

4.2 Summarize data and trends from the data linked above, reflecting on the prompts below.

The College of Wooster Educator Preparation Program continually analyzes our data to determine specific goals for ongoing improvement. The Quality Assurance System (QAS) has enabled us to utilize the Annual Data Retreat (typically held after the spring semester has ended) to systematically view the performance data of our candidates and the impact they have on P-12 students.

1. Impact on P-12 Learning and Development: Ohio's value-added data system provides information on student academic gains. As a vital component of Ohio's accountability system, districts and educators have access to an extensive array of diagnostic data through the Education Value-Added Assessment System (EVAAS). Schools can demonstrate through value-added data that many of their students are achieving significant progress. Student growth measures also provide students and parents with evidence of the impact of their efforts. Educators and schools further use value-added data to inform instructional practices. The EPP data is low due to a majority of graduates leaving Ohio for teaching positions or graduate school. Ohio value-added data only captures a portion of graduates teaching in Ohio public schools and does not provide student growth information for out-of-state graduates or graduates teaching in grades or courses where state value-added reporting is not used.

2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness: Ohio's system for evaluating teachers (Ohio's Teacher Evaluation System) provides educators with a detailed view of their performance, with a focus on specific strengths and opportunities for improvement. The system is research-based and designed to be transparent, fair, and adaptable to the specific contexts of Ohio's school districts. Furthermore, it builds on what educators know about the importance of ongoing assessment and feedback as a powerful vehicle to support improved practice. Teacher performance and student academic growth are the two key components of Ohio's evaluation system. An apparent dip in evaluations for the most recent "Initial License Effective Year" cohort comes from the perception that any given year's evaluation results is actually a chronological view of evaluations. Rather, it's a view of the evaluations from that school year, showing four different cohorts of licensed educators. The most recently licensed cohort will eventually have more evaluation results in its second year as more educators find employment as teachers or principals. Limitations of the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System (OTES) Data: The information in the report is for those individuals receiving their licenses with effective years of 2016, 2017, 2018, and 2019. Annual results must be masked for The College of Wooster because we have fewer than 10 completers with OTES data. Employment more accurately monitored through personal contact with completers. Typically, completers voluntarily contact the Alumni Office with employment information. If no contact is made, the Alumni Office attempts to reach out to the graduate through email or social media. The EPP currently tracks first and second-year employment type and place, when information is provided. The EPP provides an Alumni Survey to completers the fall semester following graduation and years two and four after graduation. The Alumni Survey provides information depicting where completers are employed and how the EPP program prepared them for teaching. This procedure mirrors the same procedure used by the State of Ohio. We have found that we get a slightly better return rate when the request

comes from the EPP as opposed to a state agency. Two areas that our department focused on based on survey results related to teaching diverse populations, knowledge in how to work with ESL learners, and classroom management. That said, even when coming from the EPP, the return rates on these surveys typically fall under 50%. This has been and continues to be a point of concern for the department. In connection with the Alumni Survey, the EPP uses completer-provided information to identify employers to participate in a survey about perceptions of completers' preparedness. In connection with the Alumni Survey, the EPP uses completer-provided information to identify employers to participate in a survey about perceptions of completers' preparedness. The State of Ohio has its own protocol for soliciting employer information. The State provides this information to the EPP in the annual MRS process. Information on validity and reliability for the state employer and graduate surveys can be found in the evidence. As with the Alumni Survey, the State Employer Survey has historically low rates of return across the state - not just this EPP. The return rates on the EPP administrated survey is much higher, typically 5-10 times the response of the state administration. EPP faculty review and apply these suggestions to inform program improvement.

Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones: The Resident Educator Program in Ohio encompasses a robust four-year teacher development system. The data shows the persistence of Ohio Educator Preparation Provider graduates through the program. Data from this table captures a year-to-year snapshot of the persistence of Ohio Educator Preparation Provider graduates through the program. Corrections to prior year reporting may be captured in the current year's reporting. Data used to create this "snapshot" table is sourced not only from the current year's resident educator completion data results but also prior-year results because a Resident Educator may fail to complete all the program year requirements within the same academic year.

Satisfaction of Completers: To gather information on student satisfaction with the quality of preparation provided by their educator preparation programs, the Ohio Department of Higher Education administers a survey aligned with the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession (OSTP), Ohio licensure requirements, and elements of national accreditation. All Ohio candidates receive an invitation to complete the survey during their professional internship (student teaching). The results of this survey are reflected here. A total of 2,903 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 68 percent. This is lower than the previous year, due to the pandemic. College of Wooster Survey Response Rate = 45.45 % - Total Survey Responses = 5. The lowest averages on the Pre-Service Evaluation Survey indicate a need to provide more instruction and discussion around the Resident Educator Program, Ohio's Operating Standards, and Value-Added Growth Measures and how they all impact new teachers. This will be an area of focus during the student teaching seminar.

Graduation Rates: Data is gathered for each cohort in the following areas: Entered student teaching, intervention during student teaching, dismissed from student teaching, did not meet all of the requirements for licensure, successful completion, and percentage of completion rate.

