

**University of Pikeville
Patton College of Education**

**2017-2018 Case Study of Educator Preparation
Program Impact for CAEP Standard 4**

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Purpose of the Study.....	3
Methods.....	3
Participants	3
Procedures.....	3
Data Analysis and Results.....	4
Discussion of Findings and Implications for Improvement	10
Continuous Improvement Efforts	10
Reference	11
Addendum: Additional Data	12

2017-2018 Case Study of Educator Preparation Program Impact for CAEP Standard 4

Introduction

The University of Pikeville Patton College of Education chose to develop and implement mixed-method case study of data to determine the quality of the undergraduate teacher education programs (TEP) through the performance of program completers (CAEP Standard 4). The case study will focus on the completers' teaching effectiveness and impact on P-12 learning.

Purpose of the Study

1. To provide both qualitative and quantitative data to demonstrate undergraduate teacher education program completers positively impact P-12 learning. (KTPS/InTASC 4.1)
2. To provide both qualitative and quantitative data to demonstrate teaching effectiveness within P-12 classrooms. (KTPS/InTASC 4.2)
3. To use the resulting data for continuous improvement efforts. (KTPS/InTASC 5.1)

Research shows that educator preparation programs are vital to the future success of their preservice teachers. "A great teacher can make a tremendous difference. We know this from our own experience in school. And a body of research now documents that a student learns more with an effective teacher — or languishes in the classroom of a less effective one" (SREB, p. 2.). Therefore, in an attempt to improve the quality of their undergraduate teacher preparation programs, the Patton College of Education gather and analyze both qualitative and quantitative data from completers.

Methods

Participants

To begin the case study, we reached out to all eleven of our May 2017 graduates to determine if they were willing to participate in our case study. Our goal was to give all completers an equal chance to participate in the case study. Since we are a small EPP, we can accomplish this goal. Five completers, or approximately 45% of our total completers, contacted us and indicated that they were willing to share with us their student data to demonstrate impact on P-12 learning and/or teacher evaluation data to demonstrate teaching effectiveness.

Identifier	Licensure Area	Teaching Position
Completer 1	Elementary	Primary – All Content Areas
Completer 2	Middle School Social Studies	Middle Grades Social Studies
Completer 3	Elementary	Primary - Mathematics
Completer 4	Elementary	Primary – All Content Areas
Completer 5	Elementary	4 th /5 th Grade Social Studies

Procedures

The completers who responded became our focus group. We asked them to share only formal documentation of their teacher effectiveness and/or impact on P-12 student learning. We

communicated with the focus group through email, text, and phone conversations. We were aware that the data would be diverse since all the completers were teaching in different school districts and some in different states.

Data Analysis and Results

Completer 1:

Completer 1 teaches in the primary grades of an elementary school in Kentucky. Completer 1 shared official documentation that she successfully passed the Kentucky Teacher Internship Program (KTIP). To successfully complete KTIP, first-year teachers must be observed and evaluated by a teacher educator, resource teacher, and the school principal. All three people on this committee must agree that the first-year teacher has successfully met all indicators on the evaluation instrument, which is aligned with the *Kentucky Framework for Teaching* (based on the research-based *Danielson Framework for Teaching*) and the Kentucky Teacher Performance/InTASC Standards.

All of the KTIP sources of evidence are aligned with the *Kentucky Framework for Teaching* and the Kentucky Teacher Performance/InTASC Standards. To successfully complete KTIP, a first-year teacher cannot have any ineffective ratings; therefore, Completer 1 received ratings of *developing* or above on all indicators. The following table demonstrates the alignment of the sources of evidence.

Table1
Standards Alignment with KTIP Sources of Evidence

Source of Evidence	Kentucky Teacher Performance/ InTASC Standards	Kentucky Framework for Teaching Components
Observation of Teaching	1 – Learner Development 3 – Learning Environment 4 – Content Knowledge 5 – Application of Content 6 – Assessment 8 – Instructional Strategies	2A – Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport 2B – Establishing a Culture for Learning 2C – Managing Classroom Procedures 2D – Managing Student Behavior 2E – Organizing Physical Space
Lesson Plans	1 – Learner Development 2 – Learning Differences 4 – Content Knowledge 6 – Assessment 7 – Planning for Instruction	3A – Communicating with Students 3B – Questioning and Discussion Techniques 3C – Engaging Students in Learning 3D – Using Assessment in Instruction 3E – Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness 1A – Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy 1B – Demonstrating Knowledge of Students 1C – Setting Instructional Outcomes 1D – Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources 1E – Developing Coherent Instruction 1F – Designing Student Assessment
Post Observation Reflection	9 – Professional Learning and Ethical Practice	3E – Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness 4A – Reflecting on Teaching
Assessment and Analysis of Student Learning	6 – Instructional Practice	3D – Using Assessment in Instruction

