WSU | COLLEGE OF APPLIED STUDIES

2025 CAEP Annual Report Impact Measure 1
Completer Effectiveness and Impact on P12 Learning and Development
CAEP Component R4.1

I. INTRODUCTION

Impact on P-12 learning and development is a necessary component for determining effectiveness of a teacher preparation program. CAEP Standard R4.1 requires that the education preparation provider (EPP) demonstrate that program completers effectively contribute to student-learning growth and apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve. To demonstrate this, each year the Wichita State University (WSU) EPP will conducts a multiple case study to ascertain the effectiveness of its program completers and their impact on P-12 learning and development.

This report presents findings from the 2024 Completer Effectiveness Case Study, synthesizing data from eight completers from the academic year 2023-2024 who secured teaching positions in local schools.

II. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. To what extent are completers effectively contributing to P-12 student-learning growth?
2. How and to what extent are completers using the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that they learned in their WSU preparation program?
3. What actions based on R1 and R2 findings is the EPP taking to improve program quality so that completers have a greater impact on student learning growth?

III. METHODOLOGY

An embedded multiple case study design guided the research. Participants completed pre-interviews, questionnaires, and post-interviews; submitted lesson plans, student work samples, and pre/post-assessment data; and provided formal teaching evaluations. Data were analyzed individually and across cases to identify patterns and actionable insights. Individual case study reports were prepared for each individual participant. This report shares results across cases. Reports are shared with program faculty and Program Advisory Council (PAC) members for feedback during the EPP's annual reporting cycle.

IV. CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION

A total of eight program completers volunteered to participate. Of these, four graduated from the Teacher Apprentice Program™, one from the Early Childhood Unified (ECU) program, one from the MAT-ECU program, one from the Transition to Teaching (T2T) program, and one from the Elementary Education (On-Campus) program. Six out of seven participants were female, with six identifying as non-Hispanic and White and one identifying as Hispanic. Participants taught across a wide spectrum of grade levels from Pre-K, Kindergarten, Elementary (2-5) and high school. Two participants taught special education exclusively in either inclusive or specialized classrooms. Geographic contexts spanned classrooms in Kansas and outside of Kansas and within urban, suburban, and rural communities. Tables 1-4 share city, school district, school building, and classroom demographics by each case study participant.

Table 1.
City Demographics by Participant

Participant	City Population	Median Household Income	Households with Broadband Internet	Families Below Poverty Level (%)	Families with Food Stamps (%)	Children with Disabilities (%)
AY24_G	2,929	$39,308.00	2,566	17.1%	11.15%	11.6%
AY24_I	2,3713	$63,582.00	8,583	13.5%	15.4%	10.1%
AY24_F	328,014	$51,237.00	133,176	21.5%	22.9%	8.4%
AY24_E	328,014	$51,237.00	133,176	21.5%	22.9%	8.4%
AY24_D	328,014	$51,237.00	133,176	21.5%	22.9%	8.4%
AY24_B	74,670	$70,332.00	90.5%	13.2%	14.7%	11.4%
AY24_A	161,504	$87,772.00	93.3%	9.9%	10.9%	4.7%

Table 2.
School District Demographics by Participant

Participant	District Population (n)	Female (%)	Male (%)	White (%)	Black (%)	Hispanic (%)	Asian (%)	Students with Disabilities (%)	Free/Reduced Lunch (%)	English Learners (%)
AY24_G	924	51%	49%	86%	0.5%	4.7%	0%	17%	38.4%	0%
AY24_I	5777	50%	50%	66.7%	2.1%	18.6%	2.7%	17.8%	34.9%	3.0%
AY24_F	47174	49%	51%	30.4%	19.5%	36.8%	4.3%	17.3%	55.7%	18.9%
AY24_E	47174	49%	51%	30.4%	19.5%	36.8%	4.3%	17.3%	55.7%	18.9%
AY24_D	47174	49%	51%	30.4%	19.5%	36.8%	4.3%	17.3%	55.7%	18.9%
AY24_B	948	47%	53%	41.5%	34.3%	6.7%	5.4%	11.4%	15.6%	4.4%
AY24_A	775	48%	52%	58.9%	10.8%	12.4%	4.5%	74.7%	15.6%	6.4%

