AQUINAS COLLEGE

2025 CAEP Accountability Measures Report

This annual Accountability Measures Summary Report is organized according to the following Impact and Outcome Measures. Supporting data with narrative explanations includes, but is not limited to, the data listed under each of the four measures in the table below.

Accountability Measures (2023-2024 Academic Year)	

1. **Completer effectiveness and impact on P-12 learning and development** (R4.1)
  a. *MDE Educator Effectiveness Ratings*
  b. *AQ SOE Advisory Council Feedback*
 	
2. **Satisfaction of employers and stakeholder involvement** (R4.2, R5.3, RA4.1)
  c. *MDE Year-Out Survey Results*
  d. *AQ SOE Advisory Council Feedback*
	3. **Candidate competency at completion** (R3.3)
	  e. *Danielson Framework for Evaluation observation ratings*
	  f. *Michigan Teacher Test for Certification (MTTC)*
	
	4. **Ability of completers to be hired (in positions for which they have been prepared)**
	  g. *AQ Completer Employment Data*

1. *Completer effectiveness and impact on P-12 learning and development (R4.1)*

    Since the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) does not release student growth data to EPP's, the AQ SOE continues to seek effective measures to demonstrate our completers' impact on student growth and learning. The data points below were used to monitor and evaluate this impact component for those who completed our program: *MDE Educator Effectiveness Ratings and Advisory Council Feedback.*

    a) MDE Educator Effectiveness Ratings
    This evidence, used to support that our completers apply their knowledge, skills, and dispositions as **effective educators**, comes from the Educator Effectiveness ratings data from the Michigan Department of Education (MDE).

    Educator Effectiveness ratings are collected by the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) annually and are based on year-end teacher evaluations completed by the building principal or employment supervisor. This reporting is required of all public schools and is voluntary for non-public schools. Teachers are given a rating of Highly Effective, Effective, Minimally Effective, or Ineffective which is based on one of five evaluation systems that are on the MDE approved list.

    From our report for the 2023-2024 Academic Year, we received 188 ratings for 139 unique individuals (some had more than one evaluation submitted to the MDE for the end of the year depending on their building or teaching assignments.

    When looking at the data disaggregated by gender, the rate of our educators rated Highly Effective or Effective are comparable. When looking at the data disaggregated by race/ethnicity, the rate of our educators rated Highly Effective or Effective are comparable.

    61% (85) of our educators in this data were Elementary level and 39% (54) were Secondary level. When looking at the data disaggregated by program and then by gender and race/ethnicity, the rate of our educators rated Highly Effective or Effective continues to be comparable.

ALL	TOTAL	Highly Effective	Effective	Minimally Effective	Ineffective
All Educators	139	38 (27%)	98 (71%)	3 (2%)	0
GENDER					
Male	32 (23%)	5 (16%)	26 (81%)	0	0
Female	107 (77%)	33 (31%)	72 (67%)	2 (2%)	0
RACE/ETHNICITY					
Asian	1 (1%)	1 (100%)	0	0	0
Black or African American	1 (1%)	0	1 (100%)	0	0
Hispanic or Latino	10 (7%)	3 (30%)	7 (70%)	0	0
Multiracial	1 (1%)	0	1 (100%)	0	0
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	1 (1%)	0	1 (100%)	0	0
White	125 (90%)	34 (27%)	88 (70%)	3 (2%)	0

ELEMENTARY	TOTAL	Highly Effective	Effective	Minimally Effective	Ineffective
All Elementary Educators	85	25 (29%)	58 (68%)	2 (2%)	0
GENDER					
Male	8 (9%)	0	7 (88%)	1 (13%)	0
Female	77 (91%)	25 (32%)	51 (66%)	1 (1%)	0

RACE/ETHNICITY					
Asian	**0**	0	0	0	0
Black or African American	**0**	0	0	0	0
Hispanic or Latino	**3** (4%)	1 (33%)	2 (67%)	0	0
Multiracial	**1** (1%)	0	1 (100%)	0	
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	**1** (1%)	0	1 (100%)	0	0
White	**80** (94%)	24 (30%)	54 (68%)	2 (3%)	0

