

Table of Contents for Data Section 4

1. Impact on P-12 Learning and Development
2. Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness
3. Satisfaction of Employers and Employment Milestones
4. Satisfaction of Completers
5. Graduation Rates
6. Ability of Completers to meet Licensing and State Requirements – Title II- UG and GR
7. Ability of Completers to be Hired in education positions- UG and GR
8. Student Loan Default Rates
9. NCATE/CAEP Programs

1. Impact on P-12 Learning and Development: Case Study of a First Year Teacher

The state of Maryland does not provide teacher impact data to colleges and universities. Therefore, McDaniel College has chosen to provide a case study on a graduate one year out from graduation. This case study highlights a graduate in their first year of teaching and focuses on The Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching, specifically Domain Three, Instruction. Within this domain, data was collected on standards 3b Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques, 3c Engaging Students in Learning and 3d Using Assessment in Instruction. The Danielson Framework is used for this study as it is a nationally recognized and validated tool. Of particular note is that the Danielson Framework is designed to promote teacher professional growth across a continuum founded on the concept that all teachers should be continuing to grow and develop. The study looks at the efficacy of the teachers by using the rubric scores for the teacher as well as the qualitative evidence from the comments by the observer. In order for the teacher to remain anonymous, the term, "The Teacher" has been substituted for the teacher's name in the feedback provided by the supervisors.

This first-year teacher was in the 2019-2020 completor cohort from McDaniel College and holds a B.A. in Spanish and an M.S. in Teaching. The teacher was hired by a large urban/suburban school district and is teaching in one of the largest high schools in the school system, one with a high ESOL population. This year, this teacher is teaching grades 9-12, specifically Spanish 1 and Spanish 3. The teacher's class sizes range from 12-32 students and the teacher notes that the teacher has approximately 20 students with IEPs. To date, this first-year teacher has been teaching virtually, however, students are due to return to in-person learning by the time this report is submitted.

For the purpose of this case study, the teacher provided four observation/evaluations. The first observation in October 2020 focused on 3a and 3c in Domain Three: Instruction, of the Danielson Framework. As the focus areas for this study are 3b, 3c and 3d, only the feedback related to 3c, Engaging Students in Learning is noted. This initial observation was not rated, as the purpose was to only provide feedback to this new teacher. However, the following comments are from the teacher's supervisor:

- "(The teacher) utilized strategies to engage students in learning with mixed results.
 - (The teacher) showed a Spanish lyric video to students at the beginning of class. However, she missed the opportunity for students to interact or connect with the music.
 - Students were tasked to read independently and annotate a text about climate change on Microsoft Word. However, it was unclear how many students were completing the task.
 - (The teacher) reviewed the text annotation activity by reading parts of the text and students were given a chance to participate/respond with key words/phrases.
 - Approximately 85% of the class meet was composed of teacher talk.
 - 7/19 students (37%) used their microphone or the chat box to participate at least once during whole class discussions.
- Consequently, some students were visibly engaged throughout the class period."

While this observation did not include a rating, the feedback provided both commendations and areas of growth typical for a first-year teacher in the first term of the school year.

The second, formal observation occurred in December of 2020. The following feedback was provided on Domain Three. The teacher was rated Developing in 3b, Effective in 3c and Developing in 3d. The supervisor also provided the following comments:

“The Teacher communicated expectations and instructions in a clear way. The Teacher broke down words into parts so that students could intuit their meaning... and used carefully chosen language to ensure students understood their meaning in Spanish. The Teacher utilized the words in order to ensure that students made the connection between the Spanish and the English. However, The Teacher primarily provided instruction and classroom materials in English with little time devoted to utilizing Spanish vocabulary. It is important to spend the majority of each lesson in Spanish so that students have time to practice with interpretive skills.

The Teacher’s activities that focused on the cultural products, practices, and perspectives were deeply engaging for students. Students watched two videos and worked to categorize the cultural phenomena, with the end goal of connecting the products and practices to central perspectives in Hispanic culture. The Teacher is to be commended for attempting such a deep cultural dive that, as discussed in the post-observation conference, students in upper-level classes tend to struggle with. Though the students did not quite make the connection, they were well on their way to that understanding, and The Teacher mentioned that the subsequent classes were designed to focus on doing so.

