

## **EPP CASE STUDY REPORT FOR 2020-2021**

### **I. Audience**

The CAEP Standard 4 Committee conducted a Case Study regarding DSU's teaching effectiveness and ability to facilitate student learning during the third cycle from Fall 2020 to Fall 2021.

### **II. Purpose of Case Study**

The Mississippi Department of Education had limited data reporting that allowed Delta State University to collect the appropriate data on our Program Completers. CAEP Standard 4 required 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 implied that the state department of education was 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 2021, the Standard 4 Committee met and identified six programs to use for the third cycle of data: the Elementary Education program, the Special Education program, the SPED program, the MAT program, the HPER 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 nine identified completers, and program coordinators also contacted them personally to encourage them to participate (see APPENDIX E). Initially all nine completers accepted the invitation. These completers were from six different school districts in areas served by DSU. 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 convinced only six completers to overcome their various concerns and complete the Case Study. Two more completers were quickly identified and agreed to participate.

**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). Approval was obtained for all but one of the initial identified completers. The superintendent of this completer was cautious about agreeing to the Case Study due to the additional work load and stress the pandemic was already causing on his teachers. Therefore, this completer had to decline. Another completer had to drop out due to the early delivery of her baby. Therefore, we quickly identified two more completers for the Elementary Education Program to fill these gaps. Also due to the occurrence of the Covid-19 pandemic, most evaluators were unable to visit the schools because schools were either not allowing visitors or were teaching virtually.

**VI. Final Completers**

After much communication and encouragement, the committee was able to identify eight completers. Four of the completers were from the Cleveland area which is a low socioeconomic district with a majority of African American students. Both the HPER completer and the Secondary English completer taught in the Cleveland School District while the two Elementary Education completers taught at a Cleveland parochial school which was 90% Caucasian. There was one Elementary Education completer from the Jackson area in a higher socioeconomic school district with predominantly Caucasian students. The SPED completer was also from the Jackson area in a higher socioeconomic secondary school with a predominantly Caucasian population. The final Elementary Education completer taught in a school district located in the northwestern area of the state which has a majority of students from a medium socioeconomic level and was primarily composed of Caucasian students. However, the African American student population was quite large as well. Lastly, the Secondary English completer taught in another district located in the northwestern part of the state which was comprised of students with a low socioeconomic status. The school population was approximately half Caucasian and half African American.

**VII. Chronicle of Events**

A timeline was developed for the 2020-2021 data cycle, starting in September 2020 and continuing to August 2021. Eight completers were identified with four elementary education completers, two secondary education English completers, one HPER completer, one MAT completer, and one SPED completer.

During September and October 2020, invitations were sent to each of the completers (See APPENDIX E). Dori Bullock and Anjanette Powers also conducted a DSU Supervisor training on the different instruments to be used during the Case Study. During this time, the DSU supervisors received the names of their assigned completers and contacted their completers, explaining the expectations to them.

In November 2020, DSU supervisors began collecting data from completers, specifically the Student Perception Survey and universal screener/benchmark data. The DSU supervisors also conducted the first interview with their completer.

During January, February, and March, DSU supervisors conducted the formal and informal evaluations of their completers. They also collected principal evaluation data and additional universal screener/benchmark testing data. During this time, two of our completers were unable to continue the study; therefore, in March, we had to quickly identify two more Elementary Education completers.

In late April and early May, final data was collected from DSU supervisors and 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 to 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 Dori Bullock and 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 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 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.

## COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

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 and the second cycle of 2019-2020, eight completers were quickly identified for the Case Study and were contacted, drawing from the Elementary Education program, SPED program, HPER program, the MAT program, and Secondary English program.

The team began collecting data from the completers in October 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 February 2021 and would be followed up with the Second Program Completer Interview Questionnaire.

Because of the continuance of the pandemic and personal issues, two of the completers were unable to continue in the Case Study. Due to the short time remaining in the school year, our last two completers were chosen due to their convenient proximity. Because of this timing, end of the year activities and 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.

Over the summer of 2021, test data was collected; however, some growth data analysis was limited due to the testing exemption from the previous year because of the pandemic.

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

**X. Participant Data**Data from Participant 1*Interview #1*

The completer was most confident with teaching social studies, differentiating instruction and learning activities, identifying remedial students, and asking questions. She was least confident with math and science instruction, time management, and classroom management. To assess prior knowledge, the completer asked questions; then she built background knowledge by showing videos. For ELA remediation, she provided limited remediation by providing reteaching opportunities for struggling students. For enrichment activities, she did not provide much enrichment and wished to improve this. To differentiate instruction, the completer used various instructional strategies and grouping. The completer utilized both formative and summative assessments which include commercially prepared and teacher made tests. Concerning technology, the completer used the smartboard for modeling and building background knowledge, used iPads for formative assessment and reinforcement, and calculators during math instruction. Concerning her pre-internship experience, the completer said it benefitted her by allowing her to view classroom management first hand and to learn effective questioning techniques. The completer expressed a need for more assistance with math and science instruction.

*Interview #2*

The completer set goals for the unit which included understanding and writing ordered pairs. The completer incorporated prior knowledge by reviewing previous units and referring to a familiar game called Battleship. In order to check for understanding, the completer used teacher observation while students were working independently and by asking questions throughout the lesson. The completer allowed students to practice new content by working sample problems and working with a partner to play a Battleship-like game. In order to remediate students, the completer gave additional examples, retaught the lesson to those who were confused, and worked with struggling students one-on-one. She did not provide enrichment. The completer assessed their learning by observing their partner work and independent work. After reflection of the unit, the completer recognized the need for a better assessment of prior knowledge. Reflecting on the participation in this study, the completer believed the experience helped her realize that she needed to improve her assessment practices, her evaluation of student progress, and her enrichment and remedial instruction.

*Informal Observation by DSU Supervisor*

The learning goals were not posted, but they were clearly stated at the beginning of the lesson. The purpose of the lesson was to evaluate numbers with decimals

## COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

and round them. The completer connected this to real life by relating this to using money at a store to purchase items. The teacher assessed prior learning by reviewing previous lessons on decimals. During the lesson, all of the students were engaged. The completer used questioning during whole group, observed during independent practice, and evaluated results on a Kahoot! formative assessment. The completer engaged learners on two different levels of learning by asking questions at various levels both orally and on the assessment. Technology was used to model instruction and for students to practice rounding decimals. Instructional time was very efficient since the schedule and routine was well established. The completer involved all students regardless of diversity by calling randomly on students. The classroom environment promoted instruction by being warm, inviting, and structured. Strengths of the completer include clarifying confusing content and misconceptions, using technology, and utilizing classroom helpers. The completer was weak in providing remedial and enrichment opportunities, analyzing student data, and varying assessment types.

*Principal Observations*

The completer did not provide any principal observation data.

*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). The specific question asked students if the teacher pushed students to do their best. 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 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 the teacher used different community members to help them learn and if the teacher explained information in different ways.

*Formal Observation- TIAI and TWS*

The unit of study taught by Completer 1 was a math unit on graphing ordered pairs of numbers on a coordinate grid. 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

## COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

the main idea and goal, objectives, appropriate procedural statements that included an introduction/motivation, study/learning, guided practice, independent practice, culmination and follow-up assessment. She used appropriate materials and resources, such as graphs on the Smart Board, individual dry erase boards, and hands-on games.

During the formal observation of the TIAI unit lesson, the DSU supervisor noted the completer gave clear directions, communicated well, was enthusiastic, and had good rapport with her students. She did a nice job appropriately teaching her lesson by using the “I do, we do, you do” process. She showed examples on the grid that was displayed on the Smart Board, had students work problems on the Smart Board as well as individual dry erase boards, and had the students play a hands-on game with miniature grids that was similar to the board game, Battleship. 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 asked good, thought-provoking questions throughout her lesson. There were a few skills noted that the completer needed to enhance, such as making accommodations for enrichment and remedial learners and making connections to prior knowledge.

Based on the results of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI), Completer 1 had an overall mean score of 2.85. She received a score of acceptable (2) or target (3) on all indicators. She received a target score (3) in the following areas:

- incorporated diversity, including multicultural perspectives, into lessons, and used knowledge of student backgrounds, interests, experiences, and prior knowledge to make instruction relevant and meaningful;
- integrated core content knowledge from other subject areas in lessons;
- planned appropriate and sequential teaching procedures that included innovative and interesting introductions and closures, and used a variety of teaching materials and technology;
- prepared appropriate assessments based on core content knowledge to effectively evaluate learner progress;
- communicated assessment criteria and performance standards to the students and provided timely feedback on students’ academic performance;
- used acceptable written, oral, and nonverbal communication in planning and instruction;
- provided clear, complete written and/or oral directions for instructional activities;
- communicated high expectations for learning to all students;
- conveyed enthusiasm for teaching and learning;

- provided opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning;
- demonstrated knowledge of content for the subject(s) taught;
- used a variety of appropriate teaching strategies to enhance student learning;
- engaged 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;
- elicited input during lessons, allowed sufficient wait time for students to expand and support their responses, and adjusted lessons according to student input, cues, and individual/group responses;
- used family and/or community resources in lessons to enhance student learning;
- monitored and adjusted the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning;
- attended to or delegated routine tasks;
- used a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs;
- created and maintained a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students;
- maximized time available for instruction;
- established opportunities for communication with parents and/or guardians and professional colleagues.
- demonstrated use of low profile desists for managing minimally disruptive behavior;
- demonstrated appropriate use of disciplinary action to handle disruptive student misbehavior.