Licensure Exam Data: Ohio educator licensure requirements include passage of all required licensure examinations at the state-determined cut score. The reported results reflect Title II data and therefore represent pass rate data solely for initial licenses. Further, because the data are gathered from the Title II reports, there is a one-year lag in accessing the data. Teacher licensure pass rate data are the only reported metric for which the data do not reflect the reporting year 2019-2020. Trends on the Ohio Assessments for Educators (OAE) stay consistently high and are above the state average. Extensive efforts to incorporate key concepts/criteria from the OAE domains into the curriculum and alignments of course objectives alignment have a positive effect on test results. Our EPP has compiled our own data for the last three years and is reflected in the reporting measures.

The Ability of Completers to be Hired: Data gathered is related to completers employment in teaching positions for which they were prepared in year one and year two after graduation. A number of our completers teach outside of Ohio after graduation, therefore, we rely on EPP gathered data based on individual responses.

Student Loan Default Rates and Other Consumer Information: Link is provided to the Consumer and Accreditation Information on The College of Wooster website. Data is also provided related to federal student loan default rate up until the 2017 fiscal year. The current default rate is 2.4%

The EPP shares data and outcome measures not only with the education faculty but also with our Internal (Faculty, staff, and students) and External (Administrators, teachers, and other education personnel) Advisory Boards which meet once in the fall and once in the spring. All annual measures are shared via the departmental website in accordance with the CAEP reporting requirements. In addition, we extensively use our external advisory board and internal advisory boards as outside entities meant to digest our metrics reporting. These have been mutually beneficial and final relationships for all parties concerned.

The EPP did not have a plan to evaluate EPP-based clinical educators, nor for EPP-based clinical educators to evaluate school-based clinical educators. (Component 2.2)

During the Spring 2020 External/Internal Advisory Board meeting the EPP discussed the implementation of a feedback loop for clinical educators and school-based clinical educators. We were very careful in how we describe and promote this tool since the External Advisory Board members were clear that a formal "evaluation" of the school-based mentors was not something they would be willing to sanction during the previous year's meetings. The process for providing feedback was considered more palatable. The feedback was extremely useful for our EPP and we were able to look at and discuss outcomes and better evaluate our clinical educators. One need to continue to keep in mind is, due to our geographic placement, we do not have an endless supply of mentors and any strained partnerships would cause a serious disruption in our programmatic experience. Based on the suggestions and feedback from Internal and External Advisory Committees these forms were used starting in Fall 2019 and continue to be used with methods and clinical classes only.

The EPP does not have a formal system to collect evaluations of candidates from P-12 clinical educators. (Component 2.2)

In partnership with the EPP, P-12 clinical educators formally evaluate teacher candidates throughout the clinical experience. The formal evaluations are completed in three ways: 1) Weekly Collaboration Logs, 2) Classroom Observations 3) Using the CFAST form during midterm and final evaluation conferences. First, all student teachers complete a Collaboration Log every Friday during the clinical experience. This log is a co-reflective tool that targets specific goals and provides scaffolding for meeting these goals. All of these logs are shared with the clinical supervisor as well as the clinical seminar teachers. Second, supervisors meet with mentor teachers and student teachers weekly to discuss observations, strategies, strengths, weaknesses, and goals moving into the next week. Finally, the CFAST form is applied during midterm and final evaluation conferences. To begin this process, during the clinical educator/mentor orientation and training, P-12 educators and college supervisors receive training on the CFAST Form. The CFAST Form is a valid and reliable formative and summative assessment that is used during student teaching. The assessment has two sub-scales: Pedagogy and Dispositions that contain detailed descriptors of observable, measurable behaviors to guide scoring decisions. The CFAST is completed at the mid-term and during the final week of student teaching. The student-teacher is evaluated by the university supervisor, the P-12 clinical educator, as well as a student self-evaluation and a consensus score are then discussed and agreed upon. The assessment also provides for the opportunity to write goals related to corresponding rows in the CFAST Form. In reference to the Collaboration Logs above, student teachers also meet with the P-12 clinical educator at the end of each week to complete a Collaboration Log. The tool allows the mentor and the student-teacher to discuss what's working, the current focus, and the next steps for both individuals. This assessment tool guides the candidates and mentors to examine the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession in an effort to make connections and find evidence between the standards and current practice. The Director of Field, Assessment, and Candidate Engagement will enter evaluations into Qualtrics to compile data and trends. Information is collected and communicated during department meetings through online tools that help to tell our story visually and contextually. As a result, the EPP is able to visualize areas of success and to take action on areas of weakness. We feel that this three-tiered procedure gives mentors the opportunity to provide detailed, timely, and thorough feedback and evaluation on formative and summative levels.

The EPP does not have a formal plan to regularly or systemically analyze and interpret data. (Component 5.3)

The EPP meets every other week to discuss our program's goals, candidate's progress and analyze and interpret data. Twice a year, the EPP meets with Internal and External Advisory Boards. The Boards consist of faculty and staff at the institution and area educators outside of the institution. Not only do the groups reflect upon the program's impact on candidates and

completers, but they suggest innovative ideas to help better prepare our future educators. Recently, the Advisory Boards helped the EPP to determine content validity for a new formal plan to evaluate clinical educators and school-based clinical educators as evidenced in component 2.2. Additionally, the EPP meets each fall or spring through a departmental retreat to analyze data as a method to inform program development and improvement. This process ensures a near-constant conversation around our candidates' data, our orientation to the results, and an action planning process for its use.