



# THOMAS MORE COLLEGE

## Annual Reporting Measures (CAEP Component 5.4 | A.5.4)

### Impact Measures (CAEP Standard 4)

#### 1. Impact on P12 learning and development (Component 4.1)

The EPP measures, using multiple documents, that program completers contribute to an expected level of student learning growth. This is accomplished through completer focus groups held every other summer. Current data is from the summer 2016 focus group. Summer 2018, another focus group will be conducted to gather data on P12 learning impact. In the two 2016 focus group settings (one for TEP completers and one for MAT completers), six program completers shared measures and samplings of data directly from their classrooms in order to reflect P-12 student learning for the provider. One elementary completer shared a data sample, two middle school completers shared a sample, and four secondary completers shared data samples.

Data measures vary by schools and school districts. Shared multiple data measures included: Professional Growth Effectiveness System, [PGES Student Voice Surveys](#), [Measures of Academic Progress \(MAP\) Scores](#), [College Equipped Readiness Tool \(CERT\) scores](#), and [a set of placement test scores](#). Data samples included national representation (MAP, CERT), State representation (PGES Student Growth Goals, PGES Student Voice Surveys), as well as data from public and private settings.

#### 2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness (Component 4.2)

##### Completer Teaching Effectiveness 2016/2017

Level	N	Observation 2A	Observation 2B	Observation 2C	Average
Elementary	2	4	4	4	4
	1 <sup>st</sup> , 5 <sup>th</sup>				
Middle School	2	4	4	4	4
	Business; Science				
Secondary	2	4	4	4	4
	Math; English				
UND	3	4	4	4	4
MAT	3	4	4	4	4
Total	6	4	4	4	4

3. Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones (Component 4.3 | A.4.1)  
**(Rating Rubric: 4-Excellent; 3-Good; 2-Average; 1-Unsatisfactory)**

Below are the results of the most recent employer survey (2015-2016 graduates):

No. of Employers responding to the survey: 10

Understanding how students learn	Meeting individual student needs	Effective Classroom management	Addressing the needs of diverse learners	Teaching Strategies	Student Assessment	Effective use of technology in the classroom	Competency in written communication	Overall preparation for teaching
3.6	3.3	3.1	3.3	3.4	3.2	3.3	3.6	3.5

4. Satisfaction of completers (Component 4.4 | A4.2)

**(Rating Rubric: 4-Excellent; 3-Good; 2-Average; 1-Unsatisfactory)**

Below are the results of the most recent graduate survey (2015-2016):

No. of (undergraduate)Graduates responding to the survey: 5 undergraduates/9 total

Understanding how students learn	Meeting individual student needs	Effective Classroom management	Addressing the needs of diverse learners	Teaching Strategies	Student Assessment	Effective use of technology in the classroom	Competency in written communication
3.8	3.2	3.4	3.2	3.4	3.4	3.6	3

## Outcome Measures

### 5. Graduation Rates

Initial		Advanced	
No. Student Taught	20	No. Student Taught	1
No. Completers	20	No. Completers	1
% Completers	100	% Completers	100

### 6. Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements; title II (initial & advanced levels)

[https://kcews.ky.gov/Content/Reports/TPPFR\\_2016\\_INST\\_00200100.pdf](https://kcews.ky.gov/Content/Reports/TPPFR_2016_INST_00200100.pdf)

**7. Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared (initial & advanced levels)**

Initial		Advanced	
No. Completers	20	No. Completers	1
No. Hired	17*	No. Hired	1
% Hired	85%	% Hired	100%

\*12 UND Completers: 1 – enrolled in grad school following undergraduate graduation;  
1 – status unknown

8 GRAD Completers: 1 subbing at local schools (not included in “hired”)

**8. Student loan default rates and other consumer information (initial & advanced levels)**

The United States Department of Education calculates each school's cohort default rate based on repayment of federal loans made to students for attendance at the school. Thomas More College's current Default Rate calculated for the 2014 cohort and published in September 2017 is 5.8%.

## Analysis

1. Due to the low number of completers providing data samples from the focus groups, data is too small to demonstrate statistically significant trends, however, all program completer data indicated student growth in classrooms.

