# Case Study: Examining Completers' Teaching Effectiveness 2016-2017
Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation
Component 4.1 Impact on P-12 Student Learning and Development

Cheryl A. Lindeman, Peggy Schimmoeller, and Consuella Woods

Randolph College

## Introduction

The case study method was developed by Randolph College's EPP to demonstrate the following program completers teaching skills including the following: using multiple measures; the influence of program completers on P-12 student learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools; and the satisfaction of completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation (CAEP Standard 4 –Program Impact). Four components to the standard were addressed in the 2016-2017 case study. These include the following: completer impact on P-12 student learning and development, indicators of teaching effectiveness, satisfaction of employers, and satisfaction of completers. The case study method was deemed the only way to provide data to support completer's teaching effectiveness on P-12 student learning and development since the Virginia Department of Education will not release student summative data (Virginia SOL) to the Virginia EPP's.

**Aims of the case study:**

- To gather substantial quantitative and qualitative documentation that provides supporting evidence the Randolph College EPP completers have a positive impact on students learning.
- To improve the RC teacher preparation program as part of continuous improvement.

Linda Darling-Hammond (1999) reported effective teachers are the product of exemplary teacher preparation programs. She purports candidates must "learn about learning and about the structures and modes of inquiry of their disciplines so they can translate what they know into effective curriculum, teaching strategies, and assessments." Darling-Hammond asserts candidates who do not matriculate from exemplary preparation programs will not sustain research-based best teaching practices when they enter their own classrooms. She maintains these new teachers often revert to teaching practices they encountered during their high school and college courses. A long term goal of this project is to examine the influence of the RC teacher preparation program over time. Moreover, a deeper investigation into the various aspects of the program will assist the education department faculty in providing graduates with the skills and knowledge they need to maintain research-based teaching practices throughout their teaching careers. As we analyzed artifacts collected from program completers, CAEP Standard 4 guided us in examining the broader scope of preparing candidates who, according to Darling-Hammond, Hammerness, Grossman, Rust, & Shulman (2005) "support their students toward productive lives and careers (p.441)."

## Method

### Participants

Three outside case study researchers were hired to oversee the case study and to collect data. The case study researchers were selected from a group of Randolph College (RC) college supervisors because they were familiar with the program and the observation protocol. Participants included six program completers (based on the 10% benchmark set by CAEP) who were selected by drawing a stratified random sample from the completer years 2008 through 2015. Five completers (see Table 1.0) attended a focus group session February 26, 2016, One completer was unable to attend, therefore, a separate interview by the case study interviewer was scheduled.

Table 1. Case study completers' graduation year, licensure area, current teaching position.

| Completer pseudonym | Graduation Year | Licensure area(s) | Current teaching position |
|---|---|---|---|
| Helen | 2008 | special education- general curriculum | special education- general curriculum |
| Caroline | 2010 | biology, chemistry & earth science | high school – chemistry & biology |
| Wanda | 2014 | preK-6 elementary | elementary 2nd grade |
| Ursula | 2014 | biology and earth science | middle school-earth science |
| Sam | 2015 | special education- general curriculum | special education- general curriculum |
| Ruth | 2015 | special education – general curriculum, add on history & social studies | high school – US history & VA history |

### Procedure

**Focus group**. Participants were invited to attend a focus group discussion. Participants reviewed the IRB and signed the consent to participate agreement. The focus group session was videotaped and lasted one hour and 16 minutes. All participants completed the RC EPP graduate follow–up evaluation form. Three college supervisors facilitated the focus group interview session. Table 2.0 includes questions asked during the focus group. Once the session was completed, the video tape was submitted to a faculty member in the RC EPP for transcription.

**Individual Interviews**. One college supervisor assigned to the completer who was not in the focus group video session, scheduled a meeting with the completer to ask the focus group questions during a one to one meeting following the lesson observation. All completers were asked a set of five questions (See Table 3.0) by their respective assigned college supervisor. This information was submitted to the Randolph EPP for analysis.

**Classroom observations and completer artifacts.** Each college supervisor was assigned two completers. One classroom observation was arranged independently with each participant

program completer during a window of eight weeks following the focus group. The Randolph Classroom Observation form (version 3/16) was completed by each college supervisor following the observation. The college supervisors collected decoded student data completers voluntarily agreed to provide as evidence of teacher effectiveness. Also, principal observations were submitted if the completer agreed to supply a copy of instrument. The college supervisor submitted completer artifacts to the Randolph EPP for analysis.

