

Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness

AY 2020-2021

The Kansas Department of Education (KSDE) does not share any student or teacher data with EPPs. In order to meet CAEP Standard 4, Kansas State University-College of Education (KSU-COE) is in the process of conducting a longitudinal case study in which we will sample from all of our programs. This study will span over three academic years, starting in 2019. The data gathered from this research serves to demonstrate **“through structured and validated observation instruments and student surveys, that completers effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve” (CAEP 4.2).**

In addition, data gathered also reflects the updated benchmarks set forth for CAEP Standard 4. Completers: **effectively contribute to P-12 student-learning growth AND B. apply in P-12 classrooms the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions the preparation experiences were designed to achieve. In addition, the provider includes a rationale for the evidence provided. AND [completers] apply in P-12 classrooms the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve. In addition, the provider includes a rationale for the data elements provided.**

As part of the case study, and as a means to assess our completers' effectiveness, we asked our participants to share their institutional summative evaluations. Respondents shared these evaluations through a Likert survey that included 12 items, aligned the *InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards* (2011) and to *Kansas Educator Evaluation Protocol* (KEEP) performance standards (see table 1). All KSU-COE programs are aligned to both InTASC and KEEP standards, which define key proficiencies that pre-service teachers are to exhibit, and that all teachers continue developing and refining throughout their careers. Additionally, most Kansas school districts follow the Kansas Department of Education (KSDE)'s KEEP Framework.

Our initial data suggests that a large majority of our Cohort 1 completers (94% of respondents) scored Effective/High Effective on InTASC Standard 3/KEEP 1.3: “Completers work with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation” (see Table 2). This was also the area in which Cohort 1 respondents scored highest last year. New areas of growth, emerged with approximately 65% of respondents scoring Effective/Highly Effective on InTASC 6/KEEP 3.2 and InTASC 7/KEEP 3.1: “completers understand and use multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide both my and my students' decision making” and “completers plan instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context” respectively.”

For a majority of our Cohort 2 respondents (92%) scored Effective/Highly Effective on InTASC 4/KEEP 2.1. In addition, 92% of respondents also scored Effective/Highly Effective on InTASC Standard 1/KEEP 1.1: “Completers understand how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas.” A key area for growth was InTASC 5/KEEP 2.2: “Completers understand how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues,” with 58% of respondents scoring Effective/Highly Effective (see Table 3).

Table 1. Institutional Summative Evaluation Data Description and Alignment

Item Number	Evaluation Measure:	InTASC Standard Alignment	KEEP Standard Alignment
1	Completers understand how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas.	InTASC 1	KEEP 1.1
2	Completers use their understanding of Learner Development to design and implement developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.	InTASC 1	KEEP 1.1
3	Completers use their understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.	InTASC 2	KEEP 1.2
4	Completers work with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.	InTASC 3	KEEP 1.3
5	Completers understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) they teach.	InTASC 4	KEEP 2.1
6	Completers use their understanding of Content Knowledge from the previous statement (above) to create learning experiences that make the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.	InTASC 4	KEEP 2.1
7	Completers understand how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.	InTASC 5	KEEP 2.2
8	Completers understand and use multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide both my and my students' decision making.	InTASC 6	KEEP 3.2
9	Completers plan instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon	InTASC 7	KEEP 3.1

Group Average by Measure:	3.12	2.94	3	3.35	3	3.06	2.82	2.82	2.88	2.88	3.06	3.06
% of respondents who reported a score of 3 or better on a 4-point scale; by measure	88%	76%	82%	94%	76%	88%	71%	65%	65%	76%	76%	82%
<i>Likert Scale: 1= Ineffective 2= Developing 3= Effective 4= Highly Effective</i>												

Table 3. Institutional Summative Evaluation Data Cohort 2; Year 1 Participants

Participant Number	Item 1	Item 2	Item 3	Item 4	Item 5	Item 6	Item 7	Item 8	Item 9	Item 10	Item 11	Item 12
A	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4
B	3	3	4	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	4
C	4	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	2
D	3	3	4	3	3	4	2	2	4	3	4	4
E	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	2	2
F	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
G	3	2	3	4	3	3	2	3	3	4	3	2
H	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3
I	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	3	2	3	2	3
J	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	4
K	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
L	3	2	4	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	3
M	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
N	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	3	2
O	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
P	3	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Q	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	4	3
R	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4
S	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
T	3	3	3	4	x	3	4	3	3	3	4	4
U	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3
V	3	2	2	3	3	x	3	2	3	3	3	3
W	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
X	3	3	2	3	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	3

Group Average by Measure:	3.04	2.75	3.08	3.20	2.96	2.91	2.71	2.92	2.96	2.96	3	3.04
% of respondents who reported a score of 3 or better on a 4-point scale; by measure	92%	71%	83%	92%	84%	71%	58%	79%	79%	79%	76%	75%
<i>Likert Scale: 1= Ineffective 2= Developing 3= Effective 4= Highly Effective</i>												

References

InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards: A Resource for State Dialogue (Rep.). (2011). Retrieved April 7, 2019.

Kansas State Department of Education. (2021). <https://www.ksde.org/Agency/Division-of-Learning-Services/Teacher-Licensure-and-Accreditation/Educator-Evaluations/KEEP-Districts>.