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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 2018 semester, the EPP began its second year of completer case studies. The case study was piloted during the 2017-2018 year with two elementary completers. As part of the second year plan, two additional participants were added. Again, the two participants selected were provided with the goals and plan of the case study, and a small stipend after signing the case study MOU. The second year plan also includes following the two participants from the first year case study.

As with the first year case study, for 2018-19, the EPP used multiple data sources to describe the impact of the two elementary completers’ teaching practices on P-12 student learning. The process for collecting data for the two new participants followed the same protocol of an initial interview to discuss the process of the case study and the submission of test data and principal observation/evaluations by the participant. For the second year participants, the EPP added two focus students for each completer to further explore their impact on student learning. Data from the focus students will include benchmark assessment scores from the Star assessments and the WV General Summative Assessment. The following descriptions of these assessments provide an understanding of their use in the classroom.

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 form the second year case study were reviewed in summer 2019 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 2018-19 Academic Year:**

Two additional participants were selected from a pool of second-year teachers (completers S17). 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 four participants (two from the first year study, and two for the second year study).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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: 3.95  TWS: 96 (100)  WVERT: 2.83 (3.00) overall mean  PLT: 179 (160)  Praxis Subject Assessments  Reading/LA – 196 (157)  Math – 175 (157)  Science – 184 (159)  Social Studies – 173 (155)  Teaching Reading – 192 (162) | Third year teacher, 3rd grade classroom. | Completed second year case study and agreed to participate in third 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: 3.86  TWS: 100 (100)  WVERT: 2.83 (3.00) overall mean  PLT: 181 (160)  Praxis Subject Assessments  Reading/LA – 190 (157)  Math – 193 (157)  Science – 161 (159)  Social Studies – 179 (155)  Teaching Reading – 187 (162) | Third year teacher, 6th grade classroom (departmentalized, math) | Completed second year case study; May be transferring to an out-of-state school. |
| Nikki | F | White | Elementary | Completed 16 week student teaching placement in a 3rd grade classroom.  GPA: 3.58  WVTPA 2.84 (4.00)  WVERT: 3.00 (3.00) overall mean  PLT: 180 (160)  Praxis Subject Assessments  Reading/LA – 172 (157)  Math – 162 (157)  Science – 167 (159)  Social Studies – 176 (155)  Teaching Reading – 177 (162) | Second year teacher, 3rd grade. | Completed first year case study and agreed to participate in second year study. |
| Eva | F | White | Elementary;  SPED Multi-categorical (K-6);  Early Childhood SPED PreK-K | Completed 16 week student teaching as a TIR in a multi-categorical special education classroom, grades 3-5.  GPA 3.44  WVTPA: 2.00 (4.00)  WVERT: 3.00 (3.00) overall mean  PLT: 179 (160)  Praxis Subject Assessments  Reading/LA – 176 (157)  Math – 165 (157)  Science – 173 (159)  Social Studies – 160 (155)  Teaching Reading – 178 (162)  SPED Core 179 (153)  SPED Preschool/ Early Childhood 175 (159) |  | ,Completed first year case study and agreed to complete second year study |

Janet continued working in the same school and same position as she had during 2017-18. Peter transferred to a position teaching sixth grade math in a middle school in Mercer County. At the end of the spring 2018, Peter completed his M.Ed. program in educational leadership/supervision. He also added a math 5-9 endorsement. Nikki’s first year of teaching was in a 2nd grade classroom in another school. She transferred to her current position in July. She also was enrolled in an M.Ed. program in reading. Nikki taught her first year as a special education teacher in the same school where she completed her student teaching. An opening teaching 5th grade in the same school was available at the end of her first year, and she applied for this position and was able to move. She and Janet teach in the same school.

The chart below identifies the demographics for each school setting (School #1 is Janet; #2 is Peter, # 3 is Nikki, and #4 is Eva.).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | County | School | Enrollment | Enrollment Composition | Special Education % | Low SES % | ELL % |
| 1 | Mercer | BIS | 338 | 54% Male  46% Female  60% White  31% African American  9% Multi-racial | 24% | 73% | 0% |
| 2 | Mercer | PMS | 508 | 51% Male  49% Female  83% White  7% African American  7% Multi-racial  3% Unidentified | 17% | 53% | 0% |
| 3 | Mercer | SE | 178 | 54% Male  46% Female  98% White  0% African American  0% Multi-racial  2% Unidentified | 19% | 50% | 0% |
| 4 | Mercer | BIS | 338 | 54% Male  46% Female  60% White  31% African American  9% Multi-racial | 24% | 73% | 0% |

**Findings of the Case Study**

The 2018-19 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 measure included all available growth measures required by the state for its teachers, other state-supported P-12 impact measures, and other measures employed by the provider. The study also included the use of a state mandated evaluation instrument used by principals to review teacher performance.

