

## CAEP Annual Reporting Measures (2018)

Introduction: Beginning with this year, all institutions, who are members of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), are required to publish eight reporting measures that are part of the institution's annual report to CAEP\*. These measures are outlined below.

\*Note #1: The Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) merged in 2013 to form CAEP. Westfield State University is a legacy NCATE institution and is now a member of CAEP. We still display the NCATE logo because our current national accreditation was completed when we were a member of NCATE.

Annual Reporting Measures (CAEP Component 5.4   A.5.4)	
Impact Measures (CAEP Standard 4)	Outcome Measures
1. Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component 4.1)	5. Graduation Rates (initial & advanced levels)
2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness (Component 4.2)	6. Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements; Title II (initial & advanced levels)
3. Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones (Component 4.3   A.4.1)	7. Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared (initial & advanced levels)
4. Satisfaction of completers (Component 4.4   A.4.2)	8. Student loan default rates and other consumer information (initial & advanced levels)

The first four annual reporting measures are aligned with CAEP Standard 4: *The provider demonstrates the impact of its completers on P-12 student learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools, and the satisfaction of its completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.*

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

REPORTING MEASURE ONE. Suitable "impact on P-12 learning and development" data is not available from the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE). As part of an employment report available through a portal (EDWIN Analytics) for use by education preparation providers, Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) test data is only available for two tests, English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics (MATH). Students take MCAS tests from grades 3 to 8 and in 10th grade, when a passing score is required for a high school diploma. Data from the employment report (EP702) is available

broken out by school districts. When this is done, even when collapsing across all employment years available (AY 10-11 – AY 15-16), most districts do not meet the threshold (minimum of n = 6 for each cell) for reporting MCAS results due to protecting the privacy of the P-12 students. WSU completers who completed initial licensure between AY 10-11 and AY 15-16 were employed in 159 school districts in Massachusetts. Of those there are only six districts with MCAS ELA and MCAS MATH results reported in EP702. Also, in each district not all WSU completers work with P-12 students who take the MCAS ELA and MCAS MATH tests (e.g., secondary biology or physical education). The total number of WSU completers employed in Massachusetts from AY 10-11 to AY 15-16 (latest employment year available) is 632 (corrected from 637 reported to CAEP on 4/30/2018) according to EP702. The total number of completers teaching in the six districts with MCAS data available is 287, but only 84 of these teachers have MCAS data reported in the aggregated data for each of these six districts. Therefore only 84 teachers of a total cohort of 632 have reportable MCAS data. (See Table 1a below.) This means only 13% of the cohort of 632 completers have MCAS data reported. This is not suitable for drawing any conclusions from the MCAS data provided.

Table 1a (as reported to CAEP)

District Name	# of WSU completers employed in the district from AY 10-11 to AY 15-16	WSU completers with aggregate MCAS data (must work with students who take MCAS ELA and MCAS MATH)
Agawam	23	7
Chicopee	41	8
Hampden Charter School of Science (East)	8	8
Holyoke	36	8
Springfield	143	37
Westfield	36	16
TOTAL	287	84

Table 1b (corrected)\*\*

District Name	# of WSU completers employed in the district from AY 10-11 to AY 15-16	WSU completers with aggregate MCAS data (must work with students who take MCAS ELA and MCAS MATH)
Agawam	24	7
Chicopee	43	8
Hampden Charter School of Science (East)	8	8
Holyoke	38	8
Springfield	149	37
Westfield	40	16
TOTAL	302	84

**\*\*Note #2:** In EP702, males and females are reported separated. In Table 1a the data in the middle column is for females only because the values in a separate EP702 report for males was inadvertently not included. In Table 1b, males are now included with females. Including males in Table 1b, did not change the values of WSU completers who have aggregate MCAS data as reported the third column.