**Principal Interview.** Each college supervisor was assigned to schedule a meeting with the completer's principal and use the Administrator/Employer's follow-up evaluation form. One principal's video was submitted along with completing the evaluation form. The completed forms were submitted to the Randolph EPP for analysis.

Table 2. Focus group questions used for the February 26, 2016 group interview.

| |
|---|
| Question 1 - Think about your education classes you have taken, which have been the most beneficial in your teaching career and why? |
| Question 2- Of the education classes you have taken, which have been the least beneficial at the time? |
| Question 3- Tell us about your success & highlights so far during your teaching career. |
| Question 4 - Tell us frustrations you've dealt with during your teaching. |
| Question 5 - So you think about your classes that you took during the program impacted your ability to manage classroom experiences. |
| Question 6- How do you measure student achievement summative and formative? |
| Question 7 - If there is anything we haven't covered, and you'd like to share about your preparation here at Randolph's teacher education program? |

Table 3. Case study individual completer interview questions asked by the college supervisors.

| |
|---|
| 1. What motivates you to teach and was it what you expected? |
| 2. How influential were the professors at Randolph in your decision to teach? |
| 3. What are you long term goals in education? |
| 4. What pleases you most about teaching? |
| 5. How have you adjusted to teaching multi-language children? |

**Data analysis** All data were analyzed to capture completers' teaching effectiveness. The qualitative analysis case study method described by Creswell & Poth (2018) was used as a guide for determining approaches to reviewing completers' artifacts. The intent was to cast a wide net gathering multiple measures and view artifacts in reference to InTASC standards. Each instrument had a target mean score or benchmark established by the EPP. The findings were organized by CAEP Standard 4 components to reveal the supporting evidence of RC EPP's program completers' impact on student learning.

**Focus Group.** The video recording was transcribed manually and organized by time stamp with the lines numbered. A qualitative data analysis coding of transcripts recommended by Wargo (2013) was used to develop coding themes (attributes of teaching) mentioned by the participants during the focus group session. Themes were tagged to the InTASC standards (1-10) and by InTASC standard clusters (The learner and Learning, Content Knowledge, Instructional Practice and Professional Responsibility). For each question InTASC themes were tagged by question. Participant quotes were identified to support the themes for each question.

**Student achievement data.** Submitted student summative data provided were analyzed by calculating the % improvement if two or more reporting benchmark scores were shared. Benchmark test score report pass rates were averaged and compared to the VA SOL pass rate. If VA SOL end of year % pass rate for the completer was self-reported, data were reported as percent rate based on the submitted scores for a particular class. If the completer reported annual goals for improving student achievement, the overall class average % improvement data was reported. If the completer submitted multiyear VA SOL subject pass rates, rates were compared to the Virginia pass rate for each subject area. If the completer submitted substitute end-of-year test scores, such as Advanced Placement subject pass rates, these data were recorded as the percent pass for the class. One completer provided anecdotal information about a student's progress through a life skills course making a connection for enrolling the student into a technical school in the automotive industry. Data submitted are described in Table 4.

**College supervisor lesson observation**s. The college supervisor's classroom observations, using the Classroom Observation form, for their assigned completers were recorded by each item using a Likert scale: distinguished (5); proficient (4); satisfactory (3 – target level or above for all completers); developing (2); and unsatisfactory (1). Given only six participants, data were not analyzed by licensure areas. For each section of the evaluation (professional knowledge, instructional planning, instructional delivery, assessment of and for student learning, professionalism and student academic progress) means and standard deviations were calculated. Each subsection item was tagged with the corresponding InTASC standard. A target mean score of 3.0 was set.

**Employer surveys.** The administrators/employer follow-up evaluation forms were returned to RC EPP by the college supervisors. The data were recorded for the 20 item survey using a five point Likert scale prompted by the question, "How well did Randolph College prepare __to __? The Likert scale was 5- 4 (high), 3-2 (average) and 1 (low). Each item on the instrument was tagged to InTASC standards. Means and standard deviations were calculated for

each item. A target mean score of 3.0 was established as acceptable competence in the performance skill. Question 21 was a free response question. Comments were recorded anonymously. One principal's video interview was transcribed and coded for themes.

**Completer evaluations.** Five out of the 6 completers submitted a Randolph College Graduate Follow-up Evaluation Form after the focus group session. The Likert scale on the form was 5- 4 (high), 3-2 (average) and 1 (low). Each item on the instrument was tagged to InTASC standards. Means and standard deviations were calculated for each item. Target means of 3.0 was set as the target. The completer scores were compared to employer's responses to the same questions.

