Fluency (PSF)	Common Core State Standard (CCSS)[b] Math Test
Letter Sounds (LS)	Fact Fluency (FF)
Developmental Spelling Assessment (DSA)	Math Fluency-Subtraction (MF-S)[c]
Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI)[d]	Math Fluency-Division (MF-D)[e]
Benchmark Assessment System (BAS)[a]	
Reading Inventory (RI)	

a. The goal of BAS is to determine the level of text that the student can read at an instructional level (90-94% accuracy and comprehension). It has no district benchmarks but is used to set individual goals.
b. At all points, a score of 0-69 is *Basic*, 70-79 is *Proficient*, and 80-100 is *Goal*.
c. On MF-S students are given five minutes to complete 25 subtraction questions (Benchmark 20-25 correct).
d. SRI is a computer-adaptive assessment designed to measure how well students read texts of varying difficulties. The score is a lexile level, and the expectation is to reach the 740-940L range in fourth grade. Due to the large proportion of ELLs, growth is a more meaningful indication of learning.
e. On MF-D students are given five minutes to complete 50 division questions (0-34 *Basic*; 35-39 *Proficient*; 40-50 *Goal*).

Impact on Student Learning and Development

Table 1.20. Completer and Student Demographics - Fair Haven School: Student Growth

Completer ID[a]	Grade/s Completer Currently Teaches and Discipline (if applicable)	Year Graduated from QU	Number of Students Completing the Survey	Percent of Students Identified as English Learners	Number of Students with IEPs/504s
Lynn	Kindergarten	2017	17	NA	IEP = 1
Abigail	Kindergarten	2014	37	89.1	NA
Molly	Kindergarten	2017	18	77.7	IEP= 4/504 = 1
Celia	Second grade	2014	25	48.0	IEP=4
Naomi	Fourth grade	2017	18	100.0	IEP=4
Julie	Fourth grade	2018	19	26.3	IEP=1/504=3
Valerie	Seventh and Eighth Grade English	2015	66	"most"[b]	504=12

a. Note that all completers have been given pseudonyms.
b. This completer did not provide the actual number of English learners in her classroom. In a focus group, she said "most" of the students in her classroom are English learners

Table 1.21. Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Individual Goals (IND) and District (DST) Benchmarks at Posttest

	Kindergarten						Second grade		Fourth grade				7th & 8th grade English	
	Lynn		Abigail		Molly		Celia		Naomi		Julie		Valerie	
	IND	DST	IND	DST	IND	DST	IND	DST	IND	DST	IND	DST	IND	DST
Literacy														
PSF	53	52	80	60	56	50								
LS			53											
DSA							46							
SRI									60		36	41		
BAS		41[a]		100		44	100	73	86					
RI													83	72
Mathematics														
CCSS-math	82	53	67	98	100	75	100	58						
FF			100	100										
MF-S							87	63						
MF-D									68	73		50		

a. For the BAS in kindergarten, participants did not provide individual goals—rather, the goal for all children was to be reading at the district benchmark by posttest (Level D). Therefore, no data is provided for the percent of children meeting individual goals for this assessment.

Kindergarten

More than 50% of students met or exceeded their individual and district PSF goal, (Table 4.1.b.3), between 35-83% moved out of the lowest reading levels (BAS; Table 4.1.b.4), and 53% of students met their individual LS goal (Table 4.1.b.5). By posttest, on average, all classes met, or were within 0.5 points of, goal CCSS-math scores (Table 4.1.b.6.) and 66%-100% of students met or exceeded individual goals. One completer provided FF data for 8 students who scored at or above 99 on the mid-year CCSS-math (no district benchmark).

Table 1.22. Completers' Student Scores, Growth, and Progress Toward Goals on Phoneme Segmentation Fluency (PSF[a]) Assessment at Pretest, Mid-Year, and Posttest

	Pretest Mean (SD, range)	Mid-Year Mean (SD, range)	Posttest Mean (SD, range)	Average Growth from Pretest to Posttest Mean (SD, range)	Percent of Students Meeting/ Exceeding Individual Goal	Percent of Students Meeting/ Exceeding District Goal
District Benchmark Scores	4-11	10-19	25-39			
Lynn (n = 17)	2.82 (4.07, 0-12)	10.76 (8.44, 0-30)	26.71 (14.76, 1-45)	23.88 (13.95, 1-43)	53%	52.94%
Abigail (n = 5)[a]	2.60 (3.05, 1-8)	16.60 (7.64, 11-30)	31.40 (14.88, 18-57)	28.80 (15.64,17-56)	80%	60%
Molly (n =16)	4.25 (9.17, 0-35)	12.31 (8.09, 3-37)	30.38 (13.87, 6-48)	26.13 (12.90, 6-43)	56%	50%

a. PSF evaluates students' fluency with a specific aspect of phonemic awareness, segmentation, which a key foundation for beginning reading and writing.
b. Abigail only provided scores for five students on the PSF Assessment because they comprised a subgroup of students that met their Letter Sound goals by mid-year and were therefore ready for this more difficult assessment. These five students were included in the Letter Sound data for Abigail found later in this report.

