

Measure 2: Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness

EdTPA

The EdTPA provides a baseline of SOE completers' preparedness. On average, candidates' strongest areas are P01 (Planning for Content Learning), P02 (Planning to Support Varied Student Needs), P05 (Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Student Learning), I06 (Learning Environment), I09 (Subject Specific Pedagogy), A12 (Providing Feedback to Guide Learning), and A15 (Using Assessment to Inform Instruction) which suggests that candidates are well prepared for day one as teachers of record. In areas where average scores were below state or national averages, including I07 (Engaging Students in Learning), and I08 (Deepening Student Learning), Employer Surveys suggest completers' skills in these areas developed during the first year of teaching (See Measure 3).

Completers' mandated state teacher evaluations

Since Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) does not provide teacher evaluations or ratings, a sample of our 2017 cohort (from 4 states where completers are most often hired) self-reported ratings earned on state-mandated teacher evaluation during their first year of teaching are shared below. Given different focal criteria and levels to evaluate teachers (Table 4.2.e.1) comparing ratings across states is not straightforward. However, 95% of completers were rated in the top half of their state's scoring rubric. In February 2020 we asked completers from 2014-2019 to share their evaluations however COVID-19 closures has delayed responses.

Completers' student surveys

The SOE and Advisory Board developed surveys (based on InTASC standards) for K-12 students. Students were asked to rate their teacher (an SOE completer) on 10 items, with space for comments (Table 4.2.c.1). Student respondents were assured their individual responses would be kept confidential. Elementary and Secondary students rated all completers highly (Table 4.2.c.3).

Completer focus groups

Two focus groups were convened to gather data on how completers perceived their impact on student learning. The Associate Dean facilitated the discussions. Responses from the first focus group were transcribed and coded based on InTASC Standards. Questions for the second focus group were aligned with InTASC standards. A summary statement is included (page 8). Based on findings from the focus groups, completers appear well prepared to differentiate instruction to support diverse K-12 learners across content areas and grade levels and, among Secondary completers, to use technology. Additional focus on SEL and ELL support is a recurring theme for future focus within our program.

Completer interviews

To examine how completers apply professional knowledge and skills in their teaching practices, a faculty member conducted one-on-one interviews with completers from 5 cohorts (Table 4.2.d.1). Interviews were structured to explore completers' skills and knowledge as well as satisfaction with their preparation and support. Questions were tagged to InTASC standards. Completers detailed the ways in which they make learning experiences and content accessible and meaningful for students, how they use authentic and/or strategic assessment to support student learning and guide instructional practices, and the role of the EPP in developing these skills. Differentiation was widely cited as an important part of their experience in our program. Overall, findings were consistent with those that emerged from focus groups and surveys.

Trends and External Benchmarks

Based on CT edTPA passing scores published in September 2019, we estimate an overall pass rate of 83.6% for our June 2019 graduating cohort (Table AL), with pass rates over 85% for all program areas except Secondary Spanish.

In the absence of publicly available state data, and the differences in metrics used to assess teaching effectiveness by regional Schools of Education (SOEs), we are unable to make direct comparisons in completer effectiveness between our SOE and other regional SOEs. We can say that a sample of our 2017 cohort (from 4 states where completers are most often hired) self-reported ratings earned on state-mandated teacher evaluation during their first year of teaching (Table 4.2.e.1) and that 95% of respondents were rated in the top half of their state's scoring rubric. Through the student survey, we observed that K-12 learners rated their teachers (completers) highly, with some variation according to grade level and content area (Tables 4.2.c.2; Table 4.2.c.3).

Based on the focus groups data, completers appear well prepared to differentiate instruction to support diverse K-12 learners across content areas and grade levels and, among Secondary completers, to use technology. These findings were triangulated and affirmed through completer interviews where the theme associated with differentiation emerged frequently and was widely cited as an important part of their experience at the SOE.

