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The state of West Virginia does not collect Value Added Measures (VAM) and does not release student test data connected to specific teachers Thus, it is up to each EPP to establish an agreement with a school(s) or district(s) within the state to access PK-12 teacher and student data. For the purposes of this self-study to address CAEP 4.1 and 4.2, the EPP reached out to its local school districts (Mercer County and Raleigh County), which hire a large number of EPP graduates. In an initial effort to capture data for CAEP Components 4.1 and 4.2, a case study was designed by the EPP to be implemented in these local school districts. The focus of the case study project was based on two questions: 1) Do our program completers contribute to expected levels of student learning growth and 2) Do our program completers effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve? In essence, the EPP set out to describe and explain the impact of the EPP on our graduates’ teaching practice and to explore the potential impact of our graduates’ practice on P-12 student learning.

During the fall 2017 semester, the EPP delineated the plans for the completer case study. It was decided to keep the case study small for the pilot year. The case study was piloted during the 2017-2018 year with two elementary completers. The EPP invited potential participants based on proximity, content area, and developmental level to participate. The EPP also met with the school district Superintendents to discuss the plans of the proposed case studies and to secure their assistance in securing both teacher and student data. The two participants selected were provided with the goals and plan of the case study, and were provided a small stipend after signing the case study MOU.

The EPP used multiple data sources to describe the impact of our two elementary completers’ teaching practices on P-12 student learning. The process for collecting data on each case included an initial interview to discuss the process of the case study and the submission of test data and principal observation/evaluations by the participant. The EPP decided to delay active participation in the classroom via observations, student surveys and the student work sample project until the second and third years of participation in the case study. Faculty resources and time prevented the full participation in the classrooms of the two case study participants. Therefore for the first year of study, the EPP depended upon the following data sources to analyze completer impact on student learning.

Renaissance Star assessments in reading and mathematics were provided by the participants. Star Assessments are standards based, computer-adaptive tests (CATs) for pre-K—12 students that measure reading, math, and early literacy skills. CATs adjust the difficulty levels based on students’ responses. If the student answers a question correctly, the next assessment is more difficult. If he or she answers incorrectly, the next assessment is easier. CATs adapt to the right difficulty level throughout the test to provide a highly accurate prediction of the student’s ability in reading, and math. At the beginning of the school year, students are given grade level assessment to produce a grade level equivalent and, for the reading assessment, a Lexile reader measure. Lexile reader measures describe how strong of a reader a student is. Students are tested throughout the year and are monitored for being above grade level, at grade level, below grade level, or intensive. A year end assessment is given to measure student growth.

The West Virginia General Summative Assessment (WVGSA) for students in grades 3-8 is an online summative test given toward the end of the school year to measure student performance on the state’s content standards, which provide clear, consistent guidelines for what students should know and be able to do at each grade level. Students in grades 3-8 are assessed in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics. Students in grades 5 and 8 also are assessed in science. Student achievement level descriptors provide a general description of student performance at each level. A cut score is a selected score point on the scale for each assessment that determines each of the achievement levels for that assessment. Achievement level descriptors are: does not meet standard, partially meets standard, meets standard, and exceeds standard. Participants shared this data in a way to maintain student anonymity.

In addition to these student assessments, the Case Study Team reviewed principal evaluations from the WV Evaluation Rubric for Teachers.

Data for the pilot year case study were reviewed in summer 2018 by EPP faculty members. The narrative below describes the work of the Case Study Team, including design of the case study, findings and suggestions.

 **Participants 2017-18 Academic Year:**

Two participants were selected from a pool of second-year teachers (completers S16). Participation was voluntary and participants gave permission for their evaluations and other evidence to be released to the case study team for review. Prior to agreeing to participate, members of the Case Study Team met with the participants and described the expectations. The table below provides a brief description of the two participants.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Participant****(Pseudonym)** | **Gender** | **Race/****Ethnicity** | **Program Area** | **Student Teaching Semester Data** | **Current Position** | **Case Study Outcome** |
| Janet | F | White | Elementary | Completed 16 week student teaching placement in 2nd grade classroom.GPA: 3.95TWS: 96 (100)WVERT: 2.83 (3.00) overall meanPLT: 179 (160)Praxis Subject AssessmentsReading/LA – 196 (157)Math – 175 (157)Science – 184 (159)Social Studies – 173 (155)Teaching Reading – 192 (162) | Second year teacher, 3rd grade classroom. | Completed case study and agreed to participate in second year study. |
| Peter | M | African-American | Elementary | Completed 16 week student teaching as a Teacher in Residence in a 3rd/4th grade split classroom.GPA: 3.86TWS: 100 (100)WVERT: 2.83 (3.00) overall meanPLT: 181 (160)Praxis Subject AssessmentsReading/LA – 190 (157)Math – 193 (157)Science – 161 (159)Social Studies – 179 (155)Teaching Reading – 187 (162) | Second year teacher, 5th grade classroom. | Completed case study and agreed to participate in second year study. |