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

- selected developmentally appropriate, performance-based objectives that connect core content knowledge for lessons based on Mississippi Curriculum Frameworks/College and Career Readiness Standards;
- planned differentiated learning experiences that accommodated developmental and/or educational needs of learners based on assessment information which is aligned with core content knowledge;
- incorporated a variety of informal and formal assessments to differentiate learning experiences that accommodated differences in developmental and/or educational needs;

- provided learning experiences that accommodated differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners (enrichment and remedial).

Based on the results of the Teacher Work Sample (TWS), Completer 1 had an overall mean score of 3.00. She received a score of indicator met (3) on all five 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 1 appropriately met (3) the following indicators concerning learning objectives:

- developed instructional objectives that were measurable, focused, standards-based, and varied;
- justified learning objectives with contextual factors.
- aligned objectives with local, state, or national standards;
- identified the level of each learning objective using Bloom's Taxonomy, DOK, or MS CCRS; and
- explained how objectives promote creativity and higher-level thinking.

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

- presented assessment data clearly and accurately;
- aligned assessments with learning objectives;
- accurately interpreted data and drew conclusions;
- provided 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 1 developed section 6 of the TWS and provided a graph depicting her pre and post test results for her entire class. She analyzed the results and wrote narratives explaining her data. The results of the pre-test indicated that most students had very little knowledge of locating, naming, and graphing ordered pairs of numbers on coordinate grids. After teaching the unit and administering the post-test, the results of the post-test indicated that all students showed significant growth from the pre-test results. All students passed the post-test except for two students. Even though both of these students did not pass the final post-test they did show growth.

#### *Universal Screener/Benchmark Tests and/or State Tests*

The completer administered an achievement test at the end of the academic year. However, due to the pandemic, her students did not take this assessment the

## COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

previous year. Therefore, there is no achievement data to evaluate growth from one year to the next.

Data from Participant 2*Interview #1*

The completer was most confident with classroom management, learning environment design, instructional technology, lesson design, center development and management, routines and procedures, and professional responsibilities. She was least confident dealing with parents, leading guided reading groups, and teaching writing. The completer stated that contextual factors have required her to plan lessons that are developmentally appropriate, incorporate a lot of instruction in the use of technology since many students are from a low socioeconomic background, and develop engaging lessons based on student interests. To assess prior knowledge, the completer gave a parent survey to gather information about their prior learning experiences, interests, and fears; gave the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment (KRA) to assess mastery of readiness skills; and administered the DRA three times a year. For ELA remediation, she pulled students into small groups for LLI (Leveled Literacy Instruction), pulled struggling students in the morning for additional work with phonics and sight words, and assigned them to the teacher assistant for additional support during whole group learning. For enrichment activities, she taught advanced reading and phonics skills during LLI groups and taught them writing skills earlier. To differentiate instruction, the completer used various centers to differentiate learning including using movements and STEM centers for kinesthetic learners, listening centers and videos for auditory learners, and videos, charts, and books for visual learners. Additional differentiation is provided by LLI groups in which all learners are reading and learning skills on their specific developmental level. In this self-contained classroom, the completer used district made tests for ELA and used daily observation for informal, formative assessments. Concerning technology, the completer was disappointed that her smartboard was malfunctioning for the majority of the year; however, each student did have an iPad in which they completed I-Ready lessons each week which provided personalized instruction. The completer expressed being most successful at content area instruction especially math instruction, grouping, lesson development, differentiation, remediation and enrichment, developing and managing centers, and setting up routines and procedures but expressed that she needed more training with teaching the writing process, interpreting data, dealing with parents, and teaching ELL and SPED students.

*Interview #2*

The completer set goals for the unit which included summarizing a text using complete sentences and incorporated different levels including Bloom's Taxonomy: Analyze and DOK Level: Recall and Extended Thinking. The completer incorporated

## COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

prior knowledge by reviewing previous units on weather and plants, using data from an interest inventory, and reviewing the use of capital letters and punctuation. Considering the contextual factors, the completer chose books with diverse characters, avoided topics that the students could not relate to because of low socioeconomic status, chose a holiday that all students celebrated, and incorporated technology into lessons. In order to check for understanding, the completer used teacher observation while going over examples and by asking questions, making sure students used the correct written expression of their thoughts by using complete sentences with capital letters and punctuation. The completer allowed students to practice new content by brainstorming ideas, sorting sentences in the correct order, correcting given sentences, and creating original sentences. The completer differentiated her lessons based on reading ability levels. In order to remediate students, the completer allowed students to sequence words to create sentences, looking for capital letters and punctuation. In order to provide enrichment, the teacher had the enrichment group create original sentences. She also gave students leveled reading passages when teaching the same skill. Verbal and written feedback was given immediately in small groups, and modeling was providing to clarify misconceptions. The completer assessed their learning by administering a school-wide test on sentence structure. After reflection of the unit, the completer recognized the need for more examples during instruction and the need to provide more guidance to students on how to generate new ideas rather than copying other answers. Reflecting on the participation in this study, the completer believed the experience helped her reflect and analyze her teaching more deeply and reminded her how important assessment data is.

*Informal Observation by DSU Supervisor*

The learning goals were not posted, and the students were a bit unclear what skill they were learning. The purpose of the lesson was to recall details from a story. The completer connected this to real life by choosing a Christmas topic and relating the learning to animals that the students encountered in the real world. The teacher assessed prior learning by questioning students about their knowledge of reindeer. During the lesson, approximately ninety-five percent of students were engaged while the assistant helped the remedial students during whole group instruction. The completer used questioning during whole group and observation during small groups to assess learning. The completer engaged learners on two different levels of learning: recalling facts and analyzing characteristics. Although the smartboard was not functioning correctly due to issues out of the completer's control, she used the document camera to model while teaching; however, it was very difficult to see. Instructional time was very efficient since the schedule and routine was well established. The completer involved all students regardless of diversity by calling randomly on students, providing flexible, choice seating, and

## COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

differentiating instruction for different learners. The classroom environment promoted instruction by providing a print-rich learning environment with clearly visible anchor charts, books, and student work. Also, appropriate support was provided with readily available supplies, effective use of teacher assistant to promote instruction, and placement of student desks. Strengths of the completer include strong ELA content knowledge, classroom management, learning environment, communication, feedback, and modeling. The completer was weak in communicating learning goals and developing objectives.

*Principal Observations*

Using the Teacher Growth Rubric, the completer's highest domain was Domain IV: Professional Responsibilities. The components of this domain included the teacher engaging in professional learning and establishing/maintaining effective communication with families and guardians. The completer's lowest domains were Domain I: Lesson Design and Domain II: Student Understanding. The components of Domain I included the alignment of lessons with coherent sequence of learning and high levels of learning for all students. The components of Domain II included the teacher assisting students in taking responsibility for learning and monitoring student learning as well as providing multiple ways for students to make meaning of content.

*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 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 the teacher treated students with respect and if their teacher explained the importance of what they were learning. There were several questions under each standard, and this completer had the highest mean scores and lowest mean scores on questions pertaining to Standard 4. 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 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

## COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

to assure mastery of the content). The specific question that was low under Standard 4 asked students if the teacher explained things in different ways to insure understanding. The specific question under Standard 1 asked the students if the teacher helped them when they make a mistake.

*Formal Observation- TIAI and TWS*

The unit of study taught by Completer 2 was a language arts unit on sentence structure. The objectives for the unit were aligned to the Mississippi College and Career Readiness (MSCCRS) Language Arts Writing Standards. During the formal observation of the TIAI unit lesson, the DSU supervisor observed a specific lesson on sentence writing. Students were rotating among learning centers. The supervisor noted that technology was being utilized in centers, and it allowed the completer to differentiate her instruction as students could dictate, write, draw, and present the stories they created on their iPads. The completer displayed enthusiasm; gave written support; provided many examples; integrated social studies and science into her lesson; gave explicit, clear instruction; communicated well both orally and in writing; used cooperative learning and discovery learning in centers; used appropriate wait time; used questioning to enhance instruction and prompt students to think critically; and incorporated family values and traditions into discussion. She managed her classroom well by having routines and procedures in place, treating students with respect and kindness, fostering student responsibility, using positive reinforcement to correct behavior issues, and establishing clear expectations. She demonstrated effective use of time management throughout the lesson. Enrichment and remedial activities took place during teacher led small groups. There were only a few skills noted that the completer needed to enhance, such as providing more immediate feedback and using formal assessments.