Table 3.
School Building Demographics by Participant

Participant	School Population (n)	Female (%)	Male (%)	White (%)	Black (%)	Hispanic (%)	Asian (%)	Students with Disabilities (%)	Economically Disadvantaged (%)	English Learners (%)
AY24_G	193	51.8%	48.2%	83%	0%	5.7%	5.2%	16.1%	65.8%	0%
AY24_I	407	50%	50%	60.4%	0.7%	18.9%	7.4%	21.3%	52.4%	7.1%
AY24_F	442	50%	50%	16.9%	18.2%	51.9%	9.9%	9.9%	95.4%	49.1%
AY24_E	421	50%	50%	17.7%	31.8%	39.8%	3.9%	17.7%	91.5%	36.8%
AY24_D	524	48.7%	51.3%	61.6%	6.8%	21.6%	2.9%	16.5%	48%	9.3%

| AY24_B | 948 | 43% | 57% | 32.7% | 41.1% | 11.2% | 0.3% | 46% | 54.1% | Not available |
| AY24_A | 775 | 50.7% | 49.3% | 57.2% | 13.3% | 11.8% | 1.16% | 12.0% | 42.3% | 7.8% |

Table 4.
Classroom Demographics by Participant.

Participant	Classroom Population (n)	Female (%)	Male (%)	White (%)	Black (%)	Hispanic (%)	Students with Disabilities (%)	Free/Reduced Lunch (%)
AY24_G	21	76%	24%	85.7%	14.3%	0%	23.8%	28.6%
AY24_I	16	31%	69%	81.3%	12.5%	6.2%	100%	6.2%
AY24_F	37	35%	65%	56.7%	21.6%	10.8%	27%	Not Available
AY24_E	37	56.8%	43.2%	21.6%	32.4%	24.3%	29.7%	100%
AY24_D	8	12.5%	87.5%	37.5%	37.5%	12.5%	100%	50%
AY24_B	25	44%	52%	36%	48%	8%	24%	80%
AY24_A	23	56%	44%	39.1%	17.4%	13%	13%	30%

V. FINDINGS

In the following sections, cross-case findings are organized by guiding research questions 1 and 2, which are aligned to CAEP R4.1 standards. Case study findings facilitate holistic evaluation of the effectiveness of program completers and their impact, which assists the EPP in identifying areas for continuous improvement. Specific areas identified for improvement (i.e., Research Question 3) are documented in the EPP's Professional Education Unit Annual Report.

To what extent are completers effectively contributing to P-12 student-learning growth? Each participant completed a student growth activity where they collected pre-and post-assessment data. Pre-data about student knowledge was collected by the completer prior to implementing their unit or set of lessons. Post-assessment data was collected and compared to the pre-assessment data. The EPP analyzed the completer scores by using a paired samples t-test to demonstrate the level of difference from the class pre-assessment scores to the class post-assessment scores.

The results of the analysis demonstrated that all completers had a significant difference in the pre-to post assessment scores indicating an effective contribution to the student-learning growth from the unit or set of lessons that were implemented. The class mean scores and the paired t-test analysis demonstrating significant differences are provided in the table below. Significance is demonstrated by a p value of less than 0.05 (95% confidence level).

Table 5. Paired Sample T-Test by Participant				
Participant ID	Program	Pre-Assess Mean	Post-Assess Mean	Paired T-Test P<0.05 Sig.
AY_24A	Elementary	3.66	7.5	<.001
AY_24B	T2T	12.64	18.48	<.001
AY_24C	TAP	2.66	4.33	<.001
AY_24D	ECU	2.83	6.83	<.001
AY_24E	TAP	29.64	38.08	<.001
AY_24F	MAT-ECU	7.99	9.99	<.001
AY_24G	TAP	1.75	6.5	<.001
AY_24I	TAP	10.90	15.28	<.001

How and to what extent are completers using the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that they learned in their WSU preparation program?

