

Completers' Positive Impact on K-12 Student Learning and Development

The EPP conducted its first case study in order to provide data with regard to our completers' impact on K-12 student learning and development. In May 2019, the EPP held an orientation meeting with four completers to discuss expectations, timeline, and due dates to gather quantitative and qualitative data. The completers chosen were a kindergarten teacher, 1st grade teacher, 2nd grade teacher, and a high school math teacher.

Data collected to measure the impact on K-12 student-learning growth:

- Quantitative Data
 - State Assessment – ISIP Istation, Renaissance STAR, ACT
 - Observations – from completers' principals and/or by EPP faculty
- Qualitative Data
 - Reflective Journals

Fall 2019 Timeline:

- EPP faculty observed all four completers in their classroom and conducted an evaluation using the TESS instrument.
- Completers wrote two reflections regarding their K-12 students' proficiency levels.
 - Reflection 1 asked candidates to give their initial impression of students' learning and development prior to taking assessments (i.e. starting point from teacher's viewpoint).
 - Reflection 2 asked completers to provide their insight and analysis of data regarding students' learning and development after receiving results from their pre-assessments (i.e. starting point from data results) on the Istation assessment, Renaissance STAR, ACT.
- Also during this semester, the EPP asked completers' principals to provide results from their own observations of the completers in the classroom.

Spring 2020 Timeline:

- In February 2020, the EPP was able to conduct three of the four observations of the completers in the classroom.
- In March 2020, the Governor of the State of Arkansas ordered schools to close because of the coronavirus pandemic. With schools closed, the EPP was not able to observe one completer for the second time.
- Completers wrote one reflection regarding their K-12 students' proficiency levels.
 - Reflection 3 asked completers to provide their insight and analysis of data regarding students' learning and development after receiving results from their interim assessments (i.e. student growth mid-way).
 - The EPP was able to receive three of the four reflections due to the coronavirus pandemic.
- The EPP was not able to collect post assessment data due to schools closing for the remainder of the school year and the cancellation of all state testing. However, in future case studies, completers will complete Reflection 4, which asks completers to provide insight and analysis of data regarding students' learning and development after receiving results from their post-assessments (i.e. overall student growth).

The following narrative provides an analysis of the data collected from three of the four completers.

Completer A, 1st Year Teacher:

Assessment: ISIP Istation: Pretest given in September, Interim Test given in January

Observation: Fall Observation by EPP, Spring Observation by EPP

Classroom Description:

N = 18, NOTE: began with 19 students, 1 student moved away

Relevant background information: 2 students with 504s, 1 with IEP, 3 receiving RTI, 1 in Foster Care

Analysis of Pretest Reading Scores to Interim Reading Scores and Pretest Math Scores to Interim Math Scores:

A paired-samples *t* tests was calculated to compare the mean pretest reading score to the mean interim reading score and the mean pretest math scores to the mean interim math score.

- The mean on the pretest reading was 213.11 (*sd* = 12.21), and the mean on the interim reading was 219.78 (*sd* = 13.38). A significant increase from the pretest reading to interim reading was found ($t(17) = -3.265$, $p < .05$).
- The mean on the pretest math was 2066.89 (*sd* = 44.9), and the mean on the interim math was 2134.94 (*sd* = 46.91). A significant increase from the pretest math to interim math was found ($t(17) = -1.638$, $p < .05$).

Analysis of TESS Evaluations and EPP Faculty Reflection:

- Observer 1: Overall Score: 3.29 Effective
 - Domain 1: 3.17 Effective
 - Domain 2: 3.80 Effective
 - Domain 3: 3.20 Effective
 - Domain 4: 3.00 Effective
 - Feedback: “Outstanding classroom environment! Positive, warm, inviting and safe! Students took responsibility for implementing station work and they remained on task for the entire hour of instruction.”
- Observer 2: Overall Score: 2.78 Effective
 - Domain 1: 2.67 Effective
 - Domain 2: 3.00 Effective
 - Domain 3: 2.80 Effective
 - Domain 4: 2.67 Effective
 - Feedback: “Teacher successfully accommodated students’ questions. She identified her low performing students and placed them in a group of higher performing students. The low performing students mastered the objective. She was very pleased, having the students go to smartboard and mark perfect beside their picture.”

Conclusion:

Due to the Governor cancelling all state assessment in the Spring of 2020, data results from the post assessment could not be collected. However, the mean scores from pretest to interim tests for both the reading and math tests increased with a significant difference found with the reading and math assessment. Results from the TESS evaluations indicate that the teacher is implementing effective practices in her classroom.

