

EPP CASE STUDY REPORT FOR 2019-2020

I. Audience

The CAEP Standard 4 Committee conducted a second cycle of Case Study regarding DSU's teaching effectiveness and ability to facilitate student learning during the second cycle from Fall 2019 to Fall 2020. The committee reviewed the findings in Fall 2020 and shared results with faculty members at the CAEP Fall Retreat in November 2020. In Spring 2021, 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. In the meantime, DSU has committed resources to continue and expand the case study process.

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. 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 fall 2020, the Standard 4 Committee met and identified four programs to use for the second cycle of data: the Elementary Education program, the Special Education program, the SPED program, the secondary English program, and the MAT program. Moving forward, the Committee refined 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 eight identified completers, and program coordinators also contacted them personally to encourage them to participate (see APPENDIX E). Initially all seven completers accepted the invitation. These completers were from four different school districts in areas served by DSU. (including 3 near Cleveland, MS, one in suburban Jackson, MS and one in the northwest portion of the state). As supervisors were directed to communicate expectations with completers, completers were reluctant to participate due to the additional workload. However, repeated communication and encouragement to participate allowed completers to overcome their various concerns.

V. Communication with P-12 Schools and Extenuating Circumstances.

MOUs were sent to each school district in which the 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 identified completers. Due to the occurrence of the Covid-19 pandemic, the implementation of the case study suffered severe setbacks. Most evaluators were unable to visit the schools because schools were either not in session or were attempting to teach virtually. Another barrier that the pandemic caused was a cancellation of state testing which prohibited DSU faculty from collecting this important piece of assessment data.

VI. Final Completers

After much communication and encouragement, the committee was able to identify eight completers. The first three completers were elementary teachers and a secondary English teacher in a district in the northwestern area of the state. This district has a low socioeconomic district with a majority of African American students. The fourth completer was from an HPER program in the Cleveland area. This school district is a low socioeconomic district with a majority of African American students. The fifth and sixth completers were elementary teachers from the Jackson area in a higher socioeconomic school district with predominantly Caucasian students. The seventh completer was from the SPED program and was also from the Jackson area in a higher socioeconomic secondary school with predominantly Caucasian population. The eighth completer was from the MAT program who taught secondary history in a Cleveland area district. This school district is a low socioeconomic district with a majority of African American students. Seven out of eight completers were located in Title 1 schools which means that at least 40% of students were from low income families.

VII. Chronicle of Events

A timeline was developed for the 2019-2020 data cycle, starting in October 2019 and continuing through August 2020. In October 2019, Dori Bullock, Anjanette Powers, and Merideth Van Namen met with Kathe Rasch (a senior advisor) 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 and what changes could improve the quality of data collected. Eight completers were identified with four

elementary education completers, one secondary education English completer, one HPER completer, one special education completer, and one MAT program completer teaching secondary social studies.

During October and November 2019, invitations were sent to each of the eight completers (see APPENDIX E). In January 2020, Dori Bullock and Anjanette Powers conducted a more in-depth training on the different refined instruments to be used by DSU supervisors based upon needs for more specific data. Each supervisor received the names of their assigned completers. DSU supervisors contacted their Completers and shared the expectations with them. DSU supervisors completed Student Perception Surveys with the completer's K-12 students, conducted the first completer Interview, collected universal screeners and other test data from the beginning of the school year, and collected principal evaluations.

In February 2020, DSU Supervisors conducted the informal observation. During March 2020, DSU faculty involved encountered many obstacles with formal observations due to the Covid-19 outbreak. With some observations scheduled before spring break (about the time of the country's lockdown), half of the formal observations did occur. However, the second half of completers were unable to teach their unit since schools were closed statewide after spring break. Further events on the timeline outlined in the Protocol were unable to occur due to the Covid-19 pandemic. This would include end-of-the-year state testing, end-of-the-year benchmark testing, second Completer Interview Questionnaire, and final principal evaluations.

In October 2019 to January 2020, final data were collected from DSU Supervisors. The data was analyzed for the Case Study, identifying themes and implications for DSU programs. What follows are the results of what DSU was able to implement and analyze.

VIII. Development of Instruments

In order to obtain the necessary data, several instruments had to be created in 2018-2019 and refined in 2019-2020. 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 administration of the survey.

DSU Supervisors were supposed 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 and refined the Informal Observation Tool that the DSU supervisors would use 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 aligned with and provided data for CAEP Component 4.2.

CAEP component 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. The Standard 4 Committee made changes to second interview based on implications from the first cycle.

Committee members identified another instrument that would be used to gather data for CAEP Component 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 DSU Teacher Work Sample (TWS) rubric to gather information for CAEP Component 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 (Appendix D).

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

Drawing upon experience from the pilot cycle of 2018-2019, eight completers were quickly identified for the Case Study and were contacted, drawing from the Elementary Education program, SPED program, HPER program, Secondary English program, and MAT program.

