

## **Table of Contents for Data Section 4: Data and Accreditation**

### **Completer Impact and Effectiveness**

1. Impact on P-12 Learning and Development
2. Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness

### **Satisfaction of Employers and Stakeholder Involvement**

3. Satisfaction of Employers
4. Employment Milestones
5. Satisfaction of Completers

### **Candidate Competency and Completion**

6. Graduation Rates
7. Ability of Completers to meet Licensing and State Requirements – Title II- UG and GR

### **Ability to be Hired in Education Positions**

8. Ability of Completers to be Hired in education positions- UG and GR

### **NCATE/CAEP Programs**

## 1. Impact on P-12 Learning and Development: Case Studies of First Year Teachers

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 2020-21 completer cohort from McDaniel College and holds a B.A. in Elementary Education. The teacher was hired by a medium/small school district and is teaching in one of the smaller elementary schools. This teacher is teaching 4<sup>th</sup> grade and teaches all subjects.

For the purpose of this case study, the teacher provided three observation/evaluations. The first observation in October 2021 focused on all areas of the Danielson Framework. As the focus areas for this study are 3b, 3c and 3d, only the feedback related to these areas is noted. This initial observation was rated as Proficient in all three areas. The following comments are from the teacher’s supervisor:

“Continue to make similar choices as demonstrated in the following actions as they support engagement and achievement:

- Foundations included choral review of letter sound drill, vowels, -r & all glued sounds.
- Student pairs alternated use of white boards & letter boards, giving each child opportunities to express skills using both items.
- Q & A used to check for understanding of characters and changes over time within the story (How did he feel in the middle?) with prompting for reflection and explanation to support students' responses.
- Q & A opportunity for students regarding directions before commencing small group tasks.
- Supplemental task for those who may finish early (word search).
- Lots of Q & A regarding changes occurring within the story.
- Listening to each student read aloud to assess for each child's strengths/needs.
- Seeking students' understanding of purpose of punctuation used in the story (!).
- Brief discussion of calming & readiness strategies (deep breaths, yoga poses, stretching, whole body listening).

Take the following actions to enhance/promote/further improve student engagement & achievement:

- Develop techniques to collect student performance information during small group reading to help guide next instructional steps for each child.
- Refer to ILOs to bring closure to lessons; ask students to tell if the objective was met or not, & what evidence they have to support that decision.

It was a pleasure to observe your instructional leadership & interpersonal relationships with your students.”

The overall rating for this observation was Proficient. The feedback provided both commendations and areas of growth and demonstrated that this first-year teacher is finding great success in the classroom.

The second, formal observation also occurred in October of 2021. The following feedback was provided on Domain Three. The teacher was rated Proficient in 3b, Distinguished in 3c and Proficient in 3d. The supervisor also provided the following comments:

- “Students were engaged in completing a word search while the teacher assessed a student one-on-one.
- The teacher could not get the online social/emotional video to work, so [they] adjusted and quickly moved on by looking at the feelings chart. [They] did a pulse check on how students were feeling and immediately got into [their] whole group instruction.
- Whole group word work began with quick sound drill, led by the teacher. The teacher used parroting to help [their] students remember the definition. The teacher repeated with the word “rings,” pointing out that ring is the base word and the -s is the suffix. Next, students practiced adding suffixes -s or -ed based on the base word endings.
- Students practiced writing words that ended in the three previously mentioned letters and then added the suffix (Ex. -s or -es) to change boss to bosses based on the spelling rule. Students used the word in a sentence to show their understanding of the word's meaning (Ex: "Jade's bosses make her do a lot of work.") Students tapped sounds in words as they spelled the dictated words. The teacher introduced the suffix -ed and -ing using the same process.
- The teacher drew attention to the ELA whole group objective. Before reading their story, the teacher read aloud the reading response for the whole group independent work. Students followed along as the teacher read aloud. As students read, they discussed the vocabulary words as they read.
- For whole group comprehension instruction, students used text evidence to discuss the informational text. The teacher highlighted text features as students read. Before dismissing students to small reading groups, the teacher shared students' response to text from the previous day's reading.
- Small group reading instruction was differentiated, engaging, and appropriate for the needs of [their] students.”

Again, these comments note that this first-year teacher is demonstrating success in these three areas of the Danielson Framework.