Throughout the lesson, it was evident that students struggled with the vocabulary necessary for a substantial discussion. It is important that The Teacher review essential prior knowledge before introducing new information. By doing so, The Teacher would be able to assess students’ understanding, note deficiencies and confusion, and make adjustments as necessary.”

Again, these comments note the developing nature of a first-year teacher, with two areas still developing while one was effective.

A third structured observation took place in mid-February 2021. The following feedback was provided. The teacher was rated Effective in 3b, 3c, and 3d:

“The Teacher communicated instructions and content clearly and stressed the importance of engaging with the lesson material. Throughout the lesson, she communicated encouragement and suggestions. As a result, participation in class was robust and meaningful. The Teacher questions focused on what students wanted to do during their vacations, and what they actually did during them. The structure of these questions focused on the imperfect and the preterit tenses. Though distinguishing between the two is often challenging for students, they engaged in the questioning because of the relevance to the COVID-19 pandemic. Students were then asked to move into breakout rooms for group conversation. The Teacher is to be commended for this, as fostering group conversation is challenging in person, and even more so during virtual instruction. In the breakout rooms, students struggled somewhat to engage in meaningful conversation, evidently due to difficulty with recalling the new information. It is important that a model be provided to students before breaking out into groups, especially with new activities and/or new structures that students may not easily recall. Assessments were interspersed throughout the lesson, starting at the very beginning and continuing to the end result, where The Teacher collected information to use in planning for the subsequent class. “

Growth made by the teacher in all three areas is clearly noted. The teacher is found to be Effective in 3b, 3c and 3d. The teacher, at mid-year, is effectively demonstrating a positive impact on student learning. Both the comments and the ratings indicate the impact of the teacher on the students.

Finally, another observation took place in late February 2021. As was the case with the October observation this one also focused on 3a and 3c in Domain Three: Instruction, of the Danielson Framework. As the focus areas for this study are 3a, 3c and 3d, only the feedback related to 3c, Engaging Students in Learning is noted. Again, this observation was not rated:

“The Teacher utilized strategies to engage students in learning with mixed results.

- The Teacher utilized a variety of tools to engage students. For example, she used Quizziz, Jam Board, and a Schoology discussion post.
- Approximately 95% of the class meet was composed of teacher talk.
- Students were not given materials or activities to engage with the new learning during the synchronous class session.

- 7/15 students (47%) used their microphone or the chat box to participate at least once during whole class discussions.
- The Teacher reviewed the Quizziz activity for 8 minutes and gave students 3 opportunities to interact during the review.

Consequently, some students were visibly engaged throughout the class period “

Overall, by the middle of the first year, this teacher was rated effective by the supervisor. Teacher efficacy is critical for student achievement. While this first-year teacher was marked as developing in earlier in the school year, this teacher demonstrated growth as is noted in her mid-year evaluation. By mid-year, this teacher received marks of Effective in Domains 3b, 3c and 3d. The teacher, at mid-year, is effectively demonstrating a positive impact on student learning. Both the comments and the ratings indicate the impact of the teacher on the students.

Considering the nature of virtual instruction and the challenges faced by first year teachers in an uncertain environment, The Teacher’s growth from a developing teacher to an effective teacher in a few short months demonstrates that The Teacher has the foundational teaching skills to be effective as well as the ability to receive feedback and make adjustments to instruction to positively impact student achievement, even in these most unusual times.

2. Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness

The State of Maryland does not provide teacher impact data to colleges and universities. The data set in this section provides teaching effectiveness data from the final full-time internship of candidates at both the mid-term and at the conclusion of the final full-time professional semester (student teaching). The College Supervisor, in collaboration with the mentor teacher, completes the CCAST Evaluation Tool. McDaniel entered into a partnership with Ohio State University to use their CCAST system to evaluate the effectiveness of our teacher candidates. This research-validated tool is aligned to both InTASC and CAEP standards. Beginning in the 2018-2019 academic year, the department began training and implementation as this new system requires mentor teachers, and supervisors to be trained on the CCAST tool. Mentor, teacher candidates and supervisors collaborate using a consensus protocol to determine a final score for each standard.

