EPP CASE STUDY REPORT FOR 2018-2019

I.   **Audience**

The CAEP Standard 4 Committee conducted a Case Study regarding DUS's teaching effectiveness and ability to facilitate student learning during the first pilot cycle from Spring 2019 to Fall 2019. The committee reviewed the findings in Spring 2020 and shared results with faculty members at the CAEP Spring Retreat in February 2020. In March 2020, these results will be shared with our partner P-12 schools in order to provide additional information to the EPP for program improvement.

II.   **Purpose of Case Study**

Mississippi Department of Education has limited data reporting that allows Delta State University to collect the appropriate data on our Program Completers. CAEP Standard 4 requires that the EPP solicit specific data from the completers regarding their ability to effectively carry out the requirements of their jobs and meet professional expectations required in their first three years of employment. In many states, this implies that the state department of education is collecting data. Thankfully, the Mississippi Department of Education, in collaboration with the EPPs, has begun to provide a statewide database to look at the success of completers during their first year.

The Standard 4 Committee implemented a Case Study modeled after the case study done by Amy Vinlove from the University of Alaska Fairbanks. This model was presented at a CAEP conference Fall 2018, which DSU members attended. This model addressed multiple components of CAEP Standard 4 including components 4.1 (The provider documents, using multiple measures, that program completers contribute to an expected level of student learning growth); 4.2 (The provider demonstrates, through structured and validated observation instruments and student surveys, that completers effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve); and 4.4 (The provider demonstrates, using measures that result in valid and reliable data, that program completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job, and that the preparation was effective). Following this model, Delta State partnered with school districts in which program completers were employed and then used collected data for continuous program improvement and collaboration with P-12 partners. Furthermore, the purpose of this Case Study is to solicit data and information from Program Completers and their administrators to determine Program Completer impact on P-12 student learning

and development, classroom instruction, and schools and Program Completer satisfaction based on their preparation at Delta State University for the purpose of CAEP accreditation. At the same time, it is intended to provide support for the program completer for planning and support of student learning.

III.   **Plan for the Case Study**

In the fall of 2019, the Standard 4 Committee met and identified four programs to use for the first cycle of data: the Elementary Education program, the Special Education program, the secondary math program, and the secondary English program. Moving forward, the Committee developed a Case Study Protocol that outlined processes for the research study and roles and responsibilities of the program completers and faculty at Delta State University (see APPENDIX L). The protocol consisted of five sections containing interview questions, guidelines for unit documentation, unit designed assessments, student satisfaction surveys, and student assessment data from unit and from the state assessments. In order to conduct research within these P-12 schools, the Committee submitted the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for approval and obtained IRB approval (see APPENDIX A), obtained school district agreement by entering into Memorandums of Understanding (MOU) (see APPENDIX G), and identified Delta State faculty who would serve as supervisors to the program completers and trained those supervisors in the use of the instruments to be administered (see APPENDIX B). A Student Perception Survey was created, and content validity was obtained by using both faculty and P-12 partners. Other assessments, including the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) (see APPENDIX C), the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) (see APPENDIX D), test data, interviews (see APPENDIX H), principal evaluations, and informal observations (see APPENDIX I) by the supervisor, were identified as effective measure to ascertain effectiveness of the program completers.

IV.   **Results of Invitations to Participants**

Invitations were emailed to six identified Completers, and program coordinators also contacted them personally to encourage them to participate (see APPENDIX E). Initially all six Completers accepted the invitation. These Completers were from three different school districts in areas served by DSU. As supervisors were directed to communicate expectations with Completers, Completers began to decline to participate. Repeated communication and encouragement to participate could not cause the Completers to overcome their various barriers to participate which included family issues, time constraints, or lack of time in current teaching position.

V.   **Communication with P-12 Schools and Barriers**

MOUs were sent to each school district in which the initially identified Completers were employed (see APPENDIX G). These MOUs had to be presented to the school boards for approval which delayed our interaction with the Completers. Approval was obtained for each of our initially identified Completers.

VI.   Final Completers

After much scrambling, the committee was able to identify four additional Completers. The first two completers were elementary teachers from the Cleveland area. The Cleveland School District is a low socioeconomic district with a majority of African American students. The third completer was an elementary teacher from a low socioeconomic school district with predominantly African American students. The fourth completer was from the HPER program who was teaching out of area as a middle school science teacher in a low socioeconomic school district with predominantly Caucasian students. This became a convenient sample; the committee learned that additional efforts would be needed to identify appropriate participants for subsequent years.

VII.   Chronicle of Events

A timeline was developed for the 2019 data cycle, starting in November 2018 and continuing to January 2020. In November 2018, Dori Bullock, Anjanette Powers, and Merideth Van Namen met with Kathe Rasch to discuss the requirements of Standard 4 and determine the instruments, data, and resources that would be used to meet each part of Standard 4. Six completers were identified with three elementary education completers, one secondary education English Completer, one secondary education math completer, and one special education completer.

In December 2018, Dori Bullock created the DSU Student Perception Survey which was aligned with the InTASC Standards and aligned to CAEP Standard 4.2 (see APPENDIX J). The Standard 4 Committee also determined that universal screeners and state tests of the Completer's students combined with Case Study data would satisfy CAEP Standard 4.1. Invitations were sent to each of the six Completers (see APPENDIX E).

In January 2019, Franco Zengaro submitted the IRB for approval and approval was granted. Merideth Van Namen identified the TIAI as a formal observation tool DSU supervisors would use to evaluate completers during the formal observation. Because the TIAI evaluates the professional knowledge, skills and dispositions of the Completer, the TIAI would provide data for CAEP Standard 4.2 (see APPENDIX C). Content validity exercises for the DSU Student Perception Survey (see APPENDIX J)

was completed in the Professional Education Council (PEC) which is composed of community members, members from partner P-12 schools, and DSU faculty members (see APPENDIX K). This also corresponded with CAEP Standard 4.2. During this time, we encountered many obstacles with obtaining commitments from Completers. One Completer had been deployed while another Completer had only been employed a month and felt overwhelmed with just starting his job. An attempt was made to contact the special education Completer again, but we could never get a response. At this point we had three completers confirmed.