InTASC standards identify the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary for effective teaching. These standards are used by WSU's program faculty to guide the training of initial licensure program candidates. As such, all candidates are expected to have demonstrated their classroom application of these knowledge, skills, and dispositions to successfully complete their preparation program. To determine the extent to which program completers are using the knowledge, skills, and dispositions they learned in their WSU preparation program, data were collected from the completer's formal teaching evaluation and pre/post interviews.

Each school district may use a different formal evaluation tool. As such, the EPP analyzed the criteria of each formal evaluation and created a cross-walk that aligned the evaluation items to one of the InTASC four categories: 1) The Learner and Learning, 2) Content Knowledge, 3) Instructional Practice, and 4) Professional Responsibility. The cross-walk outlined how performance levels were recorded into either the "Proficient or Higher" category or "Below Proficient" category.

Table 6 shows the number of evaluation items, across all 8 participants, that aligned to each InTASC category and the percent of ratings that fell within the "Proficient or Higher" range or "Below Proficient "range. The findings shared reveal that more than 90% of ratings were Proficient or Higher, which highlights the effectiveness of WSU's teacher preparation program in equipping completers with the necessary knowledge, skills, and dispositions for effective teaching. Areas for improvement include a small percentage of participants ratings below proficient in content knowledge and instructional practice.

Table 6. Formal Teaching Evaluation Alignment to InTASC and Completers' Score Proficiency		
InTASC Category	**Proficient or Higher**	**Below Proficient**
Learner and Learning: Development, differences, and environments	36 (100%)	0 (0%)
Content: Knowledge and application.	23 (92%)	2 (8%)
Instructional Practice: Assessment, planning, and strategies.	36 (90%)	4 (10%)
Professional Responsibility: Professional development, ethical practice, leadership, and collaboration.	25 (96%)	1 (4%)

To understand how completers are applying what they learned in their teacher preparation program in their classroom, the EPP conducted pre- and post-interviews aligned with the four InTASC categories. Pre-interviews focused on how completers utilize knowledge, skills, and dispositions gained during their program, as well as their satisfaction with preparation in each area. Post-interviews explored the reasons behind quantitative student growth results and allowed participants to reflect on their instructional effectiveness in a supportive context. Responses were analyzed by first aligning responses to InTASC standards. Next, responses were analyzed inductively, allowing for key themes to emerge related to how and to what extent completers are using the knowledge, skills, and dispositions they learned in their teacher preparation program (e.g., InTASC standards) in their professional practice as a teacher. Specific areas of strength and improvement are noted within each theme. The following six themes emerged.

Theme 1: Differentiation and Diversity in Instructional Design
Completers are actively applying strategies learned in their preparation program to differentiate instruction and address diverse learning needs. They frequently use tiered lesson plans to accommodate struggling, average, and advanced learners, and they integrate strategies learned in diversity-focused courses, such as adapting lessons for cultural relevance and connecting with diverse learners. These approaches reflect the program's emphasis on scaffolding and cultural awareness, which completers credited with preparing them to create inclusive and adaptable learning environments. However, some completers noted limitations in translating theory into practice due to insufficient real-world application during their coursework. While these strategies are central to their teaching practice, they expressed that additional hands-on opportunities during preparation would have further enhanced their confidence and effectiveness.

Relevant Completer Quotes:
"All of that foundation was there, and it really helps me be a much more beneficial, much more effective teacher. Not only to improve student academia, but also in building those relationships and knowing how to connect and do all those really important things for those kiddos that really deserve the education just like anybody else does."

"I loved the differentiation class. [It] was so great because I was really able to understand how to break down my lesson plans and create those plans for a struggling learner, for a middle of the road learner, and then also for those high achieving students. So, taking that class and really understanding what that looks like and how I can break that down in my different classes, whether it's starting with a full group instruction and breaking it into small groups and then very intentionally having a group of students work with me so I can provide that extra support and scaffolded support with those students was really helpful."

