

## **Table of Contents: CAEP Annual Report**

TEACHER RETENTION AT 5 YEARS

ABILITY OF COMPLETERS TO BE HIRED IN EDUCATIONAL POSITIONS FOR WHICH THEY HAVE BEEN PREPARED

ABILITY OF COMPLETERS TO MEET LICENSING AND ANY ADDITIONAL STATE REQUIREMENTS – TITLE II- UG AND GR

GRADUATION RATES UPDATED

IMPACT ON P-12 LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT

INDICATORS OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

SATISFACTION OF EMPLOYERS SURVEY

SATISFACTION OF COMPLETERS

STUDENT LOAN DEFAULT RATE

## Section 4: Data

### Teacher Retention at 5 Years

Almost 50% of new teachers leave the classroom within the first 5 years.<sup>1</sup> In the summer of 2011, McDaniel College began a study of its teacher preparation program completers and their employment five years after program completion. Data were collected under the direction of the Coordinator of Teacher Professional Development and involved contacting completers by phone, email, or in person, and, in some cases, searching the internet for information on school web pages, resulting in the following.

	Total 2005-06 Completers	Total 2006-07 Completers	Total 2007-08 Completers	Total 2008-09 Completers	Total 2009-10 Completers	Total 2010-11 Completers	Total 2011-12 Completers	Total 2012-13 Completers	Total 2013-2014 Completers
Number of completers	75	47	50	47	29	48	54	44	40
Completers not located	6/75 = 8%	5/47 = 11%	6/50=12%	5/47 = 11%	5/29 = 17%	7/48 = 14.5%	5/54= 9.3%	4/44 = 9%	7/40=17.5%
Completers never taught	5/69 = 7%	4/42 = 10%	4/44 = 9%	1/42 = 2% (Candidate is PT Assistant)	2/24 = 8% (Candidate is college coach)	3/41 = 7.3%	5/49=10% (One completer is in doctoral program)	5/40 = 12.5%	1/33=3%
Completers entering teaching	64/69 = 93%	38/42 = 90%	40/44 = 91%	41/42= 98%	22/24 = 92%	38/41= 93%	44/49 = 89.8%	35/40 = 87.5%	32/33=97%

<sup>1</sup> Ingersoll (2003); Ingersoll, R., Merrill, L., & Stuckey, D. (2014). Seven trends: the transformation of the teaching force, updated April 2014 . CPRE Report (#RR-80). Philadelphia: Consortium for Policy Research in Education, University of Pennsylvania. citing Perda, D. (2013). Transitions into and out of teaching: A longitudinal analysis of early career teacher turnover (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia

Completers no longer teaching after 5 years (Leavers)	8/64 = 13%	3/38 = 8%	3/40 = 8%	2/41 = 5% (1 completer works in a public library and 1 is home raising children)	0/24 = 0%	2/38 = 5%	5/44 = 11.4% (2 are home with children, one is out of the country, and one is searching for another location)	2/35 = 5.7% (both are home with children; one of these taught one year while the second taught 3.5 years)	1/33=3%
Completers teaching now but less than 5 years	Data Not Collected	Data Not Collected	7/40 = 18%	7/41= 17%	3/22 = 14%	13/38 = 34%	7/44 = 15.9%	7/35 = 20%	0/33=0%
Completers teaching 5 years	56/64 = 88%	35/38 = 92%	30/40 = 75%	32/41 =78%	19/22 = 86%	23/38 = 61%	72.7%	26/35 = 74%	32/33=97%

For the data on teacher retention, information was gathered for 33 of 40 graduates. 7 of 40 students, or 17.5% were not located. For the 2013-2014 graduates who were located, 1 out of 33 (3%) has never taught and 32 of 33 (97%) have entered the teaching profession. The data indicate the McDaniel graduates remain teaching at a much higher rate than the national average of 50%. For 2013-2014 graduates from McDaniel College, none of the 32 who entered the profession left the profession after 5 years. In regard to teachers teaching less than five years, 32 of 33 (97%) have been teaching for all 5 years. This is nearly double the rate that remain in teaching compared to the national average.