Evidence: Star Assessment Data in Reading and Math

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Participant** | **Star Reading Report**  **Pretest Mean**  **Lexile** | **Star Reading Report**  **Posttest Mean**  **Lexile** | **Star Math**  **Report**  **Pretest Mean** | **Star Math**  **Report**  **Posttest Mean** |
| Janet | Pretest- 254 (N=22)  Lexile Score 45L | Posttest- 366 (N=22)  Change +112  Lexile Score 325L  Change +260L | Pretest- 490 (N=19) | Posttest-588 (N=22)  Change +98 |
| Peter | NA\* | NA\* | NA\* | NA\* |
| Nikki | Pretest- 296 (N=15)  Lexile Score- 150 | Posttest- 360 (N=15) Change +64  Lexile Score- 280L Change +130L | Pretest- 506 (N=15) | Posttest- 583 (N=15)  Change +77 |
| Eva | Pretest- 387 (N=19)  Lexile Score- 355L | Posttest- 408 (N=19) Change +21  Lexile Score- 350L  Change -5L | Pretest- 531 (N=19) | Posttest- 578 (N=19) |

\*Star Assessment is not used above grade 5.

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 fourth 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.

Evidence: Star Assessment Data in Reading and Math Individual Students for First Second Year Participants:

Janet: Grade 3

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Participant** | **Star Reading Report**  **Pretest/Posttest Score**  **Lexile**  **Grade Equivalency** | **Star Math Report**  **Pretest/Posttest Score**  **Grade Equivalency** |
| Student 1 | 104/355  +251  BR315L/345L  +660L  1.4/3.3  +1.9 | 425/491  +66  2.3/2.9  +0.6 |
| Student 2 | 467/564  +97  590L/770L  +180L  4.2/5.0  +0.8 | 482/578  +96  2.8/3.8  +1.0 |

Evidence: WV General Benchmark Assessment ELA Grade 3, Grade 5, and Grade 6 Tests:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Participant | Teacher Benchmark Percent Proficient and Average Score | School Benchmark  Percent Proficient  and Average Score | County Benchmark Percent Proficient and Average Score | State Benchmark  Percent Proficient and Average Score |
| Janet  Grade 3 | 11% N=19  536 | 12% N=103  342 | 11% N=630  540 | 14% N=18,583  386 |
| Peter  Grade 6 | NA\* | NA\* | NA\* | NA\* |
| Nikki Grade 3 | 0% N=15  NA | NA | 11% N=630  540 | 14% N=18,583  386 |
| Eva  Grade 5 | 9% N=23  NA | NA | NA | NA |

\*Peter taught only 6th grade math in a departmentalized setting.

Evidence: WV General Summative Assessments ELA Grade 3, Grade 5, and Grade 6 Tests:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Participant | Teacher Summative Percent Proficient and Average Score | School Summative  Percent Proficient  and Average Score | County Summative Percent Proficient and Average Score | State Summative  Percent Proficient and Average Score |
| Janet  Grade 3 | 45% N=22 (+40)  434 |  |  |  |
| Peter  Grade 6 | NA\* | NA\* | NA\* | NA\* |
| Nikki Grade 3 | 43% N=14 (+43)  NA | NA |  |  |
| Eva  Grade 5 | 11% N=18 (+2)  433 | 41% N=104  614 | 46% N=676  618 | 47% N=19,462  417 |

\*Peter taught only 6th grade math in a departmentalized setting.

