

## Table of Contents for Data Section 4: Data and Accreditation 2023

### Completer Impact and Effectiveness

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

9. [CAEP/NCATE Programs](#)

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

The state of Maryland does not provide direct 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 supervisor 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 2021-22 completor cohort from McDaniel College and holds a B.A. in Elementary Education. The teacher was hired by a medium/small school district in Maryland and teaches 4th grade STEM at a Title I school. The student population consists of students within a wide range of socioeconomic statuses. The teacher reported that the fourth grade math data ranked second in the county for the January benchmark assessment, so there is evidence of strong instruction on this grade level team.

For the purpose of this case study, the teacher provided two observations and one evaluation. Two observations were completed in October 2022 and December 2022, both of which focused on Domains 1-3 of the Danielson Framework. An evaluation was completed in April of 2023 which focused on all four areas of the Framework. As the focus areas for this study are 3b, 3c and 3d, only the feedback related to these areas is noted. The initial observation in October for this teacher was rated Distinguished in 3B, Distinguished in 3C and Proficient in 3D. The following comments are from the observing supervisor:

- "The Teacher communicated expectations for learning, directions and procedures, and explanations of content using age-appropriate language and vocabulary.
- The Teacher posed quality questions and allowed sufficient time for students to respond. Students generated quality questions and initiated discussions and ideas that extended the learning for all.
- The teacher seized opportunities to enhance her student's learning by building on their questions, responses, and misconceptions."

The overall rating for this observation was Distinguished. The feedback demonstrated that this first-year teacher is finding great success in the classroom.

The second observation of this teacher occurred in December of 2022. The teacher was rated Proficient in 3B, Distinguished in 3C, and Proficient in 3D. A different supervisor observed the teacher for this observation. The supervisor provided the following comments related to the above areas of the Domain 3:

- "Sharing the learning objective before the lesson and unpacking the verbiage helps students to focus in on the task at hand.
- Revisiting the objective after the lesson helps students monitor their own learning.
- Allowing for fidget time before beginning instruction is developmentally appropriate given that they have had such limited use of manipulatives in the past.
- Clear classroom expectations have been established
- Consider additional informal assessments during whole group instruction, even if it's just for targeted students, as another way to form your small groups"

The overall rating for this observation was Proficient. While the first observation was Distinguished and the second Proficient, this first- year teacher is clearly demonstrating success in the identified areas of Domain 3.

The teacher's evaluation from April 2023 again indicated that this teacher is successful in those same identified components. The teacher's overall evaluation rating was Effective, and the teacher was rated Proficient in 3B, Distinguished in 3C, and Proficient in 3D. The team of supervisors came together and provided the following comments for the teacher:

- “The Teacher’s students, throughout the lesson, are highly intellectually engaged in significant learning and contribute to the activities, student groupings, and selection of materials.
- The Teacher is able to adapt as needed to the needs of individuals, and the structure and pacing allow for student reflection and closure.
- We are proud to have the Teacher as a part of the teaching staff. We look forward to watching her continued growth in her craft.”

Both the comments and the ratings indicate the impact of the teacher on the students. As John Hattie’s research demonstrates, teacher efficacy is essential 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. The ratings and comments also demonstrate the teacher’s ability to receive feedback and make adjustments to instruction to positively impact student achievement. Teacher efficacy for students with high needs is of paramount importance. This first-year teacher is, as noted in the ratings, making a meaningful impact on student learning and 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 CFAST Evaluation Tool. McDaniel entered a partnership with Ohio State University to use their CFAST 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 CFAST tool. Mentor teachers, teacher candidates, and supervisors 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 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 CFAST used in the spring of 2019, thus the 2018-2019 academic year was a transition year. Currently, CFAST is the only tool used for data collection from 2019-2020 forward.

In the CFAST 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 (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.