"I think there's diversity classes that we took. Three or four of them were really, really crucial in this kind of differentiation process. So, there was the cultural practices one; I believe there was one about going into the schools and observing and you had to observe a student that had some type of difference."

"But those classes were really crucial. Those different diversity classes. I remember interviewing someone from a different culture for one of my classes that was talking about how did your culture inform you growing up and I interviewed one of my friends who was Asian American his experience was interesting. And I think about that a lot in my own practice] with] kids."

"I loved the differentiation class. [It] was so great because I was really able to understand how to break down my lesson plans and create those plans for a struggling learner, for a middle of the road learner, and then also for those high achieving students. So, taking that class and really understanding what that looks like and how I can break that down in my different classes, whether it's starting with a full group instruction and breaking it into small groups and then very intentionally having a group of students work with me so I can provide that extra support and scaffolded support with those students was really helpful."

"[It was] stressed to us was just the scaffolding and the changing of vocabulary depending on the student you are speaking with or the students you're teaching."

"They touch on differentiation, but they never actually sit down and say, 'Okay, this is what the standard looks like; how are you going to differentiate that with this kid sitting in front of you?' That's what I feel like I didn't get in my class. [It] was like, 'Okay, we're going to do this, but we're just going to talk about the differentiation. We're not going to actually practice doing it.' So then, like, more real life [practice], it would have been [an] authentic experience."

Theme 2: Relationship-Building & Classroom Management
Completers consistently credit their preparation program for instilling the importance of relationship-building as a foundation for effective classroom management. Through training in resources like Conscious Discipline, completers learned to approach classroom management with empathy and rapport, using non-punitive strategies to create supportive environments. Many completers described how they replicate the relationship-building practices modeled by their instructors, fostering positive and respectful interactions with students. This skill is one of the most frequently used aspects of their preparation and is considered central to their teaching practice. Completers emphasized that these strategies help them manage student behavior effectively while maintaining a nurturing classroom culture.

Relevant Completer Quotes:
"Classroom management comes, honestly, comes down to the relationships that you build with kids. And that's hard, that is so hard to teach. I think that WSU does a really good job of building relationships with their students. And so, by modeling how to build those relationships, now then it's easier for us to go in and build those relationships with students, too."

"I applied a lot of what I learned from the TAP program for like the classroom setting into…classroom management."

"That class was virtual, but she brought in so many people to talk to us that were real world teachers, whether they were principals or counselors or first year teachers or five-year teachers. And I think that real world discussion about what does classroom management look like, especially post-COVID. It was very honest, which I think really need is teachers really sunshine and rainbows version of teaching."

Theme 3: Instructional Techniques
Completers frequently use instructional strategies learned during their preparation program, particularly scaffolding, modeling, and hands-on activities, to support student learning. These techniques help them break down complex concepts into manageable steps, gradually transitioning students from guided to independent learning. Completers noted that modeling and repetition are essential for reinforcing expectations and building student confidence. They highlighted the program's strong focus on student-centered teaching, which they consistently apply in their classrooms. While

these strategies are foundational to their practice, some completers suggested that additional guidance on applying these techniques in real-world contexts would have been beneficial for refining their effectiveness.

Relevant Completer Quotes:

"The best, the best things that I ever had to do in any of my classes was when the professor was like, make a lesson plan, teach it to the class."

"I've learned that the best way to teach them was just that constant modeling, the constant...relooking at what we did the day before and then doing it again today. I used a lot of scaffolding, like we were super, super, super hands-on. And then as the unit went on, I let them do a couple of partner work activities, and then I let them do a couple individual work activities. Now, mindful that there are some of my kids that aren't ready to do partner work, so it was more like, I'm going to be partner with a para, or I'd rather work by myself because I can't work with somebody else. Those kinds of things were kept in mind."