**Note#3:** Although we do not have a direct measure of impact on student learning at this time, we can provide some additional information about where our students are employed. WSU graduates reported in Table 1b above, except for Hampden Charter School of Science (East) are partnering districts. Therefore, 294 of 632 or 47% WSU graduates from AY 10-11 – AY 15-16 are employed in partnering districts. Also, data from EP702 for females (n=590) and males (n=42) for these same years indicates that 304 of 632 or 48% are working in urban districts. (This additional information was not directly related to CAEP Reporting Measure One and therefore was not included in the annual report.)

REPORTING MEASURE TWO. EDWIN Analytics provides survey data in EP704 Survey Reports. The Hiring Principal Survey component of this report (subarea: New Hire Feedback), asks the following stem question: "Relative to all other teachers (both novice and experienced) you've worked with, please indicate the extent to which this teacher's performance is significantly above or below average." Rating choices are as follows: Top 1%, Top 10%, Top 25%, Typical, and Bottom 50%. New hires are scored on the six critical elements identified under the state's PSTs. For 2016-17, an "n" of 35 principals reported the following:

- Critical Element 1. Consistently enforces high expectations for all students: 74% rated at top 1, 10, or 25 percent; 6% rated in bottom 50 percent. In contrast, the state average (n=282) was 63% (top 25%) and 11% (bottom 50%).
- Critical Element 2. Implements well-structured lessons: 72% rated at top 1, 10, or 25 percent; 3% rated in bottom 50 percent. In contrast, the state average was 63% (top 25%) and 11% (bottom 50%).
- Critical Element 3. Maintains an academic learning environment where students are unafraid to take academic risks: 68% rated at top 1, 10, or 25 percent; 6% rated in bottom 50 percent. In contrast, the state average (n=284) was 63% (top 25%) and 9% (bottom 50%).
- Critical Element 4. Makes adjustments in practice based on assessment data: 82% rated at top 1, 10, or 25 percent; 3% rated in bottom 50 percent. In contrast, the state average (n=284) was 59% (top 25%) and 10% (bottom 50%).
- Critical Element 5. Meets the diverse needs of learners within the classroom: 77% rated at top 1, 10, or 25 percent; 3% rated in bottom 50 percent. In contrast, the state average (n=284) was 61% (top 25%) and 11% (bottom 50%).
- Critical Element 6. Uses self-reflection to improve practice: 82% rated at top 1, 10, or 25 percent; 6% rated in bottom 50 percent. In contrast, the state average was 68% (top 25%) and 10% (bottom 50%).

In all six elements, Westfield exceeded state results by a margin of 10% or greater being rated in the top 25 percent of new or experienced teachers. See Table 2 below.

Table 2

		Number of respondents	Top 1%	Top 10%	Top 25%	Typical (Top 26 – 49%)	Bottom 50%	Percentage rated in Top 25%
Consistently enforces high expectations for all students	WSU	35	9%	34%	31%	20%	6%	74%
	STATE	282	7%	24%	32%	26%	11%	63%
Implements well-structured lessons	WSU	35	6%	37%	29%	26%	3%	72%
	STATE	284	6%	21%	29%	35%	10%	56%
Maintains an academic learning environment where students are unafraid to take academic risks	WSU	35	11%	31%	26%	26%	6%	68%
	STATE	284	10%	25%	28%	28%	9%	63%
Makes adjustments in practice based on assessment data	WSU	35	11%	31%	40%	14%	3%	82%
	STATE	284	7%	22%	30%	30%	10%	59%
Meets the diverse needs of learners within the classroom	WSU	35	9%	37%	31%	20%	3%	77%
	STATE	284	8%	24%	29%	29%	11%	61%
Uses self-reflection to improve practice	WSU	34	12%	44%	26%	12%	6%	82%
	STATE	283	12%	30%	26%	21%	10%	68%