As the CCAST was first used in the spring of 2019, there were two sets of data used in 2018-2019 to determine teacher efficacy- the evaluation model previously utilized by McDaniel in the fall of 2018 and the CCAST in the spring of 2019, thus the 2018-2019 academic year was a transition year. Currently CCAST is the only tool used for data collection in 2019-2020.

The data below show the evaluation tool results for CCAST in the first full year of implementation:

In the CCAST 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, 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.

CCAST Consensus Results Fall 2019 Completers N=7

CCAST Domain	Mid-Term Mean	Mid-Term Standard Deviation	Final Mean	Final Standard Deviation
Planning for Instruction and Assessment	2.18	.52	2.64	.46
Instructional Delivery	2.03	.51	2.43	.55
Assessment	1.72	.62	2.24	.54
Analysis of Teaching	1.43	.53	1.71	.76
Professional Commitments and Behaviors	2.37	.46	2.60	.52
Professional Relationships	2.43	.44	2.65	.46
Critical Thinking and Reflective Practice	2.57	.54	3.00	0

CPAST Consensus Results-Spring 2020 Completers N=32

CPAST Domain	Mid-Term Mean	Mid-Term Standard Deviation	Final Mean	Final Standard Deviation
Planning for Instruction and Assessment	2.22	.74	2.35	.67
Instructional Delivery	2.19	.71	2.32	.62
Assessment	1.97	.64	2.17	.62
Analysis of Teaching	1.31	.86	1.72	.77
Professional Commitments and Behaviors	2.68	.79	2.41	.63
Professional Relationships	2.21	.62	2.55	.56
Critical Thinking and Reflective Practice	2.58	.67	2.75	.44

Source: CPAST Consensus Form

3.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. As this data is collected one year out from graduation, it will always appear a year behind and will not show as data collected in the current year. However, completing this survey one year out allows the principals of the candidates to have several months of observation and evaluation information to inform their survey responses.

Of the 29 completers in 2018-2019, one took a Disney internship, one declined a part-time teaching position and one was not located. These are not counted in the total; therefore, for this data collection, N= 26¹

Permission to contact principals was requested of those teaching as of January 2019²

Scoring Scale is as follows: 4 Consistently; 3 Inconsistently; 2 Minimally; 1 Not at all; Insufficient evidence³

Year	Students Completing Program ¹	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 ²	
	#	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2018-2019	26*	12/26	38%	3/26	12%	0/26	0%	26/26	100%	14/26	54%
Returned Surveys N=14, 54%											

Employer Survey ³															
	McDaniel College 2016-2017 N=17					McDaniel College 2017-2018 N=7					McDaniel College 2018-2019 N=14				
This beginning teacher...	Mean	Mode	Median	SD	Insufficient Evidence	Mean	Mode	Median	SD	Insufficient Evidence	Mean	Mode	Median	SD	In. Evid
• understands the diverse needs of students	3.94	4	4	0.24	0	3.86	4	4	.35	0	3.79	4	4	.56	0
• plans for the diverse needs of students	3.76	4	4	0.44	0	3.71	4	4	.45	0	3.79	4	4	.56	0
• knows the required content ⁵	3.94	4	4	0.24	0	3.57	4	4	.49	0	3.86	4	4	.52	0

• effectively teaches required content	3.94	4	4	0.24	0	3.86	4	4	.35	0	3.79	4	4	.56	0
• creates a respectful environment that supports learning for all students.	4.0	4	4	0	1	3.86	4	4	.35	0	3.79	4	4	.77	0
• implements effective instruction that engages students in learning*	3.88	4	4	0.33	0	3.71	4	4	.45	0	3.57	4	4	.53	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	3.79	4	4	.52	0
• demonstrates professionalism	3.88	4	4	0.33	0	3.71	4	4	.45	0	3.79	4	4	.26	0
• uses technology in ways that improve student learning	3.75	4	4	0.45	1	3.00	4	4	.37	1	3.79	4	4	.26	0