Based on the results of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI), Completer 2 had an overall mean score of 2.93. She received a score of acceptable (2) or target (3) on all indicators. She received a target score (3) in the following areas:

- selected developmentally appropriate, performance-based objectives that connect core content knowledge for lessons based on Mississippi Curriculum Frameworks/College and Career Readiness Standards;
- incorporated diversity, including multicultural perspectives, into lessons, and used knowledge of student backgrounds, interests, experiences, and prior knowledge to make instruction relevant and meaningful;
- integrated core content knowledge from other subject areas in lessons;

- planned appropriate and sequential teaching procedures that included innovative and interesting introductions and closures, and uses a variety of teaching materials and technology;
- planned differentiated learning experiences that accommodate developmental and/or educational needs of learners based on assessment information which is aligned with core content knowledge;
- incorporated a variety of informal and formal assessments to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs;
- used acceptable written, oral, and nonverbal communication in planning and instruction;
- provided clear, complete written and/or oral directions for instructional activities;
- communicated high expectations for learning to all students;
- conveyed enthusiasm for teaching and learning;
- provided opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning;
- demonstrated knowledge of content for the subject(s) taught;
- used a variety of appropriate teaching strategies to enhance student learning;
- provided learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners (enrichment and remedial);
- engaged 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.
- elicited input during lessons, allows sufficient wait time for students to expand and support their responses, and adjusted lessons according to student input, cues, and individual/group responses;
- used family and/or community resources in lessons to enhance student learning;
- monitored and adjusted the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning;
- attended to or delegates routine tasks;
- used a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs;
- created and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students;
- maximized time available for instruction;

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

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

- prepared appropriate assessments based on core content knowledge to effectively evaluate learner progress;
- communicated assessment criteria and performance standards to the students and provided timely feedback on students' academic performance.

Based on the results of the Teacher Work Sample (TWS), Completer 2 had an overall mean score of 3.00. She received a score of indicator met (3) on all 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 2 appropriately met (3) the following indicators concerning learning objectives:

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

Completer 2 appropriately met (3) the following indicators dealing with analyzing student learning:

- presented assessment data clearly and accurately;
- aligned assessments with learning objectives;
- accurately interpreted data and drew conclusions;
- provided evidence of impact on student learning.

The learning goals, the MSCCRS for Language Arts that the unit was based on, explanations depicting how the lesson objectives and the standards were linked, and explanations of the enrichment and remedial objectives were provided by Completer 2. These were used to evaluate section 2 of the TWS. The learning goals were well-written and linked directly to Bloom's Taxonomy and DOK, and they were

## COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

aligned to the MSCCRS. Completer 2 developed section 6 of the TWS and provided a graph depicting her pre and post test results for her entire class as well as graphs depicting several subgroups of students, which included comparing the data of students who are in Tier 1 and Tier 2. She analyzed the results and wrote narratives explaining her data. The Completer reported that 18 out of her 21 students were able to achieve the learning goals for the unit. Students were able to brainstorm an idea, construct a kindergarten level sentence, use correct punctuation, and draw a corresponding illustration. Three of her students did not successfully master the learning objectives for the unit and will need further remediation. However, two of these students did show growth.

*Universal Screener/Benchmark Tests and/or State Tests*

In this kindergarten classroom, the Star Early Literacy assessment was given in both the fall and winter. The data revealed that 77% of students showed growth by advancing at least one reading level. Further analysis of the data revealed that 14% of students were Early Emergent Readers, 48% of students were Late Emergent Readers, 33% of students were Transitional Readers, and 5% were Probable Readers.

Data from Participant 3*Interview #1*

The completer was most confident with routines and procedures and differentiation. She was least confident dealing with behavior problems. To assess prior knowledge, the completer gave a variety of pretests that were developmentally appropriate. She provided limited remediation and enrichment activities which were based on reading levels. To differentiate instruction, the completer used reading groups that provided reading passages at different levels. In this self-contained classroom, the completer used assessments provided by the curriculum. Concerning technology, the completer used the smartboard daily, provided learning activities on the iPads for students each day, used a document camera to model instruction, and provided reading experiences with read aloud videos. During her pre-internship, the completer said that she benefited from the experience by observing firsthand how an effective kindergarten classroom operated which better prepared her for her own classroom. The completer expressed being most successful at creating engaging lesson plans and teaching reading but expressed that she needed more training with managing classroom behavior.

*Interview #2*

The completer set goals for the unit which included understanding the life cycle of a frog. The completer assessed prior knowledge by giving a pretest and asking

## COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

questions. In order to check for understanding, the completer used questioning and obtained student feedback by using student signal cards. The completer allowed students to practice new content by creating diagrams, engaging in discussions, and sequencing pictures. The completer differentiated her lessons based on reading ability levels. In order to remediate students, the completer retaught the skill in small groups the following day. There was no enrichment. The completer assessed their learning by using teacher observation and giving a written assessment. Reflecting on the participation in this study, the completer believed the experience helped her reflect on the importance of remediation, enrichment, higher-order questioning, and effective teaching strategies.

*Informal Observation by DSU Supervisor*

The learning goals were not posted, but the completer verbally stated the learning goals for each center. The purpose of the lesson was to identify vowel sounds in given words. The completer connected this to real life by explaining how knowing letter sounds help us read. The teacher assessed prior learning by reviewing previous phonics lessons and listening to students read. During the lesson, most of the students were engaged while they rotated in learning centers. The completer used questioning and teacher observation during small group to assess learning. Technology was used on a daily basis, particularly while modeling instruction and during learning centers. Instructional time was very efficient since the schedule and routine was well established. The completer involved all students regardless of diversity. The classroom environment promoted instruction by allowing ample space to move and learn for kindergarten students. Strengths of the completer included creating an effective learning environment, providing sufficient practice with the skill, and managing learning centers. The completer was weak in differentiating her lessons, providing remediation and enrichment activities, and asking questions on various cognitive levels.

*Principal Observations*

The completer did not provide this data.

*Student Perception Survey*

Based on student responses, this completer had the highest mean on all the questions except one. 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) The specific question that was low under Standard 1 asked students if the teacher used the community to help them learn.

*Formal Observation- TIAI and TWS*

The unit of study taught by Completer 3 was a science unit on the life cycle of animals and insects. 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, appropriate procedural statements that included an introduction/motivation, study/learning, guided practice, independent practice, culmination and follow-up assessment. She utilized technology by showing videos on the smartboard and having her students complete activities on their individual iPads. She used a variety of materials and resources, such as videos, hands-on activities, signal cards, and pictures.

During the formal observation of the TIAI unit lesson, the DSU supervisor observed the specific lesson on the life cycle of frogs and noted the completer managed her classroom well, gave clear directions, used instructional time wisely, communicated well, was enthusiastic, and had good rapport with her students. She gave explicit instruction and provided thorough explanation and discussion of the content. There were a few skills noted that the completer needed to enhance, such as making accommodations for enrichment and remedial learners, using a variety of assessments, and asking questions on a variety of levels.

Based on the results of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI), Completer 3 had an overall mean score of 2.85. She received a score of acceptable (2) or target (3) on all indicators. She received a target score (3) in the following areas:

- selected developmentally appropriate, performance-based objectives that connected core content knowledge for lessons based on Mississippi Curriculum Frameworks/College and Career Readiness Standards;
- incorporated diversity, including multicultural perspectives, into lessons, and used knowledge of student backgrounds, interests, experiences, and prior knowledge to make instruction relevant and meaningful;
- integrated core content knowledge from other subject areas in lessons;
- planned appropriate and sequential teaching procedures that included innovative and interesting introductions and closures, and used a variety of teaching materials and technology;
- prepared appropriate assessments based on core content knowledge to effectively evaluate learner progress;
- communicated assessment criteria and performance standards to the students and provides timely feedback on students' academic performance;

- used acceptable written, oral, and nonverbal communication in planning and instruction;
- provided clear, complete written and/or oral directions for instructional activities;
- communicated high expectations for learning to all students;
- conveyed enthusiasm for teaching and learning;
- provided opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning;
- demonstrated knowledge of content for the subject(s) taught;
- used a variety of appropriate teaching strategies to enhance student learning;
- elicited input during lessons, allowed sufficient wait time for students to expand and support their responses, adjusted lessons according to student input, cues, and individual/group responses;
- used family and/or community resources in lessons to enhance student learning;
- monitored and adjusted the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning;
- attended to or delegates routine tasks;
- used a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs;
- created and maintained a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students;
- maximized time available for instruction;
- established opportunities for communication with parents and/or guardians and professional colleagues.
- demonstrated use of low profile desists for managing minimally disruptive behavior;
- demonstrated appropriate use of disciplinary action to handle disruptive student misbehavior.

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

- planned differentiated learning experiences that accommodate developmental and/or educational needs of learners based on assessment information which is aligned with core content knowledge;
- incorporated a variety of informal and formal assessments to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs;

- provided learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners (enrichment and remedial);
- engaged students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking through higher-order questioning and provided opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking.

Based on the results of the Teacher Work Sample (TWS), Completer 3 had an overall mean score of 3.00. She received a score of indicator met (3) on all five 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 3 appropriately met (3) the following indicators concerning learning objectives:

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

Completer 3 appropriately met (3) the following indicators dealing with analyzing student learning:

- presented assessment data clearly and accurately;
- aligned assessments with learning objectives;
- accurately interpreted data and draws conclusions;
- provided 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 3 developed section 6 of the TWS and provided a graph depicting her pre and post test results for her entire class. She analyzed the results and wrote narratives explaining her data. The results of the pre-test indicated that a few of her students did have some knowledge of the life cycles of various animals and insects, but not all of them. After teaching the unit and administering the post-test, the results of the post-test indicated that all students showed significant growth. All students passed the post-test with several students making a perfect score.

*Universal Screener/Benchmark Tests and/or State Tests*

The completer administered an achievement test at the end of the year. However, at the time of this report, results were not received. Also, since this was a kindergarten class, this data would only provide the baseline rather than show growth.