REPORTING MEASURE THREE. With respect to employer satisfaction, we currently distribute both initial and advanced employer surveys every year. This year our response rate on both surveys is too low to provide reliable information. Only two employers of professional licensure M.Ed. completers responded to the survey. Seventeen principals responded to the initial survey, but only six had hired a WSU graduate in the 2016-2017 school year and of those six principals, only three completed the survey. We have had better response rates in the past, but overall the numbers are consistently low. In Reporting Measure two above, we report principal ratings of our completers on the six critical elements used for evaluating teacher effectiveness. At this time, we are considering using the DESE Edwin Analytics data exclusively. With respect to employment milestones, Edwin Analytics data indicate that 767, or 76.6%, of Westfield completers (from AY 2010-11 to 2015-16) were employed in MA public schools, and 94% of that cohort had remain employed after two years.

Table 3

<a href="#">Westfield State University</a>	1,214	76.6	767	94.0
--	-------	------	-----	------

REPORTING MEASURE FOUR. We survey both initial and advanced completers (alumni) annually. In the AY 2016-2017 survey, there were two responses (7% response rate). Beginning spring 2018, we are replacing the advanced alumni survey with an exit survey of advanced completers, in part to capture a better response from this category of completers and better assess program satisfaction. The new survey is aligned to the NBPTS standards for each discipline in which we offer a professional licensure program.

Beginning in 2016-17, we implemented a new survey of initial licensure alumni, which is aligned to the 10 InTASC standards as well as the state Professional Standards for Teachers, for a total of 25 outcomes. Although the response rate is 30 (18% response rate), only 23 of the 30 respondents completed the outcomes section of the survey where the 25 items are presented. The vast majority of our candidates indicate they are either “adequately prepared” or “well prepared” on almost all 25 items. The exception are the two items on preparation for teaching English Language Learners and having the skills necessary to communicate with English Language Learners and their families. (See Table 4 below.)

Table 4

Initial Alumni Survey (AY 2016-2017)

As a first-year teacher...

# of 23\* who answered  
well-prepared or  
adequately prepared

\*except where noted in  
Items 10a and 10b

Percentage

1. I had sufficient knowledge of how children (within the age span of my licensure area) grow and develop in cognitive as well as socioemotional and physical areas and could apply that knowledge to creating meaningful learning experiences.	19	83
2. I was equipped with strategies and skills for assisting individual students develop social-emotional skills (e.g. self-confidence, self-management, relationship skills, responsibility).	19	83
3. I was able to identify developmental and personal differences among individual students in my classes and apply that knowledge toward adapting instruction to the learning needs of the range of students in my classroom.	21	91
4. I had the skills and commitment to hold all students to high expectations and knew strategies for making knowledge accessible to all students, either through my own teaching or in advocating for resources or materials.	20	87
5. I was able to create a classroom environment that is inclusive, respectful, safe, and equitable for all learners regardless of personality, culture, race, religion, gender, or sexual orientation.	20	87
6. I was equipped with strategies for managing a classroom through developmentally appropriate routines, procedures, norms and expectations designed to encourage positive behavior, active participation, and collaborative learning.	19	83
7. I have the knowledge and skills to		

be a culturally proficient educator who respects and values differences in culture, heritage and language backgrounds represented in the school or classroom.	20	87
8. I understand the major concepts, processes, and ways of knowing that are central to my licensure area. My understanding provided a solid foundation for developing and teaching lessons using academic language appropriate to the grade level...	20	87
9. I am knowledgeable of both state and national curriculum standards for students and was able to apply them to developing units of instruction to ensure student mastery of learning objectives and progressions identified by standards.	20	87
10a. Art, music, physical education, and secondary education teachers only: I was equipped with a repertoire of methods and strategies for communicating the specific concepts of my teaching area to students.	7** ** n = 8	88
10b. Early childhood, elementary, and special education teachers only: I was equipped with a repertoire of methods and strategies for teaching the central concepts and essential ideas for reading and literacy, mathematics, social studies, and science.	15*** *** n= 20	75
11. I was equipped with knowledge and skills for using a range of digital and interactive media resources to enhance learning specific to the grade level and content of my teaching.	17	74
12. I was able to access and use educational resources and best practices to further all aspects of my teaching practice.	19	83
13. I was able to distinguish between, use, select, and design assessment tools (as applicable), including diagnostic assessments; formative and summative assessments; and formal and informal assessments.	17	74
14. I was able to use assessments as a tool for monitoring and providing feedback to individual and whole group learners, as well as how to adapt assessments for individual learners, and adjust future instruction based on formative assessment results	17	74