A third structured observation took place in mid-February 2022. The following feedback was provided. The teacher was rated Proficient in 3b, Distinguished in 3c, and Proficient in 3d. The observer included the following comments:

“Continue the following actions as they support student engagement and achievement:

- Morning Message and Today we will ... (agenda) posted and reviewed with whole class.
- Anticipatory Set. Read aloud to prompt students to connect with feelings of the story's characters and a recent story about Harriett Tubman's bravery.
- Choral review of letter-word-sound drill. Students led classmates following the teacher's model.
- Students practiced writing "trick" words on dry erase boards and by sky-writing
- Single words featuring or and are written as part of Bingo-style game, then assessed by students following teacher's spelling of each.
- Deliberate and structured movement (Simon Says. Carpet to desks. Desks to carpet)
- Q & A regarding directions before start of small group tasks.
- Small group: Listening to each student whisper read to assess each child's strengths/needs and sense of main idea (paleontologist passage).

Take the following actions to strengthen student engagement & achievement:

- When presenting words for students to write, consistently say each word at least twice and use the word in a sentence to give it context/meaning
- It was a pleasure to observe your instructional leadership and engagement with your students. It is clear that procedures have become routines that maximize instructional time as there was no need to redirect students within any lesson component or during transitions.”

The teacher was clearly finding success in multiple areas with the students. The teacher is found to be overall Proficient in this observation. The teacher, at mid-year, is effectively demonstrating a positive impact on student learning, particularly in Domains 3b, 3c and 3d . Both the comments and the ratings indicate the impact of the teacher on the students. Teacher efficacy is critical for student achievement. Considering the nature and the challenges faced by first-year teachers in an uncertain environment, the teacher’s proficiency 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 to make adjustments to instruction to positively impact student achievement.

A second teacher is highlighted in a case study. This teacher is a first-year high school teacher who is a 2020-2021 completer in the Master of Science in Teaching program who teaches both Biology and Chemistry in a rural/suburban school district. The teacher indicated that they have a high number of special needs students in one particular course.

For the purpose of this case study, the teacher provided three observation/evaluations. The first observation in September of 2021 focused on all areas of the Danielson Framework. As the focus areas for this study are 3b, 3c and 3d, only the feedback related to these areas is noted for all observations. This initial observation was rated as: 3B- Basic, 3C- Proficient, 3D- Basic. The overall rating for this observation was Proficient. The following comments are from the teacher’s supervisor related to the identified areas:

- “Overall, the lesson was proficient and provided students with a variety of learning opportunities. The teacher provides a quality learning environment for students and is comfortable with the content. The teacher will continue to grow in the area of classroom management by providing simple and clear expectations for all students. Higher level questioning and utilizing formative assessment are two instructional areas that can improve daily instruction.”

The second, formal observation also occurred in October of 2021. The following feedback was provided on Domain Three. The teacher was rated Proficient in all three areas. The supervisor also provided the following comments:

- “The teacher’s lesson activities were appropriate for high school students and is aware of students’ special learning and medical needs.
- The lesson outcomes represented high expectations and were clearly written. The lesson had a clearly defined structure around which activities were organized. Consider having students perform some exploration to engage students and provide an experience to connect to their learning
- The teacher has created an environment of respect and rapport with [their] students. [They are] alert to student behavior at all times and use proximity and positive interactions to re-direct students to their learning. The teacher has established clear routines as evidenced by students getting out their computers to get to Schoology for the drill at the beginning of class.
- Classroom expectations for learning, procedures and explanations of content were delivered to students in a clear manner. Most of the teacher’s questions were of high quality and adequate time was provided for students to respond. The teacher did a wonderful job of eliciting prior knowledge from students to connect to the lesson “

The teacher made great progress from the first observation at the very start of the school year to this second observation. It would be very consistent with the experience of first-year teachers to have some Basic ratings early in the year. However, in just a few short weeks, this teacher demonstrated significant growth in the three identified areas within Domain 3 of the Framework.

A third structured observation took place in December of 2021. The following feedback was provided. The teacher was rated Proficient in all three components and the observer included the following comments:

- “Quality Instruction
  - The teacher used proximity and circulating the room to monitor and assist students. They interacted with many students personally and answered questions.
  - There are 23 students enrolled in this class. This quarter’s class/grade book shows 14 assignments. The average grade in the class for quarter two is 84. Most students are meeting success in this class.
  - The classroom is organized. Supplies were readily available.
  - High expectations and clear directions in your teaching are appreciated! Keep up the hard work!”

This teacher, at approximately the mid-point of the year, is demonstrating great success via the ratings and the comments from the supervisors. Similar to the first case study, this teacher was clearly finding success in multiple areas with the students. The teacher, at mid-year, is effectively demonstrating a positive impact on student learning, particularly in Domains 3b, 3c and 3d . Both the comments and the ratings indicate the impact of the teacher on the students. Teacher efficacy is critical for student achievement. Considering the nature and the challenges faced by first-year teachers in an uncertain environment, the teacher’s proficiency 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 to make adjustments to instruction to positively impact student achievement.