SECONDARY	TOTAL	Highly Effective	Effective	Minimally Effective	Ineffective
All Secondary Educators	**54**	**13** (24%)	**40** (74%)	**1** (2%)	**0**
GENDER					
Male	**24** (44%)	5 (21%)	19 (79%)	0	0
Female	**30** (56%)	25 (32%)	51 (66%)	1 (1%)	0
RACE/ETHNICITY					
Asian	**1** (2%)	1 (100%)	0	0	0
Black or African American	**1** (2%)	0	1 (100%)	0	0
Hispanic or Latino	**7** (13%)	2 (29%)	5 (71%)	0	0
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	**0**	0	0	0	0
White	**45** (83%)	10 (22%)	34 (76%)	1 (2%)	0

In comparison to previous data, the 2023-2024 MDE Educator Effectiveness data indicates that over 95% of recent SOE graduates continue to be rated as "Effective" or "Highly Effective" by their employers.

Educator Effectiveness Ratings - AQ Completers

TOTAL: ELEM & SEC	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024
Highly Effective	11	9	17	38
Effective	75	33	29	98
Minimally Effective	2	0	2	3
Ineffective	1	0	0	0
	88	42	48	139
Effective/Highly Effective	**98%**	**100%**	**96%**	**98%**

b) Advisory Council Feedback

In addition to direct communication with individuals for specific placements, AQ SOE invites Principals, CTs, District Administrators and other stakeholders to an Advisory Meeting twice a year. These meetings include a presentation from AQ SOE faculty with students and/or graduates on a topic in education, opportunities to discuss any updates on the AQ Education Programs, and feedback from our community partners related to the preparation of our graduates and needs in the field. A survey is also sent to Advisory Meeting attendees and other stakeholders as part of our efforts to identify areas of strength and areas for growth as well as the impact of our completers on P-12 learning and development.

Fall 2023 respondents were asked to what extent they believed AQ Interns were prepared to enter the teaching profession. On a scale of 1-5 with 5 being To a Great Extent and 1 being Not At All, the average from all respondents was **4.1**, average from Admin/Principals only was 4.3 and the average from Teacher/Mentors only was 4.

Respondents were asked how likely they would be to hire a recent Aquinas College graduate for an open teaching position in their building/district. On a scale of 1-5 with 5 being Very Likely and 1 being Not Very Likely, **57%** selected 5 (Very Likely) and **43%** selected 4.

Additionally, respondents were asked to rate a series of skills. 67% of respondents responded that AQ Teacher candidates are prepared to *a great extent* to establish an environment that supports learning.

2. *Satisfaction of employers and stakeholder involvement (R4.2, R5.3, R4.1)*

c) MDE Year-Out

Each year in April and May, the MDE invites recent program completers to provide feedback on their professional preparation through a Year-Out Survey. Findings from the most recent MDE Year-Out Survey (2023-2024) indicate areas of strength and key areas for program improvement in seven categories: Career Support; Overall Preparation; Meeting Student Needs; Technology; Instructional Strategies and Assessment; Professionalism; Clinical Experiences & Program Prep.

Eight educators from our Preparation Program completed this MDE survey at the end of of their first year out.

AREAS OF STRENGTH
   Areas with Response Efficacy of 51-100% (Agree or Strongly Agree)
   ● Career Support (58.3%)
   ● Overall Preparation (100.0%)
   ● Meeting Student Needs (76.3%)
   ● Technology (93.8%)
   ● Instructional Strategies & Assessment (76.4%)
   ● Professionalism (87.5%)
   ● Clinical Experiences & Program Prep (64.3%)

AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT
   Areas with Response Efficacy of 0-50% (Somewhat Disagree or Not At All)
   ● None

Additionally, there are opportunities for respondents to include anecdotal data.

Do you have additional elements of your preparation program you feel made a positive contribution to your readiness to begin a teaching career?

   ● The relatively small class sizes/cohort provided really great opportunities to get to know instructors well, but also learn from, network with, and build relationships with peers in similar situations.