*Only 13 responses for this question

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 nine employer survey questions developed by the MD Assessment Collaborative. This is the third year this data has been collected in this form so there is only three years of trend data. Due to the discrepancy in the size of number of completed surveys, is it difficult to make direct comparisons. Overall, scores for 2018-2019 are slightly higher than they were for 2017-2018, as was the response rate. This is a positive trend that will hopefully continue. It is clear that employers report they are satisfied in all nine areas surveyed for 2018-2019. With the mode and median consistently at 4 and the lowest mean at 3.57 and highest at 3.79, it is evident that there is overall high employment satisfaction. Of particular note is the increase in the overall satisfaction with the use of technology by McDaniel graduates and the professionalism of the graduates. In addition, an increase in satisfaction in the area of “knows required content” was very positive. 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:

- In the area of “understanding the diverse needs of students,” McDaniel completers scored a mean of 3.86 on a 4-point scale with a standard deviation of .35 for 2017-2018. In 2018-2019, the completers scored a 3.79 mean on the same 4-point scale with a standard deviation of .56.
- In the area of “planning for the diverse needs of students,” McDaniel completers scored a mean of 3.71 on a 4-point scale with a standard deviation of .45 for 2017-2018 and 3.79 with a standard deviation of .56 in 2018-2019.

- In the area of “knows required content,” McDaniel completers in 2017-2018 scored a mean of 3.57 on a 4-point scale with a standard deviation of .49. The 2018-2019 completers scored 3.86 with a standard deviation of .52.
- In the area of “teaches required content,” McDaniel completers in 2017-2018 scored a mean of 3.86 on a 4-point scale with a standard deviation of .35. The 2018-2019 completers scored 3.79 with a standard deviation of .56.
- In the area of “creating a respectful environment that supports learning for all students,” 2017-2018 McDaniel completers scored a mean of 3.86 on a 4-point scale with a standard deviation of .35. The mean for 2018-2019 is 3.79 with a standard deviation of .77.
- In the area of “implementing effective instruction that engages students in learning,” McDaniel completers scored a mean of 3.71 in 2017-2018 on a 4-point scale with a standard deviation of .45. The 2018-2019 completers scored a mean of 3.57 with a standard deviation of .53.
- In the area of “implements a range of assessments to measure the progress of learners to improve instruction,” the 2017-2018 completers had a mean of 3.71 with a standard deviation of .45. In 2018-2019, the completers had a mean of 3.79 with a standard deviation of .52.
- In the area of “demonstrates professionalism,” the 2017-2018 completers scored a mean of 3.71 and a standard deviation of .45. In the 2018-2019 completer cohort, those students scored a 3.79 mean with a standard deviation of .26.
- In the area of “uses technology to improve student learning,” completers in 2017-2018 scored a mean of 3.00 and a standard deviation of .37. In the 2018-2019 completer cohort, completers scored a 3.79 mean and a standard deviation of .26.

Teacher Retention at 5 Years

Almost 50% of new teachers leave the classroom within the first 5 years.¹ 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 Placement and 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 2013-14 Completers	Total 2014-15 Completers
Number of completers	75	47	50	47	29	48	54	44	40	28

¹ 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 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%	1/28=3.5%
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%	3/28=10.5%
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%	24/28=86%
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%	3/28=10.5%
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%	0/28=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%	24/28=86%

For the data on teacher retention, data was gathered for 27/28 graduates. Only one graduate was not located. For the twenty-eight 2014-2015 graduates, 3 out of 28 (10.5%) have never taught and 24 of 28 (86%) have entered the teaching profession. The data indicate the McDaniel graduates remain in teaching at a much higher rate than the national average of 50%. For 2014-2015 graduates from McDaniel College none have left the profession after 5 years. In regard to teachers teaching less than five years, none of the 24 who went into teaching have been teaching for less than 5 years and 24 of the 28 (86%) have been teaching for all 5 years. This is a substantially higher rate compared the rate that remain in teaching nationally