The team began collecting data from the Completers in January 2020, including the Student Perception Survey, principal evaluations from the beginning of the year, First Program Completer Interview Questionnaire, and universal screener/benchmark testing data. Formal evaluations were scheduled for March 2020 and were planned to be followed up with the Second Program Completer Interview Questionnaire.

In mid-March 2020, the Covid-19 pandemic occurred, resulting in the closure of all Mississippi schools and a cancellation of end-of-the-year state testing. This created a significant obstacle in conducting the remaining formal observations and second interview and collecting test data and end-of-the-year principal evaluations.

After collecting the data from all the DSU supervisors in September/October 2020, it revealed some missing pieces of data from several of our Completers that were not collected before the pandemic occurred.

X. Participant Data

Data from Participant 1

Interview #1

The completer was most confident in content knowledge in Physical Education, but was least confident with classroom management of younger children. The completer also felt confident stating clear learning outcomes and assessing through observation and questioning. Using contextual factors from her classes, she differentiated her instruction by using learning groups, types of activities, and different types of equipment that was appropriate for both abled and disabled students. She felt confident modeling skills to students and giving immediate feedback to students when completing performance assessments. For students who needed remediation, she worked one-on-one with them. In order to incorporate the community, the completer led discussions about the physical activities the students participate in at home. The completer feels that she needs additional support with designing and implementing enrichment for advanced students. She also was not confident in maintaining attention when explaining rules and giving directions.

Interview #2

The completer led a discussion which included questioning to activate prior knowledge before the unit. The completer demonstrated the skill, asked questions during the lesson to check for understanding, provided multiple activities during the lesson to give students practice with the new skill, and monitored the students' practice with the skill for mastery. For remediation, the completer pulled struggling students aside for one-on-one reteaching and additional practice. For enrichment, the completer provided tasks that required more advanced physical 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 checklists with a scale of 1-5 to monitor progress. When implementing her unit, she realized that she needed to adjust the room arrangement and grouping in order for the learning activity to be more

effective. After reflection of her unit, she analyzed data from the checklists 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 differentiating her lessons for her students according to their skill levels and the importance of being flexible when change is needed for success.

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 about previously learned healthy habits and the previous unit's skills in golf in order to assess prior learning for the current unit. The completer connects this lesson to real life by relating the healthy habit of recharging to their needs as humans. Several tasks were assigned during this time, including those who were hitting balls and those were collecting the balls. For assessments, the completer used questioning and teacher observation of performance tasks. When two random students were questioned about how the teacher knows if they understand, they responded that she watches them do their work. The completer did not use multiple levels of instruction. The completer uses technology to enhance instruction by playing soothing music while students practice hitting the golf balls. The music also serves as an indicator of rotation times for centers. All students, regardless of diversity, participated and were called on during class discussion and teacher questioning. The completer created an effective learning environment by providing a clutter free environment, appropriate spacing, and smooth transitions. No strengths or weakness were specified by the DSU Supervisor.

Principal Observations

No data for this instrument were submitted due to Covid-19

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), 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 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 how their teacher's behavioral expectations, if their teacher explains the importance of what they are learning, and if their teacher teaches them how to solve problems using previously learned skills. The completer had the lowest mean with questions regarding 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), 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), and 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 students needed help, used technology to aid instruction, and used classwork to help students understand skill.

Formal Observation- TIAI and TWS

The unit of study taught by Completer 1 was a physical education unit on golf. Her lesson plans included learning objectives, warm up activities, core learning activities which included the teaching of the skills, closures, and assessments. Her instructional methods included visual demonstrations, modeling, various questioning techniques, and hands-on materials. She integrated other core subject areas into her lessons, such as math.

During the formal observation of the TIAI unit lesson, the DSU supervisor noted the Completer did an excellent job of monitoring her students while they were working at learning stations. She adjusted her groups at one point during the lesson when she noticed a few of her students were becoming slightly off task. She provided the students with clear directions and gave immediate and corrective feedback throughout her lesson. She asked good questions and kept the students actively engaged and on task.

Based on the results of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI), Completer 1 had an overall mean score of 2.53. 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;
- 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;
- incorporates a variety of informal and formal assessments to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs;
- 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;
- monitors and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning;
- 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 appropriate use of disciplinary action to handle disruptive student misbehavior.

The Completer received an acceptable score (2) in the following areas:

- 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;
- uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies to enhance student 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;
- uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs;
- demonstrates use of low profile desists for managing minimally disruptive behavior;
- demonstrates appropriate use of disciplinary action to handle disruptive student misbehavior.

Completer 1 developed both Section 2: Learning Goals and Section 6: Analysis of Student Learning of the TWS to accompany her unit on golf. Her learning goals were appropriate and aligned to the Mississippi College and Career Readiness Standards as well as the National Association of Sport and Physical Education Standards. Under each of her learning goals, she included the knowledge and skills the students would glean from mastering the goals. She also used Bloom's Taxonomy in the development of the learning goals.