"For instructional strategies, we're very student-centered. Everything is student centered. Of course, there's a time and a place for a teacher-led, you know, direct instruction, whole group moment. But that's definitely not the focus. We're told from the beginning that if that's the type of, you know, if that's oftentimes the type of teacher that we were exposed to when we were students and that's not, that is not effective practice. And I think that's a hard challenge when you're, when you've experienced something and now, you're going to do something different. But that being student-centered and always thinking about how [lessons are] perceived from the students."

Theme 4: Technology Integration

Completers have integrated technology into their teaching practices, often using tools like Loom and music websites introduced during their preparation program to enhance instruction and maintain student engagement. They appreciated the program's encouragement to explore technology in authentic and meaningful ways, which helped them develop a personalized approach to selecting tools that align with their teaching style and classroom needs. While many completers felt well-prepared to use technology, some noted variability in the depth of training provided, particularly during virtual instruction periods. Overall, technology integration has become a significant component of their instructional practice, and they continue to build on the foundational skills gained during their preparation.

Relevant Completer Quotes:

"I feel prepared to do it [integrate technology]. They stressed a lot. They really loved when we use[d] technology and our lesson plans and stuff like that. And they encouraged it almost like every single time we met."

"There was a teacher that showed us how to use and integrate music websites into our teaching for core content classes."

"One that I still use in my practice today that I believe was from a math professor It was Loom, it's a screen reading device type thing where you can record your screen and have your face in the corner while you're talking about your content. So on our snow days, when we have snow days here, we make them virtual days now. I can be home, and I can record a lesson for my students using this Loom program and that absolutely changed my practice, and I shared it with my whole team."

"There was so much ownership that was placed on us to learn technology and to choose what we were interested in, and that grace if something doesn't speak to you that then don't do it because then it's not going to be real in your classroom."

"I can't say that they didn't prepare me to not be ready for technology. There's no way to learn every technology piece, but they taught me how to be a learner and excited about technology."

Theme 5: Content Knowledge

Completers' application of content knowledge varied by subject area, with reading and science instruction receiving higher marks than math and social studies. They frequently draw on their strong foundation in reading, particularly in strategies for teaching dyslexia, and use inquiry-based approaches in science to design effective, standards-aligned lessons. However, they expressed challenges in

applying what they learned in math and social studies, citing gaps in depth and practical application during their coursework. Completers suggested that greater attention to these areas during preparation would better equip them to deliver effective instruction. Despite these challenges, they consistently apply their content knowledge in reading and science to create engaging and effective learning experiences.

Relevant Completer Quotes:

"Reading you're covered, that's solid."

"I'll be honest, my math content class at WSU was probably my least valuable one. It's the one that I got the least use out of, because you can't read a book and know how to teach math."

"I just think like there's a lot of attention to detail and reading instruction that I got in college. And there's not the same thing for math. There's not the same thing for science. And there's not the same thing for social studies. I don't even know where to begin when I'm teaching science."

"[The science content professor] prepared us so, so, so well for that content knowledge. I feel like I knew those standards inside and out with the practice that we did going into the classrooms and teaching those different lessons and just a really deep, rich understanding of those standards and inquiry, the process of inquiry and all those types of things. So, science was definitely a really high point."

"Yeah, so WSU, was really, really so helpful and supportive and encouraging because it was scary. It's really hard to say, "Yeah, I'm an expert in this area." I have KPIs (key performance indicators) and all kinds of data to say I know business, but everything else, that was hard. But they were very supportive and just really built my confidence as an educator."

"[In reading] I felt like half of our instruction was about dyslexia and that was kind of it, which is funny because I'm still taking dyslexia hour long training. I feel like with reading instruction, I didn't get a ton of that other than dyslexia, but I also know that those were virtual classes for me, and it was hard for me to focus and pay attention. And our math classes were also virtual. Those were really tough to do because it was kind of middle of COVID."

Theme 6: Assessment Preparedness & Application

Completers use some assessment strategies from their preparation program but noted challenges in implementing formative and quick-check methods consistently. While project-based and summative assessments were covered in depth during their training, they felt less confident in applying formative assessment techniques for daily and immediate feedback. Completers appreciated creative assessment methods learned during the program and adapted them to engage students meaningfully. However, they suggested that more comprehensive training on balancing creativity with practical data collection would enhance their ability to provide consistent feedback on student learning.

