



TEACHER EDUCATION DIVISION

CAEP Annual Reporting Measures 2021

CAEP Required Measure	What We Use	page
<u>Impact Measures</u>		
1. Impact on P-12 learning and development (4.1)	Completer Mentor Program Outcomes 2018-20	2-9
2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness (4.2)		
3. Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones (4.3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % ID Masters Premium • Employer Survey Data 1718 - 1920 	10-14
4. Satisfaction of completers (4.4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completer Survey Data 1718- 1920 	15-18
<u>Outcome Measures</u>		
5. Graduation Rates	Graduation Rate	19
6. Ability of completers to meet licensing and any additional state requirements	Licensing Rate of Completers	
7. Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared	Percentage completers	
8. Student loan default rates and other consumer information	See Lewis-Clark State College's Consumer Information Page (https://www.lcsc.edu/consumer-information)	

Impact on P-12 Learning & Development and Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness

Completer Mentor Program Data

We participated with other Idaho EPPs in a completer mentor pilot using a SAHE grant from 2016 to 2018, though only two of our completers participated in the statewide effort. Based on the SAHE approach, we then initiated our own voluntary completer mentor program in Fall of 2018. The completer agrees to carry out an objective-based assessment with a pre-test, post-test model and rates the outcomes in terms of objective(s) not met, objective(s) partially met, or objective(s) met for each student. **We use this data for the required: Impact on P-12 Learning and Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness.** See data on following page.

In addition, the completer self-evaluates and has their students take a Tripod 7C's Survey to evaluate them. We have compiled the outcome data for our completers who have participated in the program and use it for the requirement, **Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness.** See data starting on page 4.

There has been a low participation rate: only four completers have agreed to be part of this program since its initiation (including the two from the SAHE grant). Since the covid pandemic began in the U.S., we have been unable to get even one completer to agree to take part in the program. While we present the data obtained, and the conclusion that it offers is that our completers do indeed contribute to an expected level of student-learning growth, we recognize that (1) this is one measure, not multiple measures and (2) the n is low and the materials tested are varied.

Satisfaction of Employers & Employment Milestones

Milestones: We have identified that, while only 2.46% of the teachers in the State of Idaho have received the [Idaho Master Educator Premium](#), an award and monetary bonus for consistent excellence in teaching as measured by evaluation and principal recommendation, 3.26% of our completers working in Idaho public schools are recipients.

Satisfaction of Employers:

Our Employer Survey results directly address the extent to which our completers carry out the range of teaching tasks effectively. See data starting on following page.

The same employer survey is conducted for all EPPs in the State of Idaho. Validity and reliability were established in the making of the instrument by Boise State University on behalf of the Idaho Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, whose member institutions all use the instrument in one centralized distribution each year. The results are sorted and sent to the institutions from which the completers graduated (so LC gets the records of all respondents who are employers of LC completers only). The compiled results (which contain the questions on the instrument) are included in evidence.

The response rate usually accounts for only 10-15% of program completers, despite the fact that the surveys are distributed by Boise State University for every EPP in the State, and we follow up with a duplicate version sent by LC each year to try to increase the response rate.

Despite the *n* of only one principal in 18-19 for two candidates who was clearly not approving of their preparation, the final average (adjusted for number of respondents) for all areas was 2.09, in the proficient range. There is no trend for high or low ratings, but interestingly they do not rate working with ENL students poorly as the completers themselves do.

Another piece of information suggesting that employers continue to be pleased with our completers is that 45% of the teaching force in our surrounding districts are our program completers. The districts welcome our completers enthusiastically, knowing that they are well prepared to teach.

Satisfaction of Completers

Our Completer Surveys directly address the extent to which completers are prepared to carry out the entire range of teaching tasks effectively. See data starting on following page.

The same employer survey is conducted for all EPPs in the State of Idaho. Validity and reliability were established in the making of the instrument by Boise State University on behalf of the Idaho Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, whose member institutions all use the instrument in one centralized distribution each year. The results are sorted and sent to the institutions from which the completers graduated (so LC gets the records of all respondents who are employers of LC completers only). The compiled results (which contain the questions on the instrument) are included in evidence.

The response rate accounts for 20-30% of program completers, despite the fact that the surveys are distributed by Boise State University for every EPP in the State, and we follow up with a duplicate version sent by LC each year to try to increase the response rate. Within the constraints of the low n , the surveys do demonstrate that, overall, completers feel that LC has prepared them well for their professional obligations, as the average score for all areas across all three years is 2.2, in the proficient area. The strongest areas noted are choosing and utilizing teaching strategies, reflection, and collaboration.

Outcome Measures

5. Graduation Rates

Year Graduated	% of Admitted Candidates Graduated
2015	89
2016	95
2017	97
2018	96
2019	91
2020	73.7*

(so far – covid slowed progress for some candidates)

6. % Completers Licensed

Year Graduated	No. of Program Completers	No. Licensed in ID	% of Program Completers Licensed in ID
2015	40	38	95
2016	40	40	100
2017	36	35	97
2018	40	40	100
2019	52	51	98
2020	45	44	98

7. Hiring Rate

Year Graduated	# Hired into Teaching Positions	Total # Graduated	% Graduated Hired Into Teaching Positions
2015	39	42	93
2016	34	36	94
2017	31	34	91
2018	31	33	94
2019	16	22	72
2020	33	44	75

8. Student loan default rates and other consumer information
 See [Lewis-Clark State College's Consumer Information Page](https://www.lcsc.edu/consumer-information)
 (<https://www.lcsc.edu/consumer-information>)