Data from Participant 4*Interview #1*

Completer was most confident with developing lesson plans, assessing the learning needs of students, conducting good classroom management, setting high expectations, and teaching reading. She was least confident dealing with parents, teaching math, and diagnosing student weaknesses. The completer stated that the specific contextual factors of lower socioeconomic students and ELL students affected her instruction. Due to these factors, she had to focus a bit more on physical and emotional needs than in a typical classroom. To assess prior knowledge, the completer administered a universal screener for both math and ELA to identify missing prerequisite skills. She also gave parents surveys about their child and did KWLs before units. For remediation, she pulled students into small reading groups and guided reading groups, assigned I-Ready lessons to individual students for remediation of missing skills, and gave additional practice on skills that students are struggling with. For enrichment activities, she used centers that offered math practice on different levels in order to extend their learning. The completer did not offer much differentiation in math except to offer different levels of worksheets, and there was limited differentiation in ELA. The completer used district made tests for ELA that were aligned to the state framework and teacher-made tests that were constructed similarly to the state test. Concerning technology, the completer was limited due to poor internet at the school and very few classroom computers; however, she did use the smartboard for modeling and the computer games and assessments that accompanied the ELA curriculum. The pre-internship experience gave the completer confidence and the opportunity to gain valuable skills such as giving adequate wait time, grouping students, managing time, differentiating instruction, and using small groups and centers. The completer expressed being most successful at differentiation but expressed that she needed more training with teaching and accommodating SPED students, teaching math, and analyzing data.

*Interview #2*

The completer set goals for the unit which included solving two-step word problems and incorporated different levels including Bloom's Taxonomy: Understand and Apply and DOK Level: Recall and Skill/Concept. The completer incorporated prior knowledge by administering a pretest, looking at student I-Ready data, Case21 data, and reviewing the previously learned skill of one-step word problems. Considering the contextual factors, the completer chose word problems

## COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

in which all students could relate to regardless of socioeconomic status. In order to check for understanding, the completer used observations, exit slips, and online quizzes. The completer allowed students to practice new content by incorporating guided practice, using manipulatives, and working in small groups. The completer differentiated her lessons by placing students in small groups based on ability levels and by presenting content in a variety of ways. In order to remediate students, the completer placed struggling students in small groups during stations and intervention time to offer additional instruction and help. In order to provide enrichment, the teacher guided the enrichment group in critical thinking by getting them to analyze the word problems. Verbal and written feedback was given immediately in small groups. The completer assessed their learning by administering a premade unit test. After reflection of the unit, the completer recognized the need to introduce the CUBE strategy during one-step word problem instruction instead of during two-step word problem instruction. Reflecting on the participation in this study, the completer believed the experience helped her reflect on her teaching more deeply and reminded her how important differentiation is.

*Informal Observation by DSU Supervisor*

The learning goals were clearly posted, and the completer also told the students what they would be learning. The purpose of the lesson was to learn how to solve math word problems using the CUBES strategy, and all instruction and learning activities were aligned to the purpose. The completer connected this to real life by giving examples of how they would use problem solving in real life. The teacher assessed prior learning by reviewing the previous lesson on solving one-step word problems and made the connection to solving two-step word problems. During the lesson, the majority of students were on-task, and the completer regularly called on students to keep them engaged. The completer used questioning during whole group instruction and observation during independent practice. The completer engaged learners on multiple different levels of learning: knowledge, understanding, applying, and analyzing. Technology was used effectively to model math problems during the lesson. The completer involved all students regardless of diversity by encouraging all students to participate in the lesson and monitoring each child's progress. The classroom environment promoted instruction by providing a safe environment and a print-rich environment with learning posters, anchor charts, and other displays. Strengths of the completer included using questions effectively, being prepared and resourceful, possessing strong content knowledge, encouraging students, and being willing to try new ideas. The completer was weak in communicating learning goals and clear behavior expectations.

*Principal Observations*

Using the Teacher Growth Rubric, the completer's highest domain was Domain III: Culture and Learning Environment. The components of this domain included the teacher managing a learning-focused classroom community and managing classroom space, time, and resources. The completer's lowest domain was Domain II: Student Understanding. The components of Domain II included the teacher assisting students in taking responsibility for learning and monitoring student learning as well as providing multiple ways for students to make meaning of content.

*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 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 students if the teacher expected students to behave, if their teacher explained the importance of what they were learning, and if the teacher explained how learning is related to different subjects. There were several questions under each standard, and this completer scored had the highest mean scores and lowest mean scores on questions pertaining to Standard 3. The Completer had the lowest mean scores 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 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 they knew what they are supposed to learn everyday and if their classwork helped them understand what they are learning.

*Formal Observation- TIAI and TWS*

The unit of study taught by Completer 4 was a math unit on two-step word problems. Her lesson plans followed the DSU elementary education format for lesson plans and were aligned to the Mississippi College and Career Readiness Standards. The lesson plans were very well-written and included the main idea and

## COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

goal, objectives, appropriate procedural statements that included an introduction/motivation, study/learning, guided practice, independent practice, culmination and follow-up assessment. She used a variety of appropriate materials and resources, such as a smartboard, anchor charts, and exit tickets.

During the formal observation of the TIAI unit lesson, the DSU supervisor observed a specific lesson on solving two-step word problems using the CUBES strategy. It was noted that the Completer used the “I do, we do, you do” strategy to teach this lesson. She provided the students with many good examples and opportunities to work together. The supervisor stated that Completer 4 was knowledgeable about the students backgrounds and interests, integrated reading into the lesson; utilized throughout the lesson in a meaningful and interesting way; used formative assessments and good questioning techniques, made accommodations for both enrichment and remedial students, communicated effectively both in writing and orally, gave clear directions, modeled how to work the problems, was enthusiastic and motivated, had students work cooperatively, and utilized a variety of teaching strategies. She also managed her classroom well by monitoring and observing students, creating a positive classroom environment, and communicating high expectations for students.

Based on the results of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI), Completer 4 had an overall mean score of 3.00. She received a score of target (3) on all indicators. She received a target score (3) in the following areas:

- selected developmentally appropriate, performance-based objectives that connect core content knowledge for lessons based on Mississippi Curriculum Frameworks/College and Career Readiness Standards;
- incorporated diversity, including multicultural perspectives, into lessons, and uses knowledge of student backgrounds, interests, experiences, and prior knowledge to make instruction relevant and meaningful;
- integrated core content knowledge from other subject areas in lessons;
- planned appropriate and sequential teaching procedures that included innovative and interesting introductions and closures, and used a variety of teaching materials and technology;
- prepared appropriate assessments based on core content knowledge to effectively evaluate learner progress;
- planned differentiated learning experiences that accommodate developmental and/or educational needs of learners based on assessment information which is aligned with core content knowledge;
- communicated assessment criteria and performance standards to the students and provided timely feedback on students’ academic performance.

- incorporated a variety of informal and formal assessments to differentiate learning experiences that accommodated differences in developmental and/or educational needs;
- used acceptable written, oral, and nonverbal communication in planning and instruction;
- provided clear, complete written and/or oral directions for instructional activities;
- communicated high expectations for learning to all students;
- conveyed enthusiasm for teaching and learning;
- provided opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning;
- demonstrated knowledge of content for the subject(s) taught;
- used a variety of appropriate teaching strategies to enhance student learning;
- provided learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners (enrichment and remedial);
- engaged 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.
- elicited input during lessons, allowed sufficient wait time for students to expand and support their responses, and adjusted lessons according to student input, cues, and individual/group responses;
- used family and/or community resources in lessons to enhance student learning;
- monitored and adjusted the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning;
- attended to or delegated routine tasks;
- used a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs;
- created and maintained a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students;
- maximized time available for instruction;
- established opportunities for communication with parents and/or guardians and professional colleagues.
- demonstrated use of low profile desists for managing minimally disruptive behavior;
- demonstrated appropriate use of disciplinary action to handle disruptive student misbehavior.

Based on the results of the Teacher Work Sample (TWS), Completer 4 had an overall mean score of 3.00. She received a score of indicator met (3) on all 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 4 appropriately met (3) the following indicators concerning learning objectives:

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

Completer 4 appropriately met (3) the following indicators dealing with analyzing student learning:

- presented assessment data clearly and accurately;
- aligned assessments with learning objectives;
- accurately interpreted data and draws conclusions;
- provided evidence of impact on student learning.

For section 2 of the TWS, Completer 4 provided the objectives for all five days of the math unit. This included enrichment and remedial objectives. Each objective was aligned to the appropriate Bloom's Taxonomy level as well as DOK level. She provided the MSCCRS that the objectives were aligned with and a rationale discussing how each objective was appropriate in terms of development, prerequisite knowledge, skills, and other student needs. She also explained how the objectives promoted creativity and higher-level thinking skills. Completer 4 developed section 6 of the TWS and provided a graph depicting her pre and post test results for her class. She analyzed the results and wrote narratives explaining her data. The results of the pre-test indicated that not all students knew how to solve two-step word problems. After teaching the unit and administering the post-test, the results of the post-test indicated that all students showed significant growth from the pre-test results.