Relevant Completer Quotes:

"I think one of my favorite things that I ever learned was creative assessments and project learning. All of these things that can be very real-world output that really buy in the student, get them really excited. If you can start off something with a driving question on how it impacts them, they're going to be so much more engaged."

"I think assessment is a bit of a harder spot for me. I don't think I quite grasped the assessment as well as some of my other peers did in the program. And I think especially for my content now, I've kind of gotten away with not using it as much, you know, I don't teach a math course, which is very, very heavy on data and pre and post [assessments]. And, you know, you can figure out how many of your students know long division before you teach it and after you teach it. That's very easy. Writing is so much more subjective. And so I'm thinking back to college, and I just struggled a lot with assessment."

"One thing that I did [in] my ECU program specifically we talked a lot about how to keep data, how to take anecdotal data...and that's where I get my assessment sheets from."

"[I learned] easy assessment [methods], note taking sheets. And this I feel like is something I got directly from college. I think that the way that I assess, the way that I use anecdotal data and... avid strategies, TPTs, those types of things, they were directly set in college...and I do utilize."

"I do a lot of like inquiry...I'm constantly trying to ask my kids questions...so that they can try to figure out the answer without us giving it to them. And I've learned that a lot of times too in this room with the kids [is that they] like to learn from each other. If I can kind of empower one or two of them through the modeling and through the scaffolding [they] take that leadership role.'

"I don't know if that was Wichita State's fault or my fault. I recall talking about different types of things, of exit tickets and I recall talking about formative and summative assessments and I remember doing a[n] illustration with an umbrella that talked about your formative assessments kind of raining down from the top and then your summative assessments underneath and I feel like summative assessments are something that I was way more prepared for because it's in my brain, it's easier to do big things like projects and reports and speeches and that all makes sense to me because I'm used to these big long units."

Completers are actively applying foundational skills and knowledge gained from their preparation program, particularly in differentiation, relationship-building, scaffolding, and reading and science instruction. These skills are central to their professional practice and align with program goals. However, challenges in translating theory into practice for differentiation, formative assessments, and content preparation in math and social studies reveal areas for improvement. Completers' reflections highlight both the success of the program in fostering adaptable and empathetic educators and opportunities to strengthen real-world applications of their training.

VI. CONCLUSION

The findings of the 2024 Completer Effectiveness Case Study demonstrate that **program completers are successfully applying the knowledge, skills, and dispositions acquired during their teacher preparation program to positively impact P-12 student learning and development**. Pre- and post-assessment data provided compelling evidence of significant student growth across all participating completers, with paired t-tests showing statistically significant improvements in student performance ($p < 0.001$) for every completer. These results highlight the ability of completers to design and implement instruction that promotes meaningful learning outcomes for their students.

Completers consistently applied knowledge of differentiating instruction, building relationships, and student-centered instructional strategies, enabling them to meet the diverse academic and social-emotional needs of their students. They reported using tiered lesson plans, scaffolding, and creative assessments to engage learners across readiness levels, further contributing to measurable learning gains. Completers also leveraged content knowledge, particularly in reading and science, and integrated technology effectively to enhance instructional delivery and student engagement. These practices align with professional standards and underscore the program's success in preparing educators to create impactful and inclusive classroom environments.

While completers demonstrated significant contributions to student-learning growth, areas for improvement were identified to further enhance their effectiveness. These include providing more hands-on practice with differentiation strategies, deeper preparation in formative assessment techniques, and expanded content training in math and social studies. Addressing these gaps can help completers further refine their instructional practices and maximize their impact on student outcomes.

In summary, the AY 24 Completer Effectiveness Case Study confirms that these program completers are making a meaningful difference in P-12 learning growth through the application of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions they learned in their teacher preparation program. At the same time, the findings present actionable opportunities to strengthen the program's focus on real-world applications, ensuring future completers are even better equipped to meet the evolving demands of today's classrooms.