Records and Communication	10 – Leadership and Collaboration	4B – Maintaining Accurate Records 4C – Communicating with Families
Professional Involvement Log	9 – <i>Professional Learning and Ethical Practice</i> 10 – <i>Leadership and Collaboration</i>	4A – Reflecting on Teaching 4B – Maintaining Accurate Records 4D – Participating in a Professional Community 4E – Growing and Developing Professionally 4F – Showing Professionalism
Professional Growth Plan	9 – Professional Learning and Ethical Practice 10 – Leadership and Collaboration	4A – Reflecting on Teaching 4E – Growing and Developing Professionally

Completer 1 also shared MAP student data from reading and math. In reading, 39% of the completer’s P-12 students scored at or above the norm grade level mean according to their RIT scores. In addition, another 22% had a RIT score within five points of the norm grade level mean. Approximately, 44% of the P-12 students scored at or above the norm grade level mean according to the RIT scores, and 17% were within five points of the norm grade level mean.

Completer 2:

Completer 2 teaches at middle grades level at an out-of-state school. Completer 2 shared two Formal Classroom Observations with specific feedback and the summative teacher performance report completed by a school administrator. The documents were scanned and emailed from the original documents. Administrator comments related to professional knowledge from the first observation completed in the fall semester stated that Completer 2 “continually checked for understanding and communicated clearly with students.” Related to instructional planning, the administrator indicated that Completer 2 was “using the CIP lesson plan,” and that Completer 2 had “activities broken down in specific time blocks.”

The second Formal Classroom Observation was completed in the spring semester. Feedback related to professional knowledge from the administrator stated that Completer 2 “continually checked for understanding and communicated with the students.” Further documentation related to instructional planning indicated that “the plans are aligned with the SOLs and the _____ County School curriculum.”

The end-of-the-year Teacher Summative Performance Report showed *proficient* ratings for Professional Knowledge, Instructional Planning, and Instructional Delivery, which align with the KTPS/InTASC categories of the *Learner and Learning*, *Content Knowledge*, and *Instructional Practice*. The Formal Classroom Observation reports did not provide ratings on the sheets that were shared with the EPP. Only the first sheet of each observation was shared, but the administrator feedback was adequate to provide specific information related to the professional knowledge and the instructional planning abilities of Completer 2. Page 1 of the Teacher Summative Performance Report contained the following summative ratings for professional knowledge, instructional planning, and instructional delivery, which are reflective of teaching effectiveness.

Table 2**Teacher Summative Performance Report**

Assessed Area	Rating
Professional Knowledge	Proficient
Instructional Planning	Proficient
Instructional Delivery	Proficient

Completer 3:

Completer 3 teaches math at an out-of-state elementary school. Completer 3 submitted the largest amount of data. The first was the Informal Teacher Observation #1 completed by a school administrator during the fall semester. The Teacher Formal Observation was completed in the spring semester, and the Final Summative Rating of Teaching Effectiveness was completed at the end of the academic year. The table below contains the data from the identified assessments. The ratings included *ineffective*, *developing*, *skilled*, and *accomplished*. Administrator ratings for Completer 3 ranged from developing to skilled. Completer 3 received no ratings of ineffective.

Table 3**Teacher Observation Data**

Instrument	Standard	Assessed Area	Evaluator Comments/Feedback/ Evidence	Rating
Informal Teacher Observation #1	Standard 1 :Students Standard 2: Content Standard 4: Instruction (InTASC: Learner and Learning, Content Knowledge, Instructional Practice)	Prior Content Knowledge/ Sequence/ Connections	“The teacher makes clear and coherent connections with students prior knowledge and future learning both explicitly to students and within the lesson.”	Proficient
	Standard 1: Students Standard 4: Instruction (InTASC: Learner and Learning, Instructional Practice)	Differentiation	“The teacher relies on a single strategy or alternate set of materials to make the lesson accessible to most students though some students may not be able to access certain parts of the lesson and/or some may not be challenged.	Developing
	Standard 1: Students Standard 5: Learning Environment Standard 6: Collaboration and Communication (InTASC: Learner and Learning, Professional Responsibility)	Classroom Environment	“Appropriate expectations for behavior are established, but some expectations are unclear or do not address the needs of individual students. The teacher inconsistently monitors behavior.”	Developing
	Standard 3: Assessment	Assessment of Student Learning	“Your use of focused instruction and wait time is providing all students with	Developing