## 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 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 from 2019-2020 forward.

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 2020 Completers N= 3

CCAST Domain	Mid-Term Mean	Mid-Term Standard Deviation	Final Mean	Final Standard Deviation
Planning for Instruction and Assessment	2.25	.58	2.25	.69
Instructional Delivery	2.40	.69	2.40	.55
Assessment	1.89	.84	2.00	.87
Analysis of Teaching	1.67	1.53	2.00	1.0
Professional Commitments and Behaviors	2.33	.90	2.40	.62
Professional Relationships	2.34	1.12	2.50	.58
Critical Thinking and Reflective Practice	2.33	.58	2.33	.58

**CPAST Consensus Results-Spring 2021 Completers N= 32**

<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>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>.58</b>	<b>2.35</b>	<b>.62</b>
<b>Instructional Delivery</b>	<b>2.21</b>	<b>.59</b>	<b>2.53</b>	<b>.50</b>
<b>Assessment</b>	<b>1.90</b>	<b>.54</b>	<b>2.15</b>	<b>.52</b>
<b>Analysis of Teaching</b>	<b>1.15</b>	<b>.71</b>	<b>1.55</b>	<b>.79</b>
<b>Professional Commitments and Behaviors</b>	<b>2.29</b>	<b>.60</b>	<b>2.40</b>	<b>.55</b>
<b>Professional Relationships</b>	<b>2.25</b>	<b>.61</b>	<b>2.47</b>	<b>.67</b>
<b>Critical Thinking and Reflective Practice</b>	<b>2.61</b>	<b>.50</b>	<b>2.73</b>	<b>.45</b>

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, thus the chart below indicates the completion year. Data was collected one year out in the spring of 2021. 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 \*39 completers who completed in 2019-2020, one attended graduate school and one student was not located. These are not counted in the total; therefore, for this data collection, N= 37

Permission to contact principals was requested of those teaching as of January 2021<sup>2</sup>

Scoring Scale is as follows: 4 Consistently; 3 Inconsistently; 2 Minimally; 1 Not at all; Insufficient evidence<sup>3</sup>

Completion 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>	
	#	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2019-2020	*37	3	8%	1	3%	0	0	34	92%	34	92%
Returned Surveys N= 23											

Employer Survey <sup>3</sup>																				
	McDaniel College 2016-2017 N=17					McDaniel College 2017-2018 N=7					McDaniel College 2018-2019 N=14					McDaniel College 2019-2020 N=23				
This beginning teacher...	Mean	Mode	Median	SD	Insufficient Evidence	Mean	Mode	Median	SD	Insufficient Evidence	Mean	Mode	Median	SD	In. Evid	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	3.96	4	4	.20	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	3.78	4	4	.83	1
• knows the required content <sup>5</sup>	3.94	4	4	0.24	0	3.57	4	4	.49	0	3.86	4	4	.52	0	3.91	4	4	.41	0
• effectively teaches required content	3.94	4	4	0.24	0	3.86	4	4	.35	0	3.79	4	4	.56	0	3.96	4	4	.20	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	4.0	4	4	0	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	3.96	4	4	.20	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	3.96	4	4	.20	0
• demonstrates professionalism	3.88	4	4	0.33	0	3.71	4	4	.45	0	3.79	4	4	.26	0	4.0	4	4	0	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	4.0	4	4	0	0

\*This number denotes the number of program completers, not completers as defined by Title II

\*\*Only 13 responses for this question in 2018-2019

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 fourth year this data has been collected in this form so the department is developing trend data. Due to the discrepancy in the size of number of completed surveys, is it difficult to make direct comparisons. Overall, scores for 2019-2020 are slightly higher than they were for 2018-2019, 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 2019-2020. With the mode and median consistently at 4 and the lowest mean at 3.78 and highest at 4.0, 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, the creation of a respectful environment, understanding the needs of diverse students and the professionalism of the graduates. In addition, an increase in satisfaction in the area of knows required content and teaches 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 consistently high levels of satisfaction over the past four years:

- 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. While there were slight declines over the next two years, that data rebounded in 2019-2020 with a mean of 3.96 and a standard deviation of .20
- In the area of “planning for the diverse needs of students,” McDaniel completers initially scored a mean of 3.76 on a 4-point scale with a standard deviation of .44 for 2016-2017 and the mean has been consistent over the past four years with 2019-2020 showing a mean of 3.78 and a standard deviation of .83.
- In the area of “knows required content,” McDaniel completers in 2016-2017 scored a mean of 3.94 on a 4-point scale with a standard deviation of .24. 2017-2018 showed a dip in the mean at 3.57 and a standard deviation of .49. this area has rebounded over the past two year with the 2019-2020 mean at 3.91 with a standard deviation of .41.
- In the area of “teaches required content,” McDaniel completers in 2016-2017 scored a mean of 3.94 on a 4-point scale with a standard deviation of .24. This data has remained consisted with the exception of 2018-19. The 2019-2020 data is the strongest yet with a mean of 3.96 with a standard deviation of .20.
- In the area of “creating a respectful environment that supports learning for all students,” 2016-2017 McDaniel completers scored a mean of 4.0 on a 4-point scale with a standard deviation of 0. After a slight two- year decline, this data returned strong in 2019-2020 with the same mean and standard deviation from 2016-2017.
- In the area of “implementing effective instruction that engages students in learning,” McDaniel completers scored a mean of 3.88 in 2016-2017 on a 4-point scale with a standard deviation of .33. The 2019-2020 completers scored the strongest mean yet of 3.96 with a standard deviation of .20.
- 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 with a standard deviation of .. In 2019-2020, the completers scored the highest mean yet of 3.96 with a standard deviation of .20.
- In the area of “demonstrates professionalism,” the 2016-2017 completers scored a mean of 3.88 and a standard deviation of .33. While scores over time were very good, the 2019-2020 completer cohort, those students scored an outstanding 4.0 mean with a standard deviation of 0.
- In the area of “uses technology to improve student learning,” completers in 2016-2017 scored a mean of 3.75 and a standard deviation of .45. In the 2019-2020, completers demonstrated the highest scores in that area with a 4.0 mean and a standard deviation of .0, rebounding from a low of a 3.0 mean and a standard deviation of .37 in 2017-2018.

#### 4. Employment Milestones: 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 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	Total 2015-2016 Completers
Number of completers	75	47	50	47	29	48	54	44	40	28	33
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%	5/33=15%
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%	3/27=11%	2/28= 7% (2/28 are teaching at college)
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%	24/27=89%	26/28=93%
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)	1/32=3%	3/24=12.5%	1/26=4% (one taught 3 years and is currently home with children- will return next year)
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%	1/32=3%	3/24=12.5%	1/26=4%

<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 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%	31/32=97%	21/24=87.5%	25/26=96%
-----------------------------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	---------------	----------------	----------------	-------	----------------	-----------	-------------	-----------

For the data on teacher retention for 2015-2016, data was gathered for 26/33 graduates. Five graduates were not located. For the twenty-eight 2015-2016 graduates, 2 out of 28 (10.5%) have never taught and 26 of 28 (93%) 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 2015-2016 graduates from McDaniel College, only one has temporarily left the profession after 5 years. This is the same person who went into teaching and has been teaching for less than 5 years. and 25 of the 26 who went into teaching have been teaching for all 5 years. This is a substantially higher rate compared the national rate of those that remain in teaching.

**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	2015-16	Total to Date
California		1							1			1		3
College		1						1	1					3
Connecticut		1												1
Florida		1							1	1			2	5
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	1	35
MD – Caroline County				1										1
MD – Carroll	9	11	12	2	17	16	14	15	11	12	10	5	8	142
MD - Cecil								1						1
MD - Charles			1											1
MD – Frederick	2			3	2	5	1	4	3	4	2	2	3	31
MD – Harford		2						1	1					4

MD – Howard	1		2			2	1	2	3	4	3	1	3	21
MD - Kent								2						2
MD – Montgomery	6	1	3		1	1	1	2	4	4	4	3	1	31
MD – Prince George’s	1	2				1		1	1	2	1			9
MD – Queen Anne’s				1										1
MD – Talbot		1									1		1	3
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
Colorado														
New Jersey		1			1	1	1	1		1		1	1	8
New York												1		1
Non-public	1	1	2			1	3	2	4	1	2	1	2*	20
North Carolina									1			1		3
Ohio								1					1	2
Pennsylvania	2		1	1	1	2			2		2	3	2	16
Texas		1									1			2
Virginia		1								2			1	4
West Virginia												1		1
TOTAL	27	29	24	11	30	39	22	38	44	33	32	28		376

**\*Private College**

## 5. Satisfaction of Completers

At the end of the 2020-2021 academic year, completers were asked to evaluate the degree to which they were prepared to address key elements of effective teaching based on the INTASC standards. This year saw great improvement in overall satisfaction. While this data will continued to be reviewed to identify areas for improvement, one can only assume that the return to face-to-face learning after the previous year of students who experienced a major disruption in their learning greatly impacted this data. Completers indicated very high satisfaction, as the following data demonstrates:

- 100% felt well prepared or prepared to understand the diverse needs of students, while 0% felt they were somewhat or not prepared
- 100% felt well prepared or prepared to plan for the diverse needs of students, while 0% felt they were somewhat or not prepared
- 100% felt well prepared or prepared to know the content they would be required to teach, and 0% indicated they were somewhat or not prepared
- 94% felt well prepared or prepared to teach required content, while 3% responded that they felt somewhat prepared, 0% felt not prepared and 1% did not respond
- 100% felt well prepared or prepared and 0% felt somewhat prepared to create a respectful environment that supports learning for all students. 0% indicated they were only somewhat or not prepared
- 100% felt well prepared or prepared and 0% felt somewhat or not prepared to implement effective instruction that engages students in learning
- 100% felt well prepared or prepared and 0% felt somewhat or not prepared to implement a range of assessments to measure the progress of learners and improve instruction
- 95% felt well prepared or prepared and 5% felt somewhat while 0% felt they were not prepared to demonstrate professionalism to stakeholders
- 100% felt well prepared or prepared and 0% felt somewhat or not prepared to use technology in ways that improve student learning.
- 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 2020-2021 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?	61%	39%	0%	0%	0%
How prepared are you to plan for the diverse needs of students?	64%	36%	0%	0%	0%
How prepared are you to know the content you will be required to teach?	72%	28%	0%	0%	0%

How prepared are you to teach required content?	75%	19%	3%	0%	3%
How prepared are you to create a respectful environment that supports learning for all students?	97%	3%	0%	0%	0%
How prepared are you to implement effective instruction that engages students in learning?	58%	42%	0%	0%	0%
How prepared are you to implement a range of assessments to measure the progress of learners and improve instruction?	64%	36%	0%	0%	0%
Question	Well Prepared	Prepared	Somewhat Prepared	Not Prepared	No Response
How prepared are you to demonstrate professionalism to stakeholders?	56%	39%	5%	0%	0%
How prepared are you to use technology in ways that improve student learning?	64%	36%	0%	0%	0%
How prepared are you to positively impact student growth through leadership and collaboration?	61%	31%	8%	0%	0%

Source: Education Department

## 6. 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 2020-21 IPEDS graduation rate is calculated on the FTFY for 2015. Please note 2021 was only the third year we had graduates from our newly-approved Elementary Education major, and no one from the FTFY 2015 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.

<b>Undergraduate Graduation Rate 2020-2021</b>	<b>FTFY 2015 All Majors</b>	<b>FTFY 2015 Education Major</b>	<b>FTFY 2015 Education Minor</b>
Less than Expected (<4 years)	2%	0%	13%
Expected (4 years)	56%	0%	87%
More than expected (6 years)	7%	0%	0%
Transfers out	4%	0%	0%

<b>Graduate Graduation Rate 2020-2021</b>	<b>2021 GR Master's in Teaching</b>	<b>2020 GR Master's in Teaching</b>	<b>2019 GR Master's in Teaching</b>
Less than Expected (<7 semesters)	43%	33%	31%
Expected (7 semesters)	0%	25%	49%
More than expected (8-9 semesters)	43%	33%	15%



Incomplete	14%	9%	5%
------------	-----	----	----

Source: Institutional Research, McDaniel College

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

Of the thirty-five 2020-2021 initial certification program completers as reported to Title II, (83%) passed certification examinations (PRAXIS II or the required American Council for the Teachers of Foreign Languages assessments).

## 8.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.

\*36 completed the program and does not indicate "Completer" as defined by Title II

<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>	
	2020-2021 Completer Data
Candidates Completing the Program Leading to Initial Certification	36
• Graduate	5
• Undergraduate	31
Completers Working in Field of Education	35
Completers Not Working in Field of Education	1
• 1 student is going to graduate school	
Completers Not Located	0
Places of Employment	
• Maryland	
Anne Arundel County	3
Baltimore County	2
Baltimore City	2
Carroll County	13
Frederick County	2
Howard County	2
Montgomery County	3
Prince George's County	2
Somerset County	1
Wicomico	2
• Non-Public College Ohio	1
• Pennsylvania	1
• North Carolina	1

## 9.NCATE/CAEP Programs

The following programs were reviewed in the 2016 NCATE visit:

<b>Program</b>	<b>Degree</b>	<b>Initial/Advanced</b>
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.**