In February 2019, Anjanette Powers created the MOU format to be sent to district offices of our partner P-12 schools. This was initially slated to be sent out in February; however, due to a lack of participating Completers, it was delayed. Also during this time, Dori Bullock developed the Case Study Protocol, developed the Informal Observation Instrument that the DSU Supervisors would use during their informal observations that aligned with CAEP Standard 4.2 (see APPENDIX I), developed the first Program Completer Interview Questionnaire that would be administered by DSU Supervisors to solicit information used to gather information for CAEP Standard 4.4 (see APPENDIX H). P-12 partner schools also completed a content validity exercise for the DSU Student Perception Survey (see APPENDIX J and APPENDIX K).

In March 2019, MOUs were sent to the district office of P-12 partner schools. Dori Bullock developed the second Program Completer Interview Questionnaire that would be administered by DSU Supervisors to solicit information used to gather information for CAEP Standard 4.4 (see APPENDIX H). Anjanette Powers conducted a training on the different instruments to be used for DSU supervisors. Franco Zengaro revised the IRB. Program Completers were slated to teach their teaching units during this month, but this was pushed forward.

During April 2019, progress was limited due to several delays. First, school districts were slow to return MOU approvals. Therefore, DSU Supervisors could not start working with Completers. Second, we lost commitments from two of the four Completers and had to quickly find replacements. Thankfully, we were able to obtain a commitment from a fourth Completer. Supervisors were finally able to make contact with Completers; however, by this time state testing preparation and state testing had begun to dominate classroom instruction which created limitations for teacher observations.

In May 2019, DSU Supervisors observed Completers teaching unit, interviewed Completers twice, administered the DSU Student Perception Survey, and gathered test data and principal evaluations.

In June 2019, most DSU Supervisors submitted collected data in a formatted spreadsheet and pdf copies of documents.

In October 2019 to January 2020, final data was collected from DSU Supervisors. The data was analyzed for the Case Study, identifying themes and implications for DSU programs. Then the Case Study was written.

VIII.   **Development of Instruments**

In order to obtain the necessary data, several instruments had to be created. These instruments would be used to gather data from various sources, including DSU supervisors, the Completers, and the Completers' students.

The Student Perception Survey was created by Dori Bullock and was aligned by InTASC standards and the Dispositions Rating Scale in order to satisfy CAEP Standard 4.2. The answer responses were in Likert Scale format. A content validity exercise was completed by the PEC and faculty members from our partner P-12 schools. In a subsequent training, DSU supervisors were trained by Anjanette Powers on how to administer the survey.

DSU Supervisors were required to observe the Completers a minimum of two times. One of these times was an informal observation in which they would need a common instrument to be used to assess the Completers. Dori Bullock developed the Informal Observation Tool that the DSU supervisors would using during this informal observation. The DSU Supervisor received training on the administration of this instrument by Anjanette Powers. This tool provided information about the effect of the Completer on the learning process of her students and gathered some information from the students themselves. This would align with CAEP Standard 4.2.

CAEP Standard 4.4 required that EPPs gather information from the Completers about their perception concerning their preparation for teaching and their effectiveness on student learning. Therefore, DSU supervisors conducted interviews of Completers using a formatted questionnaire developed by Dori Bullock. The first Program Completer Interview Questionnaire gathered information from the Completer concerning their perceived preparation, their strengths, their weaknesses, and effectiveness in relation to the instructional year as a whole. The second Program Completer Interview Questionnaire gathered information from the Completer concerning their perceived implementation of best practices in a specific unit which was observed by the DSU supervisor and asked the Completer for personal implications concerning the participation in the CAEP Case Study.

Committee members identified another instrument that would be used to gather data for CAEP Standard 4.2 which would show the Completers' ability to effectively apply professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions. The Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) would be used for the formal evaluation. This instrument is a common assessment used by all Mississippi universities and measures teacher performance in five different domains: Planning and Preparation, Assessment, Instruction, Learning Environment, and Professional Responsibilities.

Along with the TIAI, DSU supervisors would also use the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) rubric to gather information for CAEP Standard 4.2. Completers would conduct an analysis of their teaching unit by completing Instructional Objectives indicators 1-5 and Analysis of Student Learning indicators 1-4 of the TWS. DSU Supervisors would evaluate the TWS using the TWS rubric which would provide information such as teacher impact on student learning.

In order to use multiple measures that Completers contribute to an expected level of student learning growth as required by CAEP Standard 4.1, the committee used the Completers' universal screeners and state tests scores to document student growth as they were available. The Mississippi Department of Education requires schools to administer universal screeners in grades kindergarten through third grade at least three times each school year from an approved list of tests. These approved tests include I-Ready (K-12), Istation Indicators of Progress (K-5), mCLASS Reading 3D (K-3), Measures of Academic Progress Growth (K-2), Measures of Academic Progress (2-10), STAR Early Literacy (PK-3), and STAR Reading (1-12). While only reading screeners are required, many school districts elect to give math screeners as well since many of these screeners have a math counterpart. Mississippi schools also administer the Mississippi Academic Assessment Program (MAAP) to measure knowledge, skills, and academic growth in grades 3-8 in English and mathematics. Students are also assessed in grade 5 and 8 in science with MAAP. Secondary students are assessed with MAAP in specific subject areas: Algebra I, English II, Biology, and U.S. History.

The final instrument used was the Case Study itself. A Case Study was necessary to elicit data about Completer effectiveness on student learning that was not readily available from the Mississippi Department of Education. Dori Bullock developed a Case Study Protocol and Timeline that would dictate when observations, interviews, student surveys, completer surveys, employer surveys, and analysis of test data would occur.

IX.   **Story of Implementation**

Knowing time was a factor, six completers were quickly identified for the Case Study and were contacted, drawing from the Elementary Education Program, SPED Program, and Secondary Math Program. However, due to a variety of factors, including deployment and maternity leave, many of the six completers initially contacted were unable to commit, leaving us with one completer. Unable to find Completers from each program, we were able to get a convenience sample of three Elementary Education Program Completers and one HPER Completer who was teaching out of area.

The team had many delays due to IRB approval and MOU approval from school districts which caused the study not to begin until March 2019. Because of this timing, preparation and administration of state testing became a major obstacle for observations and data collection. Thus, DSU Supervisors had to complete many tasks in a short time period at the end of the school year.