**Table 1.1: Teaching Locations for Program Completers Five Years After Program Completion**

Location	Fall 2005 Completers	Spring 2006 Completers	Fall 2006 Completers	Spring 2007 Completers	2007-08 Completers	2008-09 Completers	2009-10 Completers	2010-11 Completers	2011-12 Completers	2012-13 Completers	2013-14 Completers	Total to Date
California		1							1			2
College		1						1	1			3
Connecticut		1										1
Florida		1							1	1		3
International						1						1

MD – Anne Arundel	1	1				1		1	4		1	9
MD – Baltimore City	2				1	1		1				5
MD – Baltimore County	1	3	1	2	4	6		2	5	2	5	31
MD – Caroline County				1								1
MD – Carroll	9	11	12	2	17	16	14	15	11	12	10	129
MD - Cecil								1				1
MD - Charles			1									1
MD – Frederick	2			3	2	5	1	4	3	4	2	26
MD – Harford		2						1	1			4
MD – Howard	1		2			2	1	2	3	4	3	18
MD - Kent								2				2
MD – Montgomery	6	1	3		1	1	1	2	4	4	4	27
MD – Prince George’s	1	2				1		1	1	2	1	9
MD – Queen Anne’s				1								1
MD – Talbot		1									1	2
MD – St Mary’s	1						1	1				3

MD - Washington					1				1			2
MD - Wicomico			1		2							3
MD - Worcester			1	1		1			1			4
New Jersey		1			1	1	1	1		1		6
Non-public	1	1	2			1	3	2	4	1	2	17
North Carolina									1			1
Ohio								1				1
Pennsylvania	2		1	1	1	2			2		2	11
Texas		1									1	2
Virginia		1								2		3
TOTAL	27	29	24	11	30	39	22	38	44	33	32	329

## Ability of Completers to be Hired in Educational Positions for Which They have Been Prepared

Each year the Coordinator of Teacher Professional Development at McDaniel College contacts the previous year's completers to identify their current employment and location.

<b>Description of Data Set: Employment Status One Year After Program Completion</b>	
<i>Each year, the Coordinator of Teacher Professional Development at McDaniel College contacts the previous year's completers to identify their current employment and location.</i>	
	2018-2019 Completer Data
Candidates Completing the Program Leading to Initial Certification	29*
• Graduate	14 (48%)
• Undergraduate	15 (52%)
Completers Working in Field of Education	26 (90%)
Completers Not Working in Field of Education	2 (7%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 student was offered a part time position in Physical Education but did not accept the position because he needed medical benefits</li> <li>• 1 student accepted a year- long internship with Disney World in Florida</li> </ul>	
Completers Not Located – student did not respond to numerous attempts to reach her via email, text and phone	1 (3%)
Places of Employment	
• Maryland	
Anne Arundel County	2
Baltimore County	2
Carroll County	9
Frederick County	4
Harford County	1
Howard County	4

Montgomery County	1
Non-Public	1
• Pennsylvania	1
• Virginia	1

\*Title II data shows 28 completers. This is due to a data input error for one student. This student will be included in the 2019-2020 Title II data Source: Education department

## Ability of Completers to Meet Licensing and any Additional State Requirements – Title II- UG and GR

All 2018-2019 initial certification program completers (100%) passed certification examinations (PRAXIS II or the required American Council for the Teachers of Foreign Languages assessments). One student who passed the test will be counted in the 2019-2020 count due to a data input error.



## Graduation Rates Updated

McDaniel College annually files an Integrated Post-Secondary Education Data System (IPEDS) report to the federal government in accordance with their data guidance. Upon entry to the College, students are assigned a First Time First Year (FTFY) cohort from which graduation rates are calculated in subsequent years. The 2018-19 IPEDS graduation rate is calculated on the FTFY for 2013. Please note 2019 saw the first graduates from our newly-approved Elementary Education major, and the numbers are now reflected below. Although the IPEDS does not require graduation rates for graduate students, McDaniel reports initial certification students' graduation rate for both undergraduate education minors and those students who earn their initial certification through the graduate Masters in Teaching Program, which is typically a part-time program.

