

CAEP Annual Outcome Measures for Teacher Education 2020 Report of 2017-2019 Data

Impact Measures

1. Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component 4.1): A. The following graduate and employer survey data (graduated in years 2015-16 and 2017-18) demonstrate the program's impact on P-12 learning and development. (The survey is completed in the Spring of the year after graduation and after two full years of teaching.) Data are gathered 1. via onsite interviews with graduates and their employers and 2. electronically. B. Data from Case Study Analysis of program graduates' classrooms conducted in Spring of 2020 (2018-2019 graduates) provide evidence of program impact based on pre-/post-testing of graduate's students.

A. Data from the 2019 Survey of 1st and 3rd year graduates demonstrate consistent responses with the prior year survey. Elementary program graduates reference specific data available (e.g., AIMSweb) more consistently than do secondary or all-level program graduates. 2) Music program graduates use performance data to demonstrate student impact (e.g., complexity of music from one performance to the next, intonation, etc.). 3) Secondary employers reference student engagement in observations, relationships, and understanding of content as evidence of student progress demonstrated by program graduates. Data from the second question (both program graduate and employer) indicate, in general, that program graduate's impact on PreK-12 student progress is positive.

See the full report ([program completer/graduate](#) and [employer](#)) for quantitative data on classroom management, planning, human growth and development, methods, assessment, technology, and equity.

B. Continuing departmental work on conducting case study research of impact on P-12 learning and development using a pre- post-test statistical comparison, a senior research student conducted her research on four program graduates from the 2017-2018 school year and their students. Her research included a two-tiered approach: in tier one, she investigated each teacher individually and in tier two, she investigated the EPP as an aggregate based on the individual results. As a result of her study, she concluded, based on significant paired t-scores, that first-year teachers were considered academically impactful because they had a significantly positive impact on their students' success and understanding. Her tier-two hypothesis was also accepted and she concluded "the Teacher Education Program did produce graduates who were impactful in P-12 classrooms."

During the late fall 2019 the department invited 2018-19 graduates to participate in a continuation of this study. Two graduates submitted data prior to the closure of schools in the spring of 2020 due to Covid-19. Using a paired t-test analysis of student data, the data resulted in a t-score of 3.705 which was significant at the 0.01 level, indicating that the education program adequately prepared graduates to have an impact on their PreK-12 students ([study data link](#)).

2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness: A. The following program completer and first-year employer survey data (2019) demonstrate the program completers indicators of teaching effectiveness.

Managing my classroom: 1) Employers (weighted average 3.4 on a 4-point scale) viewed graduates as stronger in this area than did the graduates themselves (weighted average 3.0 on a 4-point scale).

Planning units and lessons: 1) In each of the indicators, the program completer weighted average was in the 2.6 to 3.2 range, while the employer weighted average was in the 3.0 and above range (on a 4-point scale). The school in which the program completer is employed may impact their own view of competence in unit planning.

Understanding my learners: There is no clear distinction between program completer view of self and employer view of program completer in this area (back and forth between indicators). For each indicator, indicator averages for both program completers and employers fell between 3.0 and 3.2, while program completers indicated that "recognizing that students mature and develop at different rates" was the strongest, while employers indicated that "understand and respect divers learning needs of students" was the strongest category (both at 3.2).

Utilizing methods of teaching and instruction: 1) Program completer and employer provided same overall average weighted rating (3.0 on a 4-point scale). Overall, "using methods of teaching and instruction" received the lowest rankings for individual indicators within the overall category; "recognize varying modalities and learning styles" received a 2.6 (on a 4-point scale) from both completers and their employers.

Assessing and tracking student performance: 1) Across the board, program completers view skills lower than do employers. Data demonstrate that program completers view the indicators within this category less positively than other overall categories. 2) Program completers indicate that their strongest indicator of this category is "communicate growth and change in student performance." 3) "Document student performance" is the highest indicator for the employers.

Cross-cutting theme, Technology integration: 1) The highest weighted average of the indicators was "modeling safe, legal, and ethical use of information." 2) "Technology integration" received an overall rating of 3.6 from employers and a 3.2 from completers.

Cross-cutting theme, Equity/All learners: The EPP finds it interesting that the indicator rated lowest by program completers was one of the indicators rated highest by their employers (although the two scores are fairly close) - "collaborating with families and communities to promote learner growth and development."

See the full report ([program completer](#) and [employer](#)).

3. Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones: See full [employer survey report](#).
Bethel uses a two-pronged approach to surveying graduates and their employers in their first- and third-years of teaching. To ensure a 20% response rate, Bethel has hired an outside interviewer to go to the graduate’s place of employment and conducts interviews with the graduate and their employer in separate meetings. All other graduates and their employers are asked to complete the same questions, over graduate’s overall performance in teaching areas, in an electronic survey. The interview and the survey are completed in the spring of the year, then compiled and analyzed over the summer. The data reported here come from employers of graduates from the 2017-18 school year (first year of teaching 2018-2019).

Employers demonstrated strong support for program graduates, with comments as follows: “If I could have a building full of teachers like her, we would have an awesome school.” “Passionate. Strong values. Loving kids is important?” “Very satisfied with his preparation. Very ready and very coachable.” “Very well prepared. She is very hireable. Wants to learn and grow. She puts in the time.”

4. Satisfaction of completers: See full [program completer survey report](#).

Bethel uses a two-pronged approach to surveying graduates and their employers in their first- and third-years of teaching. To ensure a 20% response rate, Bethel has hired an outside interviewer to go to the graduate’s place of employment and conducts interviews with the graduate and their employer in separate meetings. All other graduates and their employers are asked to complete the same questions, over graduate’s overall performance in teaching areas, in an electronic survey. The interview and the survey are completed in the spring of the year, then compiled and analyzed over the summer. The data reported here come from graduates from the 2017-18 school year (first year of teaching 2018-2019).

Graduates also demonstrated strong support for the program, with comments as follows: “Preparation is on a personal level.” “I was well prepared from BC professors. Explained the ‘expectations’ of being a professional teacher.” “Music – I was very well prepared to be a director.” “Small classes. Sought out other relationships with teachers.” “BC prepared me a lot during student teaching, especially in areas of literacy and instruction. Experience before student teaching was also good. Early Field Experience was good.”

Outcome Measures

5. Graduation Rates: See table below.
6. Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements; Title II: See table below.
7. Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared: See table below.

| Year Completed | Licensure Rate ² | Completion Rate ³ | Employment Rate | Location of | Average Starting |
|----------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|------------------|
|----------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|------------------|

| Program | | | Emp. in Educ. | Grad. School | Vol. Service | Employment (1 st year) | Salary – Kansas ¹ |
|----------------|------|------|---------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2015-16 (N=23) | 78% | 100% | 74% | 4% | 4% | OK, KS, NV | \$34,883 |
| 2016-17 (N=14) | 100% | 78% | 71% | 0% | 14% | KS | \$34,883 |
| 2017-18 (N=9) | 100% | 75% | 89% | 11% | 0% | KS, MO | \$35,769 |
| 2018-19 (N=8) | 100% | 89% | 100% | 0% | 0% | KS | Not yet reported |

¹According to NEA.

²Licensure Rate – defined as the ratio between candidates who obtained licensure and the candidates who completed the program. By extension, a 100% licensure rate indicates that all candidates successfully achieved a passing score on the required licensure exams. A lower licensure rate could be the result of multiple factors.

³Completion Rate – defined as the ratio between candidates who completed the program and the candidates who entered the program (candidates only counted during their anticipated graduation year).

8. Student loan default rates and other consumer information: In addition to the chart below, please see the following links for Consumer Information about Bethel College and the Teacher Education Program.

<https://www.bethelks.edu/academics/areas-study/teacher-education>

<https://www.bethelks.edu/about/consumer-information>



School Default Rates
FY 2017, 2016, and 2015

Record 1 of 1

| OPE ID | School | Type | Control | PRGMS | | FY2017 | FY2016 | FY2015 |
|--------|--|-------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| 001905 | BETHEL COLLEGE 300 EAST 27TH STREET NORTH NEWTON KS 67117-8061 | Bachelor's Degree | Private | Both (FFEL/FDL) | Default Rate | 9.5 | 6.2 | 8 |
| | | | | | No. in Default | 18 | 11 | 15 |
| | | | | | No. in Repay | 188 | 175 | 186 |
| | | | | | Enrollment figures | 598 | 587 | 568 |
| | | | | | Percentage Calculation | 31.4 | 29.8 | 32.7 |

ENROLLMENT: To provide context for the Cohort Default Rate (CDR) data we include enrollment data (students enrolled at any time during the year) and a corresponding percentage (borrowers entering repayment divided by that enrollment figure). While there is no direct relationship between the timing of when a borrower entered repayment (October 1 through September 30) and any particular enrollment year, for the purpose of these data, we have chosen to use the academic year ending on the June 30 prior to the beginning of the cohort year (e.g., FY 2017 CDR Year will use 2015-2016 enrollment).

Current Date : 09/30/2020

The previous table can be accessed at:

<https://www2.ed.gov/offices/OSFAP/defaultmanagement/index.html>