The team had to adjust the timeline because state test data are not available until the fall of the following school year. After collecting the data from all the DSU supervisors, it revealed some missing pieces of data from several of our Completers. All the data was finally collected by January 2020.

X.   **Participant Data**

Data from Participant 1

Interview #1

The Completer was most confident in researching, developing, and implementing different teaching strategies, but was least confident with classroom management. The Completer also felt confident in understanding and using contextual factors effectively to enhance instruction. She collects the data through parent-teacher conferences and daily conversations with her students. The Completer uses pre-tests and post-tests throughout the year to compare results and reflect on student growth. She also uses pre-screening assessments given at the beginning of the year to evaluate prior knowledge. She uses a variety of assessments including teacher-made assessments and commercially prepared assessments. She also uses a variety of evaluation tools including checklists, teacher keys, and rubrics. She makes an effort to provide remediation and enrichment objectives and learning activities during lessons. She feels very confident implementing technology in a variety of ways including student research, informational videos, and online activities, but she feels that technology is more of a hindrance at this young age than advantageous. She feels that the pre-internship

experience benefitted her and helped her better prepare her for her first year of teaching by giving her rich experiences with great teaching. The Completer feels most successful at establishing relationships with students, creating a safe learning environment, and finding ways to motivate her students to learn. The Completer feels that she needs additional support with designing and implementing interventions for struggling students.

Interview #2

The Completer set goals for her unit, gave a pre-test and asked questions to activate prior knowledge before the unit. The Completer asked questions during the lesson to check for understanding and provided multiple activities during the lesson to give students practice with the new content. For remediation, the Completer pulled struggling students into a small group for reteaching and additional practice. For enrichment, the Completer provided tasks that required higher order thinking skills for students who needed more challenge. The Completer allowed students to demonstrate their learning by giving demonstrations, answering questions, and explaining their answers. She used answer keys, rubrics, and checklists to monitor progress. After reflection of her unit, she analyzed data from the pre-and post-tests and concluded that the students did grow. However, she expressed the need for better time management. The Completer believed that this experience has reiterated the importance of monitoring student progress throughout a unit.

Informal Observation by DSU Supervisor

Learning goals were posted and were clearly explained to students. The Completer asked questions to insure understanding. When two random students were asked about the learning goals, they could state the goals. The Completer asked questions and reviewed previous unit in order to assess prior learning for the current unit. The Completer connects this lesson to real life by relating it to their needs as humans (This lesson was on plants). A variety of groups was used during this time. Some groups were talkative while others were fully engaged. For assessments, the Completer used questioning and teacher observation. When two random students were questioned about how the teacher knows if they understand, they responded that she watches them do their work, asks them questions, and gives them grades. The Completer uses multiple levels of instruction. Examples of using Depth of Knowledge levels include DOK 3 Comparing and Contrasting (people and plants) and DOK 1 Describing. Examples of different levels of Bloom's Taxonomy include Analysis, Knowledge, and Understanding. The Completer uses technology to enhance instruction by incorporating iPads during center time and uses time effectively by engaging students from the beginning of the time period to the end of the period. All students, regardless of diversity, participated and were called on during class discussion and teacher questioning. The Completer created an effective

learning environment by displaying beneficial anchor charts, grouping students at tables to promote the use of centers, and displaying student work. Strengths of this Completer that were observed include friendliness, preparedness, enthusiasm, and encouragement. Weaknesses observed include clarifying the objective and ensuring that students are understanding the concept.

Principal Observations

No data for this instrument were submitted.

Student Perception Survey

Based on student responses, this Completer had the highest mean with questions regarding InTASC Standard 8 (The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways) and Standard 6 (The teacher understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making). These specific questions asked students if they felt that their teacher explained information in multiple ways, asked questions to make sure they understood, used technology to help them learn, and required students to explain their answers. The Completer had the lowest mean with questions regarding InTASC Standard 1 (The teacher understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences) and 3 (The teacher works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation). These specific questions asked students if their teacher used the community to help them learn and helped them when they made a mistake; the students also responded that they were unclear that they knew what they were supposed to learn every day and that some students were afraid to ask questions in class.

Formal Observation- TIAI and TWS

The unit of study taught by Completer 1 was a science unit on plants. Her lesson plans followed the DSU elementary education format for lesson plans. The plans were well written and included the main idea and goal, objectives that included accommodations for enrichment and remedial students, appropriate procedural statements that included an introduction/motivation, study/learning, guided practice, independent practice, culmination and follow-up assessment. Throughout her daily lessons, she integrated other core subject areas. She used a variety of

materials and resources, such as graphic organizers, posters, and songs. She provided activities for early finishers. She invited a community member, a farmer, to come and give a presentation to her students. Her lessons included accommodations for enrichment and remedial students, as well as the slow workers.

Based on the results of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI), Completer 1 had an overall mean score of 2.79. She received a score of acceptable (2) or target (3) on all indicators. She received a target score (3) in the following areas:

- selects developmentally appropriate, performance-based objectives that connect core content knowledge for lessons based on Mississippi Curriculum Frameworks/College and Career Readiness Standards;
- integrates core content knowledge from other subject areas in lessons;
- plans appropriate and sequential teaching procedures that include innovative and interesting introductions and closures, and uses a variety of teaching materials and technology;
- prepares appropriate assessments based on core content knowledge to effectively evaluate learner progress;
- uses acceptable written, oral, and nonverbal communication in planning and instruction;
- provides clear, complete written and/or oral directions for instructional activities;
- communicates high expectations for learning to all students;
- conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning;
- provides opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning;
- demonstrates knowledge of content for the subject(s) taught;
- uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies to enhance student learning;
- elicits input during lessons and allows sufficient wait time for students to expand and support their responses, makes adjustments to lessons according to student input, cues, and individual/group responses;
- monitors and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning;
- attends to or delegates routine tasks;
- uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs;
- creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students;
- maximizes time available for instruction;

- demonstrates use of low profile desists for managing minimally disruptive behavior;
- demonstrates appropriate use of disciplinary action to handle disruptive student misbehavior.