**Additional artifacts.** If completers provided information about leadership roles, committee work, awards, or additional comments about teaching, these data were incorporated into CAEP Standard sub categories as appropriate artifacts supporting teaching effectiveness. If the completer submitted copies of employer's evaluations (student indicators of engagement and observation/document review forms) used by the school, the items were compared to the RC case study employer survey and Classroom Observation form to see if there were similar instrument items and if there were noted ratings below average or written comments regarding teaching effectiveness.

## Results

In order to elicit completers' teaching effectiveness, data gathered from the focus group, student achievement data, college supervisor lesson observations, employer and completer surveys, and additional artifacts were reviewed. Analyzing the results in this way provided multiple measures to support each of the CAEP 4 subheadings. Results are reported for each sub category of the CAEP Standard 4 Program Impact.

### 4.1 Completer impact on P-12 student learning and development

Data reviewed for this section included the focus group transcript (Table 5) and student assessment data submitted by completers (Table 4). Sample student performance data submitted by completers included benchmark data based on SOL summative tests, task completion for life skills, end of year pass rates on AP tests substituted for VA SOL testing, and nine week test data for two cycles. Completers' assessment submissions were analyzed to see if there was evidence of student improvement. Table 4 shows each of the 5 completers have student achievement improvement.

Table 4. Assessment data (decoded) submitted by case study completers.

| Completer | Assessment(s) provided | Analysis method | Evidence of student improvement |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ruth | 1 & 2 9 weeks benchmark tests US history | calculated class improvement 52% | yes |
| Ursula | 1 & 2 9 weeks earth science benchmark tests | calculated class improvement 64.2% | yes |
| Helen | 1 & 2 9 weeks algebra I class benchmark tests | calculated class improvement no change, 43% of the class scored 80% or higher on the 2nd 9 week test. | yes |
| Wanda | 3rd 9 weeks benchmark test results 2nd grade history and math | individual scores above 80% pass rate | yes |
| Caroline | End of year AP biology % pass rate (2015) Regular chemistry SOL scores (2011-2015) AP chemistry scores (2012-2015) | AP biology pass rate was 80% score of 2 or better on the AP scale Regular chemistry Sol pass rates for 5 years 90% or better. Two years had 100% AP chemistry scores 2012-56%, 2014 – 46% and 2015 75%. Each of these years had biology/chemistry block | yes |

The second measure used to support student learning and development was evident by matching coded teaching effectiveness themes (see table 5) with InTASC teaching performance standards. Table 5 included an itemized list along with the number of completers who shared explanations which incorporated the themes multiple times. The teaching themes, matched with InTASC standards 1-3, relate to learning development, learning differences, and learning environments that support student development. The six completers described details of what effective teachers accomplish when planning instruction to meet student developmental needs. InTASC standards 6-8 address assessment, planning for instruction and instructional strategies vital to student learning and development. During the focus group, there was over 20 minutes of discussion about assessments. There were several times when the completers expressed frustrations about

testing constraints, environment, and limited instructional time for meaningful everyday applications supporting their teaching. Selected quotes expressing frustrations are:

Ruth expressed frustration as follows: "They all come from different places and they have different values and I guess just trying to get them all ready for the same thing.. And [making sure] they're prepared to learn in your class that day… It's kinda like a roller coaster ride."

Ursula expressed her concerns when she said, "somethings are just out of your control and regardless of what walks in the door, you are going to make the best of it…… I guess the hardest for them to understand is that I was not there to be their friend..I was there to be their teacher and some of them couldn't handle that and it was very frustrating."

Caroline had a different frustration because she felt she was "not meeting the needs of high achieving students."

Helen and Ruth described how their Masters' action research literature reviews, research designs, and data analysis, translated to working with students in their classrooms. Ruth indicated she "knows what it takes to actually analyze data and look at it and use it to help inform my instruction." Helen explained, "My first year that I taught as a special education teacher, I had all sixth grade self-contained classes with a group of boys, who I was teaching reading…one of the boys was a low reader and the other two boys were on the autism spectrum. They were put in my class because they didn't have anywhere else for the boys. It turned out good for me because I did my graduate research on reading and African American boys…By the end of that year through the reading program… and knowing it is better for them to hear better readers,..So for this weak student hearing better readers, he increased three grade levels in one year.