For section 6 of the TWS, graphs and an in-depth analysis were provided for the following: whole class pre-skills test, whole class post skills test, male pre skills test, male post test skills test, female pre skills test, female post test skills test, male and female most growth skills test, whole group written golf pretest, male written golf pretest, female written golf pretest. She analyzed the results from each of these assessments and wrote narratives explaining her data. After administering the various pretests, Completer 1 used the data to guide her instruction on the proper techniques for holding golf clubs, positioning their feet and body, and swinging the golf clubs. She used the data to assist her in differentiating her instruction during her lessons. A comparison was conducted on the pre and post test data looking specifically at the difference in the male and female students test results. The results showed that the females' post test scores increased the most from their pretest scores. 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, and optimal learning was achieved.

Based on the results of the Teacher Work Sample (TWS), Completer 1 had an overall mean score of 2.78. She received a score of indicator met (3) on all but one of the indicators on TWS Section 2: Instructional Objectives. She received a score of indicator met (3) on all but one of the indicators on Section 6: Analysis of Student Learning.

Completer 1 appropriately met (3) the following indicators concerning learning objectives:

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

Completer 1 partially met (2) the following indicators concerning learning objectives:

- justifies learning objectives with contextual factors.

Completer 1 appropriately met (3) the following indicators concerning analyzing student learning:

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

Completer 1 partially met (2) the following indicators concerning analyzing student learning:

- aligns assessments with learning objectives.

Universal Screener/Benchmark Tests and/or State Tests

No test data available due to Covid-19.

Data from Participant 2

Interview #1

The completer was most teaching phonics and phonemic awareness due to preparation in classes at DSU. However, she felt least confident teaching math due

to a lack of hands-on math instruction at DSU. With contextual factors, she was challenged with dealing with a lot of home issues that she was not prepared for. To assess prior knowledge, the completer used short quizzes from computer programs and teacher questioning. For remediation, the completer utilized different stations in which she could work with students; she also provides a lot of teacher-led instruction to guide students through difficult material. As for enrichment, the completer provides more challenging writing activities and small group activities for those who need more challenge. The completer used a variety of assessments. Some assessments were teacher-made while others were from various internet sources. The completer found that differentiating in her classroom was difficult; however, she did clarify vocabulary for ELL students. The completer felt confident using technology in the classroom, used the Smart Board consistently, and integrated internet sites and videos into learning activities. Unfortunately, her classroom does not have a 1:1 computer-student ratio. The completer felt that the pre-internship experience benefitted her by teaching her how to provide hands-on instruction for ELA; however, she felt that it did not prepare her for dealing with the contextual factors of her current area. The completer expressed a need for a mentor from her current area and more guidance in math instruction.

Interview #2

No data were available due to Covid-19.

Informal Observation by DSU Supervisor

No data were available due to Covid-19.

Principal Observations

Multiple principal evaluations were considered. During one of these, the principal noted that the completer possessed good classroom management skills and utilized data and assessments to implement data driven instruction. During another observation, the principal noted that the completer needed to implement small groups more effectively. She also noted that the completer gave positive feedback to students, possessed good time management, and displayed smooth transitions. In an additional observation, the principal noted that students were engaged in educational task at a high level. Furthermore, the principal noted that the completer displayed professionalism with colleagues, participated in professional learning communities, collaborated well with her colleagues, and communicated well with parents. This participant scored highest in the domains of

Culture and Learning, 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 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), 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), 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), 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). These specific questions asked students if their teacher helped them when they made mistakes, pushed them to do their best, had clear behavioral expectations, helped them in different ways when they did not understand, and explained the importance of what they are learning. 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 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 the teacher incorporated the community into their learning and if the students knew what they were supposed to learn every day. Standard 3 appears in both highest and lowest because of responses to separate questions.

Formal Observation- TIAI and TWS

No data were available due to Covid-19.

Universal Screener/Benchmark Tests and/or State Test

Due to Covid-19, we obtained limited data from benchmark testing. Instead of having three cycles of testing, all students were only given the fall administration after four weeks of instruction. On the NWEA benchmark test in ELA, 70.4% of students met the standard.

Participant 3 Data:

Interview #1

Completer was most confident working one-on-one with students. She was least confident handling IEPs and using intervention data which was required with the contextual factors that I had present in my room. The completer stated that contextual factors have required her to work harder to build connections and motivate her students due to it being a low-economic school. To assess prior knowledge, the completer used NWEA and DIBELS to assess prior knowledge along with pre-test for each unit. To remediate students, the completer conducts a lot of remediation for math but did not clarify how she did this. For ELA remediation, she pulled students into small groups for LLI (Leveled Literacy Instruction). For enrichment activities, she required her students who needed more challenge to construct original math problems and surveys then plot the data on a graph. To differentiate instruction, the completer used guided reading groups along with stations that integrated phonics and reading. In this self-contained classroom, the completer used district made tests for math and created her own tests for ELA. Concerning technology, the completer used the smartboard daily with instruction. The completer expressed that the pre-internship helped prepare her to develop lesson plans correctly, scaffold instruction, build confidence, and learn classroom management skills. The completer expressed being most successful at reading instruction and setting up routines and procedures but expressed that she needs more training in documentation and providing interventions for struggling students.