Janet’s first year of teaching was out of her preparation area, teaching gifted students in the elementary setting. At the end of the school year, she applied for and was hired as a third grade teacher. Peter was hired as a first year teacher teaching in a fifth grade classroom. Both Janet and Peter continued in those same positions during the 2017-18 academic school year. During this time, Peter enrolled in an M.Ed. program in educational leadership/supervision. He also served as the school’s faculty senate president, and the local school improvement council (LSIC) chairperson. Peter was also nominated by the school for the Presidential Award for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching.

The chart below identifies the demographics for each school setting (School #1 is Janet; #2 is Peter).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | County | School | Enrollment | Enrollment Composition | Special Education % | Low SES % | ELL % |
| 1 | Mercer | BIS | 355 | 54% Male46% Female59% White32% African American 9% Multi-racial | 25% | 74% | 0% |
| 2 | Raleigh | BE | 448 | 52% Male48% Female45% White33% African American19% Multi-racial 3% Hispanic/Latino | 18% | 82% | 0% |

**Findings of the Case Study**

The pilot case study data and evidence materials that were provided to the team were analyzed to address CAEP Standard 4, component 4.1: The provider documents, using multiple measures that program completers contribute to an expected level of student-learning growth. Multiple measures shall include all available growth measures (including value-added measures, student-growth percentiles, and student learning and development objectives) required by the state for its teachers and available to educator preparation providers, other state-supported P-12 impact measures, and any other measures employed by the provider. The study also included the use of a state mandated evaluation instrument used by principals to assess educator performance based on the West Virginia Professional Teaching Standards.

Evidence: Star Assessment Data in Math and Reading

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Participant** | **Star Reading Report****Pretest Mean** | **Star Reading Report****Posttest Mean** | **Star Math** **Report****Pretest Mean** | **Star Math** **Report****Posttest Mean** |
| Janet | Pretest- 336 (N=22) Lexile Score 265L  | Posttest- 452 (N=22) Change +116 Pretest Lexile Score 525L Change +260L | Pretest- 547 (N=22) | Posttest-648 (N=22) Change +101 |
| Peter | Pretest- 510 (N=23) Lexile Score 610L | Posttest- 724 (N=23) Change +214 Pretest Lexile Score 884L Change +274L | Pretest- 650 (N=23 | Posttest-790 (N=23) Change +140 |

Summary of the Evidence from the Star Assessments

The two completers of the EPP’s elementary education program were second year teachers. One was teaching in the third grade, the other in fifth grade. The Star assessments are given at the beginning of the year as a benchmark. Throughout the year, students continue to take Star assessments and their progress is monitored by the classroom teacher. As can be seen in their evaluations by their principals, both Janet and Peter used data from the Star assessments in reading and mathematics to plan lessons. At the end of the year, the posttest is given. Both Janet’s and Peter’s students showed overall growth in reading and math. Average Lexile reader levels showed gains in both classrooms. A Lexile reader measure can range from below 0L for early readers to above 2000L for advanced readers. The Lexile reader measure range for third grade is 415L to 760L. At the end of the school year, Janet’s classroom average was at the middle of this range. The Lexile reader measure range for fifth grade is 770L to 1080L. Peter’s classroom average is within this range. Both Janet and Peter were able to improve their students Lexile reader measure average from below grade level to at grade level by the completion of the school year.

Evidence: WV General Summative Assessment ELA Grade 3 and Grade 5 Tests

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Participant | Teacher Summative Percent Proficient and Average Score | School Summative Percent Proficientand Average Score | County Summative Percent Proficientand Average Score | State Summative Percent Proficientand Average Score |
| Janet | 68% N=22434 | 47% N=112418 | 39% N=690416 | 48% N=19,265422 |
| Peter | 55% N=23632 | 36% N=78587 | 41% N=923609 | 44% N=19,462618 |

Evidence: WV General Summative Assessment ELA Mathematics Grade 3 and Grade 5 Tests