- **PGES Student Growth Goals:** One TEP P-5 completer and one MAT 5-12 completer reported student growth goals. Student data reflected proficiency in both classrooms. This small data representation indicates that program completers successfully contribute to expected levels of student growth through the training they received in their preparation program and ascertained by school and district administrators.
- **PGES Student Voice Surveys:** One TEP 5-9, one 8-12 completer, and one 8-12 MAT completer reported Student Voice Survey Results. It is important to note the inconsistency in the way these surveys are implemented among school districts. For example, one sample involved a random class sample in which one of five classes was surveyed for one completer, while another sample included every student present that particular day for that completer. Overall the averages for this tool suggest that the program completers contribute to the expected levels of student growth as classroom expectations are shifted to student perspectives and reflection that directly impact the EPP.
- **MAP Scores** were submitted by one elementary completer. MAP data is presented in three cycles: fall, winter, and spring scores for Math, Reading, and Language Arts. Within this set of data, the expected levels of student learner growth were positive, increasing at least 10 (standard deviation) points per cycle. Again, this data represents the impact of one completer on one class. The data indicates learner growth is occurring.
- **CERT Scores** were submitted by one 8-12 MAT completer. CERT scores are reported in two cycles: Fall and Spring for English and Reading. These particular scores reflected all students staying at or above benchmark for both test cycles (although fluctuating student numbers need to be considered).

Due to the small number of completers reporting to the EPP to establish a documentation process for expected levels of learner growth, the trends within the data are not statistically significant, and better reflect individual candidates' proficiencies and areas of strength within individual classrooms. However, all program completer data indicated student growth in classrooms. Such feedback is critical to the EPP to review and contribute to policies and procedures that inform programmatic structure and change that directly impact P-12 learners.

2. This was our first round of completer data collection (2016/2017). It was used to both measure teacher effectiveness of completers and also determine inter-rater reliability of evaluators. Completers were purposefully chosen to represent multiple levels, programs, and subject areas. Scores of 3.2 and above are considered successful. Our completers scored 4s in all evaluated areas—the Accomplished level in the Danielson Framework which is the foundation of the current observation tool used.

3. Ten employers responded to the employer satisfaction survey. This was a X% return rate. None of the scores were below the “good” rating of 3.0. The lowest score, a 3.1, occurred in classroom management, an area that both employers and students have

requested support in and will be addressed in several ways by the EPP. Student teachers and Option 6 candidates will be going through a 2-day summer “boot camp” to prepare them for the work in the classroom. Classroom management will be a large part of this workshop. Additionally, the overall teacher preparation measurement was at 3.5, well above an 80% satisfaction rating.

4. The undergraduate completer return rate was 56%--well above the CAEP 20% requirement. Interestingly, undergraduate completers were more concerned with writing competency than with classroom management preparation. Again, none of the scores fell below the “good” rating level of 3.

5. Graduation rates were at 100% for the 2016/2017 year. The EPP will continue to explore ways to sustain this number.

*6. Information provided by the state represents Thomas More as statistically insignificant – because our numbers are below 10, our data do not show up in data due to data being segregated by program.*

That being stated, Kentucky teacher preparation programs do not have access to EPSB data around these issues, but EPSB is required to report data to KCEWS (Kentucky Center for Education and Workforce Statistics). The 2016 report (which shares data for 2011, 2012, and 2013) suggests the following. 100% of students received their statement of eligibility for each year and then the majority of students received their five year certificate with science and elementary education demonstrating the highest percent for certification.

7. 86% of our students were hired in full time education positions. If you remove the student who went to graduate school (an indication of self-improvement and program quality that should not be used to deduct from the EPP program), that percentage is 90%. If the substitute is included, the rate is 95%. Only one graduate did not move into the field of education after leaving the EPP. The EPP works very hard with local school districts to match graduates with districts in order to meet the needs of both the new teacher and the students they will be serving.

8. Student default rates

[http://thomasmore.edu/heoa/fin\\_aid.cfm](http://thomasmore.edu/heoa/fin_aid.cfm)

All required disclosures for TMC: <http://www.thomasmore.edu/heoa/>