These findings suggest to us that our completers are effective teachers and are well prepared to differentiate instruction to support diverse K-12 learners across content areas and grade levels as assessed through multiple measures.

Measure 2: Data Table Guide

EdTPA

EdTPA Rubric Means by Cohort and Program Area.....p. 3

State Teacher Evaluations

Performance Levels Used in Four States (Table 4.2.e.1).....p. 4

Self-Reported Performance Level Rating (Table 4.2.e.2).....p. 4

Completer Student Surveys

Background Information on Completers (Table 4.2.c.1).....p. 5

Statistics of Secondary Respondents (Table 4.2.c.2).....p. 6

Statistics of Elementary Respondents (Table 4.2.c.3).....p. 7

Completer Focus Groups

Completer Focus Groups Summary Statement.....p. 8

Completer Interviews

Interviewees by Cohort Year and Program Area.....p. 9

Interview Questionsp. 9

EdTPA Data

Table AL.3. MAT Candidates' edTPA Rubric Means by Cohort and Program Area

		Planning					Instruction					Assessment					Mathematics		
4+1 MAT 2017		P01	P02	P03	P04	P05	I06	I07	I08	I09	I10	A11	A12	A13	A14	A15	M19	M20	M21
Elementary Education	Candidate (n=3)	2.7	2.3	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.7	3.3	3.3	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.3	2.7	2.7	3.0	3.0
	State	2.6	2.5	2.7	2.6	2.4	3.0	2.8	2.7	2.7	2.6	2.5	2.9	2.0	2.4	2.7	2.0	2.2	1.7
	National	3.0	3.1	3.1	3.0	2.9	3.1	3.0	2.9	3.0	2.8	3.0	3.3	2.8	2.9	3.1	2.9	2.9	2.7
Secondary Education*	Candidate (n=2)	3.5	3.5	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.0	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0			
	State**	3.0	3.8	2.9	2.8	2.7	3.0	2.8	2.8	2.6	2.5	2.5	2.8	2.2	2.4	2.5			
	National**	3.1	3.0	3.1	3.0	3.0	3.1	3.0	2.9	2.9	2.7	3.0	3.2	2.7	2.9	2.9			
4+1 MAT 2018		P01	P02	P03	P04	P05	I06	I07	I08	I09	I10	A11	A12	A13	A14	A15	M19	M20	M21
Elementary Education	Candidate (n=23)	2.8	3.0	3.1	3.1	2.6	3.0	2.9	2.9	3.1	2.7	3.1	3.3	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.8	3.2	2.8
	State	2.8	2.6	3.0	2.8	2.6	3.0	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.6	2.8	3.1	2.6	2.8	2.8	2.6	2.8	2.6
	National	2.9	2.9	3.1	2.9	2.8	3.0	2.9	2.8	2.9	2.8	3.0	3.3	2.8	2.8	3.1	2.8	2.9	2.7
Secondary Education***	Candidate (n=3)	3.0	2.7	3.0	2.7	3.0	3.0	2.7	3.2	3.0	3.2	3.0	3.7	3.0	2.7	2.8			
	State**	2.9	2.8	2.8	2.7	3.0	3.0	2.8	2.8	2.6	2.5	2.7	3.0	2.4	2.6	2.6			
	National**	3.1	3.0	3.1	3.0	2.9	3.1	3.0	2.9	2.8	2.7	2.9	3.2	2.7	2.9	2.9			
4+1 MAT 2019		P01	P02	P03	P04	P05	I06	I07	I08	I09	I10	A11	A12	A13	A14	A15	M19	M20	M21
Elementary Education	Candidate (n=32)	2.9	3.0	3.0	3.1	2.8	3.2	2.9	3.1	3.1	3.1	2.8	3.4	2.9	3.0	3.2	2.9	3.0	2.8
	State	2.7	2.7	2.9	2.7	2.5	3.0	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.6	2.7	3.1	2.6	2.7	2.8	2.5	2.7	2.4
	National	2.8	2.9	3.1	2.9	2.7	3.0	2.8	2.8	2.9	2.7	2.9	3.3	2.8	2.8	3.0	2.8	2.9	2.6
Secondary English Education	Candidate (n=7)	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.1	3.0	3.6	3.1	3.6	3.1			
	State	3.2	3.0	3.2	2.8	3.0	3.1	3.1	3.0	2.9	2.7	2.9	3.3	2.7	2.8	2.9			
	National	3.3	3.1	3.2	3.0	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.0	3.0	2.9	3.1	3.4	2.8	2.9	3.1			
Secondary History Education	Candidate (n=8)	2.8	2.8	2.5	2.4	2.6	3.1	3.0	3.0	2.6	2.5	2.7	3.1	2.6	2.7	2.6			