The Completer received an acceptable score (2) in the following areas:
- incorporates diversity, including multicultural perspectives, into lessons, and uses knowledge of student backgrounds, interests, experiences, and prior knowledge to make instruction relevant and meaningful;
- plans differentiated learning experiences that accommodate developmental and/or educational needs of learners based on assessment information which is aligned with core content knowledge;
- communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to the students and provides timely feedback on students' academic performance;
- incorporates a variety of informal and formal assessments to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs;
- provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners (enrichment and remedial);
- engages students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking through higher-order questioning and provides opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking;
- uses family and/or community resources in lessons to enhance student learning;
- establishes opportunities for communication with parents and/or guardians and professional colleagues.

Based on the results of the Teacher Work Sample (TWS), Completer 1 had an overall mean score of 3.0. She received a score of indicator met (3) on all indicators on TWS Section 2: Instructional Objectives and Section 6: Analysis of Student Learning. Completer 1 appropriately met the following indicators dealing with learning objectives:
- develops instructional objectives that are measurable, focused, standards-based, and varied;
- justifies learning objectives with contextual factors;
- aligns objectives with local, state, or national standards;
- identifies the level of each learning objective using Bloom's Taxonomy, DOK, or MS CCRS;
- explains how objectives promote creativity and higher-level thinking.

She appropriately met the following indicators dealing with analyzing student learning:

- able to present assessment data clearly and accurately;
- aligns assessments with learning objectives;
- accurately interprets data and draws conclusions;
- provides evidence of impact on student learning.

The learning goals used to evaluate section 2 of the TWS were provided on the unit lesson plans. Completer 1 developed section 6 of the TWS and provided a graph depicting her pre and post test results for her entire class as well as three students who are in the RTI process. She also analyzed the scores of the student who showed the least amount of improvement and the one who showed the greatest amount of improvement from the pre test to the post test. She analyzed the results and wrote narratives explaining her data. Overall, the results of the analysis of student learning section for Completer 1 showed that all students in her class scored higher on the post-test than the pre-test. While all students did not pass the post-test, they all showed growth.

The supervisor only provided scores on the TIAI and TWS rubrics. There were no comments provided during the formal observation of the TIAI or during the evaluation of the TWS. The completer did provide the unit lesson plans and section 6 of the TWS. The scores Completer 1 received on both the TIAI and TWS are not consistent with the other data collected from the first observation and student surveys. Therefore, it is hard to draw substantial conclusions from this information.

Universal Screener/Benchmark Tests and/or State Tests

The Completer administered the Universal Screener, I-Ready. Between two different administrations submitted, students grew 11% to 21% in the Above Grade Level category and from 68% to 79% in the On Grade Level category. Lower category percentages declined showing growth as seen in a reduction from 11% to 0% in the Two or More Grade Levels Below category.

Data from Participant 2

Interview #1

The Completer was most confident creating lesson plans with engaging learning activities but was least confident with classroom management of older elementary age. Because the Completer had so many students who were on an RTI plan or 504 plan, she felt that she had used these contextual factors to help plan her learning

environment and group activities. To assess prior knowledge, the Completer used pre-tests and teacher questioning. The Completer differentiated instruction by using grouping based on learning style, ability level, and knowledge of topic. These groups were constantly changing based on how students progress with objectives. She also differentiated reading instruction for diverse learners by using leveled passages to teach reading skills and used centers with technology to provide different levels of instruction on the same skill. The Completer used a variety of assessments. Some assessments were teacher-made while others were from various internet sources. The Completer felt confident using technology in the classroom, used iPads and the Smart Board consistently, and integrated internet sites into learning activities. The Completer felt that the pre-internship experience benefitted her by teaching her how to use technology, giving her classroom management experience, and providing experience using learning centers. This experience also helped build her confidence because she had more experience and provided her with more professional experiences that increased her knowledge base. The Completer expressed being most successful at creating lesson plans and finding materials for lessons but expressed being least successful with classroom management and assessment creation.

Interview #2

The Completer set goals for the unit which included using context clues to understand meanings of unknown words. The Completer assessed prior knowledge by giving students a pre-test and using teacher observation during prior learning experiences with unknown words. In order to check for understanding, the Completer used teacher observation while going over examples and by asking questions. The Completer allowed students to practice new content by giving students worksheets with practice items and by providing learning activities on iPads. In order to remediate students, the Completer used small groups which were based on reading levels. She also gave students leveled reading passages when teaching the same skill. The Completer assessed their learning by administering a test and also compared pre- and post-tests results. After reflection of the unit, the Completer expressed that the students were distracted during one day of the unit, and she will need to work on keeping them focused. Reflecting on the participation in this study, the Completer believes it will help her reflect on her teaching more.

Informal Observation by DSU Supervisor

The learning goals were not posted; however, the students knew what they were learning that day. The Completer asked questions to assess prior knowledge, to review what was learned the day before, and to connect the new learning to the previous learning. The Completer connected the content in the chapter book to their real life situations and students' personal lives. All students had the

opportunity to be engaged during the lesson although a few would drift off and lost focus occasionally. As a whole, an approximate 85% of students remained engaged. The Completer used a variety of assessments including pre- and post-tests, I-Ready, teaching questioning, projects, and worksheets. When two random students were questioned about how the teacher knows if they understand, they responded that the grades their work and asks a lot of questions. The Completer used multiple levels of instruction by using centers with enrichment and remedial activities. The teacher also used many thought-provoking questions during the reading of the chapter book. The Completer used technology to enhance her instruction by using iPads and a Smart Board with student response clickers. The Completer had good time management and taught from the beginning of the period to the end of the period with no downtime. The Completer encouraged all students to participate with many diverse students. She often called on students who raise their hands to answer but also called on those who did not raise their hands. All the students were held accountable for doing their assignments, and the Completer redirected those who were not working. The Completer and her assistant worked well together and created an environment conducive to learning. There were posters with previously taught skills displayed on the walls for support along with many reading materials for students. Strengths of this Completer that were observed include preparedness, kindness, and encouragement. Weaknesses of the Completer included a need for greater clarity with the purpose of the lesson and a need for increased small group monitoring.