<b>Undergraduate Graduation Rate 2018-2019</b>	<b>College 2019</b>	<b>2019 Ed Major</b>	<b>2019 Ed Minors</b>	<b>2018 Ed Minors</b>	<b>2017 Ed Minors</b>
Less than Expected (<4 years)	0%	100%	15%	0%	6%
Expected (4 years)	60%	0%	54%	65%	50%
More than expected (6 years)	68%	0%	31%	35%	44%
Transfers out	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%

<b>Graduate Graduation Rate 2017-2018</b>	<b>College 2019</b>	<b>College 2018</b>	<b>College 2017</b>	<b>2019 GR Master's in Teaching</b>	<b>2018 GR Master's in Teaching</b>	<b>2017 GR Master's in Teaching</b>
Less than Expected (<7 semesters)	0%	0%	0%	31%	33%	57%
Expected (7 semesters)	60%	59%	58%	49%	44%	29%
More than expected (8-9 semesters)	68%	67%	68%	15%	12%	14%
Incomplete	5%	4%	5%	5%	11%	0%

Source: Institutional Research, McDaniel College

## Impact on P-12 Learning and Development

The state of Maryland does not provide teacher impact data to colleges and universities.

During the professional year, Elementary, Secondary and PreK12 Education minors are required to complete a service project to determine their impact on student learning. The service project must be aligned to a school improvement goal, a mentor teacher's SLO or a school initiative. The student must have a clear objective which can be measured through pre and post assessment data. The student must get the proposal approved by both college and school-based personnel, implement the plan and then submit a final report which includes the student impact data.

Semester	Title	Score
Spring 2019	Physical Education Color Project	4
Spring 2019	Spanish Review	4
Spring 2019	HSA Writing Skills	4
Spring 2019	Strength Club	4
Spring 2019	Word Problem Secret Agents	4
Spring 2019	SAT Prep	4
Spring 2019	Out of the PARCC	4
Spring 2019	Fun with Fitnessgram	3
Spring 2019	One School, One Book	3
Spring 2019	Elementary Keyboarding Project	4
Spring 2019	Chillaxing	3
Spring 2019	Safe & Appropriate Recess Games	4
Spring 2019	Sight Word Recognition/Sign Language	3
Spring 2019	Improving Scores on the Pacer Fitness Test	3
Spring 2019	Learning is Spelled T-I-M-E	4
Spring 2019	Multiplication Intervention	4
Spring 2019	ADHD Behavior Management Strategies	3
Spring 2019	Improving Organizational, Time Management & Study Skills	3
Fall 2018	Sight Words	4

Fall 2018	Willie Reader's Theater – co-planned with RSM	3
Fall 2018	Breakfast Club	4
Fall 2018	Breakfast Club	4
Fall 2018	Sight Word Recognition	4
Fall 2018	Positive Behavior Reinforcement	4
Fall 2018	Untitled	3
Fall 2018	Willie Reader's Theater – co-planned with LB	3
Fall 2018	Sight Words	4
Fall 2018	Balancing Equations/Interpreting the Equals Sign	4
<b>AVERAGE SCORE</b>		<b>3.64</b>

The service project is rated on a 4-point scale with a scoring rubric. According to the data, all 28 of the students scored 3 or above on the rubric. The average score for all 28 students is 3.64.

Source: Education Department

## Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness

The State of Maryland does not provide teacher impact data to colleges and universities. This data set provides teaching effectiveness data from the final full-time internship of candidates. At the conclusion of the final full-time professional semester (student teaching), the College Supervisor in collaboration with the mentor teacher, rated each candidate on 21 indicators of teaching effectiveness grouped into 5 categories. Each rating used a 4 point scale: 4 Exemplary; 3 Proficient; 2 Developing; and 1 Unsatisfactory. Recognizing the need to have a data system that was more reliable and valid, McDaniel entered into a partnership with Ohio State University to use their CFAST system to evaluate the effectiveness of our teacher candidates. The tool is aligned to both InTASC and CAEP standards. Beginning in the 2018-2019 academic year, the department instituted training as this new system requires mentor teachers, and supervisors to be trained on the CFAST evaluation tool. Mentor teachers, teacher candidates and supervisors to collaborate using a consensus protocol to determine a final score for each standard.