	(InTASC: Instructional Practice)		opportunities to learn, keeping the expectation that 100% of students will understand and be prepared to answer/explain.”	
Teacher Formal Observation/ Performance #2	Standards 2: Content Standard 4: Instruction Standard 6: Collaboration and Communication (InTASC: Content Knowledge, Instructional Practice, Professional Responsibility)	Instruction and Assessment	“Teachers circulated the room, checking in with students. Students were observed to be following the process, some asked for support that they were on the right track, some needed reminders about the direction of their comparison signs.”	Skilled
	Standard 1: Students Standard 4: Instruction (InTASC: Learner and Learning, Instructional Practice)	Differentiation	“_____supplies some students with multiplication chart resources”	Skilled
	Standards 2: Content Standard 4: Instruction (InTASC: Learner and Learning, Instructional Practice)	Resources	“Smartboard, video, clipboards, practice sheets, multiplication tables”	Skilled
	Standard 1: Students Standard 5: Learning Environment Standard 6: Collaboration and Communication (InTASC: Learner and Learning, Professional Responsibility)	Classroom Environment	“MVP directions are given for each student task. Positive narration is used to focus students and decrease behavioral disruptions. Gradual release model is taught to students for scaffolded learning.”	Skilled
	Standard 3: Assessment (InTASC: Instructional Practice)	Assessment of Student Learning	“Teachers give out worksheet that students will do alone at a level zero, after one example on the board. Wilson models first problem on the board, demonstrating cross-multiplication. Teachers circulated the room, checking in with students.”	Skilled
	Standard 6: Collaboration and Communication Standard 7: Professional Responsibility and Growth	Professional Responsibilities	“The teacher has met all professional duties within the school. The teacher demonstrates support for the school and	Skilled

	(InTASC: Professional Responsibility)		district mission in meetings, in communications with students and families, and in instructional focus.”	
--	---------------------------------------	--	--	--

Summative Rating of Teacher Effectiveness

Instrument	Contributing Data	Assessed Area	Rating
Final Summative Rating of Teacher Effectiveness	Teacher Formal Observation /Performance Rubric #1	Proficiency on Standards/ Educator Performance	Developing
	Teacher Formal Observation /Performance Rubric #2	Proficiency on Standards/ Educator Performance	Skilled
	Cumulative Performance Rating (Holistic Rating using Performance Rubric)	Proficiency on Standards/ Educator Performance	Skilled
	Student Growth Measure of Effectiveness	Student Growth Data	Approaching Average
	Final Summative Overall Rating	Areas of Reinforcement Areas of Refinement	Developing
	Improvement Plan Initiated by the District: No		
	Improvement Plan Required Due to Ineffective Final Summative Rating: No		

Completer 4:

Completer 4 shared formal documentation of teaching effectiveness through the Record of Teacher Internship Year that resulted from the successful completion of KTIP. The evaluation instrument used is aligned with the *Kentucky Framework for Teaching*, which is also aligned to the KTPS/InTASC Standards. (Please see Table 1: Standards Alignment with KTIP Sources of Evidence.) The component ratings include ineffective (I), developing (D), accomplished (A), and exemplary (E).

Table 4

KTIP Component Ratings

Components	Principal	Resource Teacher	Teacher Educator	Committee	Final Marking
1A - Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy	A	A	A	A	Met
1B - Demonstrating Knowledge of Students	E	E	A	E	Met
1C - Selecting Instructional Outcomes	A	A	A	A	Met

1D - Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources	A	A	A	A	Met
1E - Designing Coherent Instruction	E	E	A	A	Met
1F - Designing Student Assessment	A	A	A	A	Met
2A - Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	E	E	A	E	Met
2B - Establishing a Culture of Learning	E	E	A	E	Met
2C - Managing Classroom Procedures	E	E	A	E	Met
2D - Managing Student Behavior	E	E	A	E	Met
2E - Organizing Physical Space	E	E	A	E	Met
3A - Communicating with Students	E	A	A	A	Met
3B - Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques	A	A	A	A	Met
3C - Engaging Students in Learning	A	E	A	A	Met
3D - Using Assessment in Instruction	A	A	A	A	Met
3E - Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness	E	A	A	A	Met
4A - Reflecting on Teaching	E	E	A	E	Met
4B - Maintaining Accurate Records	A	E	A	A	Met
4C - Communicating with Families	A	E	A	A	Met
4D - Participating in a Professional Community	E	E	A	E	Met
4E - Growing and Developing Professionally	E	E	A	E	Met
4F - Demonstrating Professionalism	E	E	A	E	Met
Committee Consensus					
Strengths related to the components of the Kentucky Framework for Teaching Design coherent instruction. Cares about her kids. Has established a great learning environment for her students. Team player. Amazing first year!					
Priority Areas for Professional Growth Literacy progressions					

Completer 5:

For Completer 5, we have MAP reading data. Although Completer 5 teaches fourth and fifth grade social studies, reading is significant part of elementary social studies; therefore, all content teachers impact student reading achievement.