**CPAST Consensus Results Fall 2021 Completers N= 6**

<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>1.95</b>	<b>.26</b>	<b>2.25</b>	<b>.83</b>
<b>Instructional Delivery</b>	<b>2.16</b>	<b>.59</b>	<b>2.30</b>	<b>.65</b>
<b>Assessment</b>	<b>1.83</b>	<b>.52</b>	<b>2.10</b>	<b>.75</b>
<b>Analysis of Teaching</b>	<b>1.33</b>	<b>.82</b>	<b>1.70</b>	<b>.52</b>
<b>Professional Commitments and Behaviors</b>	<b>1.80</b>	<b>.71</b>	<b>2.06</b>	<b>.88</b>
<b>Professional Relationships</b>	<b>2.25</b>	<b>.72</b>	<b>2.25</b>	<b>.79</b>
<b>Critical Thinking and Reflective Practice</b>	<b>2.67</b>	<b>.82</b>	<b>2.67</b>	<b>.82</b>

**CPAST Consensus Results-Spring 2022 Completers N= 29**

<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>2.03</b>	<b>.64</b>	<b>2.35</b>	<b>.60</b>
<b>Instructional Delivery</b>	<b>1.98</b>	<b>.64</b>	<b>2.28</b>	<b>.55</b>
<b>Assessment</b>	<b>1.77</b>	<b>.62</b>	<b>2.01</b>	<b>.60</b>
<b>Analysis of Teaching</b>	<b>1.07</b>	<b>.75</b>	<b>1.28</b>	<b>.65</b>
<b>Professional Commitments and Behaviors</b>	<b>2.12</b>	<b>.59</b>	<b>2.30</b>	<b>.57</b>
<b>Professional Relationships</b>	<b>2.02</b>	<b>.62</b>	<b>2.35</b>	<b>.53</b>
<b>Critical Thinking and Reflective Practice</b>	<b>2.38</b>	<b>.62</b>	<b>2.55</b>	<b>.57</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 \*36 completers who completed in 2020-2021, one attended graduate school and all students were located. These are not counted in the total; therefore, for this Employer Survey data collection, N= 35

Permission to contact principals was requested of those teaching as of January 2022<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>	
	#	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2020-2021	*36	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	35	100%	35	100%
Returned Surveys N= 7											

<b>Employer Survey<sup>3</sup></b>			
------------------------------------	--	--	--

	McDaniel College 2016-2017 N=17					McDaniel College 2017-2018 N=7					McDaniel College 2018-2019 N=14					McDaniel College 2019-2020 N=23					McDaniel College 2020-2021 N=7				
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	Mean	Mode	Med.	SD	In. Evid
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>understands the diverse needs of students</li> </ul>	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	4.0	4.0	4.0	0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>plans for the diverse needs of students</li> </ul>	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	4.0	4.0	4.0	0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>knows the required content<sup>5</sup></li> </ul>	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	4.0	4.0	4.0	0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>effectively teaches required content</li> </ul>	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	4.0	4.0	4.0	0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>creates a respectful environment that supports learning for all students.</li> </ul>	4.0	4	4	0	1	3.86	4	4	.35	0	3.79	4	4	.77	0	4.0	4	4	0	0	3.86	4.0	4.0	.35	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>implements effective instruction that engages students in learning**</li> </ul>	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	3.86	4.0	4.0	.35	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>implements a range of assessments to measure the progress of learners to</li> </ul>	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	3.86	4.0	4.0	.35	0

improve instruction																										
• 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	3.86	4.0	4.0	.35	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	4.0	4.0	4.0	0	0	