	State	3.2	3.0	3.2	2.8	3.0	3.1	3.1	3.0	2.9	2.7	2.9	3.3	2.7	2.8	2.9			
	National	3.1	3.0	3.0	2.9	3.0	3.1	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.8	3.1	3.3	2.8	2.8	3.0			
Secondary Math Education	Candidate (n=5)	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.0	2.6	3.0	2.4	2.2	2.8	2.4	2.8	2.6	3.0	2.4	2.6			
	State	3.2	3.0	3.2	2.8	3.0	3.1	3.1	3.0	2.9	2.7	2.9	3.3	2.7	2.8	2.9			
	National	2.8	2.4	2.8	2.5	2.6	3.0	2.5	2.6	2.8	2.4	2.6	3.3	2.6	2.6	2.5			
EPP 15-Rubric Handbooks****	Candidate (n=21)	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.6	2.9	3.2	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.7	2.8	3.1	2.9	2.9	2.8			
	State**	3.0	2.8	2.9	2.8	2.8	3.0	2.9	2.9	2.7	2.5	2.7	3.0	2.4	2.7	2.7			
	National**	3.0	2.9	3.1	2.9	2.9	3.1	3.0	2.9	2.8	2.7	2.9	3.2	2.7	2.8	2.9			
Graduate MAT 2018		P01	P02	P03	P04	P05	I06	I07	I08	I09	I10	A11	A12	A13	A14	A15	M19	M20	M21
Elementary Education	Candidate (n=2)	3.5	3.5	4.0	4.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.5	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.5	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.5
	State Mean**	2.8	2.6	3.0	2.8	2.6	3.0	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.6	2.8	3.1	2.6	2.8	2.8	2.6	2.8	2.6
	National Mean**	2.9	2.9	3.1	2.9	2.8	3.0	2.9	2.8	2.9	2.8	3.0	3.3	2.8	2.8	3.1	2.8	2.9	2.7
Graduate MAT 2019		P01	P02	P03	P04	P05	I06	I07	I08	I09	I10	A11	A12	A13	A14	A15	M19	M20	M21
Elementary Education	Candidate (n=9)	2.9	2.8	2.8	3.1	2.9	3.2	2.9	2.6	2.8	2.4	2.4	3.2	2.6	2.8	2.8	2.6	2.8	2.8
	State Mean	2.7	2.7	2.9	2.7	2.5	3.0	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.6	2.7	3.1	2.6	2.7	2.8	2.5	2.7	2.4
	National Mean	2.8	2.9	3.1	2.9	2.7	3.0	2.8	2.8	2.9	2.7	2.9	3.3	2.8	2.8	3.0	2.8	2.9	2.6
Secondary Spanish Education	Candidate (n=3)	2.3	2.3	3.0		2.0	3.0	1.8	2.0	1.0	2.3	1.8	2.0	2.0		2.0			
	State Mean	3.1	2.9	2.7		2.9	3.1	2.7	2.4	1.7	2.4	2.7	2.7	2.3		2.3			
	National Mean	3.0	2.9	3.0		2.9	3.0	2.6	2.4	1.9	2.5	2.7	3.0	2.5		2.7			
Secondary History Education	Candidate (n=2)	3.5	4.0	3.5	2.5	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.5	2.0	2.0	3.5	2.5	2.5	3.5			
	State Mean	3.2	3.0	3.2	2.8	3.0	3.1	3.1	3.0	2.9	2.7	2.9	3.3	2.7	2.8	2.9			
	National Mean	3.1	3.0	3.0	2.9	3.0	3.1	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.8	3.1	3.3	2.8	2.8	3.0			
Secondary Mathematics Education	Candidate (n=4)	2.8	2.8	2.8	1.8	2.8	3.0	2.3	2.3	2.8	2.0	2.5	3.0	2.8	2.8	2.8			
	State Mean	3.2	3.0	3.2	2.8	3.0	3.1	3.1	3.0	2.9	2.7	2.9	3.3	2.7	2.8	2.9			
	National Mean	2.8	2.4	2.8	2.5	2.6	3.0	2.5	2.6	2.8	2.4	2.6	3.3	2.6	2.6	2.5			
Secondary English Education	Candidate (n=2)	3.0	2.5	2.5	3.5	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.5			
	State Mean	3.2	3.0	3.2	2.8	3.0	3.1	3.1	3.0	2.9	2.7	2.9	3.3	2.7	2.8	2.9			
	National Mean	3.3	3.1	3.2	3.0	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.0	3.0	2.9	3.1	3.4	2.8	2.9	3.1			
EPP 15-Rubric Handbooks	Candidate (n=8)	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.4	3.1	3.0	2.5	2.6	2.9	2.0	2.3	3.1	2.8	2.6	2.9			
	State Mean**	3.0	2.8	2.9	2.8	2.8	3.0	2.9	2.9	2.7	2.5	2.7	3.0	2.4	2.7	2.7			
	National Mean**	3.0	2.9	3.1	2.9	2.9	3.1	3.0	2.9	2.8	2.7	2.9	3.2	2.7	2.8	2.9			