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

Location	Fall 2005	Spring 2006	Fall 2006	Spring 2007	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	Total to Date
California		1							1			1	3
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	3	34
MD – Caroline County				1									1
MD – Carroll	9	11	12	2	17	16	14	15	11	12	10	5	134
MD - Cecil								1					1
MD - Charles			1										1
MD – Frederick	2			3	2	5	1	4	3	4	2	2	28
MD – Harford		2						1	1				4
MD – Howard	1		2			2	1	2	3	4	3	1	19
MD - Kent								2					2
MD – Montgomery	6	1	3		1	1	1	2	4	4	4	3	30
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		1	7
New York												1	1
Non-public	1	1	2			1	3	2	4	1	2	1	18
North Carolina									1			1	2
Ohio								1					1

Pennsylvania	2		1	1	1	2			2		2	3	14
Texas		1									1		2
Virginia		1								2			3
West Virginia												1	1
TOTAL	27	29	24	11	30	39	22	38	44	33	32	28	352

4.Satisfaction of Completers Updated

At the end of the 2019-2020 academic year, completers were asked to evaluate the degree to which they were prepared to address key elements of effective teaching. This year saw some decline in overall satisfaction. While this data will be further reviewed to identify areas for improvement, one can only assume that the impact of COVID was significant to this group of students who experienced a major disruption in their learning. However, in spite of the major disruption, the completers indicated very high satisfaction as the following data demonstrates:

- 93% felt well prepared or prepared to understand the diverse needs of students while 7% felt they were somewhat or not prepared
- 91% felt well prepared or prepared to plan for the diverse needs of students while 9% felt they were somewhat or not prepared
- 95% felt well prepared or prepared to know the content they would be required to teach and 5% indicated they were somewhat or not prepared
- 90% felt well prepared or prepared and to teach required content while 9% responded that they felt somewhat or not prepared
- 93% felt well prepared or prepared and 2% felt somewhat prepared to create a respectful environment that supports learning for all students. 7% indicated they were only somewhat or not prepared
- 90% felt well prepared or prepared and 10% felt somewhat or not prepared to implement effective instruction that engages students in learning.
- 93% felt well prepared or prepared and 6% felt somewhat or not prepared to implement a range of assessments to measure the progress of learners and improve instruction
- 90% felt well prepared or prepared and 10% felt somewhat or not prepared to demonstrate professionalism to stakeholders
- 90% felt well prepared or prepared and 7.5% felt somewhat or not prepared to use technology in ways that improve student learning. 2.5 % did not respond to the question.
- 92% felt well prepared or prepared and 8 % felt somewhat prepared to positively impact student growth

Description of Data Set: Satisfaction of Completers					
<i>At the end of the 2019-2020 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	Not Prepared	No Response
How prepared are you to understand the diverse needs of students?	60%	33%	5%	2%	0%
How prepared are you to plan for the diverse needs of students?	60%	31%	8%	2%	0%
How prepared are you to know the content you will be required to teach?	82%	13%	2.5%	2.5%	0%

How prepared are you to teach required content?	64%	26%	8%	2%	0%
How prepared are you to create a respectful environment that supports learning for all students?	54%	39%	5%	2%	0%
How prepared are you to implement effective instruction that engages students in learning?	51%	39%	8%	2%	0%
How prepared are you to implement a range of assessments to measure the progress of learners and improve instruction?	72%	21%	5%	2%	0%
Question	Well Prepared	Prepared	Somewhat Prepared		No Response
How prepared are you to demonstrate professionalism to stakeholders?	69%	21%	8%	2%	0%
How prepared are you to use technology in ways that improve student learning?	51%	39%	5%	2.5%	2.5%
How prepared are you to positively impact student growth?	46%	46%	5%	3%	0%

Source: Education Department

5. Graduation Rates

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 2019-20 IPEDS graduation rate is calculated on the FTFY for 2014. Please note 2020 was only the second year we had graduates from our newly-approved Elementary Education major, and no one from the FTFY 2014 chose to be an Elementary Education major. 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.