Interview #2

No data were available due to Covid-19.

Informal Observation by DSU Supervisor

No data were available due to Covid-19.

Principal Observations

Multiple principal evaluations were provided. During the first informal observation, principal noted that the completer exhibited good classroom management and used effective questioning and scaffolding. She also noted that the teacher remediated students in small groups along and used her teacher assistant effectively with remediation. In the second informal observation, principal noted that all activities were not aligned with the objectives, but the Completer used good time management and communication skills. In the third observation, principal noted that teacher provided multiple reading experiences to differentiate instruction and helped struggling students. The principal also noted that the teacher maintained good parent communication and performed various in professional tasks including working in PLCs, collaborating with peers, and pursuing a higher degree.

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), 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 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). These specific questions asked the students if their teacher explained things differently if they did not understand, set clear expectations, helped them if they made a mistake, and provided a safe environment. The completer had the lowest mean scores for questions pertaining to 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) 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 created interesting lessons and related different content areas to their learning.

Formal Observation- TIAI and TWS

No data were available due to Covid-19.

Universal Screener/Benchmark Tests and/or State Test

Due to Covid-19, we obtained limited data from benchmark testing. Instead of having three cycles of testing, all students were only given the winter administration after twenty weeks of instruction. On the NWEA benchmark test in ELA, 73% of students met or exceeded the standard. On the NWEA benchmark test in Math, 64% of students met or exceed the standard.

Participant #4 Data:*Interview #1*

Completer was most confident with content literacy, teaching comprehension and text features, using centers, and transitioning between activities but was least confident in teaching writing and dealing with parents. Due to her contextual factors including several ELL students, advanced students, behavioral issues, she taught at various levels, learned to maintain the students' attention while distractive behavior occurred, and curbed behavior without distracting other students. She also adjusted the homework load due to the diverse group of families and homelives. With students who have no support at home, she worked with those students in small groups. To assess prior learning, the completer used questioning, observation, I-Ready data, checklists, and running records. For remediation, she pulled students into small groups and guided reading groups daily for ELA and after every three math lessons. The completer felt that she needed to show improvement with using enrichment activities. She enriched lessons primarily by increasing the level of work during computer work in both math and ELA. She did use peer tutoring as a way to enrich and remediate simultaneously. As for assessments, the completer uses tests provided by the district curriculum which includes formative and summative assessments (running records, rubrics, exit tickets, quizzes). The completer differentiated her instruction for her ELL students by using many visuals and peer tutoring. She also provided many active learning experiences, including movements and manipulatives, for her many kinesthetic learners. In reading, she differentiates instruction by providing instruction at different levels while using guided reading groups and conferencing with students after their running record assessment. With technology, the completer used technology effectively to enhance her whole group instruction and to aid in accountability in independent center work. The completer found the easiest tasks to be establishing a learning

environment, organizing centers, and managing the classroom. She seeks more training with technology and with diverse teaching strategies in math.

Interview #2

No data were available due to Covid-19.

Informal Observation by DSU Supervisor

During the observation, the learning goals were not posted; however, random students were questioned. These students showed understanding of what was being learned. The completer reminded the students about the math lesson and connected that learning to the current skill. During this lesson, there was very limited connection to real life situations. Most students were engaged as they worked on math problems independently. During the lesson, the completer frequently assessed students' understanding by asking questions and monitoring students while working. The completer used questioning to help students extend their learning to a higher Bloom level and apply their learning to the math skill while analyzing the problems, applying the correct strategy, remembering math facts, and creating models of their problems. She also provided superior modeling of the skill and scaffolded instruction to increase mastery. The completer used technology by providing centers using Chromebooks and using the smartboard to work math problems. 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. She allowed ELL students to share their answers using nonlinguistic representations. 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 Chromebooks for additional learning, many anchor charts, reading resources, and readily accessible supplies. Strengths of the completer included knowledge about the topic, good classroom management, and good use of questioning while weaknesses include maintaining attention during lessons and communicating the purpose and objectives of the lesson.

Principal Observations

In the formal observation conducted by the principal, the principal noted that the completer pushed students to think accurately and be accountable for their own learning. The completer developed good lessons and monitored student progress to increase learning. She also used effective questioning to guide students to a deeper understanding and created a collaborative yet structured learning environment. She scored highest in the following domains: Lesson Design and Professional

Responsibilities. She scores lowest in Student Understanding, yet this was still a high score.

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 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). These specific questions asked the students if their teacher explained things in different ways to increase understanding and helps them when they make a mistake. This completer had the lowest mean with questions regarding 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 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 the students if their teacher knows when they need help and if the students know what they are supposed to learn every day.

Formal Observation- TIAI and TWS

The unit of study taught by Completer 4 was a language arts unit on identifying the different types of texts. Her lesson plans were written in the format required by her school. Her lesson plans included learning goals, introductory activities, direct instruction which included modeling and explanations, question stems, and the use of various texts. Provisions were made daily for guided reading groups. The lesson plans were aligned to the Mississippi College and Career Readiness Standards. Her daily schedule also included the following: character education integration, interactive read alouds with science and social studies integration, journal prompts, independent reading, enrichment and remedial activities, writer's workshop block, phonics and shared reading, interactive writing, reading mini-lessons, guided reading, and learning centers.