#### *Universal Screener/Benchmark Tests and/or State Tests*

According to the 2<sup>nd</sup> grade I-Ready ELA assessment given at the beginning and middle of the year, 79% of students showed growth in their scale score. From the beginning of the year assessment to the middle of the year assessment, there was an increase from 50% to 67% of students performing on or above grade level. The

## COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

majority of this growth came from a decrease in the percentage of students performing one grade level below which decreased in this testing cycle from 42% at the beginning of the year to 33% at the middle of the year. Also, at the beginning of the year, there were 8% of students scoring two or more grade levels below; however, by the middle of the year, this decreased to 0%. When comparing these results to the end of the year data, 78% of students scored at or above grade level which was a 25% increase from the beginning of the year in that category. Students who scored below grade level decreased from 50% to 22% by the end of the year.

According to the 2<sup>nd</sup> grade I-Ready Math assessment given at the beginning and middle of the year, 71% of students showed growth in their scale score. From the beginning of the year assessment to the middle of the year assessment, there was an increase from 17% to 21% of students performing on or above grade level. There was an increase in students performing one grade below from 75% to 79%. This increase was due to students moving from the two or more grades below category; this category decreased from 8% to 0%. When comparing these results to the end of the year data, only 17% of students were at or above grade level; however, by the end of the year 52% of students were at or above grade level. At the beginning of the year, 83% of students were below grade level, but at the end of the year 48% of students were only one grade level below.

Data from Participant 5*Interview #1*

The completer was most confident with building relationships with students, dealing with parents, and managing her classroom. She was least confident developing lessons that were consistently aligned to standards. The completer stated that the specific contextual factors of lower socioeconomic students and access to technology affected her instruction. Due to these factors, she had to be flexible with assignments because of limited access to the internet at home. To assess prior knowledge, the completer administered several different student surveys concerning their interests and reflection on instruction. She also used questioning and bell ringers as a way to access prior learning. For remediation, she grouped students according to academic level, implemented peer tutoring, and assigned lessons in Reading Plus which provided instruction on their specific skill level. For enrichment, she engaged students with higher-order questioning, gave students assignment options that were more in-depth, and gave students choice in assignments. The completer differentiated her lessons based on reading levels since her tenth grades students' reading levels range from kindergarten to tenth grade. She provided some listening support for reading assignments and assigned lessons in Reading Plus which was on their instructional level. The completer used teacher-made tests that were primarily multiple choice and discussion along with formative

## COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

assessments scattered throughout the unit. Concerning technology, the completer used multiple forms of technology to enhance her instruction: Google forms, Google classroom, podcasts, Audible, student file sharing, the smartboard, and virtual student projects. The completer expressed being most successful at scaffolding instruction with engaging activities and using technology but expressed that she needed more training with differentiating instruction with such large gaps in ability levels and analyzing student data.

*Interview #2*

The completer set goals for the unit which included identifying the theme of a given text and using evidence to support the claim. The completer incorporated different levels including Bloom's Taxonomy: Understand and Apply and DOK Levels 3 and 4: Skill/Concept and Strategic Thinking. The completer activated prior knowledge by reading a familiar story and modeling how to identify the theme. In order to check for understanding, the completer used observations during the lesson and evaluated their responses from the assignment. The completer allowed students to practice new content by participating in class discussions, guided practice, and working with partners. The completer differentiated her lessons by giving students a choice in how to complete assignments based on their individual needs. In order to remediate students, the completer worked with students individually to clear up misconceptions. In order to provide enrichment, the completer allowed students to facilitate their own discussions of learning with partners. Verbal feedback was given immediately in small groups, and was used when needed. The completer assessed their learning by using an informal evaluation in Kahoot! and administering a unit test with a biographical sketch. During this unit, SPED students showed tremendous growth. Reflecting on the participation in this study, the completer believed the experience helped her closely analyze her use of formative assessments, remediation, and data driven instruction.

*Informal Observation by DSU Supervisor*

The learning goals and daily agenda were both clearly posted. The purpose of the lesson was to check understanding of the chapter they had read, to check student understanding of quotes, and to identify/explain symbolism. The completer connected this to real life by explaining how symbols were used in real life. The teacher made connections from prior learning to current learning by discussing times they experienced fear and getting students to make predictions about the story based on what they had already read. All learning activities (bell ringer, presentations, and small groups) supported and contributed to the mastery of the objective. During the lesson, the majority of students were on-task and became increasingly engaged as the lesson progressed. The completer used questioning during the lesson. The completer engaged learners on multiple different levels of

## COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

learning (knowledge, applying, and analyzing) while students presented and discussed the text. Technology is used effectively by both the teacher and the students during class presentations. The smartboard and internet were naturally integrated into the lesson. Although the entire class time was used for instruction, there was not enough time to complete the planned lesson. The completer involved all students regardless of diversity by encouraging all students to participate in class discussion and monitoring the learning of all students by proximity and observation. The classroom environment promoted instruction by displaying supportive information on the walls such as outline directions, daily agenda, a writer's wall, anchor charts, a grammar wall, an art wall, and examples of student work. Strengths of the completer included connecting with students, explaining expectations, assuring student understanding, and using effective questioning. The completer was weak in time management.

*Principal Observations*

Using the Teacher Growth Rubric, the principal rated the completer highest in Domain II: Student Understanding in which the completer assisted students in taking responsibility for learning, monitored student learning, and provided multiple ways for students to make meaning of content. The completer scored lowest in Domain I: Lesson Design in which the completer must create lessons that are aligned to standards with a coherent sequence of learning and have a high level of learning for all students.

*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) 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 helped them when they made a mistake and if the students knew the teacher's behavioral expectations. 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 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

## COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

specific questions asked students if the teacher used different community members to help them learn and if the teacher created interesting lessons.

*Formal Observation- TIAI and TWS*

The unit of study taught by Completer 5 was an English unit on writing informative texts, analyzing various texts, determining theme(s), and close reading. Her lesson plans were written in the format required by her school district but included most of the elements of the DSU education lesson plans. Her lessons were aligned to the Mississippi College and Career Readiness Standards. The lesson plans were well-written and included the following elements: An objective, bell work/do now (anticipatory set), explanation (modeling activities), interpretation (guided practice activities/checking for understanding), application (independent practice activities), closure (wrap up/exit slip), formative assessment, and modifications for Tier students.

During the formal observation of the TIAI unit lesson, the DSU supervisor observed a specific lesson on the literary analysis of a biographical memoir. The supervisor noted that Completer 5 accessed students' prior knowledge in creative ways, connected the new learning to established content, ignited students' interests, integrated science into the lesson, utilized technology, made accommodations for all types of learners, communicated well both verbally and in writing, engaged the students in higher order thinking skills, gave clear directions, established a positive classroom culture, was enthusiastic, communicates with parents, and provided both enrichment and remedial activities. She utilized a variety of materials and resources, such as the smartboard, videos, pictures, and books. She provided opportunities for discovery, reflection, discussion, demonstration, cooperative learning, and explicit instruction on the skills through explanation and discussion. She managed her classroom well through clearly established expectations and rules, building positive relationships with students, managing her time well, and keeping her students on task and engaged.

Based on the results of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI), Completer 5 had an overall mean score of 3.00. She received a score of target (3) on all indicators. She received a target score (3) in the following areas:

- selected developmentally appropriate, performance-based objectives that connected core content knowledge for lessons based on Mississippi Curriculum Frameworks/College and Career Readiness Standards;
- incorporated diversity, including multicultural perspectives, into lessons, and used knowledge of student backgrounds, interests, experiences, and prior knowledge to make instruction relevant and meaningful;
- integrated core content knowledge from other subject areas in lessons;

- planned appropriate and sequential teaching procedures that included innovative and interesting introductions and closures, and used a variety of teaching materials and technology;
- prepared appropriate assessments based on core content knowledge to effectively evaluate learner progress;
- planned differentiated learning experiences that accommodated developmental and/or educational needs of learners based on assessment information which was aligned with core content knowledge;
- communicated assessment criteria and performance standards to the students and provided timely feedback on students' academic performance.
- incorporated a variety of informal and formal assessments to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs;
- used acceptable written, oral, and nonverbal communication in planning and instruction;
- provided clear, complete written and/or oral directions for instructional activities;
- communicated high expectations for learning to all students;
- conveyed enthusiasm for teaching and learning;
- provided opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning;
- demonstrated knowledge of content for the subject(s) taught;
- used a variety of appropriate teaching strategies to enhance student learning;
- provided learning experiences that accommodated differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners (enrichment and remedial);
- engaged students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking through higher-order questioning and provided opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking.
- elicited input during lessons, allowed sufficient wait time for students to expand and support their responses, adjusted lessons according to student input, cues, and individual/group responses;
- used family and/or community resources in lessons to enhance student learning;
- monitored and adjusted the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning;
- attended to or delegated routine tasks;
- used a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs;

- created and maintained a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students;
- maximized time available for instruction;
- established opportunities for communication with parents and/or guardians and professional colleagues.
- demonstrated use of low profile desists for managing minimally disruptive behavior;
- demonstrated appropriate use of disciplinary action to handle disruptive student misbehavior.

Based on the results of the Teacher Work Sample (TWS), Completer 5 had an overall mean score of 3.00. She received a score of indicator met (3) on all 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:

- developed instructional objectives that were measurable, focused, standards-based, and varied;
- justified learning objectives with contextual factors.
- aligned objectives with local, state, or national standards;
- identified the level of each learning objective using Bloom's Taxonomy, DOK, or MS CCRS; and
- explained how objectives promote creativity and higher-level thinking.

Completer 5 appropriately met (3) the following indicators dealing with analyzing student learning:

- presented assessment data clearly and accurately;
- aligned assessments with learning objectives;
- accurately interpreted data and draws conclusions;
- provided evidence of impact on student learning.

