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 CPAST Evaluation Tool. McDaniel entered a partnership with Ohio State University to use their CPAST system to evaluate the effectiveness of our teacher candidates. This research-validated tool is aligned to both InTASC and CAEP and supervisors must be trained on the CPAST tool. Mentor teachers, teacher candidates, and supervisors collaborate using a consensus protocol to determine a final score for each standard.

As the CPAST 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 CPAST used in the spring of 2019, thus the 2018-2019 academic year was a transition year. Currently, CPAST is the only tool used for data collection from 2019-2020 forward.

In the CPAST model, Teaching Effectiveness is determined by 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 (I 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.

CPAST Consensus Results Fall 2021 Completers N= 6

CPAST Domain	Mid-Term Mean	Mid-Term Standard Deviation	Final Mean	Final Standard Deviation
Planning for Instruction and Assessment	1.95	.26	2.25	.83
Instructional Delivery	2.16	.59	2.30	.65
Assessment	1.83	.52	2.10	.75
Analysis of Teaching	1.33	.82	1.70	.52

Professional Commitments and Behaviors	1.80	.71	2.06	.88
Professional Relationships	2.25	.72	2.25	.79
Critical Thinking and Reflective Practice	2.67	.82	2.67	.82

CPAST Consensus Results-Spring 2022 Completers N= 29

CPAST Domain	Mid-Term Mean	Mid-Term Standard Deviation	Final Mean	Final Standard Deviation
Planning for Instruction and Assessment	2.03	.64	2.35	.60
Instructional Delivery	1.98	.64	2.28	.55
Assessment	1.77	.62	2.01	.60
Analysis of Teaching	1.07	.75	1.28	.65
Professional Commitments and Behaviors	2.12	.59	2.30	.57
Professional Relationships	2.02	.62	2.35	.53
Critical Thinking and Reflective Practice	2.38	.62	2.55	.57

Source: CPAST Consensus Form