Table 5. Coded themes from the case study focus group transcript matched with InTASC standards

| InTASC Standard | Themes from transcript<br>(number of comments by completers) |
|---|---|
| 1 Learner Development | behavior issues -2<br>student motivation -2<br>students asked for right answers-2 |
| 2 Learning Differences | differentiated instruction-3<br>high functioning students-1<br>IEP/504-2<br>Inclusion-3<br>Advocate-3 |
| 3 Learning Environments | classroom management-2<br>relationships daily with students -6<br>student empowerment-2<br>classroom culture-1 |

| InTASC Standard | Themes from transcript<br>(number of comments by completers) |
|---|---|
| 4 Content Knowledge | teaching experience-4<br>content knowledge-1 |
| 5 Application of Content | hands-on science-1<br>integrate literacy-2<br>AP science teaching-1<br>prepared to teach content applications-2 |
| 6 Assessment | Analyzing data-3<br>student achievement-5<br>success - test scores-3<br>applied action research-5<br>SOL tests-6<br>accreditation # AP courses-1<br>socially promote-1<br>formative assessments-7<br>interactive achievement-1<br>summative assessment-3 |
| 7 Planning for Instruction | planning (unit, lesson)-4<br>curriculum-1<br>pacing issues-2<br>technology in classrooms-3 |
| 8 Instructional Strategies | ways to deliver instruction-1<br>design brief-1<br>implement strategy-1<br>remediate/reteach-3<br>personalized learning-2<br>flipped classroom-1 |
| 9 Professional Learning and Ethical Practice | Reflective-1<br>responsibility early in program-2<br>smart goal(s)-1<br>validation of actions-1<br>frustrations-6<br>learning experience for teaching-1<br>success(self)-3<br>comments about former classes-5<br>book study, linguistics, reading assessment, reflective seminar |
| 10 Leadership and Collaboration | learned from one another-1<br>relationships with parents-3<br>modeling relationships by professors-3<br>leader-5<br>coteacher-1 |

The focus group discussion about formative and summative assessments revealed completers in all licensure areas use formative assessments on a daily basis. Summative assessments are geared toward VA Standards of Learning pacing guides or benchmark testing. All respondents shared detailed examples of how they use formative assessments on a daily basis. As expected, there were variations in approaches and flexibility in developing summative assessments. See Table 5 for the content analysis of the themes revealed from transcripts. Each licensure area is discussed in more detail to provide additional information on teaching strategies implemented by RC EPP program completers.

Secondary licensure science completers referenced formative assessments used daily. Teachers are observed by a veteran mentor who specializes in formative assessments. Student achievement is tracked using a software program (Interactive Achievement). An example of formative assessment shared included daily warm-ups when each student responds to a prompt and writes the answer on a white board. This allows for immediate feedback when teachers are monitoring student understanding based on the VA Standards of Learning. Additionally, this group shared ways they design authentic summative assessments in project based science classes.

The secondary licensure history completer(s) indicated daily formative assessments influence daily instruction and planning, because, they reveal the need to reteach concepts. The summative assessment is a department/division generated test based on the VA Standards of Learning. Teachers receive quarterly data about the progress of students.

Elementary licensure completer's responses mirrored the secondary responses regarding the importance of daily formative assessments. Having the ability to use design briefs for science activities was noted as being more informative of student understanding than responding to a SOL type set of questions. The completer noted, "In second grade, we teach them there is a right answer and a wrong answer. Because it is based on the score you get on [an] assessment. ..So, I can see the natural progression with their age levels of how it happens. Because at second grade the pace doesn't allow so much we want them to think higher level but we don't have time."

Special education licensure completers described co-teaching experiences when they modified instruction based on formative assessments depending on who was the lead teacher for the day. Helen shared." Last year I started teaching in high school. I taught algebra the smart goals my co-teacher and I set we met and exceeded our smart goals. We had an inclusion class in a double block. So that was really wonderful, really wonderful to see."

There was consensus among focus group participants they understand the purpose of formative assessments and use them daily to inform instruction. They acknowledge the need to use their school/division summative assessments so they can monitor student achievement progress on mastering the VA Standards of Learning (SOL).

There was a reoccurring theme "success" during the focus group assessment discussion. Some of the comments support the completers' passion for their students and their teaching.

Ruth shared, "Test scores and achievement ...that is success. But I think my relationships with students on a daily basis ... That's the sort of thing that keeps me going even it is not just based on student achievement. It's based on students growing and enjoying my class and wanting to be there."

Ursula noted, "Summative and formative are really big to me in science because it's so much opportunity to do hands on. Because the ones who are going to move forward in engineering, architecture, science or PhD in med, they're going to be hands on [in their work.]"