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

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 number of completed surveys, it is difficult to make direct comparisons. Overall, scores for 2020-2021 are slightly higher than they were for 2019-2020. However, the response rate was much lower than the previous year. Even with multiple points of contact to the principals, only 7 responded. Even with limited responses, it is clear that employers report they are satisfied in all nine areas surveyed for 2020-2021. With the mode and median consistently at 4 and the lowest mean at 3.86 and highest at 4.0, it is evident that there is overall high employer satisfaction. Of particular note is the slight increase in the overall satisfaction in the areas: understands the diverse needs of students, plans for the diverse needs of students, knows the required content, and effectively teaches the required content with the of the graduates. However, there was a slight decrease in satisfaction in the areas; creates a respectful environment, implements effective instruction, implements a range of assessments and demonstrates professionalism. In all of these areas, the decrease is due to one teacher, thus indicating the impact of the small sample size. McDaniel will continue to collect and analyze this data and trends over time to see where continued growth and support are 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 continued to trend upward in 2020-21 with a mean of 4.0 and a standard deviation of 0.
- 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 2020-21, the mean was 4.0 and the standard deviation was 0 showing some improvement.
- 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. Completers in 2017-2018 showed a dip in the mean at 3.57 and a standard deviation of .49. This area has continued to improve over the past with the 2019-2020 mean at 3.91 with a standard deviation of .41 and a mean of 4.0 in 2020-21 with a standard deviation of 0.

- 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 consistent 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. Results were strong again in 2020-2021 with a mean of 4.0 and a standard deviation of 0.
- 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. This area showed a slight decline in 2020-2021 with a mean of 3.86 and 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 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. The mean was still strong in 2020-2021 with a mean of 3.86 and a standard deviation of .35.
- 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 .44. In 2019-2020, the completers scored the highest mean yet of 3.96 with a standard deviation of .20. Completers in 2020-2021 still demonstrated strength in this area with a mean of .86 and a standard deviation of .35.
- 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 scored an outstanding 4.0 mean with a standard deviation of 0. Again, this decreased slightly in 2020-2021 to a mean of 3.86 and a standard deviation of .35.
- 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. Completers once again demonstrated the highest scores in 2020-2021 with a mean of 4.0 and standard deviation of 0.

#### 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 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	Total 2016-17 Completers
Number of completers	47	50	47	29	48	54	44	40	28	33	30



Completers not located	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%	1/30=3%
Completers never taught	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)	0/29=0%
Completers entering teaching	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%	29/29=100%
Completers no longer teaching after 5 years (Leavers)	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)	3/29=10.3% (two resigned when they had children and one resigned when their spouse was relocated for work)
Completers teaching now but less than 5 years	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%	0/26=0%
Completers teaching 5 years	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%	26/26=100%

<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

For the data on teacher retention for 2016-2017, data was gathered for 29/30 graduates. One graduate was not located. For the twenty-nine graduates, 100% 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 2016-2017 graduates from McDaniel College, three have left the profession for reasons noted in the chart. However, 26 of the 29 who went into teaching have been teaching for all 5 years. This is a substantially higher rate compared to the national rate of those that remain in teaching.

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



MD - Worcester	1	1		1			1						4
Colorado													
New Jersey			1	1	1	1		1		1	1	1	8
New York										1		1	2
Non-public	2			1	3	2	4	1	2	1	2*		18
North Carolina							1			1			2
Ohio						1					1		2
Pennsylvania	1	1	1	2			2		2	3	2	2	16
Texas									1				1
Virginia								2			1		3
West Virginia										1		1	2
TOTAL	24	11	30	39	22	38	44	33	32	28	33	26	360

\*Private College

## 5. Satisfaction of Completers

At the end of the 2021-2022 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 a significant decrease in overall satisfaction after seeing significant improvement in 2020-2021. This data is being reviewed by the department to identify areas for improvement. Overall, however, completers indicated very high satisfaction, as the following data demonstrates:

- 83% felt well prepared or prepared to understand the diverse needs of students, while 7% felt they were somewhat or not prepared
- 74% felt well prepared or prepared to plan for the diverse needs of students, while 26% felt they were somewhat or not prepared
- 89% felt well prepared or prepared to know the content they would be required to teach, and 11% indicated they were somewhat or not prepared
- 73% felt well prepared or prepared to teach required content, while 17% responded that they felt somewhat or not prepared
- 91% felt well prepared or prepared and 0% felt somewhat prepared to create a respectful environment that supports learning for all students, and 9% indicated they were only somewhat or not prepared
- 77% felt well prepared or prepared and 23% felt somewhat or not prepared to implement effective instruction that engages students in learning
- 85% felt well prepared or prepared and 15% felt somewhat or not prepared to implement a range of assessments to measure the progress of learners and improve instruction
- 89% felt well prepared or prepared and 5% felt somewhat while 11% felt they were not prepared to demonstrate professionalism to stakeholders
- 77% felt well prepared or prepared and 23% felt somewhat or not prepared to use technology in ways that improve student learning.
- 77% felt well prepared or prepared and 14% felt somewhat or not prepared to positively impact student growth and 9% did not respond

Description of Data Set: Satisfaction of Completers					
<i>At the end of the 2021-2022 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?	31%	52%	17%	0%	0%
How prepared are you to plan for the diverse needs of students?	34%	40%	23%	3%	0%
How prepared are you to know the content you will be required to teach?	60%	29%	11%	0%	0%
Question	Well Prepared	Prepared	Somewhat Prepared	Not Prepared	No Response

How prepared are you to teach required content?	43%	40%	17%	0%	3%
How prepared are you to create a respectful environment that supports learning for all students?	37%	54%	6%	3%	0%
How prepared are you to implement effective instruction that engages students in learning?	34%	43%	20%	3%	0%
How prepared are you to implement a range of assessments to measure the progress of learners and improve instruction?	31%	54%	12%	3%	0%
How prepared are you to demonstrate professionalism to stakeholders?	46%	43%	11%	0%	0%
How prepared are you to use technology in ways that improve student learning?	29%	48%	20%	3%	0%
How prepared are you to positively impact student growth through leadership and collaboration?	31%	46%	14%	0%	9%

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 2021-22 IPEDS graduation rate is calculated on the FTFY for 2016. Please note 2021-2022 was only the fourth year we had graduates from our newly-approved 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 2021-2022</b>	<b>FTFY 2016 All Majors</b>	<b>FTFY 2016 Education Major</b>	<b>FTFY 201 Education Minor</b>
Less than Expected (<4 years)	2%	0%	0%
Expected (4 years)	57%	82%	91%
More than expected (6 years)	9%	12%	9%
Transfers out	1%	0%	0%

<b>Graduate Graduation Rate 2021-2022</b>	<b>2022 GR Master's in Teaching</b>	<b>2021 GR Master's in Teaching</b>	<b>2020 GR Master's in Teaching</b>
Less than Expected (<7 semesters)	50%	43%	33%
Expected (7 semesters)	0%	0%	25%
More than expected (8-9 semesters)	50%	43%	33%

Incomplete	0%	14%	9%
------------	----	-----	----

Source: Institutional Research, McDaniel College

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

Of the thirty-five 2021-22 initial certification program completers as reported to Title II, (77%) passed certification examinations (PRAXIS II or the required American Council for the Teachers of Foreign Languages assessments). This is in line with the Maryland state pass rate which was also 77%.



## 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.

\*35 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>	
	2021-22 Completer Data
Candidates Completing the Program Leading to Initial Certification	35
• Graduate	6
• Undergraduate	29
Completers Working in Field of Education	
Completers Not Working in Field of Education	6
• 2 students are going to graduate school	
Completers Not Located	0
Places of Employment	
• Maryland	
Anne Arundel County	1
Baltimore County	3
Carroll County	8
Cecil County	1
Frederick County	3
Harford County	2
Howard County	2
Montgomery County	1
Prince George's County	1
Talbot County	1
• Private School- Maryland	3
• Pennsylvania	1
• Connecticut	1
• Vietnam	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.**