Table 5
MAP Reading Scores

Beginning-of-the Year		End-of-the-Year	
% Below Benchmark	% At or Above Benchmark	% Below Benchmark	% At or Above Benchmark
64	36	47	53

Discussion of Findings and Implications for Improvement

In 2016-2017, our undergraduate teacher education programs had eleven completers. Five (45%) of those completers participated in our 2017-2018 case study to help determine teaching effectiveness and impact on P-12 learning. Of those five completers who participated in our case study, two of them shared P-12 student data from the MAP test. The MAP data from Completer 1 did not include comparative data, but it did show the percentage of students who were at or above benchmark or those near benchmark. The MAP data from Completer 5 demonstrates an increase of MAP reading scores from 36% at or above benchmark at the beginning of the year to 53% at or above benchmark at the end of the year. Therefore, the participants from the study demonstrated a positive impact on P-12 student learning.

Four completers submitted formal documentation of teaching effectiveness through administrator observations, summative evaluations, and the KTIP data for first-year teachers. The evidence is diverse and from completers working in both Kentucky schools and out-of-state schools. Completer 1 successfully completed the KTIP; therefore, Completer 1 received no ratings of ineffective on any of the teaching effectiveness indicators that are aligned with the *Kentucky Framework for Teaching* and the Kentucky Teacher Performance/InTASC Standards. Completer 2's end-of-the-year Teacher Summative Performance Report showed *proficient* ratings for Professional Knowledge, Instructional Planning, and Instructional Delivery. Completer 3 received a final overall summative rating of *developing* on teaching effectiveness, and no improvement plan was initiated or required. KTIP data from Completer 4 demonstrated *accomplished* or *exemplary* ratings on all indicators of teaching effectiveness based on observations from the principal, resource teacher, and teacher educator. Therefore, based on the documented evidence from our completers, one can conclude that they are demonstrating teaching effectiveness within the P-12 classrooms in which they teach.

Continuous Improvement Efforts

We completed this case study to determine the teaching effectiveness and impact on P-12 learning of our teacher education program completers. Although we analyzed multiple data sources from five completers, we need to expand in our efforts to determine program impact.

- Next Steps
 - We will reach out to surrounding P-12 school districts for completer performance data related to teaching effectiveness and impact on P-12 learning. Mutually developed partnerships with P-12 school districts will help us use the available data from our completers to improve our teacher education programs and provide well-trained teachers who are ready to be successful within P-12 classrooms.

Reference

Southern Regional Education Board (SREB). December 2018. Report of the SREB Teacher Preparation Commission: State Policies to Improve Teacher Preparation. Retrieved 3/19/2019 from https://www.sreb.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/state_policies_to_improve_tp_report_web.pdf?1547222272

Addendum
Additional Data

After our case study was completed with the focus group of completers who agreed to participate, one of the districts shared the following data with us for MAP reading and math scores for our completers.

Comparison of *MAP Scores for the Beginning-of-the-Year (Fall) and End-of-the-Year (Spring)

	2017-2018
Math	
# Completers with Available Data	2
% Completers with Increases in MAP Mathematics Scores from Fall to Spring	50%
% Completers with Static Mathematics Scores (= or < 2%) from Fall to Spring	50%
% Completers with Decreases in MAP Mathematics Scores from Fall to Spring	0%
Reading	
# Completers with Available Data	4
% Completers with Increases in MAP Reading Scores from Fall to Spring	75%
% Completers with Static Reading Scores (= or < 2%) from Fall to Spring	25%
% Completers with Decreases in MAP Reading Scores (>2%) from Fall to Spring	0%

Note: The *MAP Test is a nationally normed test from the Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA).

Therefore, although this was limited data, one of the two completers demonstrated an increase in the percentage of P-12 students scoring at or above the benchmark score on the MAP test in math. In addition, three of the four completers demonstrated an increase in the percentage of P-12 students scoring at or above the benchmark score on the MAP test in reading.