For section 2 of the TWS, Completer 5 provided the objectives for all five days of the English unit. She provided the MSCCRS that the objectives were aligned with and a brief rationale discussing how the objectives are appropriate in terms of development, prerequisite knowledge, skills, and other student needs. She also explained how the objectives promoted creativity and higher-level thinking skills. Completer 5 developed section 6 of the TWS and provided a chart depicting her pre and post test results for her class as well as charts comparing subgroups of high and low performers. She analyzed the results and wrote narratives explaining her data.

## COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

The results of the pre-test indicated that not all students knew about writing informative texts, analyzing various texts, determining theme(s), and close reading. After teaching the unit and administering the post-test, the results of the post-test indicated that all students mastered the post-test except for two. Completer 5 believed that the two students who did not demonstrate mastery were confused between the main idea and theme. These two students were remediated.

*Universal Screener/Benchmark Tests and/or State Tests*

Secondary students do not conduct universal screeners; however, students take the MAP English assessment. Because of Covid, there is not any test data from the 2019-2020 testing cycle. Therefore, these students' scores were based on the 2018-2019 performance. Goals were set for the MAP 2020-2021 testing cycle with diagnostic testing conducted throughout the year to evaluate and predict student performance at the end of the year. Based on this data, students began the year with 45% of students meeting their growth goal. By mid-year, only 17% of students met their growth goal.

Data from Participant 6*Interview #1*

The completer was most confident with teaching small groups and teaching English and history content. She was least confident teaching whole group lessons. Since all of her students had some sort of disability, contextual factors played a large role in her instruction. With many emotional disabilities in the room, she worked diligently to build relationships with her students and to develop a safe place. To assess prior knowledge, the completer used data collected by the general education teacher, including CASE21 tests and Reading Plus assessments. All of her lessons were focused on remediation since this is a SPED classroom. She had limited enrichment activities. The completer differentiated her lessons for each student's needs, including varied readability levels for math and history assignments. The completer used the same assessments as the general education teacher, but also provided technological support and manipulatives. Concerning technology, the completer used technology every day since her students were virtual, including applications, Canvas, and videos that reinforced instruction. The completer expressed being most successful at small group instruction but expressed that she needed more training with using technology for students with disabilities and dyslexia.

*Interview #2*

The completer set goals for the unit which included equations using a variety of strategies. The completer incorporated prior knowledge by reviewing and asking

questions about the lesson presented by the general education teacher. In order to check for understanding, the completer used many open-ended questions and required the student to show their work while solving the equation. The completer allowed students to practice new content by giving many examples of different types of equations and have the student solve and explain the problems. The entire lesson was a remedial lesson based on the regular classroom teacher's lesson. There was no enrichment for this particular lesson, but she could have modeled more advanced problems and assigned more advanced polynomials for enrichment. The completer assessed their learning by evaluating student responses during the lesson. Reflecting on the participation in this study, the completer believed the experience helped her reflect on her teaching more deeply by reflecting on the feedback and reminding her of the best practices that she learned about while in school.

#### *Informal Observation by DSU Supervisor*

The learning goals were clearly communicated during the lesson but were not posted due to it being a virtual lesson. The purpose of the lesson was to understand mendelian genetics. The completer connected this to real life. The teacher assessed the students' prior knowledge using review questions. During the lesson, all students were on-task, and the completer used questioning techniques throughout the lesson to maintain engagement. The completer used questioning, observation, an informal quiz, and an exit ticket during the lesson to assess student understanding. The completer engaged learners on different levels by varying question type and level. Technology was the primary delivery method for the lesson as the completer used PowerPoint, a YouTube video, a digital whiteboard, and Quizlet. The entire class time was used for instruction. The completer involved all students regardless of diversity by calling on all students and giving feedback to all students. The online environment was warm, inviting, and nurturing. Strengths of the completer included creating a great rapport with students, maintaining on-task behavior, using effective questioning techniques, giving constant feedback, and using a variety of instructional strategies. The completer did not display any weaknesses in this observation.

#### *Principal Observations*

Using the Teacher Growth Rubric, the principal rated the completer highest in Domain I: Lesson Design in which the completer designed lessons that were aligned to standards, engaged students in higher levels of learning, and had a coherent sequence of learning. The completer also scored highest Domain IV: Professional Responsibilities in which the components included the teacher engaging in professional learning and maintaining effective communication with families. The completer scored lowest in Domain III: Culture and Learning Environment in which

## COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

the teacher managed a learning-focused community, time, classroom space, and resources and created a classroom of respect for all students.

*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 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 the teacher set clear behavioral expectations and explained things different ways to help them understand. 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 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 the teacher used different community members to help them learn and if the teacher created interesting lessons.

*Formal Observation- TIAI and TWS*

The unit of study taught by Completer 6 was a math unit on quadratic equations and parabolas. Her lesson plans were written in the format required by her school district but included most of the elements of the DSU education lesson plans. Her lessons were aligned to the Mississippi College and Career Readiness Standards. The lesson plans were well-written and included the following elements: an objective, the main idea, an anticipatory set, direct teaching, guided practice, independent practice, closure, assessment, modifications. She used the "I do, we do, you do" method of teaching the content.

During the formal observation of the TIAI unit lesson, the DSU supervisor observed a specific lesson on parabolas. The supervisor noted that Completer 6 asked good review questions, made connections between the content and the real world, utilized technology, provided explicit instruction, gave excellent examples, asked a variety of questions, provided appropriate feedback to students, displayed enthusiasm, had high expectations for all students, and established good rapport

with her students. This was a virtual lesson, and the completer made excellent use of her digital whiteboard, videos, document camera, and pictures.

Based on the results of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI), Completer 6 had an overall mean score of 3.00. She received a score of target (3) on all indicators. She received a target score (3) in the following areas:

- selected developmentally appropriate, performance-based objectives that connected core content knowledge for lessons based on Mississippi Curriculum Frameworks/College and Career Readiness Standards;
- incorporated diversity, including multicultural perspectives, into lessons, and used knowledge of student backgrounds, interests, experiences, and prior knowledge to make instruction relevant and meaningful;
- integrated core content knowledge from other subject areas in lessons;
- planned appropriate and sequential teaching procedures that included innovative and interesting introductions and closures, and used a variety of teaching materials and technology;
- prepared appropriate assessments based on core content knowledge to effectively evaluate learner progress;
- planned differentiated learning experiences that accommodated developmental and/or educational needs of learners based on assessment information which was aligned with core content knowledge;
- communicated assessment criteria and performance standards to the students and provided timely feedback on students' academic performance.
- incorporated a variety of informal and formal assessments to differentiate learning experiences that accommodated differences in developmental and/or educational needs;
- used acceptable written, oral, and nonverbal communication in planning and instruction;
- provided clear, complete written and/or oral directions for instructional activities;
- communicated high expectations for learning to all students;
- conveyed enthusiasm for teaching and learning;
- provided opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning;
- demonstrated knowledge of content for the subject(s) taught;
- used a variety of appropriate teaching strategies to enhance student learning;
- provided learning experiences that accommodated differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners (enrichment and remedial);

- engaged students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking through higher-order questioning and provided opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking.
- elicited input during lessons, allowed sufficient wait time for students to expand and support their responses, and adjusted lessons according to student input, cues, and individual/group responses;
- used family and/or community resources in lessons to enhance student learning;
- monitored and adjusted the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning;
- attended to or delegated routine tasks;
- used a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs;
- created and maintained a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students;
- maximized time available for instruction;
- established opportunities for communication with parents and/or guardians and professional colleagues.
- demonstrated use of low profile desists for managing minimally disruptive behavior;
- demonstrated appropriate use of disciplinary action to handle disruptive student misbehavior.

Based on the results of the Teacher Work Sample (TWS), Completer 6 had an overall mean score of 3.00. She received a score of indicator met (3) on all 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 6 appropriately met (3) the following indicators concerning learning objectives:

- developed instructional objectives that were measurable, focused, standards-based, and varied;
- justified learning objectives with contextual factors.
- aligned objectives with local, state, or national standards;
- identified the level of each learning objective using Bloom's Taxonomy, DOK, or MS CCRS; and
- explained how objectives promote creativity and higher-level thinking.

Completer 6 appropriately met (3) the following indicators dealing with analyzing student learning:

- presented assessment data clearly and accurately;
- aligned assessments with learning objectives;
- accurately interpreted data and drew conclusions;
- provided 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 aligned to the MSCCRS. Completer 6 developed section 6 of the TWS and provided a graph depicting her pre and post test results for her students. These results were analyzed and showed that out of nine students five scored the same, two showed growth, and two scored lower on the post-test than the pre-test. There were a variety of possible reasons for this. All nine students were special needs students with various disabilities, and several also had trauma related issues. This unit was very difficult for most of them. They were all attending school virtually this year.

#### *Universal Screener/Benchmark Tests and/or State Tests*

This school year, the completer's data was limited because she did not have the same students all year long. She had one group of students during the first semester and another group of students in the second semesters. Therefore, she was unable to track the growth of her students with test data.