What do you believe your educator preparation provider did especially well?
   ● They did a really good job of providing meaningful and intentional learning opportunities and assignments. They also put a lot of emphasis on diversity in all forms and providing concrete instructional strategies for meeting the needs of diverse learners.
   ● Creating lesson plans

- Hands on
- They did a great job preparing us to find gainful employment as a teacher.
- Aquinas trained us well in curriculum development, differentiation, and collaborating with other teachers.
- Lesson planning and unit planning

What do you believe your educator preparation provider needs to improve upon?
- The program was designed for adults who are already working in schools, which was great, but it meant that support for finding a teaching position after completing the program was not there, perhaps because of an assumption that many of us already had jobs. For me, finding a full-time teaching position has been more difficult than I anticipated, and from feedback I've received it seems partly due to the non-traditional nature of the program, and the student teaching portion in particular. In addition to providing more support for graduates in their job search and preparation, the elementary education literacy courses are an area for improvement. The instructor of those courses in particular did not seem to be current on new research in literacy instruction and evidence-based practices related to the science of reading and explicit literacy instruction.
- Teaching the material and adapting to students knowledge then scaffolding to get them to where they need to go.
- n/a
- They could improve on technology utilization in classrooms.
- Behavior management strategies/tools
- Connections with teachers/teacher organizations (networking), more time needed in classrooms (extra practicum/student teaching time)

Because these reports from the MDE include raw data, we are able to determine when the respondent was part of our preparation program and review how their experience(s) may have differed from current students. For example, we are in the process of restructuring our connections for students with varied networking opportunities and have added resources for our teacher candidates to work with classroom related technology. Responses from this anecdotal data have also initiated department conversations related to how some of our programming differs between our traditional undergraduate educator preparation and our Accelerated Masters of Education (AME) initial certification program, in particular, access to services related to securing employment.

d) Advisory Council Feedback

Aquinas College SOE Advisory Council Feedback offers another perspective on the perceived effectiveness of recent program completers. Respondents were asked to what extent they believed AQ Interns were prepared to enter the teaching profession. On a scale of 1-5 with 5

being To a Great Extent and 1 being Not At All, the average from all respondents was **4.1** and the average from only Admin/Principals was 4.3.

Respondents were asked how likely they would be to hire a recent Aquinas College graduate for an open teaching position in their building/district. On a scale of 1-5 with 5 being Very Likely and 1 being Not Very Likely, **57%** selected 5 (Very Likely) and **43%** selected 4.

An additional set of measures we use to evaluate the satisfaction of employers and stakeholders is the Administrator Survey data provided by MDE.

Each year in April and May, the MDE invites Administrators to provide feedback on their teachers and the MDE disseminates this information to the educator preparation programs. Findings from the most recent Administrator Survey (2023-2024) indicate areas of strength and key areas for program improvement in seven categories: Instructional Strategies and Assessment; Meeting Student Needs; Technology; External Relationships; Professionalism.

Nine administrators completed the 2023-2024 Administrator Survey for educators from our educator preparation program.

AREAS OF STRENGTH
    Areas with Response Efficacy of 51-100% **(To a Great Extent or To a Moderate Extent)**
- Instructional Strategies and Assessment (84.1%)
- Meeting Student Needs (81.4%)
- Technology (100.0%)
- External Relationships (88.9%)
- Professionalism (77.8%)

AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT
    Areas with Response Efficacy of 0-50% **(To a Small Extent or Not At All)**
- None

Additionally , there are opportunities for respondents to include comments or feedback for the EPP related to the specific educator. Feedback for our EPP was:

- [Educator] is a fantastic teacher with skills far above that of your typical first year educator.
- [Educator] has done a wonderful job in the classroom with a very difficult group of scholars. I am pleased with her progress this year and feel she has the makings of a master level teacher.
- [Educator's] background in her early teens and twenties working within her church, summer camps, and overall pedigree allowed her to soar.

- [Educator] genuinely cares about building relationships, figuring out what each student needs, eager to learn from colleagues and experiences, and developed a safe environment with growth mindsets in his classroom.

An analysis of the raw data showed that many of the responses for "To a Small Extent" were specific to two educators which allows our department to review records from their training and determine if there are any indicators that we should discuss and/or review for all current teacher candidates. This work will be completed during the summer.