Principal Observations

Multiple principal evaluations were considered. During one of these, the principal noted that the lesson was aligned to MSCCR Standards and the teacher made connections from learning to real life. During another observation, the principal noted that the teacher needed to meet the goal of providing opportunities for students to choose challenging tasks and instructional materials. She also noted that students needed more opportunities to correct their own errors and to make life connections to the content. She also needed to move more students to a deeper understanding of the content. The Completer did actively seek out meaningful feedback on instruction and proactively sought out professional learning activities. This participant scored highest in the domains of Lesson Design and Professional Responsibilities. Her lowest rating was in the domain of Student Understanding.

Student Perception Survey

Based on student responses, this Completer had the highest mean with questions regarding InTASC Standard 3 (The teacher works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage

positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation), InTASC Standard 5 (The teacher understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues). These specific questions asked students if they knew the behavioral expectations of the teacher, if the teacher treats students with respect, and if their teacher related their learning to other subject areas. The Completer had the lowest mean scores with questions regarding InTASC Standard 1 (The teacher understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences) and InTASC Standard 8 (The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways). These specific questions asked students if the teacher helps them when they make a mistake and if the teacher explains things in different ways to insure understanding.

Formal Observation- TIAI and TWS

The unit of study taught by Completer 2 was an English/language arts unit on context clues with social studies integration. Her lesson plans were written in the format required by her school district and were not consistent with the lesson plan format required in the elementary education program at DSU; although, they did include a few of the same components. Her lesson plans were not detailed and were missing appropriate objectives, procedural statements, and assessments. The plans were aligned to the Mississippi College and Career Readiness Standards. They included shared reading, centers, social studies, and technology daily. It is apparent that the teacher utilized centers for her main instruction. Her plans included accommodations/modifications for students with IEPs, ELL students, and students with a 504. Her plans also include a variety of materials and resources, such as vocabulary games, Kahoot, BrainPop, iReady, and geography projects.

Based on the results of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI), Completer 2 had an overall mean score of 2.79. She received a score of acceptable (2) or target (3) on all indicators. She received a target score (3) in the following areas:

- selects developmentally appropriate, performance-based objectives that connect core content knowledge for lessons based on Mississippi Curriculum Frameworks/College and Career Readiness Standards;

- incorporates diversity, including multicultural perspectives, into lessons, and uses knowledge of student backgrounds, interests, experiences, and prior knowledge to make instruction relevant and meaningful;
- integrates core content knowledge from other subject areas in lessons;
- prepares appropriate assessments based on core content knowledge to effectively evaluate learner progress;
- uses acceptable written, oral, and nonverbal communication in planning and instruction;
- provides clear, complete written and/or oral directions for instructional activities;
- communicates high expectations for learning to all students;
- conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning;
- provides opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning;
- demonstrates knowledge of content for the subject(s) taught;
- provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners (enrichment and remedial);
- elicits input during lessons and allows sufficient wait time for students to expand and support their responses, makes adjustments to lessons according to student input, cues, and individual/group responses;
- monitors and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning;
- attends to or delegates routine tasks;
- uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs;
- creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students;
- maximizes time available for instruction;
- demonstrates use of low profile desists for managing minimally disruptive behavior;
- demonstrates appropriate use of disciplinary action to handle disruptive student misbehavior.

The Completer received an acceptable score (2) in the following areas:
- plans appropriate and sequential teaching procedures that include innovative and interesting introductions and closures, and uses a variety of teaching materials and technology;

- plans differentiated learning experiences that accommodate developmental and/or educational needs of learners based on assessment information which is aligned with core content knowledge;
- communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to the students and provides timely feedback on students' academic performance;
- incorporates a variety of informal and formal assessments to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs;
- uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies to enhance student learning;
- engages students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking through higher-order questioning and provides opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking;
- uses family and/or community resources in lessons to enhance student learning;
- establishes opportunities for communication with parents and/or guardians and professional colleagues.

Based on the results of the Teacher Work Sample (TWS), Completer 2 had an overall mean score of 3.0. She received a score of indicator met (3) on all indicators on TWS Section 2: Instructional Objectives and Section 6: Analysis of Student Learning. Completer 2 appropriately met the following indicators dealing with learning objectives:

- develops instructional objectives that are measurable, focused, standards-based, and varied;
- justifies learning objectives with contextual factors;
- aligns objectives with local, state, or national standards;
- identifies the level of each learning objective using Bloom's Taxonomy, DOK, or MS CCRS;
- explains how objectives promote creativity and higher-level thinking.

She appropriately met the following indicators dealing with analyzing student learning:

- Able to present assessment data clearly and accurately;
- aligns assessments with learning objectives;
- accurately interprets data and draws conclusions;
- provides evidence of impact on student learning.

The pre and post test results depicted in the form of a bar graph were provided by Completer 2. The results of the analysis of student learning section for Completer 2 showed that all but one of the students in her class scored higher on the post-test than the pre-test. One student's scores remained the same as the pre-test, which

was a 50.   While all students did not pass the post-test, they all showed growth except for that one student.

No other data, such as the unit learning goals, were provided for the TWS. Therefore, there is not enough information to draw many substantial conclusions. The scores Completer 2 received on both the TIAI and TWS are not consistent with the other data collected from the first observation and student surveys.

Universal Screener/Benchmark Tests and/or State Test

Two forms of data were collected on this Completer. This Completer administered the I-Ready Universal Screener. This data revealed that 13% of students scored Above Grade Level, 27% of students scored On Grade Level, and 60% of students scored Below Grade Level. The teacher also administered the MAAP test in ELA and results were shown on Questar. This test data revealed that 5% of students scored PL 5 (Advanced); 14.5% of students scored PL 4 (Proficient); 58% of students scored PL3 (Passing); 24.5% of students scored PL2 (Basic); and 5% of students scored PL1 (Minimal).

