

School of Education

Annual Reporting Measures

Impact on P-12 learning and development

The New York City Department of Education is focused on ensuring that all students graduate ready for college, a career, and a future as a productive adult. A large part of meeting this goal requires them to prepare their students to think for themselves and pursue questions instead of merely answers. Great teaching is key to achieving these goals, and *Advance*, the City's system of teacher development and evaluation, is an integral part of how they recognize and strengthen teaching practice. The evaluation system uses a 4-point "HEDI" (Highly Effective, Effective, Developing, Ineffective) rating scale. Evaluations are done by an evaluator who is an authorized district superintendent, assistant superintendent, principal, or assistant principal (or other trained administrator) of the observed teacher's school who has received the requisite training to properly observe, evaluate, and/or score the teacher's Advance Overall Rating in accordance with Education Law §3012-d and as outlined in the NYC's Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) plan.

Advance uses a focused version of Charlotte Danielson's *Framework for Teaching* (2013), a research-based rubric of teacher practice, to assess teachers' professional skills, behavior, and knowledge. The full Danielson *Framework for Teaching* is comprised of 22 Components spanning four Domains: (1) Planning and Preparation, (2) The Classroom Environment, (3) Instruction, and (4) Professional Responsibilities. While the entire Danielson *Framework for Teaching* may be used for formative purposes, teachers will only receive ratings on the following **eight** prioritized components:

- 1a: Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy
- 1e: Designing Coherent Instruction
- 2a: Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport
- 2d: Managing Student Behavior
- 3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques
- 3c: Engaging Students in Learning
- 3d: Using Assessment in Instruction
- 4e: Growing and Developing Professionally

For CAEP components 4.1 and 4.2, we analyzed components in Domains 2 and 3 of the Danielson *Framework for Teaching*. Domain 3, Instruction, states "In the classrooms of accomplished teachers, all students are highly engaged in learning. They make significant contributions to the success of the class through participation in high-level discussions and active involvement in their

learning and the learning of others. Teacher explanations are clear and invite student intellectual engagement. The teacher's feedback is specific to learning goals and rubrics and offers concrete suggestions for improvement. As a result, students understand their progress in learning the content and can explain the learning goals and what they need to do in order to improve. Effective teachers recognize their responsibility for student learning and make adjustments, as needed, to ensure student success." The EPP believed that we could gather data from completers' observations to demonstrate their impact on P-12 student learning and development.

Regarding component 3c, Engaging Students in Learning, 83% of completers who submitted evaluations scored either effective or highly effective during both observations, which is consistent with the findings in the August 2013 report previously mentioned. Danielson posits that component 3c, Engaging Students in Learning, is the centerpiece of the framework and all other components support it by promoting high levels of student understanding. Danielson and colleagues further explain that engagement "refers to whether what the teacher asked students to do is sufficiently rigorous to promote deep learning" (2009, p. 304). The elements of component 3c focus on the rigor of the activities and assignments, how students are grouped for instruction, the quality of instructional materials and resources, and the structure and pacing of the lesson. Individual feedback from completers' administrators included:

- "Students had to be intellectually engaged in the lesson due to the nature of the task. Your presence in the 2 small groups pushed students to think more deeply around their responses from the questions that were posed" (Student 1, #2).
- "The teacher provides suitable scaffolding and challenges students to explain their thinking. There is evidence of some student initiation of inquiry and student contributions to the exploration of important content; students may serve as resources for one another...your Do-Now activity allowed students to reflect and practice skills from prior lessons that related and assisted them in full participation in the lesson" (Student 4, #2).
- "The learning tasks and activities were aligned with the instructional outcomes and were designed to challenge student thinking, inviting students to make their thinking visible. For example, learning activities were marked by thoughtful student interactions based on an explicit protocol given in task" (Student 5, #2).

In each of the observations, administrators highlighted the completers' ability to engage students in the lesson and challenge their thinking. Overall, completers scored an average 3.00 for component 3c indicating their teaching effectiveness and impact on student learning and development.