*English and Math

**All 15 rubric handbooks

***English, Math, Social Studies

****Includes one Biology Candidate

Self-Reported State Teacher Evaluation

Table 4.2.e.1. Self-Reported State Teacher Evaluation: Performance Level Labels Used in Four States

State	Performance Levels				
	1	2	3	4	5
Connecticut	Below standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary	NA
New York	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly effective	NA
New Jersey	Ineffective	Partially effective	Effective	Highly effective	NA
Massachusetts	No progress	Some progress	Significant progress	Met goal	Exceeded goal

Table 4.2.e.2. Self-Reported State Teacher Evaluation: Self-Reported Performance Level Rating (Respondents from 2017 Cohort)

		Performance Level Rating				
		1	2	3	4	5
Connecticut (SEED) (n = 14)	Completers	0%	0%	86%	14%	NA
	State ^b	-	-	-	-	NA
New Jersey (ACHIEVE) (n = 2)	Completers	0%	0%	100%	0%	NA
	State ^d	0.1%	1.0%	60.9%	38.0%	NA
New York (Teacher Evaluation and Development System) (n = 1)	Completers	0%	0%	100%	0%	NA
	State ^b	-	-	-	-	NA
Massachusetts (MMSEE) (n = 3)	Completers	0%	0%	33.33%	66.67%	
	State ^c	-	-	-	-	
Percent at Performance Level				80%	20%	

a. 20 respondents: 41.7% response rate

b. Comparison data not available for CT or NY

c. MA provides average scores on their summative (1-4) but not on the formative (1=5) rating scale.

d. Statewide all 2016-2017 NJ teachers.