During the formal observation of the TIAI unit lesson, the DSU supervisor noted the Completer had good rapport with her students, was enthusiastic, and had high expectations for them. She was knowledgeable of the content she was teaching and

provided opportunities to discuss the content by providing rich discussion during whole group time, providing demonstration of the skill by modeling, and used technology to reinforce the skill with the interactive sorting game on the Smart Board. She attended to her students' needs and provided different levels of support for her diverse students. For visual learners, she highlighted illustrations. For auditory learners, she gave think alouds and engaged learners in discussions. She also included written supports such as anchor charts, reference to the book title, and written supports on the Smart Board. During center time, lower performing students were given peer support during activities. Students were also given instruction on their reading level at the teacher table during center time. She did a great job leading discussions and eliciting input from students on the content by getting students to explain their answers. She adjusted her lesson to give more review since it was evident that students didn't fully remember the different types of fiction (realistic and fantasy). She had a good system for randomizing who she called on. She used both informal and formal assessments that included a sorting game, running records, and observation. She used good questioning techniques based on various levels of Bloom's and DOK. The one area noted that needs some improvement is managing student behavior. While she was successful with some of her management strategies, not all were effective.

Based on the results of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI), Completer 4 had an overall mean score of 2.53. She received a score of acceptable (2) or target (3) on all indicators. She received a target score (3) 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;
- 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;
- 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 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;
- 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;
- creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students;
- establishes opportunities for communication with parents and/or guardians and professional colleagues.

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;
- plans appropriate and sequential teaching procedures that include innovative and interesting introductions and closures, and uses a variety of teaching materials and technology;
- uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies to enhance student 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;
- 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;
- 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.

Universal Screener/Benchmark Tests and/or State Tests

Due to Covid-19, we obtained limited data from benchmark testing. Instead of having three cycles of testing, all students were only given the fall and winter administrations. On the I-Ready universal screener in ELA, students scoring on or above grade level increased from 10% to 24%; students scoring one grade level below decreased from 76% to 71%; and students scoring two or more grade levels below decreased from 14% to 5%. In math, students scoring on or above grade level increased from 5% to 24%; students scoring one grade level below decreased from 81% to 71%; and students scoring two or more grade levels below decreased from 14% to 5%.

Data from Participant 5

Interview #1

The completer was most confident with classroom management, creating class schedule and routines, and remediating students. The completer felt least confident dealing with parents and teaching the writing process in lower elementary grades. Using contextual factors from her classes, she differentiated her instruction by using learning groups, capitalizing on her students' interests, and incorporating instruction that meets the needs of various learning styles. She felt confident modeling skills to students, aligning activities to the objective, giving immediate feedback to students when completing performance assessments. She felt limited using technology due to the young age of her students. She also did not feel competent using higher-order questioning and wanted more training in teaching special education students.

Interview #2

In order to assess and activate prior knowledge, the teacher referenced prior lessons, anchor charts, and previously read books. She drew connections to real life by relating character traits to how we treat people. The completer differentiated learning by grouping students according to the reading level and providing leveled tasks for students in guided reading groups. To assess learning, she used teacher observation and questioning during whole group instruction. During guided reading, she used observation and checklists to assess learning. All learning activities and assessments were aligned with lesson objectives and provided scaffolding for learners. To remediate students, the completer provided books on students' instructional level and provided more support during group work. For enrichment, students were given higher order tasks that required them to expand on the grade

level skill and were given books at a higher level. The completer gave verbal feedback and helped guide students to correct answers during whole group instruction and small group instruction, highlighting what they did well and what they need to correct. Students who showed the most growth from the lesson were those who went to preschool before starting kindergarten and those who were from a higher SES. The completer felt that the CAEP experience benefited her by reminding her of the importance of making lessons relevant to students, guiding students to think more critically, assessing students to guide future instruction.

Informal Observation by DSU Supervisor

Learning goals were not posted. When two random students were asked about the objectives, they gave vague answers. The completer modeled the skill and provided scaffolded support throughout the lesson. The completer referred to previously taught lessons but did not capitalize on teachable moments that occurred during the writing lesson by making additional connections to previously learned skills. There was very little evidence of making connections to real life experiences. Most students were engaged throughout the lesson. To assess students, the completer used teacher observation, questioning, running records, and guided reading groups. The teacher provides multiple levels of instruction by using centers, whole group, and guided reading groups. She required students to remember, understand, apply, identify, and compare characters. She did not use technology effectively to enhance instruction, but rather used it on a basic level. The completer displayed excellent time management skills and created a rich print, learning environment with anchor charts, word walls, student work, interactive writing and more displayed. She showed great enthusiasm to her students, but needs to improve her questioning techniques to promote higher order thinking and to increase engagement in the content.