Participant 3 Data:

Interview #1

Completer was most confident maintaining classroom management, creating classroom routines, and establishing rules and procedures. She was least confident with leading guided reading groups and creating engaging instructional center activities. The Completer stated that contextual factors help her plan her lessons so that all students can learn. The Completer received physical feedback from students in the form of thumbs up or thumbs down if they understood. She also used I-Ready to assess their prior knowledge. To remediate students, the completer pulled lower students in a small group setting for thirty minutes. During this time, she taught remedial objectives, leveled readers, and old tests. They also were given I-Ready lessons to complete. For enrichment activities, the teacher's assistant worked with higher students in a small group for thirty minutes on higher reading levels. They also use I-Ready to give them challenging lessons. To differentiate instruction, the completer used I-Ready data to identify struggling students. Completer stated that since there are so many levels present in her classroom that it was very difficult to differentiate for all learners. In this self-contained classroom, the Completer created her own assessments for ELA but used I-Ready quizzes for math. Concerning technology, the Completer used I-Ready lesson daily for reading and math and her Smart Board for brain breaks and other reading activities. The Completer expressed that the pre-internship helped prepare her to use centers and helped her with time management. It also exposed her to realistic classroom settings. The Completer expressed being most successful at establishing classroom routines and maintaining

classroom management but expressed that she needs more training in teaching students with special needs.

Interview #2

Concerning the observed unit, the Completer set goals for unit and assessed prior knowledge using a worksheet. To gauge the students' learning, the Completer used a student physical response (thumbs up/thumbs down) to indicate understanding. In order to give students practice with the new content, the completer provided activities in a writing center and showed students hand motions to represent material. The Completer worked with students who needed remediation in the afternoon after the lesson was completed. The teacher had the students demonstrate their learning through creative writing and a worksheet then evaluated progress by giving an I-Ready lesson on the computer. The Completer did not see any way this experience helped her since she will be teaching in a different grade the following year.

Informal Observation by DSU Supervisor

During the formal observations, the learning objectives were not posted. The young students were limited in their responses to questions about what they were learning about. They simply said they were learning about dinosaurs. The Completer used I-Ready to assess prior knowledge and then planed lessons at centers to work on skills. There was no clear real life application observed, but all students were engaged and on task. For assessment, the Completer used I-Ready. There was little differentiation in lesson, and all the students were doing the same thing. Technology was used daily in centers with the I-Ready program. The Completer had good time management and gave students plenty of notice before transitions occurred. Regardless of diversity, the Completer involved all students in the learning process and created a neat and organized learning environment with set routines. Strengths of this completer included planning for instruction and setting routines. Weaknesses of this completer included additional training on guided reading, giving more feedback to students, understanding how to help students master objectives.

Principal Observations

Multiple principal evaluations were provided. During the first informal observation, principal noted that there needs to be more differentiation and data driven instruction. She also noted that the teacher was demonstrating the skill well and was very encouraging. In the second informal observation, principal noted that students know and understand rules and expectations, teacher is well organized, materials are accessible, teacher scaffolds whole group instruction, and transitions are smooth. In the third informal observation, principal noted that teacher used

effective questioning to support learning goals, communicated respectfully to all students, aligned lesson to MSCCR standards, and created an orderly learning environment. She also noted that the teacher should use more differentiated learning activities. In the summative formal evaluation, the principal noted that the completer was strongest in Domain III: Culture and Learning Environment and Domain I: Lesson Design.   Her weakest area was Domain II: Student Understanding.

Student Perception Survey

Based on student responses, this Completer had the highest mean with questions regarding InTASC Standard 1(The teacher understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences), InTASC Standard 3 (Standard #3: Learning Environments. The teacher works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation), and InTASC Standard 6 (The teacher understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making). These specific questions asked the students if the teacher uses the community to help them learn, if they know their teacher's expectations for behavior, if their teacher treats them with respect, and if their teacher uses technology to help them learn. The Completer had the lowest mean scores for questions pertaining to InTASC Standard 2 (The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards), InTASC Standard 4 (The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content), and InTASC Standard 7 (The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context). These specific questions asked students if their teacher knew when they needed help, if their teacher explained content in different ways to insure understanding, and if the teacher's lessons were interesting.

Formal Observation- TIAI and TWS

The unit of study taught by Completer 3 was a math unit on counting to 100 by ones. Her lesson plans were written in the format required by her school district and were not consistent with the lesson plan format required in the elementary

education program at DSU; although, they did include a few of the same components. Her lesson plans were not detailed and were missing appropriate objectives, procedural statements, and assessments. The plans were aligned to the Mississippi College and Career Readiness Standards. They included "I can" statements for the students. They included the following sections: Introduction, modeled instruction, guided practice, independent practice.   They also included a list of math vocabulary words the students needed to know during the lesson. Due to the lack of detail and appropriate procedural statements, it is difficult to determine if the completer planned an appropriate lesson utilizing the principles of differentiated instruction or best practices.

Based on the results of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI), Completer 3 had an overall mean score of 1.83. She received a score of acceptable (2) or emerging (1) on all indicators. She did not receive a target (3) on any indicators. She did not receive an unacceptable (0) on any indicators. She received an acceptable score (2) in the following areas:

- incorporates diversity, including multicultural perspectives, into lessons, and uses knowledge of student backgrounds, interests, experiences, and prior knowledge to make instruction relevant and meaningful;
- integrates core content knowledge from other subject areas in lessons;
- uses acceptable written, oral, and nonverbal communication in planning and instruction;
- provides clear, complete written and/or oral directions for instructional activities;
- communicates high expectations for learning to all students;
- conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning;
- provides opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning;
- demonstrates knowledge of content for the subject(s) taught;
- uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies to enhance student learning;
- elicits input during lessons and allows sufficient wait time for students to expand and support their responses, makes adjustments to lessons according to student input, cues, and individual/group responses;
- monitors and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning;
- attends to or delegates routine tasks;
- creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students;
- maximizes time available for instruction;

- establishes opportunities for communication with parents and/or guardians and professional colleagues;
- demonstrates use of low profile desists for managing minimally disruptive behavior;
- demonstrates appropriate use of disciplinary action to handle disruptive student misbehavior.

Completer 3 received an emerging score (1) in the following areas:
- selects developmentally appropriate, performance-based objectives that connect core content knowledge for lessons based on Mississippi Curriculum Frameworks/College and Career Readiness Standards;
- plans appropriate and sequential teaching procedures that include innovative and interesting introductions and closures, and uses a variety of teaching materials and technology;
- plans differentiated learning experiences that accommodate developmental and/or educational needs of learners based on assessment information which is aligned with core content knowledge;
- communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to the students and provides timely feedback on students' academic performance;
- incorporates a variety of informal and formal assessments to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs;
- provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners (enrichment and remedial);
- engages students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking through higher-order questioning and provides opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking;
- uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs.