<https://www.nj.gov/education/AchieveNJ/resources/201516EducatorEvaluationImplementationReport.pdf>

K-12 Student Surveys

Table 4.2.c.1. Background Information on Completers* Who Distributed Student Surveys

Completer ID	Grade/s Completer Currently Teaches and Discipline (if applicable)	Year Graduated from QU	Number of Students Completing the Survey	Number of Students Identified as English Learners	Number of Students with IEPs/504s
Abigail	Kindergarten	2014	37	33	NA
Molly	Kindergarten	2017	18	14	IEP=4/504=1
Lynn	Kindergarten	2017	17	NA	IEP=1
Celia	Second grade	2014	25	12	IEP=4
Sasha	Third grade	2018	20	0	IEP=2
Julie	Fourth grade	2018	19	5	IEP=1/504=3
Naomi	Fourth grade	2017	18	18	IEP=4
Amy	Fourth/Fifth grade	2019	17	0	IEP=1
Serena	Fifth grade	2015	21	NA	NA
Valerie	Middle School English	2015	66	“most”	504=12
Gina	High School Spanish	2018	62	NA	NA
Vonetta	High School History	2014	16	0	IEP=1

*All completers were assigned pseudonyms

Table 4.2.c.2. Statistics of Student Surveys Responses from Secondary Completers

	Average For Gina (High School Spanish)	Average for Valerie (Middle School English)	Average for Vonetta (High School History)	Average Across Completers
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
Item 1: My individual needs are met by my teacher	4.63***a (.61)	3.99 (.81)	4.69**b (.48)	4.35 (.77)
Item 2: My teacher frequently relates the content to something I already know	4.39*a (.71)	3.93 (1.13)	4.75**b (.45)	4.22 (.94)
Item 3: My teacher respects us and words with us to establish a positive and supportive learning environment	4.74*a (.44)	4.49 (.72)	4.94*b (.25)	4.65 (.59)
Item 4: My teacher encourages students to analyze ideas from diverse perspectives	3.98 (.93)	4.44**c (.69)	4.38 (.89)	4.23 (.85)
Item 5: My teacher uses clear and concise language to explain concepts and content	4.26 (.85)	4.46 (.76)	4.81*d (.40)	4.41 (.78)
Item 6: My teacher values a flexible learning environment where we are encouraged to explore and discover	4.34*e (.85)	3.95 (.85)	4.44 (.73)	4.17 (.86)
Item 7: My teacher use assessments that are fair and accurately represent student knowledge	4.66 (.65)	4.39 (.77)	4.94*b (.25)	4.57 (.70)
Item 8: I feel prepared when my teacher gives us a project or quiz at the end of a unit	4.56***a (.62)	3.87 (1.10)	4.88***b (.50)	4.28 (.94)
Item 9: My teacher does not always lecture, but plays a different role in each lesson	4.23 (.82)	3.90 (1.09)	4.38 (.72)	4.09 (.96)
Item 10: My teacher words collaboratively with my family to set goals	3.02 (.83)	3.44 (1.20)	3.25 (1.39)	3.24 (1.09)
	4.27 (.44)	4.13 (.52)	4.54 (.37)	4.24 (.49)

~p ≤ .10; *p ≤ .05; **p ≤ .01; *** p ≤ .001

- To be interpreted that Gina's students rated her significantly higher than Valerie's students on that item.
- To be interpreted that Vonetta's students rated her significantly higher than Valerie's students on that item.
- Valerie's students rated her significantly higher than Gina's students on Item 4.
- Vonetta's students rated her significantly higher than Gina's students on Item 5.
- Gina's students rated her significantly higher than Valerie's students on Item 6.