#### Data from Participant 7

##### *Interview #1*

Completer was most confident with her content knowledge in her area and her supportive relationships with students. She was least confident in time management and all the changes that the pandemic has caused within the classroom. The completer stated that the specific contextual factors of developmental levels and interests impacted her instruction. Due to these factors, she created developmentally appropriate lessons for the wide age range of students and lessons that appealed to student interests. To assess prior knowledge, the completer used questioning and data from the previous assessments. For remediation, she grouped students in heterogeneous groups to offer more support to remedial students and provided one-on-one instruction and modeling for struggling students. For enrichment, she set higher goals for her students who needed more challenge. The completer differentiated her lessons based on skill levels. She provided special equipment for physically challenged students and provided different challenge levels for different skill levels. The completer used both written and performance tests, both of which are developed by the teacher. Concerning technology, the completer used technology to expose students to different sports, to make the activities more realistic with sports sounds, and to

manage time. The completer expressed being most successful at challenging students in multiple domains (cognitive, psychomotor, and affective) and building student relationships with trust but expressed that she needed more training with time management.

#### *Interview #2*

The completer set goals for the unit which included putting, chipping, and pitching the golf ball with targeted cues and incorporated different levels including Bloom's Taxonomy: Remembering, Understanding, Applying, and Creating. The completer incorporated prior knowledge of golf from the previous year into the lesson, expanded their knowledge of the sport, and gave a written pre-test and pre-skills assessment to assess prior knowledge. Considering the contextual factors of low socioeconomic status, the completer went above and beyond helping students experience golf in the most realistic setting in order to build background knowledge and expose them to different opportunities that golf would afford them. In order to check for understanding, the completer used checklists and observation throughout the unit. The completer allowed students to practice new content by implementing hands-on activities that reinforced the skill. The completer differentiated her lessons by placing students at different stations of varying degree of difficulty and by providing special equipment to students with physical challenges. In order to remediate students, the completer gave struggling students extra time to practice the skill and opportunities to retest. In order to provide enrichment, the teacher provided more challenging stations that increased in difficulty and led students to think critically about the sport and sportsmanship. Verbal and written feedback was given immediately during guided and independent practice. The completer assessed their learning by administering a written test and a performance test. Reflecting on the participation in this study, the completer believed the experience helped her reflect on the importance of individualized, differentiated instruction based on each student's skill level.

#### *Informal Observation by DSU Supervisor*

The learning goals were clearly posted in the PE room and were addressed verbally. The purpose of the lesson was to obtain the lowest golf score by applying the correct hitting technique. The completer connected this to real life by explaining how the students can play golf at home with different objects around their house. The teacher made connections from prior learning to current learning by discussing what they already knew about golf and how they would use those skills in the current lesson. All leveled stations supported and contributed to the mastery of the objective for each learner. During the lesson, all students were on-task. The completer used questioning and observation during the lesson to assess mastery of the skill and to see who needed additional support. The completer engaged learners

## COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

in different levels of Bloom's Taxonomy including recall, apply, analyze, and evaluate. Technology was minimally used by the teacher during the lesson to play music and to display a timer. The entire class time was used for instruction, and students were given plenty of time for practice with the skill. The completer involved all students regardless of diversity by calling on all students, giving feedback to all students, and providing challenging activities to all students. The classroom environment promoted instruction by providing plenty of space for each child to practice the skill and by promoting a positive atmosphere. Strengths of the completer included connecting with students in a positive way and creating a positive classroom environment. The completer was weakest in time management.

*Principal Observations*

Using the Teacher Growth Rubric, the principal rated the completer with threes in all domains. Therefore, there was not a highest or lowest scoring domain, but rather the completer scored average in all areas.

*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 (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 students if the teacher helped them when they make a mistake, if the students knew the teacher's behavioral expectations, and if the teacher wanted students to explain their answers. There were several questions under each standard, and this completer had the highest mean scores and lowest mean scores on questions pertaining to Standard 1. These lowest scoring questions asked students if the teacher used different community members to help them learn.

*Formal Observation- TIAI and TWS*

The unit of study taught by Completer 7 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

## COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

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 reviewed the previous lesson, provided demonstrations, managed her classroom very well, provided the students with clear directions, and gave immediate and corrective feedback throughout her lesson. She asked good questions on a variety of levels and kept the students actively engaged and on task.

Based on the results of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI), Completer 7 had an overall mean score of 2.96. She received a score of acceptable (2) or target (3) on all indicators. She received a target score (3) in the following areas:

- selected developmentally appropriate, performance-based objectives that connected core content knowledge for lessons based on Mississippi Curriculum Frameworks/College and Career Readiness Standards;
- incorporated diversity, including multicultural perspectives, into lessons, and used knowledge of student backgrounds, interests, experiences, and prior knowledge to make instruction relevant and meaningful;
- integrated core content knowledge from other subject areas in lessons;
- planned appropriate and sequential teaching procedures that included innovative and interesting introductions and closures, and used a variety of teaching materials and technology;
- prepared appropriate assessments based on core content knowledge to effectively evaluate learner progress;
- planned differentiated learning experiences that accommodated developmental and/or educational needs of learners based on assessment information which was aligned with core content knowledge;
- communicated assessment criteria and performance standards to the students and provided timely feedback on students' academic performance.
- incorporated a variety of informal and formal assessments to differentiate learning experiences that accommodated differences in developmental and/or educational needs;
- used acceptable written, oral, and nonverbal communication in planning and instruction;
- provided clear, complete written and/or oral directions for instructional activities;
- communicated high expectations for learning to all students;
- conveyed enthusiasm for teaching and learning;

- provided opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning;
- demonstrated knowledge of content for the subject(s) taught;
- used a variety of appropriate teaching strategies to enhance student learning;
- provided learning experiences that accommodated differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners (enrichment and remedial);
- engaged 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.
- Used family and/or community resources in lessons to enhance student learning;
- monitored and adjusted the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning;
- attended to or delegated routine tasks;
- used a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs;
- created and maintained a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students;
- maximized time available for instruction;
- established opportunities for communication with parents and/or guardians and professional colleagues.
- demonstrated use of low profile desists for managing minimally disruptive behavior;
- demonstrated appropriate use of disciplinary action to handle disruptive student misbehavior.

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

- elicited input during lessons, allowed sufficient wait time for students to expand and support their responses, and adjusted lessons according to student input, cues, and individual/group responses.

Based on the results of the Teacher Work Sample (TWS), Completer 7 had an overall mean score of 3.00. She received a score of indicator met (3) on all 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 7 appropriately met (3) the following indicators concerning learning objectives:

- developed instructional objectives that were measurable, focused, standards-based, and varied;
- justified learning objectives with contextual factors;
- aligned objectives with local, state, or national standards;
- identified the level of each learning objective using Bloom's Taxonomy, DOK, or MS CCRS; and
- explained how objectives promote creativity and higher-level thinking.

Completer 7 appropriately met (3) the following indicators dealing with analyzing student learning:

- presented assessment data clearly and accurately;
- aligned assessments with learning objectives;
- accurately interpreted data and draws conclusions;
- provided evidence of impact on student learning.

Completer 7 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. 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 were very similar between both genders. There were no significant differences between the two. Overall, the results of the analysis of student learning section for Completer 7 showed that all students showed growth as they all scored higher on the post-test than the pre-test, and optimal learning was achieved.

#### *Universal Screener/Benchmark Tests and/or State Tests*

The completer did not administer any universal screeners or benchmark tests in PE.

Data from Participant 8

*Interview #1*

The completer was most confident with teaching content knowledge in her area, developing lessons, managing her classroom, and dealing with parents. She was least confident with using technology. The completer stated that the specific contextual factors of socioeconomic status, limited access to technology, and lack of parental involvement affected her lesson development. To assess prior knowledge, the completer used student interest surveys, questioning, and pretests to assess prior knowledge. For remediation, she used small groups to increase peer learning and tutored individual students on specific skills. For enrichment, the completer integrated challenging, enrichment objectives within project-based learning activities, online activities, interactive notebooks, and peer group instruction. The completer differentiated her lessons by providing multiple approaches to learning including group projects, small group instruction, online textbook differentiation, and close reading and annotation. The completer used teacher made assessments with multiple choice and short answer items along with performance-based projects. Concerning technology, the completer incorporated online textbooks, Common Lit programs, Promethean Board applications, online primary resources, and videos to enhance instruction. The completer expressed being most successful building relationships with students and families and developing engaging lessons but expressed that she needed to collaborate more with other teachers and needed more technology training.

*Interview #2*

The completer set goals for the unit which included comparing and contrasting ideas of the era to those of the modern time. She also incorporated different cognitive levels including Bloom's Taxonomy: understanding and analyzing and different DOK levels: (1) Recalling and (2) Analyzing, and (3) Creating. The completer assessed prior knowledge using a KWL, class discussion, review of previous lessons, and a concept map. Considering the contextual factors of different ability groups and student interests, she differentiated assignments by providing assignments on various levels and developing lessons that catered to the students' interests. In order to check for understanding, the completer used formative assessments, vocabulary development, observations, rubrics, questioning, and interactive galleries from the online textbook. The completer allowed students to practice new content by providing scaffolded activities that gradually released learning responsibility to the student. In order to remediate students, the completer provided extra content

instruction to increase retention of information. In order to provide enrichment, the teacher provided additional criteria to assignments to activate higher order thinking. Verbal and written feedback was given immediately during whole group instruction and on rubrics for written assignments. The completer assessed their learning by analyzing the students' Venn diagrams and essays. During the lesson, the completer adjusted to the lesson based on her observations of student engagement and implemented small groups with peer interaction rather than whole group discussion. Reflecting on the participation in this study, the completer believed the experience helped her reflect on the importance of incorporating higher order thinking skills and giving more feedback to students.