Wanda explained, "Successes for me are the little moments when the students have a little light gleam in their eye(s). They put together the relationships you formed with self-student empowerment and they want to achieve from themselves… They just want to achieve for themselves…We kinda teach them there is a right answer and a wrong answer. Unfortunately, the pace doesn't allow them to think higher level…summative is for the SOL, science project [design brief] is formative."

Additional artifacts were reviewed to search for more indicators of student achievement and development. Data provided on the "student indicators of engagement form" provided a detailed check list about the student engagement. During a second grade word study lesson, the completer demonstrated to the evaluator she was able to clearly state the objective, make connections by applying meta-cognition strategies, and received a commendation for a lesson well organized with evidence the students understood the routines. Other comments about the elementary licensures' teaching effectiveness were documented in a division observation/document form. These included, "the teacher used formative and summative assessments, and student progress revealed the targeted group was on track to meeting the end-of year goal."

### 4.2 Indicators of teaching effectiveness

In order to capture a broad perspective of indicators of teaching effectiveness an alignment table was created. In Table 6, classroom observations by the college supervisors using the classroom observation form, the employer survey, graduate/completer survey, and focus group themes were combined. By aligning the artifacts with the InTASC standards, the multiple measures were reviewed. The employer and graduate/completer surveys collected data for multiple InTASC standards except for #6 Assessment. Assessment data was collected multiple ways using the classroom observation, themes from the focus group, and the submitted student assessment data. The instrument items noted for the classroom observation column are described in Table 7 titled performance indicator ratings using the final intern evaluations for case study participants.

Table 6 Alignment of case study artifact data sources to InTASC standards.

| InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards | Classroom observation instrument items | Employer and Completer Surveys | Focus Group Themes (from video) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Learner Development | 7.1 | Evaluate pupil growth and learning<br>Show empathy for and sensitivity to all learners (survey items 2,12) | behavior issues, student motivation and students asked for right answers |
| 2, Learning Differences | 2.3,3.2,5.2 | Meet needs of individual students by differentiating instruction<br>Work in inclusive classroom situations<br>Teach and to relate to students from diverse backgrounds (survey items 3,4,21) | differentiated instruction, high functioning students, IEP/504,inclusion, advocate |
| 3. Learning Environments | 3.1, 5.1,5.3,5.4 | Involve pupils in varied learning experiences<br>Manage classrooms efficiently<br>Create a caring environment (survey items 5,6,20) | classroom management, relationships daily with students, student empowerment, classroom culture |
| 4. Content Knowledge | 1.2 | Basic knowledge of subject<br>Communicate orally<br>Communicate in writing<br>Use technology effectively<br>(survey items 1,15,16,17) | teaching experience, content knowledge |
| 5. Application of Content | 1.1, 1.3 | Be creative, flexible, imaginative (survey item14) | hands-on science, integrate literacy, AP science teaching, prepared to teach content applications |
| 6.Assessment | 1.3,1.4,3.4,4.2,4.3, 4.4, 7.1,7.2,7.3 | Teach state required standards (SOL) (survey item 18) see note 1 | Analyzing data, student achievement, success - test scores, applied action research, SOL tests, accreditation # AP courses, socially promote, formative assessments, interactive achievement, summative assessment |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 7.Planning for Instruction | 1.3, 2.1,2.2,2.4 | Plan on daily and long-term basis<br>Use a broad variety of teaching resources (survey item 7,11) | planning (unit, lesson), curriculum, pacing issues |
| 8.Instructional Strategies | 3.3,4.1 | Present lessons skillfully<br>Use a broad variety of teaching resources (survey item 8, 11) | ways to deliver instruction, design brief, implement strategy, remediate/reteach, personalized learning, flipped classroom |
| 9.Professional Learning & Ethical Practice | 6.1,6.2, 6.3 | Practice professional ethics<br>Understand how to work with parents & the community<br>Demonstrate leadership, initiative, and professional growth<br>Reflect, monitor, and adjust (survey item 9,10,13,19) | reflective, responsibility early in program, smart goal(s),validation of actions, frustrations, learning experience for teaching, comments about former classes - book study, linguistics, reading assessment, reflective seminar |
| 10.Leadership and Collaboration | None matched | Understand how to work with parents and the community<br>Demonstrate leadership, initiative, and professional growth (survey item 10,13) | learned from one another, relationships with parents, modeling relationships by professors, leader |

Note 1- Five completers voluntarily submitted copies of either benchmark scores, midyear testing, AP pass rates, SOL pass rates

Table 7. Performance Indicator Ratings using RC Classroom Observation for Case Study participants.

