



## Supporting Evidence of Teacher Educator Development: Kirkpatrick Model

Framework for evaluating learning programs, consisting of 4 levels: Reaction, Learning, Behavior, and Results

Kirkpatrick Level	Definition	Focus	Sample Evidence Sources	Data Type	Collection Timing
Reaction	How co-leads feel about project participation and coaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Satisfaction with sessions and resources</li> <li>- Perceived relevance to their role</li> <li>- Engagement in communities and TA sessions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Event surveys with satisfaction/relevance ratings</li> <li>- Community of Practice surveys (focus on value and applicability)</li> <li>- TA coaching surveys</li> <li>- Attendance/participation logs</li> <li>- Qualitative reflections ("The most valuable part of this session was...")</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Quantitative (Likert scales),</li> <li>- Qualitative (open-ended)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Immediately after events</li> </ul>
Learning	What co-leads/faculty have learned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Growth in knowledge of Science of Reading, universal screening, early intervention, and family engagement strategies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Baseline Self-Assessment of prior knowledge and instructional practice as compared to demonstrated learning through scenario based tasks or case studies, and digital simulations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Quantitative (scores),</li> <li>- Qualitative (artifact review, feedback)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pre-project, post-project, and at key milestones</li> </ul>
Behavior	How co-leads/faculty apply learning in practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Changes in program content, assessment, and clinical experiences</li> <li>- Frequency and fidelity of new practices</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Revised syllabi incorporating structured literacy</li> <li>- Updated assessments aligned with SOR principles</li> <li>- Changes to clinical experiences (e.g., more targeted practicum work on phonics instruction)</li> <li>- Use of simulations with teacher candidates</li> <li>- Feedback from pre-service teachers on observed changes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Qualitative (document analysis, feedback),</li> <li>- Quantitative (implementation tracking)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ongoing; mid-year and end-of-year review</li> </ul>
Results	Impact on teacher candidates and PK-3 learners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Improved readiness of teacher candidates to deliver structured literacy</li> <li>- Better early literacy outcomes for PK–3 learners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Improved literacy outcomes in program graduates' classrooms</li> <li>- Increased alignment of program with state/national early literacy standards</li> <li>- Reduction in instructional gaps between coursework and school-based practice</li> <li>- Positive stakeholder reports from principals/district leaders on graduate readiness</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Quantitative (student outcome data, alignment scores),</li> <li>- Qualitative (stakeholder feedback)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Annually</li> </ul>