3. *Candidate competency at program completion (R3.3, RA3.4)*

The 2023-2024 academic year is the last year we were utilizing the Danielson framework with our pre-service teachers to measure their competency at program completion. We started transitioning to the PreCPAST and CPAST from The Ohio State in the Spring Semester of 2024 as we have determined that measure will be more directly aligned to expectations for teacher candidates. Our first cycles of data with the CPAST are not yet available.

e) Danielson Framework for Evaluation Observation Ratings

Student Teacher Final Evaluations from Cooperating Teachers & Field Supervisors

F23 (n=20)	Distinguished	Proficient	Basic	Unsatisfactory	No Opportunity
Domain 1a. Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy	2	6	11	1	0
Domain 1b. Demonstrating Knowledge of Students	1	8	11	0	0
Domain 1c. Setting Instructional Outcomes	0	8	11	1	0
Domain 1d. Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources	1	7	11	1	0
Domain 1e. Designing Coherent Instruction	4	5	10	1	0
Domain 1f. Designing Student Assessments	0	5	11	1	3
Domain 2b. Establishing a Culture for Learning	3	12	4	1	0
Domain 2c. Managing Classroom Procedures	3	9	7	1	0
Domain 2d. Managing Student Behavior	2	10	7	1	0
Domain 2e. Organizing Physical Space	2	8	9	1	0
Domain: 3a. Communicating with Students	3	5	10	1	1

Domain: 3c. Engaging Students in Learning	3	9	7	1	0
Domain: 3d. Using Assessment in Instruction	2	8	9	1	0
Domain: 3e. Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness	2	7	10	1	0
Domain: 4a. Reflection on Teaching	0	5	12	1	2
Domain: 4b. Maintaining Accurate Records	3	8	8	1	0
Domain: 4d. Participating in a Professional Community	2	6	11	1	0
Domain: 4e. Growing and Developing Professionally	1	6	10	0	3
Domain: 4f. Showing Professionalism	1	2	10	1	6

Use of the Danielson as End of Program Measure

As a general rule, we anticipate that AQ student candidates will score at the Basic (2) level and do not expect them to achieve Proficiency (3) or Mastery (4) as those latter two scores are reserved for veteran teachers. We advised classroom teachers (CTs) and field supervisors (FSs) to write in the comments section specific reasons why anything is scored above Basic (2). We expect that if a student teacher has earned Unsatisfactory (1) in any category, the CT and FS will have had a conversation about this student's performance before being evaluated.

Evaluations are collected from the Cooperating Teacher and Field Supervisor for each Intern during and following Student Teaching. Ratings are reviewed by department faculty using a rubric. The goal for Teacher Interns is to achieve a minimum of Basic in all categories.

88% or more of all Teacher Interns scored Basic or Above on all of the components except for 4F: Showing Professionalism. For this component, 65% of candidates scored Basic or Above, 5% (1 candidate) scored Unsatisfactory and 30% (6 candidates) were scored as No Opportunity.

Five of the components were scored as "No Opportunity" for at least two candidates: 1f. Designing Student Assessments; 3a. Communicating with Students; 4a. Reflection on Teaching; 4e. Growing and Developing Professionally; 4F: Showing Professionalism. This is consistent with previous years' data and is one reason we chose to transition to the CPAST moving forward.

f) Michigan Teacher Test for Certification (MTTC)

As evidenced by the most recent 3-Year Michigan Teacher Test for Certification (MTTC) results, Aquinas College program completers meet licensing requirements at a high rate.

2021-2024

TEST	N	Aquinas Completers				Statewide Completers	
		Initial Attempt		Cumulative Attempts		Initial Attempt	Cumulative Attempts
		N Pass	% Pass	N Pass	% Pass	% Pass	% Pass
English	10	6	60.0	9	90.0	73.6	84.3
Speech	2	2	100.0	2	100.0	100.0	100.0
Reading	3	3	100.0	3	100.0	77.8	80.2
Geography	1	0	0.0	0	0.0	Not reported (n is 10 or less)	Not reported (n is 10 or less)
History	3	1	33.3	2	66.7	45.4	63.1
Biology	3	3	100.0	3	100.0	61.2	81.1
Chemistry	1	1	100.0	1	100.0	65.5	81.6
Mathematics (SEC)	12	12	100.0	12	100.0	75.9	83.5
German	1	1	100.0	1	100.0	73.3	73.3
Spanish	5	5	100.0	5	100.0	85.0	90.6
Health	1	1	100.0	1	100.0	88.8	92.9
Physical Education	4	3	75.0	4	100.0	61.1	74.4
Bilingual Education	1	1	100.0	1	100.0	Not reported (n is 10 or less)	Not reported (n is 10 or less)
Social Studies (SEC)	9	6	66.7	8	88.9	64.3	80.8
English as a Second Language	5	5	100.0	5	100.0	87.0	90.5
Mathematics (EL)	7	6	85.7	7	100.0	77.6	81.6
Language Arts	2	2	100.0	2	100.0	73.6	80.1