Undergraduate Graduation Rate 2019-2020	FTFY 2014 All Majors	FTFY 2014 Education Major	FTFY 2014 Education Minor
Less than Expected (<4 years)	0%	0%	0%
Expected (4 years)	52%	0%	57%
More than expected (6 years)	62%	0%	43%
Transfers out	4%	0%	0%

Graduate Graduation Rate 2019-2020	2020 GR Master's in Teaching	2019 GR Master's in Teaching	2018 GR Master's in Teaching
Less than Expected (<7 semesters)	33%	31%	33%
Expected (7 semesters)	25%	49%	44%
More than expected (8-9 semesters)	33%	15%	12%

Incomplete	9%	5%	11%
------------	----	----	-----

Source: Institutional Research, McDaniel College

6.Ability of Completers to Meet Licensing and any Additional State Requirements

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

7.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.

*39 completed the program and does not indicate “Completer” as defined by Title II

Description of Data Set: Employment Status One Year After Program Completion	
<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>	
	2019-2020 Completer Data
Candidates Completing the Program Leading to Initial Certification	39*
• Graduate	11 (28%)
• Undergraduate	28 (72%)
Completers Working in Field of Education	37 (95%)
Completers Not Working in Field of Education	1 (2.5%)
• 1 student is going to graduate school	
Completers Not Located	1 (2.5%)
Places of Employment	
• Maryland	
Anne Arundel County	1
Baltimore County	3
Carroll County	8
Dorchester County	1
Frederick County	3
Harford County	1
Howard County	7
Montgomery County	7
Non-Public	1
• New York	1
• Thailand	1
• Vermont	1
• Virginia	2

8.Student Loan Default Rate Updated 4/20/21

Description of Data Set				
In September of each year, the federal government reports student loan default rates for higher education institutions. 2020 is the most recent year published and it is based on the 2017 cohort. This cohort consists of borrowers (aggregated graduate and undergraduate) who entered repayment in 2016 and defaulted in 2017, 2018, or 2019.				
Cohort Fiscal Year	National Default Rate	National Private 4+ Year Institutions Default rate	Maryland Default Rate	McDaniel College Default Rate
2015	10.8%	7.1%	6.7%	3.8%
2016	10.1%	6.6%	6.3%	4.6%
2017	9.7%	6.5%	5.8%	5.0%

McDaniel graduates from the 2017 cohort had a default rate of 5.0% which is lower than the 5.8% state and 6.5% national default rates for private 4+ year institutions. The McDaniel 5.0% default rate is also lower than the 9.7% national default rate for all colleges during the same time.

9.NCATE/CAEP Programs

The following programs were reviewed in the 2016 NCATE visit:

Program	Degree	Initial/Advanced
Art	Bachelor's/Master's	Initial
Computer Science	Bachelor's	Initial
Counselor Education	Master's	Advanced
Deaf Education	Master's	Initial
Educational Leadership	Master's	Advanced
Elementary Education	Bachelor's/ Master's	Initial
English	Bachelor's Master's	Initial
Foreign Language	Bachelor's/Master's	Initial
Gifted and Talented Specialist	Post Baccalaureate Certificate	Advanced
Mathematics	Bachelor's/Master's	Initial
Music*	Bachelor's/Master's	Initial
Physical Education	Bachelor's/Master's	Initial
Reading Specialist	Master's	Advanced
School Library Media	Master's	Advanced
Science	Bachelor's/Master's	Initial
Social Studies	Bachelor's/Master's	Initial
Special Education	Master's	Initial
STEM	Post Baccalaureate Certificate	Advanced

*The Music program has been discontinued and all students currently in the program will graduate by 2022.

The above programs currently accredited by NCATE will be reviewed by CAEP (Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation) in 2024.