Principal Observations

Two Principal Observations were provided. In these observations, the principal noted that the completer aligned lessons to the standards, built upon previous lessons, differentiated learning based on student ability, displayed good time management, used technology effectively, transitioned students well, and provided good feedback to students. The completer displayed professionalism with students and colleagues and actively sought help and collaboration from colleagues. The principal noted that the completer needed to improve her questioning skills by asking more higher order questions and needed to utilize her literacy resources more effectively in instruction.

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 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 their teacher explained the importance of what they were learning and if their teacher used technology to help them learn. 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 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). These specific questions asked students if their teacher helped them when they made a mistake and if they were afraid to ask question in class.

Formal Observation- TIAI and TWS

The unit of study taught by completer 5 was a language arts unit on story elements. Her lesson plans followed the DSU elementary education format for lesson plans and were aligned to the Mississippi College and Career Readiness Standards. 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. She used materials and resources, such anchor charts, graphic organizers, YouTube videos, a book, and dry erase boards. Her objectives were linked to Bloom's Taxonomy and DOK. Her lessons included accommodations for enrichment and remedial students and made provisions for guided reading groups.

During the formal observation of the TIAI unit lesson, the DSU supervisor noted the completer gave clear directions, communicated well, was very enthusiastic, and had good rapport with her students. She used a variety of teaching strategies to meet the needs of her students that included showing a video, using an anchor chart, having students write words on dry erase boards, and using graphic organizers. She tapped into the students' prior knowledge and used students' interest in Dr. Seuss and Winnie the Pooh to get students engaged in the lesson. She

gave explicit instruction and provided thorough explanation and discussion of the content. Throughout her lesson, she gave immediate feedback, and she managed her classroom and students' behavior well. She also provided evidence of communicating regularly with parents. There were a few skills noted that the completer needs to work on, such as providing students with more time for interaction, developing and asking higher order questions, providing more wait time, and using community resources.

Based on the results of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI), completer 5 had an overall mean score of 2.74. 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;
- 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;
- 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;
- uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies to enhance student learning;
- provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners (enrichment and remedial);
- 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;
- 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.

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;
- integrates core content knowledge from other subject areas in lessons;
- prepares appropriate assessments based on core content knowledge to effectively evaluate learner progress;
- incorporates a variety of informal and formal assessments to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs;
- 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;
- 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;

Based on the results of the Teacher Work Sample (TWS), completer 5 had an overall mean score of 2.78. She received a score of indicator met (3) on three of the indicators and a score of partially met (2) on two of the indicators on TWS Section 2: Instructional Objectives. She received a score of indicator met (3) on all of the indicators on Section 6: Analysis of Student Learning.

Completer 5 appropriately met (3) the following indicators concerning learning objectives:

- develops instructional objectives that are measurable, focused, standards-based, and varied;

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

Completer 5 partially met (2) the following indicators concerning learning objectives:

- justifies learning objectives with contextual factors.
- explains how objectives promote creativity and higher-level thinking.

Completer 5 appropriately met (3) 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. The learning goals were well-written and linked directly to Bloom's Taxonomy and DOK, and they were aligned to the MSCCRS. Completer 5 developed section 6 of the TWS and provided a graph depicting her pre and post test results for her entire class. She also provided charts depicting the test scores for three students who are in Tier II and three students who typically perform on grade level. She analyzed the results and wrote narratives explaining her data. Overall, the results of the analysis of student learning section for Completer 5 showed that most students in her class scored higher on the post-test than the pre-test. While all students did not pass the pre or post-test, they all showed some growth.

Universal Screener/Benchmark Tests and/or State Tests

Due to Covid-19, we obtained limited data from benchmark testing. After three months of instruction, kindergarteners took the STAR Early Literacy Assessment. Students scoring Early Emergent (level 0) decreased from 43% to 0%. Students scoring Late Emergent (level 1) increased from 43% to 81%. Students scoring Transitional Reader (level 2) increased from 5% to 14%, and students scoring Probable Reader (level 3) increased from 0% to 5%.

Participant #6 Data:

Interview #1

When she first started teaching, the completer was most confident with co-teaching and planning with the general education teacher and going into inclusion

rooms to work with students in small groups. She felt least confident with collecting data, filling out SPED paperwork, writing IEPs, and conducting IEP meetings. She gathered data on her students' contextual factors by giving interest inventories, learning styles inventories, and job interest inventories in order to create motivating lessons. She also used their backgrounds and future plans such as graduation and job plans to motivate them. The completer does not assess prior learning but rather used data from the general education classroom to direct her instruction and support. After speaking with the general education teacher about the weekly objectives, she remediated her students by breaking down the content and skills into manageable chunks. She also provided manipulatives and gave oral problems rather than written due to students' disabilities. For assessment, the completer relied on teacher made tests, quizzes, and exit tickets that are developed from question banks provided by the district. Due to the various reading levels present in her class, she differentiated her instruction by giving passages about the content at varying reading levels.