| Instrument item description/number | N | Mean Ratings of Case Study completers | STDEV |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Intern Teaching Final Evaluation Teaching Performance** | | | |
| 1.1 Effectively addresses appropriate curriculum standards | 6 | 5 | 0 |
| 1.2 Demonstrates an accurate knowledge of the subject matter | 6 | 5 | 0 |
| 1.3 Bases instruction on goals that reflect high expectations and an understanding of the subject | 6 | 5 | 0 |
| 1.4 Communicates clearly and checks for understanding | 6 | 4.8 | .41 |
| 2.1 Uses student learning data to guide planning | 6 | 4.7 | .52 |
| 2.2 Plans time realistically for pacing, content mastery and transitions. | 6 | 4.5 | .84 |
| 2.3 Plans for Differentiation | 4 | 4.8 | .5 |
| 2.4 Aligns instructional objectives to the school's pacing guide, program of studies, and appropriate SOL's. | 6 | 4.8 | .5 |
| 3.1 Engages and maintains students in active learning | 5 | 4.8 | .41 |
| 3.2 Differentiates Instruction to meet the students' needs | 4 | 4.8 | .5 |
| 3.3 Uses a variety of effective instruction strategies and resources | 5 | 4.6 | .55 |
| 3.4 Communicates clearly and checks for understanding | 6 | 4.8 | .41 |
| 4.1 Communicate expectations with clarity | 6 | 4.7 | .52 |
| 4.2 Involves students in setting learning goals and monitoring their own progress. | 5 | 3.8 | .84 |
| 4.3 Aligns student assessment with established curriculum standards and benchmarks | 4 | 4.8 | .5 |
| 4.4 Gives constructive and frequent feedback to students on their learning | 5 | 4.8 | .5 |
| 5.1 arranges the classroom to maximize learning while providing a safe environment and establishes clear expectations for classroom rules and procedures | 6 | 4.8 | .41 |

| Instrument item description/number | N | Mean Ratings of Case Study completers | STDEV |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5.2 Promotes culture sensitivity by respecting student's diversity, including language, culture, race, gender and special needs | 6 | 4.8 | .41 |
| 5.3 Maximizes instructional time and minimizes disruptions | 6 | 4.7 | .52 |
| 5.4 Establishes a climate of trust and teamwork by being fair, caring, respective and enthusiastic | 6 | 5.0 | 0 |
| 6.1 Demonstrate consistent mastery of standard oral and written English in all communication | 6 | 5.0 | 0 |
| 6.2 Demonstrates professionalism in a manner of dress according to the setting | 6 | 5.0 | 0 |
| 6.3 Exhibits a professional demeanor at all times during all situations | 6 | 5.0 | 0 |
| 7.1 Sets acceptable, measurable, appropriate achievement goals for student learning progress based on baseline data | 5 | 4.6 | .89 |
| 7.2 Document the progress of each student | 6 | 4.5 | .55 |
| 7.3 Communicates student academic progress in a timely manner | 6 | 4.8 | .41 |

**Rating Scale:** 5=Distinguished, 4=Proficient, 3=Satisfactory 2=Developing 1=Unsatisfactory N=6

The classroom observation form along with the focus group comments provide the evidence completers are effective teachers. Table 7 results indicate all of the items (100%) reveal over the 3.0 target score. All but one of the items (#4.2 Involves students in setting learning goals and monitoring their own progress – mean score 3.8) were above 4.0. Seven items had means of 5.0 and STDEV of 0. Two of the completers submitted end of the year

Focus group comments support the data shown in Table 7. Example from a special education completer's interview supports items 3.2 differentiates instruction to meet the students' needs and 7.1 sets acceptable, measurable, appropriate achievement goals for student learning progress based on baseline data. Sam's commented about working with his Life Skills class and how he is using appropriate technology and differentiating instruction. "I am assessing them on their functional skills [using Chromebooks + Google classroom, ] He [the student] came back every day to practice the skill and eventually we got into the laboratory that has a full kitchen…and changing the process so the student was able to show life skills."

Wanda commented, "differentiating instruction or using different teaching methods helped me the most...to understand each individual achiever as an individual, as well as being able to

change up my teaching style even though it is the same class of students… as much as we are teaching curriculum, classroom management.. I'd say a 50/50 partner.