Integrated Science (EL)	3	3	100.0	3	100.0	73.9	81.5
Integrated Science (SEC)	9	8	88.9	9	100.0	55.5	73.0
Music Education	2	2	100.0	2	100.0	85.3	93.3
Elementary Education	79	56	70.9	66	83.5	64.7	81.6
Early Childhood Education (General & Special Ed)	11	6	54.5	6	54.5	62.5	71.3
Health Education	1	1	100.0	1	100.0	95.4	98.1
Physical Education	1	1	100.0	1	100.0	94.3	97.4
Learning Disabilities	15	15	100.0	15	100.0	88.5	95.1
Lower Elementary (PK-3) Education Subtest 1	9	9	100.0	9	100.0	95.0	96.7
Lower Elementary (PK-3) Education Subtest 2	6	3	50.0	5	83.5	77.4	86.7
Lower Elementary (PK-3) Education Subtest 3	6	3	50.0	5	83.5	80.5	90.2
Lower Elementary (PK-3) Education Subtest 4	4	4	100.0	4	100.0	92.7	96.3
Upper Elementary (3-6) Education Subtest 1	2	2	100.0	2	100.0	83.2	90.1
Upper Elementary (3-6) Education Subtest 2	2	2	100.0	2	100.0	69.6	83.5
Upper Elementary (3-6) Education	3	2	66.7	2	66.7	85.4	91.5

Subtest 3						
Upper Elementary (3-6) Education Subtest 4	2	1	50.0	1	50.0	70.2	81.8
English as a Second Language	4	4	100.0	4	100.0	77.2	82.3
All Content Area Tests	229	180	78.6	88.6		76.1	86.0

It should be noted that the tests completed are no longer all open programs at Aquinas College so are not included in all aspects of program data analyzed for continuous improvement. The Lower and Upper Elementary with subtests are new and aligned with the restructuring of certification in Michigan. Subtest 1 is focused on Professional Knowledge and Skills, Subtest 2 on Literacy, Subtest 3 on Math and Subtest 4 on Social Studies and Science. This data set is our first related to these tests. Other areas in which our completers underperformed compared to the statewide pass rates are Early Childhood and Initial Attempts on the (secondary) English and History tests. Early Childhood is now a closed program at Aquinas. Our department will continue to collaborate with our English and History departments to evaluate possible reasons for these challenges.

4. *Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have been prepared*

g) AQ Completer Employment Data

	Total Completers	CERTIFIED	CERTIFIED	EMPLOYED (Teaching)	EMPLOYED (Teaching)
2021 SP	16	14	88%	12	75%
2021 SU	14	13	93%	13	93%
2021 FA	13	13	100%	12	92%
2022 SP	15	13	87%	10	67%
2022 SU	20	12	60%	17	85%
2022 FA	17	15	88%	14	82%
2023 SP	14	10	71%	7	50%
2023 SU	18	9	50%	8	44%

	Total	127	99	78%	93	73%
	Percentage		78%		73%	

During the 2023-2024 academic year, as we completed our self-study, we identified alumni data as an area for improvement. Previous data gathering was reliant on the AQ SOE encouraging program completers to submit updates using our online alumni form whenever they secure or change teaching positions or to search for current information on graduates by reaching out through Facebook, LinkedIn, and communications with AQ faculty. At this time, we do not have updated information for new educators for the 2023-2024 academic year. We are currently in discussions with our Admissions and Alumni Relations to explore additional possibilities for gathering and improving the quality of our completer employment data. We have also reviewed potential data management systems and are in the process of securing a new system which will make a significant difference in storing and updating our alumni data.

****