As the CFAST was first used in the spring of 2019, there are two sets of data used to determine teacher efficacy- the evaluation model previously utilized by McDaniel in the fall and spring of 2018 and 2019 and the CFAST in the spring of 2019. As academic year 2018-2019 was a transition year, these data are bifurcated. In the future, CFAST will be the only tool used.

The data below show the McDaniel College evaluation tool results from both fall and spring in the 2018-2019 academic year and the spring 2019 only results for CFAST:

### McDaniel College Evaluation Tool: Fall and Spring 2018-2019 Completers

Completer Cohort	Effectiveness Element	Mean	Standard Deviation
2018-19 N=29	Evidence of Planning (3 items)	3.48	.611
	Instructional Delivery (6 items)	3.49	.607
	Classroom Management (3 items)	3.55	.590
	Student/Teacher Interaction (2 items)	3.79	.516
	Professional Dispositions (7 items)	3.47	.497

Source: Education Department

In the CFAST model, Teaching Effectiveness is determined on seven measures consisting of 21 indicators: Planning for Instruction and Assessment (4 items on the evaluation form); Instructional Delivery (5 items on the evaluation form); Assessment (3 items on the evaluation

form); Analysis of Teaching (1 item on the evaluation form); Professional Commitments and Behaviors (5 items on the evaluation form); Professional Relationships (2 items on the evaluation form); Critical Thinking and Reflective Practice (1 item on the evaluation form). At the conclusion of the final full-time professional semester (student teaching), the College Supervisor in collaboration with the mentor teacher, and student, completed a consensus sheet and rated each of the spring candidates on the 21 indicators of teaching effectiveness grouped into 7 categories. Each rating used a 4 point scale: 3 Exceeds Expectations; 2 Meets Expectations; 1 Emerging; and 0 Does Not Meet Expectations.

**CPAST Consensus Results- 2018-2019 Spring Completers N=18**

<b>CPAST Domain</b>	<b>Mid-Term Mean</b>	<b>Mid-Term Standard Deviation</b>	<b>Final Mean</b>	<b>Final Standard Deviation</b>
<b>Planning for Instruction and Assessment</b>	1.83	.62	2.24	.69
<b>Instructional Delivery</b>	1.86	.64	2.19	.60
<b>Assessment</b>	1.66	.63	2.24	.64
<b>Analysis of Teaching</b>	.72	.57	1.22	.65
<b>Professional Commitments and Behaviors</b>	2.09	.72	2.29	.71
<b>Professional Relationships</b>	2.03	.66	2.28	.65
<b>Critical Thinking and Reflective Practice</b>	2.50	.62	2.56	.78

Source: CPAST Consensus Form

## Satisfaction of Employers Survey

College to Career data is collected from principals of candidates after their first year of full-time teaching. Permission was granted by completers to request first year performance information from their principals.

Of the 30 completers in 2017-2018, 2 accepted Fulbright Scholarships and are not counted in the total; therefore, for this data collection, N=28 <sup>1</sup>

Permission to contact principals was requested of those teaching as of January 2019<sup>2</sup>

Scoring Scale is as follows: 4 Consistently; 3 Inconsistently; 2 Minimally; 1 Not at all; Insufficient evidences

Year	Students Completing Program <sup>1</sup>	No Response from Completer		Not Employed in PreK-12 Education		Employed as Substitutes or Provisionally in Schools		Employed as Full-time Teachers in Schools		Full-Time Employed Candidates Giving Permission to Contact Employer <sup>2</sup>	
	#	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2017-2018	28*	21/28	75%	1/28	3.5%	1/28	3.5%	26/28	93%	12/28	43%
Returned Surveys N=7, 33%											