### 4.3 Satisfaction of employers and 4.4 Satisfaction of completers

Table 8 includes combined data for the employer and graduate/completer surveys aligned with InTASC standards. The means and standard deviations for each item are reported. All items had means of 4.0 or greater except item # manage the classroom efficiently. Comparing the employer's and completer's survey results, it was evident there was a difference in perceptions about the item "manage the classroom efficiently." Although the means were 3.8 for the employer and 5.0 for completers, the 3.8 mean was above the target.

Table 8. Case study employer and completer survey data

| InTASC Standard | Survey Items | Employer Means (STDEV) | Completer Means (STDEV) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1.Basic knowledge of subject | 4.3 (.47) | 4.8(.4) |
| 1 | 2.Evaluate pupil growth and learning | 4.2 (.69) | 5 (0) |
| 2 | 3.Meet needs of individual students by differentiation instruction | 4.3 (.75) | 4.8 (.4) |
| 2 | 4.Work in inclusive classrooms | 4.2 (.9) | 4.6 (.49) |
| 3 | 5.Involve pupils in varied learning experiences | 4.2 (.9) | 5 (0) |
| 3 | 6.Manage the classroom efficiently | 3.8 (.9) | 5 (0) |
| 7 | 7.Plan on daily and long-term basis | 4.8 (.37) | 4.6 (.49) |
| 8 | 8.Present lessons skillfully | 4.3 (.75) | 5 (0) |
| 9 | 9.Practice professional ethics | 4.2 (.9) | 5 (0) |
| 9,10 | 10.Understand how to work with parents and the community | 4.0 (.82) | 4.8 (.4) |
| 11 | 11.Use a broad variety of teaching resources | 4.3 (.75) | 4.8 (.4) |
| 1 | 12.Show empathy for and sensitivity to all learners | 4.3 (.75) | 4.8 (.4) |
| 9,10 | 13. Demonstrate leadership, initiative, and professional growth | 4.5 (.5) | 5 (0) |
| 5 | 14.Be creative, flexible, imaginative | 4.7 (.47) | 5 (0) |
| 4 | 15.Communicate orally | 4.5 (.5) | 5 (0) |
| 4 | 16.Communicate in writing | 4.7 (.47) | 4.8 (.4) |
| 4 | 17.Use technology effectively | 4.3 (.75) | 4.8 (.4) |
| 6 | 18.Teach state required state standards (SOL) | 4.7 (.47) | 4.8 (.4) |
| 9 | 19.Reflect, monitor, and adjust | 4.3 (.75) | 5 (0) |
| 3 | 20.Create a caring environment | 4.7 (.47) | 5 (0) |
| 2 | 21.Teach and relate to students from diverse backgrounds | 4.5 (.5) n=3 | 5 (0) |

## Discussion

The first case study aim was to gather substantial quantitative and qualitative documentation that provides supporting evidence the Randolph College EPP completers have a positive impact on students' learning. The case study design using multiple measures to determine completer's teaching effectiveness provided rich data. The results from multiple measures indicate Randolph College EPP completers understand multiple facets of teaching effectiveness demonstrated by the content analysis of the focus group transcript, classroom observation rubric results, and employer satisfaction surveys. Moreover, completers provided student achievement evidence of success, shared leadership strategies through extensive discussions about types of assessments, and concluded, teaching is about the students. Principal surveys and college supervisor observations validated teaching effectiveness of the case study completers. Completers submitted student assessments with the option to select their own data sets to represent their teaching effectiveness. The focus group teaching themes served to augment the traditional instruments used by the EPP. The traditional instruments included: employer survey, completer survey, and the classroom observation instrument. Additional artifacts provided by some of the completers were valuable indicators of student engagement, meta-cognition strategies observed while teaching.

Organizing data using the CAEP 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4 components helped support the following findings. The case study completers (N=6) represented a broad range of licensure areas and years of teaching experience. The focus group themes aligned with INTASC standards indicating our completers are knowledgeable about content, pedagogy, student learning and development, leadership and ethics. Our completers are articulate about their understanding of what skills are needed to be effective teachers. Multiple measures including, employer and completer surveys, focus group, and college supervisor classroom observations support the EPP's claim our program completers share a vision of good teaching and have extensive clinical experiences which prepare them for teaching. Completers provided anecdotal evidence of what teaching success means relating to student development, learning, and scores. Also, focus group discussions allowed completers to have a deep conversation about teaching frustrations. They brainstormed ways they can influence student achievement through designing lessons which promote student engagement and learning in creative ways, while at the same time, preparing students for state standardize testing. Focus group participants shared they were prepared, and given opportunities to share opinions during the RC program which gives them confidence to have a voice in classroom and school decisions. Leadership skills and professional development artifacts were shared in the focus group discussion and by emails to the college supervisors. Several completers are involved in leadership roles within their schools within the first three years of teaching. Comparing the employer's and completer's survey results, it was evident there was a difference in perceptions about the item "manage the classroom efficiently." Completers scored this area a 5 on average, while in contrast Employers scored this area 3.8 on average. According to Darling-Hammond et al. (2005 p. 405) striving for a shared vision of good teaching along with action

research, assessments, and portfolios relating to teaching practice provides a foundation for candidates who are prepared for teaching and are highly rated by their employers.