Interview #2

To assess and activate prior knowledge, the completer used real life situations by integrating their phones, doctor visits, weather, and exercise into the math lesson. She also used previously learned graphing skills to expand upon in this lesson. Considering contextual factors, the completer created a lesson to address different reading levels, different cultures, and different IEP qualities by providing reading opportunities, using examples from different cultures, and redirecting and refocusing students during the lesson. In order to check for understanding, the completer used questioning and teacher observation. In order to help students achieve mastery of the skill, the completer taught the skill using direct instruction, modeled the skill, and released responsibility to the student in order to practice the skill. Then the teacher gave written and verbal feedback. To assess mastery, students were given a pre-test and post test for the unit. When remediation is required, the completer taught an additional lesson on the skill in a small group. The completer would like to improve in her classroom management.

Informal Observation by DSU Supervisor

During the observation, the learning goals were not posted; however, random students were questioned. These students showed understanding of what was individually being learned since this was a SPED classroom providing remediation on different subjects. The completer used data provided by the general education teacher to determine what skills needed remediation and built upon the lessons taught in the general education classroom. Although all students were engaged, there was very little real-life application in the lesson. The completer displayed excellent time management skills by providing individual time with each student

regardless of diversity. To assess students, the completer used questioning, quick informal checks for understanding, and computer programs on which students work on independently. During instruction, the completer used different levels of instruction including remembering, applying, analyzing, and explaining. Technology is used daily to reinforce and practice skills. The learning environment supported learning by displaying assignments for each student, providing individual access to Macbooks, and providing educational supplies. The completer strengths included strong content knowledge, time management, overlapping, and withitness. She did a great job keeping students on task and applying knowledge from the IEP to help her students. Weaknesses included a lack of communication about the objectives and purposes of the lesson.

Principal Observations

In the formal observation conducted by the principal, the principal provided few annotations. The completer scored the highest in the following domains: Classroom Management, Positive Classroom Environment, Professional Responsibilities, and Positive Interpersonal Relations. The completer scored lowest in the following domains: Planning and Preparation and Effective Teaching Techniques.

Student Perception Survey

Based on student responses, this completer had the highest mean with questions regarding 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) This specific question asked the students if their teacher pushed them to do their best. 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) 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 their teacher incorporated the community into their learning and used technology to help them learn.

Formal Observation- TIAI and TWS

The unit of study taught by Completer 6 was a math unit on finding mathematical relationships in graphing. Her lesson plans followed the DSU teacher education format for lesson plans and were aligned to the MSCCRS. The plans were well written and included the main idea and goal, objectives that included

accommodations for enrichment and remedial students as well as all IEP accommodations for each of her students, appropriate procedural statements that included an introduction/motivation, study/learning, guided practice, independent practice, culmination and follow-up assessment. The plans also included the statement of learning, purpose, and link to prior knowledge. Extensive modeling and demonstrations on how to read graphs were outlined in the plans as well as multiple examples. A PowerPoint Presentation was listed as her main instructional tool. She also planned to show a video. The assessment was an exit ticket.

The supervisor only provided scores on the TIAI rubrics. There were no comments provided during the formal observation of the TIAI. The completer did provide the unit lesson plans.

Based on the results of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI), Completer 6 had an overall mean score of 3. She received a score of 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;
- 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;
- 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 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;
- 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;
- 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;
- 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.

Due to Covid-19, Completer 6 was unable to complete the TWS.

Universal Screener/Benchmark Tests and/or State Tests

Due to Covid-19, we obtained limited data from benchmark testing and no state testing data. Benchmark tests were given at the end of the first and second nine weeks in Biology I, Algebra I, and English. In Biology, two students grew at least one level and five remained at the same level while two decreased a level. In Algebra I,

three students decreased a level while four grew at least one level and one remained the same. In English, nine students grew at least one level while one decreased and two remained the same.

Participant 7 Data:

Interview #1

Completer was most confident building relationships with students, challenging them, and guiding them to figure out ways to be successful. She was least confident with classroom management. To assess prior knowledge, the completer used bell ringers and short writing assignments to see what areas need their writing needs. To remediate students, the completer looked at assessments to determine who needed remediation and then worked with them one-on-one. She provided limited enrichment and differentiation. As for assessments, the completer used district common tests and created her own assessments. The completer developed lessons that students can relate to their own lives. Concerning technology, the completer used the smartboard daily with instruction and the students use Chromebooks daily with for learning activities. The completer expressed that the pre-internship helped build her confidence and gave her valuable experience before entering her own classroom. expressed that she needs more training in documentation and providing interventions for struggling students. The completer expressed a desire to receive additional training in classroom management.

Interview #2

No data were available due to Covid-19.

Informal Observation by DSU Supervisor

No data were available due to Covid-19.

Principal Observations

Two principal evaluations were provided, but neither gave annotated information. The completer scored highest in the following domains: Culture and Learning Environment, Lesson Design, and Professional Responsibilities. Her lowest scores were in the following domain: 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) 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 sets behavioral expectations and asks questions to insure understanding. The completer had the lowest mean scores for questions pertaining to 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 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 their teacher used the community resources to contribute to learning and if they teacher used technology to help them learn.