The DSU supervisor did not observe the following two indicators during the formal TIAI observation and could not provide a score:
- prepares appropriate assessments based on core content knowledge to effectively evaluate learner progress;
- uses family and/or community resources in lessons to enhance student learning.

The following comments were provided by the supervisor during the formal TIAI observation: Plans do not contain introduction or closure; did not prepare appropriate assessments; the early finishers' activity was not based on the

assessment planned; uses i-Ready for assessment; not always kind to students; and sends newsletter home.

Based on the results of the Teacher Work Sample (TWS), Completer 3 had an overall mean score of 1.56. She received either a score of 2 (indicator partially met) or 1 (indicator not met) on the indicators on TWS Section 2: Instructional Objectives and Section 6: Analysis of Student Learning. Completer 3 partially met the following indicators dealing with learning objectives:

- justifies learning objectives with contextual factors
- aligns objectives with local, state, or national standards.

She did not meet the following indicators dealing with learning objectives:

- develops instructional objectives that are measurable, focused, standards-based, and varied;
- identifies the level of each learning objective using Bloom's Taxonomy, DOK, or MS CCRS;
- explains how objectives promote creativity and higher-level thinking.

Candidate 3 partially met the following indicators dealing with analyzing student learning:

- able to present assessment data clearly and accurately;
- aligns assessments with learning objectives;
- accurately interprets data and draws conclusions.

She did not meet the following indicator dealing with analyzing student learning:

- provides evidence of impact on student learning.

Section 2 and Section 6 of the TWS were not provided to the supervisor by the completer. The graph depicting the pre and post test scores was not provided. There was also no qualitative data submitted by the supervisor. Therefore, there was not enough information to draw substantial conclusions from the TWS for Completer 3.

Universal Screener/Benchmark Tests and/or State Test

This Completer administered the Universal Screener I-Ready in both reading and math. The reading data revealed that 95% of students are on or above grade level whereas 5% of students are only one grade level below. In math, the data revealed that 86% of students are on or above grade level while 14% of students are one grade level below.

Participant #4 Data:

Interview #1

Completer was most confident with classroom management and relationship building with students but was least confident in answering student questions on content. Completer stated that contextual factors contributed to the development and pacing of his lessons. Because of the low socioeconomic status and family educational background of his students, she slowed down her pace in order for them to master concepts. Due to beginning her employment in the middle of the school year, the Completer gave students a chapter test on previously taught material to gauge the level of knowledge and mastery on previously taught skills. The Completer accommodated different reading levels by reading content material as a class. Then students answered written questions individually to check for understanding. As a follow-up, the completer went over answers and required students to explain why the answers are or are not correct. Completer uses commercially made tests and alters them for her specific purposes.

Interview #2

The Completer set goals for the unit and assessed prior knowledge by giving a pre-test. Then, she used that data to create the unit. The Completer frequently checks for student understanding by asking questions and giving bell ringers at the beginning of each class. The bell ringer asked questions from the previous day's lesson. Students were given practice with the content by answer questions, collaborating with classmates, and participating in class discussions. There was limited focused remediation or enrichment. Instead, students were given a study guide at the end of the lesson and were given a variety of experiences to help them answer the questions. This included independent research, collaboration with peers, class discussions, and teacher explanations. Students demonstrated their learning by completing a project and taking a test. The Completer used the MSCCR 8th Grade Science Standards and pacing guide to evaluate her students' progress. This experience helped the completer reflect more on his teaching

Informal Observation by DSU Supervisor

During the observation, the learning goals were not posted; however, random students were questioned. These students had a rudimentary knowledge of what was being learned. The Completer questioned the students about the prior unit and connected that learning to the projects being completed. During this lesson on weather, there was very limited connection to real life situations. Most students were engaged as they worked on projects in small groups. Although there were no assessments observed, the students tell the observer that their teacher used demonstrations, examples, quizzes, questioning, discussions, and tests to assess

their learning. The Completer used questioning to help students extend their learning to a higher Bloom level and apply their learning to the projects. The Completer also used groups to provide different options for learners. The Completer used technology by showing videos of example projects and allowing students to research on computers and phones. The Completer used time wisely and had smooth transitions. The Completer did not discriminate against any students but rather encouraged all to participate and work together. The classroom environment promoted learning because the seating arrangement was conducive for group work yet gives students individual space to learn independently. There was also access to computers for additional learning. Strengths of the Completer included knowledge about the topic, good classroom management, and good use of questioning while weaknesses included a need to use resources more wisely to optimize learning and reduce wasted time.

Principal Observations

Three observations by the principal were provided. During the first observation, the principal observed that all students were on task, teacher was using technology to enhance instruction, and teacher had work for early finishers. During the second observation, the principal observed that objectives were displayed as I Can statements, all students were engaged, and teacher used bell ringers to review previously learned skills. During the third observation, the principal observed that objectives were clearly displayed as I Can statements, all students were engaged, and the teacher was monitoring independent student practice.

Student Perception Survey

Based on student responses, this Completer had the highest mean with questions regarding InTASC Standard 4 (The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content) and InTASC Standard 5 (The teacher understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues). These specific questions asked the students if their teacher could explain content in a way that helps them understand and if their teacher taught them to solve problems using what they learned. This Completer had the lowest mean with questions regarding InTASC Standard 1 (The teacher understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences), InTASC Standard 3 (The teacher

works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation), and InTASC Standard 8 (The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways). These specific questions asked the students if their teacher used the community to help them learn, if they were not afraid to ask questions in class, and if their teacher explained things in different ways to insure understanding.

Formal Observation- TIAI and TWS

The unit of study taught by Completer 4 was a science unit on natural disasters. Her lesson plans were written in the format required by her school district and were not completely consistent with the lesson plan format required in the education program at DSU; although, they did include some of the same components. The plans included: Objectives that were aligned to the Mississippi College and Career Readiness Standards, bell ringer, introduction, guided practice, independent practice, closure, assessment, and homework. Her plans include accommodations/modifications for students with special needs. Based on the information provided in the lesson plans, there was a lack of differentiated instruction, and a variety of materials and resources were not used.