Employer Survey <sub>3</sub>										
	McDaniel College 2016-2017 N=17					McDaniel College 2017-2018 N=7				
This beginning teacher...	Mean	Mode	Median	SD	Insufficient Evidence	Mean	Mode	Median	SD	Insufficient Evidence
• understands the diverse needs of students	3.94	4	4	0.24	0	3.86	4	4	.35	0
• plans for the diverse needs of students	3.76	4	4	0.44	0	3.71	4	4	.45	0
• knows the required contents	3.94	4	4	0.24	0	3.57	4	4	.49	0
• effectively teaches required content	3.94	4	4	0.24	0	3.86	4	4	.35	0
• creates a respectful environment that supports learning for all students.	4.0	4	4	0	1	3.86	4	4	.35	0
• implements effective instruction that engages students in learning	3.88	4	4	0.33	0	3.71	4	4	.45	0
• implements a range of assessments to measure the progress of learners to improve instruction	3.76	4	4	0.44	0	3.71	4	4	.45	0
• demonstrates professionalism	3.88	4	4	0.33	0	3.71	4	4	.45	0
• uses technology in ways that improve student learning	3.75	4	4	0.45	1	3.00	4	4	.37	1

Source: Education Department



Each year, Completers from the previous year are asked for permission to contact employers to determine the Completers effectiveness during the first year of teaching on 9 employer survey questions developed by the MD Assessment Collaborative. This is the second year this data has been collected in this form so that only two years of data exist. Due to the discrepancy in the size of number of completed surveys, is it difficult to make direct comparisons. Overall, scores are slightly lower for 2017-2018 than they were for 2016-2017. This could be attributed to the lower response rate. However, it is clear that employers report they are satisfied in all nine areas surveyed for 2017-2018. With the mean and median consistently at 4 and the lowest mean at 3.57 and highest at 3.86, it is evident that there is overall high employment satisfaction. McDaniel will continue to collect and analyze this data and trends over time to see where continued growth and support is needed.

Data indicate the following component of the survey showed high levels of satisfaction in both years. High levels of satisfaction are set at 3.70 or higher out of a possible score of 4:

- In the area of “understanding the diverse needs of students,” McDaniel completers scored a mean of 3.94 on a 4-point scale with a standard deviation of .24 for 2016-2017. In 2017-2018, the completers scored a 3.86 mean on the same 4-point scale with a standard deviation of .35.
- In the area of “planning for the diverse needs of students,” McDaniel completers scored a mean of 3.76 on a 4-point scale with a standard deviation of .44 for 2016-2017 and 3.71 with a standard deviation of .45 in 2017-2018.
- In the area of “effectively teaching required content,” McDaniel completers in 2016-2017 scored a mean of 3.94 on a 4-point scale with a standard deviation of .24. The 2017-2018 completers scored 3.86 with a standard deviation of .35.
- In the area of “creating a respectful environment that supports learning for all students,” McDaniel completers scored a mean of 4.00 on a 4-point scale with a standard deviation of .0. The mean for 2017-2018 is 3.36 with a standard deviation of .35
- In the area of “implementing effective instruction that engages students in learning,” McDaniel completers scored a mean of 3.88 on a 4-point scale with a standard deviation of .33. The 2017-2018 completers scored a mean of 3.71 with a standard deviation of .45.
- In the area of “implements a range of assessments to measure the progress of learners to improve instruction,” the 2016-2017 completers had a mean of 3.76 with a standard deviation of .44. In 2017-2018, the completers had a mean of 3.71 with a standard deviation of .45.
- In the area of “demonstrates professionalism,” the 2016-2017 completers scored a mean of 3.88 and a standard deviation of .33. In the 2017-2018 completer cohort, those students scored a 3.71 mean with a standard deviation of .45.