Table 1.23. Percent of Students Reading at Varied Levels at Mid-Year and Posttest on the Benchmark Assessment System (BAS[a]) and Average Increase in the Number of Reading Levels from Mid-Year to Posttest

	Mid-Year			Posttest			
	Levels A-C	Levels D-F	Level G and Above	Levels A-C	Levels D-F	Level G and Above	Mean Growth in Reading Level from Mid-Year to Posttest (SD, Range)
Lynn (n = 17)	94%[a]	0%	5.8%	59%	17%	24%	2.41 levels (1.87, 0-7)
Abigail (n = 6)	83%	17%	0%	0%	67%	33%	3.17 levels (1.33, 2-5)
Molly (n = 16)	100%	0%	0%	56%	44%	0%	1.56 levels (.81, 0-3)

a. On BAS, teachers provide a leveled text to students, record the student's accuracy reading this text, and ask the student questions to evaluate comprehension of the text. Text levels increase in difficulty from A to Z.
b. All percents are to be interpreted as the percent of students reading at that level within the assessment period; so, for example, 94% of Lynn's students were reading Levels A-C at the mid-year assessment.

Table 1.24. Completers' Student Scores, Growth, and Progress Toward Goals on Letter Sounds

	Pretest Mean (SD, range)	Mid-Year Mean (SD, range)	Posttest Mean (SD, range)	Average Growth from Pretest to Posttest Mean (SD, range)	Percent of Students Meeting/ Exceeding Individual Goal	Percent of Students Meeting/ Exceeding District Benchmark
Abigail (n = 34)	2 (3.03, 0-10)	15.65 (8.93, 0-25)	21.27 (6.93, 1-26)	19.27 (6.64, 1-26)	53%	N/A

Table 1.25. Completers' Student Scores, Growth, and Progress Toward Goals on the Common Core State Standard Math Assessment at Pretest, Mid-Year, and Posttest

	Pretest Mean (SD, range)	Mid-Year Mean (SD, range)	Posttest Mean (SD, range)	Average Growth from Pretest to Posttest Mean (SD, range)	Percent of Students Meeting/ Exceeding Individual Goal	Percent of Students Meeting/ Exceeding District Benchmark
Lynn (n = 17)	22.21 (16.35, 1-65)	60.03 (25.77, 11-89.5)	79.62 (18.79, 40-100)	57.41 (16.03, 30-77)	82%	53%
Abigail (n = 35)	16.42 (14.82, 0-61)	77.94 (22.85, 20-100)	95.26 (4.19, 87-100)	80.91 (7.07, 55-97)	66.67%	98%
Molly (n =16)	27.06 (15.66, 5-62)	69.09 (22.65, 29-100)	89.41 (10.02, 73-100)	62.34 (12.46, 38-81)	100%	75%

Second Grade

All students met or exceeded individual BAS goals (Table 4.1.b.7.) and 73% met or exceeded district benchmark**.** On DSA, 46% met or exceeded individual goal, administered to a subset of students (Table 4.1.b.8) the majority of whom were ELLs and not ready for BAS. On CCSS-math (4.1.b.9), 58% of students achieved *Goal* at posttest and all met their individual goal. Over 60% of students met benchmark and almost 90% met their individual goal on MS-F (Table 4.1.b.10).

Table 1.26. Average Student Growth from Pre- to Posttest on the Benchmark Assessment System for Celia

Participant	Growth from Pretest to Posttest Mean Reading Level (SD, Range)	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Individualized Goal	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding District Benchmark at Posttest
Celia (n = 22)	3.55 levels (1.28, 2-7)	100%	73%

Table 1.27. Student Scores, Growth, and Progress Toward Goals on the Developmental Spelling Assessment (DSA[a]) at Pretest, Mid-Year, and Posttest

	Pretest Mean (SD, range)	Mid-Year Mean (SD, range)	Posttest Mean (SD, range)	Average Growth from Pretest to Posttest Mean (SD, range)	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Individual Goal
Celia (n = 11)	11.27 (5.44, 0-21)	14.64 (5.89, 0-24)	16.46 (6.07, 3-24)	5.18 (3.13, 0-11)	46%

a. The DSA is an assessment of student's ability to accurately hear, and record the sounds they hear, in a series of words.