In the future, to gather more qualitative data about completers' impact on P-12 learning and development, the EPP will revise the focus group protocol to include questions about how completers impact their student learning and how they know they are impacting their students' learning.

Indicators of teaching effectiveness

A report released by the NYCDOE in August 2013 indicated that 87% of the EPP's completers hired between 2008-09 and 2011-12 were effective or highly effective teachers as measured by student improvement on standardized math and English tests between fourth and eight-grade. Although the EPP and the NYCDOE had the same percentage of effective teachers, the EPP had a higher percentage of highly effective teachers, 12%, than the rest of the NYCDOE, 7%. In the absence of access to recent State data on the impact of our completers on P-12 student learning and development and teaching effectiveness, the EPP analyzed a portion of our completers' teacher evaluations to determine its strengths and weaknesses regarding our preparation programs. Six completers who participated in alumni focus groups voluntarily provided their evaluations for analysis. A review of the data revealed that our completers are effective teachers.

Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones

The employer satisfaction survey revealed that although employers indicated overall satisfaction with our completers, there are areas that the EPP needs to focus on. The EPP is working with its Dean's Advisory Council to strengthen those areas of focus. Also, moving forward, the EPP plans to increase response rates by working with our Office of Institutional Research and Data Analysis, CUNY, the NYC Department of Education and other types of educational institutions to better track where our completers are hired to determine employer satisfaction.

Satisfaction of completers

An analysis of the most recent Alumni Survey data revealed that EPP completers are more satisfied with the preparation received from Brooklyn College than completers from other Schools within the College. When asked, "how well did your CUNY education prepare you for this job?" 78% of EPP completers responded very well or well compared to 59% of all other completers. The EPP will continue to make data-driven choices to improve our programs and ensure that our candidates receive a quality education that prepares them for the classroom.

Graduation Rates

According to a recent Brooklyn College report, the EPP's completers who graduated in the 2017 academic year, who initially enrolled as first-time freshmen, completed 5.09 years for their degree. The College's cumulative graduation rate for students who entered in 2013 and graduated within 4 years is 27.0%. The College's cumulative graduation rate for transfer students who entered in 2013 and graduated within 2 years is 14.1%; within 3 years is 39.7%; and within 4 years is 53.0%.

Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements

The percentage of completers meeting licensing requirements increased to 78% during the 2016-17 academic year from 69% in the 2015-16 academic year. Our goal is to increase that number to at least 85%.

Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared

A recent report by the NYCDOE indicated that there has been a steady increase in the number of Brooklyn College completers who applied to the NYCDOE and were hired over the last three

years. In 2014, 29% of applicants were hired; in 2015, 43% of applicants were hired; and in 2016, 50% of applicants were hired. According to the 2016 Brooklyn College Recent Graduate Survey, approximately 40% of the EPP's graduates reported being employed full-time.

Student loan default rates and other consumer information

In the most recent alumni survey, when asked if their undergraduate educational debt hinders their ability to achieve other financial and/or life goals, almost 64% of EPP completers responded that they do not have debt from their undergraduate education, their undergraduate educational debt does not hinder them at all or not too much compared to 77% of all other completers who responded to the same survey item. The difference in responses between SOE and non-SOE completers is a concern for us, and we want to ensure that our candidates are not burdened by debt. With the rising cost of certification as well as clinical experience requirements that oftentimes prevent candidates from working, the EPP will continue to identify opportunities to provide financial support to our candidates. We will continue to gather the data necessary to monitor these outcome and impact measures.

According to the Federal Student Aid [webpage](#), the FY 2014 national cohort default rate is 11.5 percent. The EPP's most recent cohort default rate is 6.0 percent.

- a. Undergraduate [tuition](#)
- b. Graduate [tuition](#)
- c. Current NYC Department of Education teacher [salary](#)