15. I was able to assess and analyze student learning data, and I was able to use assessment data to reflect and adjust future instruction.	20	87
16. I had the knowledge and skills to plan well designed and sequenced lessons and units of instruction that drew on knowledge of the content area(s), addressed the learning needs of a range of students and curriculum objectives, considered students.	19	83
17. I was equipped with a range of teaching strategies and an understanding of what strategies are effective for individual learning needs as well as learning objectives (e.g. critical thinking and questioning, problem- solving, creative processes).	20	87
18. I was equipped with strategies for making content available to English language learners and I could help learners develop and distinguish between social and academic language skills.	14	61
19. I practice being a “lifelong learner” and understand the importance of pursuing professional and career development. I am knowledgeable about professional organizations, research bases, and career growth or leadership opportunities.	21	91
20. I am a reflective practitioner who uses input such as student data, self-assessment, peer feedback, formal evaluations, and goal setting to improve my practice.	20	87
21. I have knowledge of laws, policies, professional standards of practice, and codes of ethics and their application to my professional practice.	19	83
22. I was equipped with strategies and communication skills related to developing welcoming, respectful and positive relationships with students’ families; communicating with parents about their children’s learning progress; & supporting students.	21	91
23. Specifically, I was equipped with strategies for collaborating with families of English language learners, including accessing resources to communicate across language barriers, while respecting the significance of native language and culture.	11	48
24. I have an understanding of the		



organizational structure of my school and school district; the roles of school personnel; and skills needed for working collaboratively with peers, paraprofessionals, supervisors, specialists, and teams.	19	83
25. I understand the importance of advocacy, 43.48% make use of community resources, and take 10 part in school-based decision-making and improvements.	19	83

REPORTING MEASURE FIVE. Graduation rates for 2016-17 are as follows:

- Undergraduate programs (not including secondary): 77% 6-year graduation rate; 59% 4-year graduation rate. In comparison, university-wide graduation rates for the same time period are 65% and 51%, respectively.
- Secondary (including Physical Education, Art, English, History, Mathematics): 75% 4-year completion rate
- Post-baccalaureate licensure: 57% 4-year completion rate (NOTE: Most Post-Baccalaureate students are employed so many do not typically finish the licensure program, including student teaching within four years.)
- M.Ed. initial licensure: 50% 4-year completion rate
- M.Ed. advanced (professional license): 67% 4-year completion rate
- School counseling: 57% 4-year completion rate

NOTE: All graduate degree programs at Westfield State have a six-year limit starting with the first course taken in the program of study. Many graduate students do not complete the Master's program within 4 years.

REPORTING MEASURE SIX. In academic year 2016-17, 169 initial and 36 advanced candidates were recommended for licensure as a result of satisfactory completion of programs. Since candidates must pass all licensure tests in order to complete their program, our pass rate is 100%.

REPORTING MEASURE SEVEN. According to the most recent data available to us from Edwin Analytics, our employment rate in state public institutions is 57%. The state average is 56%. Data are based on Westfield program completers in 2014-15 and 2015- 16 (combined) who are employed in 2016-17. Please also note employment data reported under Reporting Measure 3.

REPORTING MEASURE EIGHT. The WSU default rate on student loans for FY 2014 (latest data available from U.S. Department of Education) is 4.4%. The comparable national figure for similar public institutions is 7.5%.