Based on the results of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI), Completer 4 had an overall mean score of 2.63. She received a score of acceptable (2) or target (3) on all indicators. She received a target score (3) in the following areas:
- integrates core content knowledge from other subject areas in lessons;
- plans appropriate and sequential teaching procedures that include innovative and interesting introductions and closures, and uses a variety of teaching materials and technology;
- uses acceptable written, oral, and nonverbal communication in planning and instruction;
- provides clear, complete written and/or oral directions for instructional activities;
- communicates high expectations for learning to all students;
- conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning;
- demonstrates knowledge of content for the subject(s) taught;
- uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies to enhance student learning;
- monitors and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning;

- uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs;
- creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students;
- maximizes time available for instruction;
- demonstrates use of low profile desists for managing minimally disruptive behavior;
- demonstrates appropriate use of disciplinary action to handle disruptive student misbehavior.

The Completer received an acceptable score (2) in the following areas:
- selects developmentally appropriate, performance-based objectives that connect core content knowledge for lessons based on Mississippi Curriculum Frameworks/College and Career Readiness Standards;
- incorporates diversity, including multicultural perspectives, into lessons, and uses knowledge of student backgrounds, interests, experiences, and prior knowledge to make instruction relevant and meaningful;
- prepares appropriate assessments based on core content knowledge to effectively evaluate learner progress;
- plans differentiated learning experiences that accommodate developmental and/or educational needs of learners based on assessment information which is aligned with core content knowledge;
- provides opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning;
- provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners (enrichment and remedial);
- engages students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking through higher-order questioning and provides opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking;
- elicits input during lessons and allows sufficient wait time for students to expand and support their responses, makes adjustments to lessons according to student input, cues, and individual/group responses;
- uses family and/or community resources in lessons to enhance student learning;
- attends to or delegates routine tasks
- establishes opportunities for communication with parents and/or guardians and professional colleagues.

The DSU supervisor did not observe the following two indicators during the formal TIAI observation and could not provide a score:

- communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to the students and provides timely feedback on students' academic performance;
- incorporates a variety of informal and formal assessments to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs.

The supervisor made the following comments during the formal TIAI observation: demonstration, discussion, and inquiry were used; communicates with parents during extracurricular activities, such as baseball and basketball; uses active parent/active student; she went over the rubric for the science project; students get to choose the topic for the project; videos are provided on each topic that the students can choose from; Completer 3 discusses and explains each video; she asks questions about the topics, for example, "Have you ever seen a tornado tube?"; she discussed how they used to build them and add things to them when she was younger; she addresses a student talking and making comments during the lesson; she asked students for any other ideas; she looked up ideas the students gave and watched videos; she called students up to her desk one by one to see his/her averages; and discussed the exam.

Based on the results of the Teacher Work Sample (TWS), Completer 4 had an overall mean score of 2.78. She received a score of indicator met (3) or indicator partially met (2) on the indicators on TWS Section 2: Instructional Objectives. She received a score of indicator met (3) on all indicators in Section 6: Analysis of Student Learning. Completer 2 appropriately met the following indicators dealing with learning objectives:

- develops instructional objectives that are measurable, focused, standards-based, and varied;
- justifies learning objectives with contextual factors;
- explains how objectives promote creativity and higher-level thinking.

She partially met the following indicators dealing with learning objectives:

- aligns objectives with local, state, or national standards
- identifies the level of each learning objective using Bloom's Taxonomy, DOK, or MS CCRS.

She appropriately met the following indicators dealing with analyzing student learning:

- able to present assessment data clearly and accurately;
- aligns assessments with learning objectives;

- accurately interprets data and draws conclusions;
- provides evidence of impact on student learning.

A copy of the pre/post test was provided to the supervisor. The questions were well developed and reflect the information covered in the unit.

Section 2 and Section 6 of the TWS were not provided to the supervisor by the completer. The graph depicting the pre and post test scores was not provided. There was also no qualitative data submitted by the supervisor. Therefore, there was not enough information to draw substantial conclusions from the TWS for Completer 4.

Universal Screener/Benchmark Tests and/or State Tests

During the year, this Completer administered the Case benchmark tests to assess student learning in science. At the beginning of the year assessment, 10 % of students scored Advanced, 27% of students scored Proficient, 29% of students scored Basic, and 34% of students scored Minimal. At the end of the year, the final Case benchmark test data showed 10% of students in Advanced, 33% of students in Proficient, 28% of students in Basic, and 29% of students in Minimal. According to these results, students scoring in the Advanced and Proficient categories increased while students scoring in the lowest category decreased.

XI.   **Implications and Further Questions**
Commonalities across the evaluated areas seem to bear consideration. First of all, all Completers established routines, used small groups, implemented technology, established effective learning environments, and used a variety of assessments. DSU Supervisors and principals observed candidates engaging students and using assessments (some more than others). Using screeners and test scores, Completers raised achievement levels in all four classrooms. However, Completers were not as successful with clarity of lesson objectives, classroom management, support of all learners, and differentiated instruction. Completers also needed more training on designing and administering a variety of assessments.

During this first cycle of data collection, several issues were discovered. First, there must be a greater clarity for the purpose data collection for the study. Therefore, DSU supervisors must be more detailed on their observation and interview forms. Also, additional information must be collected to effectively analyze the data from the TWS. DSU Supervisors need to collect lesson plans from the unit and provide an annotated TWS rubric instead of simply scoring the rubric.

From this study, there are some implications to our programs. Positively, DSU programs provided effective preparation to Completers in lesson design and learning environments. Conversely, DSU programs needed improvement in preparing students in the areas of student understanding and should offer increased instruction on remediation and enrichment of students in different content areas. This would include not only differentiated instruction but also assessment design and administration.

APPENDIX A: IRB Approval

APPENDIX B: Supervisor Training Agenda

APPENDIX C: TIAI

APPENDIX D: TWS

APPENDIX E: Invitation to Completers

APPENDIX F: Memorandums of Understanding with P-12 Schools

APPENDIX G1 and G2: Interview Questionnaires

APPENDIX H: Informal Observation Instrument

APPENDIX I: Student Perception Survey

APPENDIX J: Student Perception Survey Content Validity Results

CITATION FOR VINLOVE STUDY