Formal Observation- TIAI and TWS

No data were available due to Covid-19.

Universal Screener/Benchmark Tests and/or State Test

Due to Covid-19, we obtained limited data from benchmark testing. Instead of having three cycles of testing, all students were only given the fall and winter administration. On the CASE21 benchmark test for English, the number of students scoring proficient or above decreased from 11% to 5%. However, the number of students with a passing score increased from 44% to 54%. When looking at 5 subsets of students determined by the instructional period, three classes remained at the same level of achievement while two classes increased by one level.

Participant 8 Data:

Interview #1

Completer was most confident building relationships with students, using their interest to motivate their learning. She was least confident with creating assessments and using technology to increase student achievement although she stated that a DSU technology class did increase her knowledge in this area. To assess prior knowledge, the completer used interest surveys, pre-tests and vocabulary development. To remediate students, the completer used cooperative learning groups including think-pair-share. She also provided choices boards for students to provide differentiated assessments. As for assessments, the completer used

commercially prepared assessments and created her own assessments. There is limited enrichment. She must consider contextual factors such as multiple reading levels within this secondary classroom and provide differentiated instruction based upon these factors. Concerning technology, the completer used the smartboard daily with instruction and the students use Chromebooks daily with for learning activities. She also incorporated internet programs to aid instruction and communicate with parents. She felt that interacting with students, planning lessons, and managing her classroom were easy due to her preparation at DSU. She expressed that she needs more training in technology because it is constantly changing. She also wanted more training in bullying, children's emotional well-being, and mental health.

Interview #2

No data were available due to Covid-19.

Informal Observation by DSU Supervisor

No data were available due to Covid-19.

Principal Observations

No data were available due to Covid-19.

Student Perception Survey

Based on student responses, this completer had the highest mean with questions regarding 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 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), INTAST 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 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 helped struggling students, set high expectations, created a safe learning environment, differentiated instruction, and used questions effectively. The completer had the lowest mean scores for

questions pertaining to 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) This specific question asked students if their teacher used the community resources to contribute to learning.

Formal Observation- TIAI and TWS

No data were available due to Covid-19.

Universal Screener/Benchmark Tests and/or State Test

No data were available due to Covid-19.

XI. Implications and Further Questions

Commonalities across the evaluated areas seem to bear consideration. First of all, all completers possessed strong content knowledge (particularly in ELA), set high expectations for both learning and behavior, and differentiated instruction. DSU Supervisors and principals observed candidates creating positive learning environments, completing professional responsibilities, modeling instruction, and connecting previous learning to new learning.

Because testing data were extremely limited due to the pandemic, data were only available for the beginning of the year and/or middle of the year. When multiple data points were available, growth was shown in the majority of students in all ELA and math classrooms. In the biology classroom, the majority of students remained the same.

In contrast, completers were not as successful with clarifying lesson objectives, using technology to support learning, and supporting all learners (particularly with SPED students). Completers also needed more training on interpreting IEPs, documenting interventions, and handling behavioral problems with SPED students. According to principal feedback, most completers struggled with the domain of student understanding.

From this study, there are some implications to our programs. Positively, DSU programs provided effective preparation to completers in lesson design, professionalism, content knowledge (particularly ELA), and learning environments. DSU should continue to teach this explicitly in our courses, continue to place

students in partner P-12 school classrooms to view effective models, continue to provide professional learning to DSU faculty in ELA, and continue to teach dispositions in courses and during student teaching.

Conversely, DSU programs needed improvement in effectively using technology to increase student learning and achievement. Moving forward, DSU will integrate more technology into DSU courses through coursework and instruction and will provide more technology training to DSU faculty on current practices and technology being used in P-12 classrooms. Completers also struggled with student understanding. Moving forward, DSU courses will incorporate explicit instruction on questioning techniques using higher order thinking in discussions and assessments and will create a module in CEL 393 Classroom Management on the MS Teacher Growth Rubric that elaborates on each required domain. Next, completers did not feel confident with SPED accommodations and documentation. Moving forward, courses (specifically CSP 340 Survey of the Exceptional Child) will emphasize the components and interpretations of IEPs and will inform students how and where to obtain additional information on IEPs and SPED accommodations from P-12 school personnel. Finally, completers did not feel confident in math content knowledge or math instructional practices. Moving forward, students will be required to teach a math lesson in their methods courses. There will also be a greater emphasis on pedagogy, particularly MAT 331.

APPENDIX A: IRB Approval

APPENDIX B: Supervisor Training Agenda, Roster and Outlined Roles

APPENDIX C: TIAI

APPENDIX D: TWS

APPENDIX E: Invitation to Completers

APPENDIX F: Documented Communication with Completers by supervisors

APPENDIX G: Memorandums of Understanding with P-12 Schools

APPENDIX H: Interview Questionnaires

APPENDIX I: Informal Observation Instrument

APPENDIX J: Student Perception Survey

APPENDIX K: Student Perception Survey Content Validity Results

APPENDIX L: Case Study Protocol

CITATION FOR VINLOVE STUDY