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Participant | Teacher Summative Percent Proficient and Average Score | School Summative Percent Proficientand Average Score | County Summative Percent Proficient and Average Score | State Summative Percent Proficient and Average Score |
| Janet | 45% N=22583 | 38% N=112575 | 37% N=690574 | 47% N=19,265580 |
| Peter | 61% N=23534 | 36% N=78466 | 41% N=923474 | 44% N=19,462480 |

Summary of Evidence from the WV General Summative Assessments

Students in grades 3-8 take the WV General Summative Assessments in May each year. In grade 3, the students are tested on English language arts and math. In grade 5, students are tested on English language arts, math, and science. Data from the fifth-grade science test were not included in the case study. Both Janet and Peter had more than 50% of their students score proficient in English language arts. Peter had more than 50% of his students score proficient in mathematics, and Janet was not far behind with 45% percent at proficient. Compared to their colleagues’ third and fifth grade students in their individual schools, Janet and Peter showed impressive student learning gains. The same is true when their percent proficient and average scores in English language arts are compared to all third and fifth grade students in their respective counties. Finally, although Janet’s percent proficient in math was slightly lower than the entire state’s summative percent proficient, her students’ average score was slightly higher. Peter’s percent proficient and average score were significantly above the whole state’s performance in mathematics. Both Janet’s and Peter’s percent proficient and average score in reading were above the whole state’s third and fifth grade classes.

Evidence: WV Evaluation Rubric for Teachers (WVERT)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **WV Professional Teaching Standards** | **InTASC Standards** | **Janet** **(Distinguished, Accomplished, Emerging, or Unsatisfactory)** | **Peter****(Distinguished, Accomplished, Emerging, or Unsatisfactory)** |
| **Standard 1: Curriculum and Planning** |  |  |  |
| 1.1 The teacher demonstrates a deep and extensive knowledge of subject matter | Standard 4: Content Knowledge | Accomplished | Distinguished |
| 1.2 The teacher designs standards-driven instruction using state-approved curricula. | Standard 8: Instructional Practices | Accomplished | Distinguished |
| 1.3 The teacher uses a balanced assessment approach to guide student learning. | Standard 6: Assessment | Accomplished | Distinguished |
| **Standard 2: The Learner and the Learning Environment** |  |  |  |
| 2.1 The teacher understands and responds to unique characteristics of learners. | Standard 1: Learner DevelopmentStandard 2: Learner Differences | Accomplished | Accomplished |
| 2.2 The teacher establishes and maintains a safe and appropriate learning environment. | Standard 3: Learning Environments | Accomplished | Accomplished |
| 2.3 The teacher establishes and maintains a learner-centered environment. | Standard 5: Application of Content | Accomplished | Accomplished |
| **Standard 3: Teaching** |  |  |  |
| 3.1 The teacher utilizes a variety of research-based instructional strategies.  | Standard 8: Instructional Strategies | Accomplished | Distinguished |
| 3.2 The teacher motivates and engages students in learning and problem solving. | Standard 5: Application of ContentStandard 8: Instructional Strategies | Accomplished | Distinguished |
| 3.3 The teacher adjusts instruction based on a variety of assessments and student responses.  | Standard 6: Assessment | Accomplished | Distinguished |
| **Standard 4: Professional Responsibilities for Self-Renewal**  |  |  |  |
| 4.1 The teacher engages in professional development that guides continuous examination and improvement of professional practice.  | Standard 9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice | Accomplished | Distinguished |
| 4.2 The teacher actively engages in collaborative learning opportunities with colleagues. | Standard 10: Leadership and Collaboration | Accomplished | Distinguished |
| **Standard 5: Professional Responsibilities for School and Community** |  |  |  |
| 5.1 The teacher participates in school-wide collaborative efforts to support the success of all students | Standard 10: Leadership and Collaboration | Accomplished | Distinguished |
| 5.2 The teacher works with parents, guardians, families and community entities to support student learning and well-being.  | Standard 9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice | Accomplished | Distinguished |
| 5.3 The teacher promotes practices and policies that improve school environment and student learning. | Standard 9 Professional Learning and Ethical Practice | Accomplished | Distinguished |
| **Standard 6: Student Learning****(Teachers establish two goals for the academic year.)** |  |  |  |
| Goal 1: The work of the teacher results in measurable progress of student learning of state-approved curricula. |  | Accomplished | Accomplished |
| Goal 2: The work of the teacher results in measurable progress of student learning of state-approved curricula. |  | Accomplished | Accomplished |
| **Summative Performance Rating** |  | Accomplished | Accomplished |

Evidence: Evaluator Comments of the WVERT

The following comments were made by the principal of Janet:

* Janet uses the CCRS (Common Core Reading Standards) to provide instruction as documented in Planbook and tracked within data notebook.
* Janet has shown a wonderful ability to earn the trust of her students and respect for her expectations. Her students are comfortable with her correcting their behaviors and understand the purpose behind her expectations.
* Janet uses a variety of teaching strategies to deliver content as documented through observations. She utilizes several different resources to gather the attention of her students.
* Janet participates in high quality professional development programs offered by Mercer County Public Schools and WVDE.
* Janet conducts [her]self in a manner that clearly demonstrates that the welfare of students is of primary importance. [She] maintains contact with parents regarding student concerns.
* Janet has done a fantastic job as a first year as a classroom teacher. She made it a priority to establish positive relationships with her students and their families. She has been a positive role model and sets the bar high for all staff at BIS. Her commitment to teaching shows in the results of her classroom.

The following comments were made by the principal of Peter:

* The teacher demonstrates a deep and thorough knowledge of the subject matter he teaches. He uses county and state approved curriculum and standards. He uses STAR data to guide student learning. His lessons are planned far in advanced and prepared for by having items scanned and prepared to use on promethean board.
* Classroom environment has a learner centered culture. Environment is appropriate for learning and students feel comfortable asking and answering questions.
* The teacher uses a variety of strategies to reach students. Students are motivated by the teacher to do their best. He encourages them to think through math problems and use problem solving strategies. He uses class assessments, STAR data, and student responses to adjust instruction as needed. Assignments are upload in Engrade and eBackpack.
* Teacher plans with other 5th grade teachers collaboratively. He also seeks out knowledge of 4th grade teachers whom students had previously. He recently completed his Master’s degree in Ed Leadership and is willing to participate in training offered by the school, county, and state.
* The teacher promotes the practices of the school and supports success of all students. He communicates with families via phone calls and meetings. He has worked to plan the 5th grade field trip to Washington, D.C. and planned numerous extra events to help fund this activity.
* Peter should be commended for working well with students who can be difficult. He is a teacher leader in our school.

Summary of Evidence from WV Evaluation Rubric for Teachers (WVERT)

Principals are required to complete a summative evaluation of all classroom teachers. The WVERT is based on the West Virginia Professional Teaching Standards which are aligned with InTASC Standards. As beginning teachers, both Janet and Peter have surpassed expectations on all standards, scoring accomplished, and Peter scoring distinguished on Standards 1, 3, 4, and 5. Standard 6 on the WVERT is based on two goals that the teacher establishes at the beginning of the year. Both Janet and Peter established goals to improve student performance in math and reading. As can be seen in the evidence from their Star assessments in reading and math, and their summative state test scores in English language arts and mathematics, as well as the accomplished rating on the WVERT, these goals were achieved. Finally, the commentaries provided by the principals regarding both Janet’s and Peter’s strength in teaching, their ability to connect to their students, their ability to manage the classroom, their ability to communicate with parents, and their overall leadership roles in their schools confirm their accomplished ratings. These principal evaluations of the two case study participants illustrate the professional competence of the EPP’s completers. If effective teachers are the products of effective teacher preparation programs, then the experiences Janet and Peter had in their programs have prepared them well. Their knowledge, skills and dispositions that made them successful in the EPP’s teacher education program have led to their success in the classroom. The qualities they have displayed as beginning teachers are the qualities of teachers who have a positive impact on their students’ learning.

**Conclusion**

Based on the evidence available, completers do contribute to an expected or above expected level of student learning growth. The EPP has used multiple measures to gather the data to support this conclusion. These measures included student assessment data in reading and math, and principal evaluations which included a standard on student learning. The two participant completers provided student achievement evidence of success. Principal evaluations validated the teaching effectiveness of the two case study completers. This evidence was used to support that this teaching effectiveness was achieved through program preparation. Accordingly, the EPP has demonstrated success in meeting CAEP Standard 4 components 4.1 and 4.2.

The EPP has gained valuable information regarding our completers from this pilot case study. However, in order to truly document that our graduates have a positive impact on student learning, we recognize that we must continue to expand the number of completers who will participate in our study. The case study plan will continue to follow the two initial participants from this case study for two more years. Each year, additional evidence will be added to include classroom observations, student surveys, and a teacher work sample. Furthermore, the EPP will expand the participants to include both elementary completers and secondary completers from the EPP’s content program areas. These secondary participants will also include completers from the MAT program. Our goal to provide exemplary evidence of completer impact on student learning.