Quinnipiac University SOE Measure 2. Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness

Table 4.2.c.3. Statistics of Students Survey Responses from Elementary Completers

	Molly's Mean (SD)	Abigail's Mean (SD)	Lynn's Mean (SD)	Celia's Mean (SD)	Sasha's Mean (SD)	Amy's Mean (SD)	Julie's Mean (SD)	Naomi's Mean (SD)	Serena's Mean (SD)	Mean Overall (SD)
Grade level	K	K	K	2nd grade	3rd grade	4/5th grade	4th grade	4th grade	5th grade	
Item 1: My teacher gives me work that is challenging, but gives me the support I need to complete the task	5.00*** a (.00)	3.97 (.87)	5.00*** (.00)	4.92*** (.40)	4.55* (.83)	4.47 (.72)	4.95*** (.23)	4.72** (.67)	4.57* (.75)	4.62 (.71)
Item 2: My teacher gives many different kinds of activities to show what we know.	5.00*** a (.00)	4.22 (.75)	5.00*** (.00)	4.96*** (.20)	4.60 (.75)	4.77* (.56)	4.84** (.38)	4.72* (.46)	4.62 (.81)	4.70 (.61)
Item 3: I feel safe and respected in the classroom.	5.00*** a (.00)	4.30 (.74)	5.00** (.00)	4.88* (.60)	4.60 (.82)	4.83 (.39)	4.74 (.73)	4.44 (.70)	4.57 (.68)	4.67 (.66)
Item 4: We work in groups and by ourselves.	4.89 (.47)	4.51 (.69)	5.00**a (.00)	5.00* (.00)	4.65 (.93)	4.77 (.56)	4.95 (.23)	4.83 (.51)	5.00* (.00)	4.82 (.54)
Item 5: My teacher explains things in many different ways	5.00**a (.00)	4.38 (.79)	4.53 (.87)	4.80 (.58)	4.74 (.45)	4.59 (.62)	4.58 (1.01)	4.67 (.69)	4.71 (.56)	4.64 (.70)
Item 6: My teacher encourages the students to listen to other students' different ideas and opinions	4.77 (.66)	4.35 (.89)	5.00* (.00)	4.76 (.88)	4.80 (.41)	4.82 (.39)	4.90 (.32)	4.89 (.47)	4.43 (.93)	4.70 (.70)
Item 7: My teacher helps us practice talking to each other to explain our ideas and opinions.	5.00 (.00)	4.41 (.64)	5.00 (.00)	4.64 (1.11)	4.50 (.61)	4.53 (.72)	4.84 (.50)	4.33 (1.14)	4.43 (.81)	4.60 (.76)
Item 8: I feel prepared when my teacher gives us a project or quiz at the end of a unit.	5.00*** b (.00)	4.43 (.77)	4.77* (.66)	4.84** (.37)	4.75* (.55)	4.82** (.39)	4.74* (.81)	3.94 (1.30)	4.33 (.66)	4.60 (.74)
Item 9: When students are confused, my teacher changes the way he/she is teaching to help us understand better.	5.00*** b (.00)	4.73** (.61)	5.00*** (.00)	4.96*** (.20)	4.70* (.98)	4.71* (.59)	4.89*** (.32)	3.94 (1.43)	4.76** (.70)	4.75 (.72)
Item 10: My teacher communicates with my family often	4.94*** c (.24)	4.65*** (.63)	4.77*** (.66)	4.76 (.60)	4.70*** (.57)	4.47** (.80)	4.52*** (1.02)	4.33* (.91)	3.48 (1.12)	4.52 (.84)
Average Score Across Items	4.96 (.08)	4.40 (.43)	4.91 (.13)	4.85 (.23)	4.67 (.39)	4.68 (.24)	4.80 (.41)	4.48 (.40)	4.49 (.33)	4.66 (.38)

~ $p \leq .10$; * $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$

a. To be interpreted as this completer's mean student ratings on the item were significantly higher than Abigail's student ratings. All other significance levels on this item indicate a significantly higher score than Abigail on this item.

b. This completer's mean student ratings on this item were significantly higher than Naomi's student ratings; all other significance levels on this item indicate a significantly higher score than Naomi on this item.

c. This completer's mean student ratings on this item were significantly higher than Serena's student ratings; all other significance levels on this item indicate a significantly higher score than Naomi on this item.