#### *Informal Observation by DSU Supervisor*

The learning goals were clearly posted in the room and were presented verbally. The students clearly understood the objectives and purpose of the lesson. The purpose of the lesson was to compare and contrast the significant events of World War II. The completer connected this to real life by explaining how WWII issues, such as censorship, still occur in current times. The teacher assessed prior learning by administering a pre-test and used the results of the pre-test during unit planning. All leveled stations supported and contributed to the mastery of the objective for each learner. During the lesson, all students were on-task within the classroom and online. The completer used questioning and observation during the lesson to assess mastery of the skill. The completer did not engage learners in different levels of Bloom's Taxonomy. The completer used technology by using the Promethean board for instructional presentations and videos. The entire class time was used for instruction. The completer involved all students regardless of diversity by calling on all students. The classroom environment promoted instruction by providing a disruption free classroom and easily accessible learning materials. Strengths of the completer included content knowledge, classroom management, communication of high expectations, enthusiasm and respect for all. The completer was weakest in writing detailed lesson plans.

#### *Principal Observations*

Using the Teacher Growth Rubric, the principal rated the completer highest in Domain II: Student Understanding in which the completer assisted students in taking responsibility for learning, monitored student learning, and provided multiple ways for students to make meaning of content. The completer scored lowest in Domain I: Lesson Design and Domain IV: Professional Responsibilities. Components of Domain I included aligning lessons to standards in a coherent sequence of learning and having high levels of learning for all students. Components of Domain IV included the teacher engaging in professional learning and maintaining effective communication with families.

*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 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), 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 used community members to help them learn, if the teacher helped them when they made a mistake and knew when they need help, if the teacher pushed them to do their best, if the teacher treated them fairly and respectfully, if the students knew the teacher's behavioral expectations, if the students were not afraid to ask questions in class, and if the teacher explained concepts in multiple ways to insure understanding. The completer had the lowest mean for 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). This specific question asked students if the teacher asked questions to make sure they understood.

*Formal Observation- TIAI and TWS*

The unit of study taught by Completer 8 was a world history unit on The Enlightenment. Her lesson plans were written in the format required by her school district but included most of the elements of the DSU education lesson plans. Her lessons were aligned to the Mississippi College and Career Readiness Standards. The lesson plans were well-written and included the following elements: An objective, bell work/do now (anticipatory set), explanation (modeling activities), interpretation (guided practice activities/checking for understanding), application (independent practice activities), closure (wrap up/exit slip), formative assessment, and modifications for Tier students.

During the formal observation of the TIAI unit lesson, the DSU supervisor observed a specific lesson on The Enlightenment Era. The supervisor noted that Completer 8 had the DOK levels associated with her lesson posted on the board;

utilized several graphic organizers, such as a KWL chart and Venn diagram; made connections to other subject areas, such as science; utilized technology throughout the lesson; made accommodations for various learners including enrichment and remedial; asked higher-order thinking questions; provided specific feedback to students; provided clear, specific directions; had high expectations for students; was enthusiastic about the lesson; provided explicit instruction; communicated with parents via an interactive app; and managed her classroom well. She used a variety of appropriate instructional strategies, such as think-pair-share, interactive games, class discussions, videos, and graphic organizers.

Based on the results of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI), Completer 8 had an overall mean score of 3.00. She received a score of target (3) on all indicators. She received a target score (3) in the following areas:

- selected developmentally appropriate, performance-based objectives that connected core content knowledge for lessons based on Mississippi Curriculum Frameworks/College and Career Readiness Standards;
- incorporated diversity, including multicultural perspectives, into lessons, and used knowledge of student backgrounds, interests, experiences, and prior knowledge to make instruction relevant and meaningful;
- integrated core content knowledge from other subject areas in lessons;
- planned appropriate and sequential teaching procedures that included innovative and interesting introductions and closures, and used a variety of teaching materials and technology;
- prepared appropriate assessments based on core content knowledge to effectively evaluate learner progress;
- planned differentiated learning experiences that accommodated developmental and/or educational needs of learners based on assessment information which was aligned with core content knowledge;
- communicated assessment criteria and performance standards to the students and provided timely feedback on students' academic performance.
- incorporated a variety of informal and formal assessments to differentiate learning experiences that accommodated differences in developmental and/or educational needs;
- used acceptable written, oral, and nonverbal communication in planning and instruction;
- provided clear, complete written and/or oral directions for instructional activities;
- communicated high expectations for learning to all students;
- conveyed enthusiasm for teaching and learning;

- provided opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning;
- demonstrated knowledge of content for the subject(s) taught;
- used a variety of appropriate teaching strategies to enhance student learning;
- provided learning experiences that accommodated differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners (enrichment and remedial);
- engaged students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking through higher-order questioning and provided opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking.
- elicited input during lessons, allowed sufficient wait time for students to expand and support their responses, and adjusted lessons according to student input, cues, and individual/group responses;
- used family and/or community resources in lessons to enhance student learning;
- monitored and adjusted the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning;
- attended to or delegated routine tasks;
- used a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs;
- created and maintained a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students;
- maximized time available for instruction;
- established opportunities for communication with parents and/or guardians and professional colleagues.
- demonstrated use of low profile desists for managing minimally disruptive behavior;
- demonstrated appropriate use of disciplinary action to handle disruptive student misbehavior.

Based on the results of the Teacher Work Sample (TWS), Completer 8 had an overall mean score of 2.78. She received a score of indicator met (3) on all but 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 8 appropriately met (3) the following indicators concerning learning objectives:

- developed instructional objectives that were measurable, focused, standards-based, and varied;

- aligned objectives with local, state, or national standards;
- identified the level of each learning objective using Bloom’s Taxonomy, DOK, or MS CCRS.

Completer 8 partially met (2) the following indicators concerning learning objectives:

- justified learning objectives with contextual factors;
- explained how objectives promote creativity and higher-level thinking.

Completer 8 appropriately met (3) the following indicators concerning analyzing student learning:

- presented assessment data clearly and accurately;
- aligned assessments with learning objectives;
- accurately interpreted data and draws conclusions;
- provided evidence of impact on student learning.

Completer 8 provided the learning objectives for her unit as well as the MSCCRS associated with the unit. The learning goals were linked directly to DOK (a requirement of the school district), and they were aligned to the MSCCRS. A brief justification was also provided to connect the learning objectives to contextual factors. Completer 8 developed section 6 of the TWS and provided a chart depicting the pre and post test results for her class as well as graphs depicting several subgroups of students, which included a proficient and a remedial reader. She analyzed the results and wrote narratives explaining her data. None of the students passed the pre-test indicating they did not have any knowledge of The Enlightenment Era. All but three of the students passed the post test. The Completer reported that 100% of the students showed growth on the post-test even the three who did not pass it. Remediation was provided for those three students.

#### *Universal Screener/Benchmark Tests and/or State Tests*

The completer taught in an untested subject in high school. Therefore, there was no test data to show whether students grew or not.

## **XI. Implications and Further Questions**

Commonalities across the evaluated areas seem to bear consideration. To begin, all completers set high expectations for both behavior and learning in the classroom, created an effective learning environment, developed a good rapport with students, and used technology to enhance instruction. Regardless of placement, all completers exhibited strong content knowledge in their area (particularly in history and ELA) but some expressed a weakness in math, science and writing instruction.

DSU Supervisors and principals observed candidates creating positive learning environments, completing professional responsibilities, modeling instruction, making learning relevant, connecting previous learning to new learning, engaging students in the learning progress, and teaching well-designed lessons.

Testing data were very limited, with some unavailable due to the pandemic. In some cases, this limited the availability of growth data since the baseline for growth was skewed. When multiple data points were available, growth was shown in the majority of students in all ELA and math classrooms. Only one completer did not show growth; however, the growth data was skewed due to the pandemic's effect on testing.

In contrast, completers were not as successful with monitoring student learning through data analysis, higher-order questioning, effective explanation, remediation for struggling students, and additional enrichment for students. According to student feedback, completers did not effectively use the community or parents to aid in their learning. According to principal feedback, most completers struggled with the domain of lesson design. This is a direct reflection of the drastic changes that occurred in learning due to the pandemic. Social distancing and virtual learning created a steep learning curve for our completers. While the pandemic certainly influenced completers' performance in these areas, these findings are also consistent with other assessment data and previous case study findings.

From this study, there are some implications to our programs. Positively, DSU programs provided effective preparation to completers in lesson design, professionalism, classroom management, instructional technology integration, content knowledge (particularly history and 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. Moving forward, DSU will incorporate more instruction on and hands-on experiences with remediation, enrichment, and differentiation, particularly in our methods courses. Next, more instruction needs to occur concerning data analysis, data driven instruction, and assessment variety which will be emphasized in CEL 497 and CRD 326. Finally, a few completers did not feel confident in math content knowledge or math instructional practices. This is a continuation of our findings from Cycle 2. These completers graduated before any modifications were made to our program. We will continue to

require students to teach a math lesson in their methods courses. There will also be a greater emphasis on pedagogy, particularly MAT 331. Some completers also did not feel confident in science content knowledge or science instructional practices. We will implement a greater emphasis on pedagogy in BIO 334.

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