Completer B, 1st Year Teacher:

Assessment: Renaissance STAR: Pretest given in September, Interim Test given in December

Observation: Fall Observation by EPP, due to coronavirus pandemic – unable to observe in Spring

Classroom Description:

N = 7, NOTE: began with 8 students, 1 student unable to test in December

Relevant background information: 4 students identified with exceptionalities: Stuttering, Speech and Sensory Disorder, Dyslexia, ADHD

Analysis of Pretest Reading Scores to Interim Reading Scores and Pretest Math Scores to Interim Math Scores:

A paired-samples *t* tests was calculated to compare the mean pretest reading score to the mean interim reading score and the mean pretest math scores to the mean interim math score.

- The mean on the pretest reading was 129.00 ($sd = 100.98$), and the mean on the interim reading was 190.14 ($sd = 97.42$). A significant increase from the pretest reading to interim reading was found ($t(6) = -4.292$, $p < .05$).
- The mean on the pretest math was 337.57 ($sd = 83.31$), and the mean on the interim math was 384.57 ($sd = 79.44$). A significant increase from the pretest math to interim math was found ($t(6) = -3.712$, $p < .05$).

Analysis of TESS Evaluations and EPP Faculty Reflection:

- Observer 1: Overall Score: 3.00 Effective
 - Domain 1: 3.00 Effective
 - Domain 2: 3.00 Effective
 - Domain 3: 3.00 Effective
 - Domain 4: 3.00 Effective
 - Feedback: “When designing instruction, the teacher incorporated reading standup, hands-on methods, variety of questioning opportunities, and differentiation. Teacher provided one-on-one assistance to each student and restructured questions.”

Conclusion:

Due to the Governor cancelling all state assessment in the Spring of 2020, data results from the post assessment could not be collected. However, the mean scores from pretest to interim tests for both the reading and math tests increased with a significant difference found with the reading and math assessment. Results from the TESS evaluation indicate that the teacher is implementing effective practices in the classroom.

Completer C, 1st Year Teacher:

Assessment: ACT: Pretest given in September, Interim Test given in February

Observation: Fall Observation by EPP, Spring Observation by EPP, Informal Feedback from Principal

Classroom Description:

N = 15, NOTE: began with 27 students, 11 students unable to take interim test due to coronavirus pandemic

Relevant background information: 16 ESOL, 1 with IEP

Analysis of Pretest Math Scores to Interim Math Scores:

A paired-samples *t* tests was calculated to compare the mean pretest math scores to the mean interim math score.

- The mean on the pretest math was 16.20 (*sd* = 2.04), and the mean on the interim math was 16.07 (*sd* = 1.94). No significant difference from pretest math to interim math was found ($t(14) = .219$, $p > .05$).
- NOTE: the pretest math and the interim test did not follow the same formatting. See teacher description below.

Analysis of TESS Evaluations and EPP Faculty Reflection:

- Observer 1: Overall Score: 3.42 Effective
 - Domain 1: 3.33 Effective
 - Domain 2: 4.00 Highly Effective
 - Domain 3: 3.00 Effective
 - Domain 4: 3.33 Effective
 - Feedback: “Teacher was name the September ‘Educator of the Month’ for her high school! This is a very large school and quite an honor as a first year teacher! The announcement noted her dedication to her students success and her availability to them. Congratulations!”
- Observer 2: Overall Score: 3.77 Highly Effective
 - Domain 1: 3.83 Highly Effective
 - Domain 2: 3.80 Highly Effective
 - Domain 3: 3.60 Highly Effective
 - Domain 4: 3.83 Highly Effective
 - Feedback: “I was able to visit with Mr. Y, Principal. He reports that Ms. X is a ‘rock star’ teacher. She is mature and effective way beyond other first year teachers. During 2nd semester, she began leading staff development for other teachers, some with over 20 years of experience. He said they have observed her room over 25 times and the high level of instruction is always present!”

Principal Informal Feedback:

“We love having X on our staff. She is performing very effectively and making a big impact with students. She was recently named ‘Most valuable educator of the month.’”

Conclusion:

Due to the Governor cancelling all state assessment in the Spring of 2020, data results from the post assessment could not be collected. Results from the TESS evaluations indicate that the teacher is implementing highly effective practices in the classroom. This result is supported by the informal feedback from the principal and the teacher with regard to receiving the Educator of the Month award, being assigned as a collaborative team leader, and being observed by her peers and administration over 25 times.