The following two areas showed significant decrease in the mean and will require further exploration. Significant decrease is defined as a decrease of .20 or higher:

- In the area of “knowledge of required content,” McDaniel completers scored a mean of 3.94 on a 4-point scale with a standard deviation of .24. However, the 2017-2018 data shows a 3.71 mean with a standard deviation of .49.
- In the area of “implementing a range of assessments to measure the progress of learners to improve instruction,” McDaniel completers in 2016-2017 scored a mean of 3.76 on a 4-point scale with a standard deviation of .44. For 2017-2018, the mean dropped significantly to 3.00 with a standard deviation of .37.

## Satisfaction of Completers

At the end of the 2018-2019 academic year, completers were asked to evaluate the degree to which they were prepared to address key elements of effective teaching. They indicated the following:

- 100% felt well prepared or prepared to understand the diverse needs of students.
- 100% felt well prepared or prepared to plan for the diverse needs of students.
- 96% felt well prepared or prepared to know the content they would be required to teach. 4% did not respond to the question.
- 96% felt well prepared or prepared and to teach required content. 4% did not respond to the question.
- 96% felt well prepared or prepared and 2% felt somewhat prepared to create a respectful environment that supports learning for all students. 2% did not respond to the question.
- 96% felt well prepared or prepared and 4% felt somewhat prepared to implement effective instruction that engages students in learning.
- 92% felt well prepared or prepared and 4% felt somewhat prepared to implement a range of assessments to measure the progress of learners and improve instruction. 4% did not respond to this question.
- 93% felt well prepared or prepared and 3.5% felt somewhat prepared to demonstrate professionalism to stakeholders. 3.5% did not respond to the question.

- 93% felt well prepared or prepared and 3.5% felt somewhat prepared to use technology in ways that improve student learning. 3.5 % did not respond to the question.
- 93% felt well prepared or prepared and 3.5 % felt somewhat prepared to positively impact student growth. 3.5 % did not respond to the question.

<b>Description of Data Set: Satisfaction of Completers</b>				
<i>At the end of the 2018-2019 academic year, completers were asked to evaluate the degree to which they were prepared to address key elements of effective teaching</i>				
Question	Well Prepared	Prepared	Somewhat Prepared	No Response
How prepared are you to understand the diverse needs of students?	68%	32%	0%	0%
How prepared are you to plan for the diverse needs of students?	61%	39%	0%	0%
How prepared are you to know the content you will be required to teach?	82%	14%	4%	0%
How prepared are you to teach required content?	61%%	35%%	0%	1%
How prepared are you to create a respectful environment that supports learning for all students?	57%	39%	2%	2%
How prepared are you to implement effective instruction that engages students in learning?	57%	39%	4%	0%
How prepared are you to implement a range of assessments to measure the progress of learners and improve instruction?	57%	35%	4%	4%
Question	Well Prepared	Prepared	Somewhat Prepared	No Response

How prepared are you to demonstrate professionalism to stakeholders?	68%	25%	3.5%	3.5%
How prepared are you to use technology in ways that improve student learning?	64%	29%	3.5%	3.5%
How prepared are you to positively impact student growth?	61%	32%	3.5%	3.5%

Source: Education Department

## Student Loan Default Rate

<b>Description of Data Set</b>				
In September of each year, the federal government reports student loan default rates for higher education institutions. 2019 is the most recent year published and it is based on the 2016 cohort. This cohort consists of borrowers (aggregated graduate and undergraduate) who entered repayment in 2016 and defaulted in 2016, 2017, or 2018.				
<b>Cohort Fiscal Year</b>	<b>National Default Rate</b>	<b>National Private 4+ Year Institutions Default rate</b>	<b>Maryland Default Rate</b>	<b>McDaniel College Default Rate</b>
2014	11.5%	7.0%	19.1%	2.4%
2015	10.8%	6.6%	9.7%	3.8%
2016	10.1%	6.3%	9.3%	4.6%

Source: Institutional Research, McDaniel College

McDaniel graduates from the 2016 cohort had a default rate of 4.6% which is lower than the 9.3% state and 6.3% national default rates for private 4+ year institutions. The McDaniel 4.6% default rate is also lower than the 10.1% national default rate for all colleges during the same time.