Table 1.28. Student Scores, Growth, and Progress Toward Goals on the Common Core State Standard Math (CCSS-Math) Assessment at Mid-Year and Posttest

	Mid-Year Mean (SD, range)	Posttest Mean (SD, range)	Average Growth from Mid-year to Posttest Mean (SD, range)	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Individual Goal	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding District Benchmark
Celia (n = 12)	66.08 (14.64, 44-84)	84.08 (10.02, 69-100)	18 (8.28, 4-34)	100%	58%

Table 1.29. Student Scores, Growth, and Progress Toward Goals on the Math Fluency-Subtraction Assessment at Pretest, Mid-Year and Posttest

	Pretest Mean (SD, range)	Mid-Year Mean (SD, range)	Posttest Mean (SD, range)	Average Growth from Mid-year to Posttest Mean (SD, range)	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Individual Goal	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Benchmark Goal
Celia (n = 32)[a]	10.09 (5.66, 0-18)	17.94 (5.89, 3-25)	18.54 (6.12, 2-25)	9.75 (6.33, 0-19)	87.5%	63.5%

a. Scores were not provided for students who scored a 24 or 25 (n=8) at the mid-year assessment as they appeared to have reached a ceiling on the assessment at that time. As a result, the number of students included in the posttest mean for this class is 24.

Fourth Grade

On average, SRI scores increased (Table 4.1.b.11). Figure 4.1.b.1 shows the increase is due to overall growth among the class. Note that one student (scored 137) was not eligible for the SRI at pre- or mid-year and was excluded from the box plots. Naomi reported 60% of her students met or exceeded individual SRI goal (no data). One completer provided BAS data for students who scored 0 on SRI. Table 4.1.b.12 indicates over 85% of students met their individual BAS goal. One completer provided individual FF-D data (Table 4.1.b.13). Over 70% of her students met district benchmark and 68% of students met their individual goal. The other completer reported 50% of her students met FF-D district benchmark.

Table 1.30. Student Scores, Growth, and Progress Toward Goals on the Scholastic Reading Inventory at Pretest, Mid-Year and Posttest

	Pretest Mean (SD, range)	Mid-Year Mean (SD, range)	Posttest Mean (SD, range)	Average Growth from Mid-year to Posttest Mean (SD, range)	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Individual Goal	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Benchmark Goal
Julie (n = 22)	557.33 (180.78, 164-904)	575.05 (181.21, 209-922)	613.59 (212.37, 137-887)	81.59 (87.89, -46-257)	36.4%	41%

Table 1.31. Average Student Growth from Pre- to Posttest on the Benchmark Assessment System for Naomi

Participant	Growth from Pretest to Posttest Mean Reading Level (SD, Range)	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Individualized Goal
Naomi (n = 8)	4.75 levels (1.58, 2-7)	85.7%

7th and 8th Grade

More than 80% of students met or exceeded individual RI goals in both classes (Table 4.1.b.14) and over 70% met or exceeded district benchmark. Figures 4.1.b.2 and 4.1.b.3 suggest the increase is the result overall growth among the class. Given the high proportion of ELLs (and students with IEPs) in her class, this growth is noteworthy.

Table 1.32. Completer's Student Scores, Growth, and Progress Toward Goals on the Math Fluency-Division Assessment at Pretest, Mid-Year and Posttest

	Pretest Mean (SD, range)	Mid-Year Mean (SD, range)	Posttest Mean (SD, range)	Average Growth from Mid-year to Posttest Mean (SD, range)	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Individual Goal	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Benchmark Goal
Nina (n = 22)	11.41 (12.95, 0-50)	28.14 (16.87, 4-50)	39.5 (14.92, 2-25)	28.09 (14.15, -1-47)	68%	73%

1.33. Completer's Student Scores, Growth, and Progress Toward Goals on the RI Assessment at Pretest and Posttest

	Pretest Mean (SD, range)	Posttest Mean (SD, range)	Average Growth from Mid-year to Posttest Mean (SD, range)	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Individual Goal	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding District Benchmark Goal
7th Grade RI Scores (n = 43)	887.67 (201.84, 247-1216)	985.21 (207.39, 257-1333)	118.19 (116.77, -80-513)	86%	72%
8th Grade RI Scores (n = 47)	952.89 (186.95, 559-1343)	1039.38 (246.29, 148-14-7)	127.04 (152.71, -158-526)	81%	72%