Completer Focus Group

4.2.b. Completer Focus Groups Summary Statement

In Summer 2018, a sample of 2017 completers (N=7) from elementary, secondary, urban, and suburban schools volunteered to participate in a focus group. In Summer 2019, a second focus group was convened (N=9) from various cohorts who teach at the same urban K-8 school (91% URM; 54.7% ELL).

Participants in the first group included 2 completers in ELA, 3 in Elementary, and 2 in Secondary Science. When asked how they ensure inclusive learning environments that enable learners to meet high standards, completers discussed various approaches to differentiation including small groups, strategic pairing, the importance of supporting “leveled” groups according to students’ needs, and specific supports for ELLs and students with special needs. Participants also shared their experiences and perspectives on the importance of approaching differentiation from a socio-emotional lens to support students’ emotional and academic development.

Unprompted, 71.4% of participants described incorporating technology into their teaching (e.g., Google Classroom, Listenwise, Plickers, simulations). Participants who did not spontaneously discuss technology were Elementary teachers whose reflections focused on their use of Total Physical Response (TPR) in the classroom to engage learners and deepen students’ understanding of content.

Many participants in the second focus group discussed their use of TPR, though songs & visuals, and using centers, small groups, games, and modeling to differentiate instruction and support learners of various abilities. Participants highlighted a number of helpful practices they learned through the EPP, such as reading/writing workshops and developing ‘centers’ for differentiation. However, participants also identified differentiation as an area where they could have benefited from additional support during their time in the EPP and highlighted the need for SEL strategies to support students.

Completer Teacher Interviews

Table 4.2.d.1 Completer Interviewees (n) by Cohort Year and Program Area

Cohort	2014	2015	2017	2018	2019	Total
Elementary	2	0	3	2	1	8
Secondary	1	1	0	1	0	3
Total	3	1	3	3	1	11

Table 4.2.d.2 Completer Interview Questions

INTERVIEW WITH: *Completer Name*

Program Area and Cohort Year

1) Tell me about the goals & content of the classes where you distributed the student surveys.
2) Can you tell me a little bit about your students? Is there a different makeup of students in different classes? In what ways?
3) Now I am going to ask you some questions that are related to the questions you were asked on the survey, covering topics ranging from differentiation and classroom climate.
4) I would love to hear a little bit about what you do in your classes to foster a supportive learning climate. <i>InTASC: Standard 3</i>
5) How do you differentiate instruction to meet the needs of each student? <i>InTASC Standard 2</i>
5a) Where did you learn this?
5b) Were there any specific classes or experiences from QU that supported acquisition of that skill?
5c) Were there specific things QU could do better to prepare you to do this?
6) Tell me a little about your approach to instruction... <i>InTASC Standards 1, 5 & 7</i>
6a) How do you make content meaningful for students? <i>InTASC Standard 8</i>
6b) Can you give me an example of a lesson you designed and implemented that supported students' agency or autonomy? <i>InTASC Standards 2 & 8</i>
6c) Where did you learn to do this
6d) Were there specific classes or experiences from QU that supported acquisition of that skill?
6e) Were there specific things that QU could do better to prepare you to do this?

Quinnipiac University SOE Measure 2. Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness

7) Tell me how you assess your students' learning? <i>InTASC Standard 6</i>
7b) How do you use assessment to guide your decision making? Can you give me examples? <i>InTASC Standard 6</i>
7c) Where did you learn how to do this?
7d) Were there any specific classes or experiences that supported acquisition of that skill?
7e) Were there specific things QU could do better to prepare you to do this?
8) Talk about how you make meaningful home-school connections. <i>InTASC Standard 10</i>
8a) Are there ways that you collaborate with families to help set goals for students? <i>InTASC Standard 10</i>
8b) Where did you learn to do this?
8c) Were there any specific classes or experiences from QU that taught you how to do this?
8d) Were there specific things QU could do better to do this?
9) Is there anything else you would like to share with me?