## Recommendations

The second aim of the case study was to provide meaningful feedback to improve the RC EPP as part of continuous improvement. CAEP evaluators indicated we should increase the number of participants to 10 and develop a stratified sample over a 3 year cycle to reflect different licensure areas. Although all areas evaluated using the classroom observation form and employer and completer satisfaction surveys met the EPP target, we examined areas with the lowest means and developed strategies to improve these areas as outlined below:

Evaluate pupil growth and learning

In field placements, candidates will be required to examine assessment measures
During student teaching candidates will be required to develop and reflect on the effectiveness of teacher designed assessments (formative and summative)

Understand how to work with parents and the community

Candidates will be required to attend and reflect on parent/teacher conferences
In 300 level method courses students will participate in case studies and mock parent/teacher conferences

Involves students in setting learning goals and monitoring their own progress

Candidates will be required to include, in each lesson plan, ways to involve students in the learning process

Work in inclusive classrooms

We will add case studies to EDUC 361 and EDUC 661 (Survey of Special Education) on collaborative teaching models
In all 300 level methods courses collaborative teaching will be addressed

Manage the classroom efficiently

Classroom management modules will be included in all methods courses

The text Management in the Active Classroom by Berger, Strasser, and Woodfin. (2015) was added to Reflective seminar (a copy of the text will be purchased for each college supervisor so they can reinforce the classroom management strategies, in addition a book study was included.

Practice professional ethics

The M.A.T. candidates take a school law course which includes ethics. In this course the instructor will create mini case studies

In all 300 level undergraduate courses, mini case studies will be develop to review ethics related to teaching

We will continue addressing multiple ways to manage the classroom efficiently by using examples in our classes and discussion with the clinical instructors and college supervisors sharing best practices.

Since the case study data collection occurred prior to our CAEP visit, we used instruments (classroom observation rubric and employer survey forms) modified based on the CAEP report. Though we collected a variety of student achievement data, it would be helpful to have the case study participants submit multiple lessons along with student assessment data to help us determine approaches they used to prepare students for summative evaluation. The college supervisors should be provided a detailed check list to augment their timeline for observations and interviews. In addition, it should be investigated to see if a student engagement observation form can be used by all college supervisors during a completer observation. The case study focus group questions should include a question about leadership or have the participants submit a current resume. This will allow the EPP to accurately capture leadership and professional development experiences as they relate to teaching effectiveness. We will add written free response questions relating to participants current teaching experiences in their content knowledge areas to the focus group questions.

# References

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (n.d.) Vision, mission and goals. Retrieved from http://caepnet.org/about/vision-mission-goals

Council of Chief State School Officers. (2013, April). Interstate teacher assessment and support consortium InTASC *model core teaching standards and learning progressions for teachers 1.0: A resource for ongoing teacher development*. Washington, DC: Author.

Creswell, J & Poth, C. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Fourth Ed. Los Angeles: Sage Publications Inc.

Darling-Hammond,L. (1999). Educating teachers for the next century: Rethinking practice and policy. In G.A.Griffin (ed.), The education of teachers (pp.221-256). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Darling-Hammond, L., Hammerness, K., with Grossman, P, Rust, F & Shulman, L.(2005). The design of teacher education programs. In L. Darling-Hammond& J. Bransford (eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do.* (pp.390-441*).* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Virginia Department of Education (n.d.). Teaching in Virginia. Retrieved from http://www.doe.virginia.gov/teaching/index.shtml

Virginia Department of Education (n.d.). School report cards. Retrieved from http://www.doe.virginia.gov/statistics_reports/school_report_card/index.shtml

Wargo, W. (April 10, 2013) Qualitative data analysis (coding) of transcripts. http://www.academicinfocenter.com/qualitative-data-analysis-coding-of-transcripts.html

Wargo, W. G. (2016). Triangulation to Establish Validity of Qualitative Data. Menifee, CA: Academic Information Center. http://www.academicinfocenter.com/triangulation-to-establish-validity-of-qualitative-data.html