Evidence: WV General Benchmark Assessments Mathematics Grade 3, Grade 5, and Grade 6 Tests:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Participant | Teacher Benchmark Percent Proficient and Average Score | School Benchmark  Percent Proficient  and Average Score | County Benchmark Percent Proficient and Average Score | State Benchmark  Percent Proficient and Average Score |
| Janet  Grade 3 | 5% N=19  390 | 5% N=103  392 | 4% N=630  386 | 6% N=18,576  386 |
| Peter  Grade 6 | 4% N=56  NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Nikki Grade 3 | 20% N=15  NA | NA | 4% N=630  386 | 6% N=18,576  386 |
| Eva  Grade 5 | 0% N=22  NA | NA | NA | NA |

Evidence: WV General Summative Assessments Mathematics Grade 3, Grade 5, and Grade 6 Tests:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Participant | Teacher Summative Percent Proficient and Average Score | School Summative  Percent Proficient  and Average Score | County Summative Percent Proficient and Average Score | State Summative  Percent Proficient and Average Score |
| Janet  Grade 3 | 45% N=22 (+40)  434 | 38% N=112 (+33)  418 | 37% N=690 (+33)  416 | 47% N=19,265 (+41)  422 |
| Peter  Grade 6 | 60% N=57 (+56)  NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Nikki Grade 3 | 43% N=14 (+23)  NA | NA | 37% N=690 (+33)  416 | 47% N=19,265 (+41)  422 |
| Eva  Grade 5 | 11% N=18 (+11)  433 | 33% N=104  466 | 36% N=677  472 | 40% N=19,511  474 |

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)** | **Nikki**  **(Distinguished, Accomplished, Emerging, or Unsatisfactory)** | **EVA**  **(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 Development  Standard 2: Learner Differences | Accomplished | Distinguished |  |  |
| 2.2 The teacher establishes and maintains a safe and appropriate learning environment. | Standard 3: Learning Environments | Accomplished | Distinguished |  |  |
| 2.3 The teacher establishes and maintains a learner-centered environment. | Standard 5: Application of Content | Accomplished | Distinguished |  |  |
| **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 Content  Standard 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 | Accomplished |  |  |
| **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 | Distinguished |  |  |
| Goal 2: The work of the teacher results in measurable progress of student learning of state-approved curricula. |  | Accomplished | Distinguished |  |  |
| **Summative Performance Rating** |  | Accomplished | Distinguished |  |  |

Evidence: Evaluator Comments of the WVERT

The following comments were made by the principal of Janet (second year participant):

* Janet has shown her knowledge of the third grade content standards in her weekly lesson planning. She uses approved curricular materials to provide whole group instruction and expands on the skills and strategies these resources introduce with supplementary materials.
* Establishing and maintaining a learner centered culture in her classroom has been a top priority of Janet’s this year. She has communicated with the parents of her students in order to gain their support and have encouragement from home when students need an extra push.
* Janet keeps her students engaged throughout the day by using a variety of instructional delivery methods. She uses both formal and informal assessments to determine whether or not her class has mastered the material they have been exposed to. Janet uses data and observation to adjust her instructional planning and student grouping.
* Janet not only attended the required school and county level trainings, but also represented BIS at the state level to help construct test items for the WVGSA. Additionally, Mrs. Walker collaborates with her colleagues in order to perfect her professional practices and maximize learning opportunities for her students.
* Janet demonstrates commitment to the students of BIS. She has helped chaperone dances and serves a daily bus duty. Both of these experiences afford Janet opportunities to interact with students and families beyond those in her current homeroom. Also, Janet volunteered to help with the after school Bible Club, which provided time for her to work with students and talk with parents. Her willingness to spend time after school helping with this club shows that Janet is dedicated to helping students have a well-rounded school experience
* Janet meets the standards for professional conduct. She follows policies and procedures, has had a good attendance record, works within her approved daily schedule, and shows respect to everyone she encounters.
* Janet does a nice job with her students. She seeks the professional opinions of her colleagues and administrator when she is unsure of a situation and is receptive of advice she is given at those times. Janet is able to apply strategies she used as a Gifted Teacher to provide acceleration to her students. She communicates with special education teachers and Title I staff to obtain resources and plan remediation for those that struggle with grade appropriate work. Janet, may you always keep your drive and passion for education! Our students are fortunate to have you at BIS.

The following comments were made by the principal of Peter (second year participant):

* Peter demonstrates extensive content knowledge in the area of mathematics. He collaborates with other teachers in various grade levels to connect student learning. He designs written instructional plans that align to the WV state curriculum. The learning activities are sequential in nature and meet varied student abilities. Peter collaborates with students to design a variety of assessments, clearly practicing and defining assessment criteria. He immediately shares feedback on performance with his students and other stakeholders in a very timely fashion.
* Peter demonstrates extensive knowledge of his students’ social, emotional, and academic needs. He does a great job of working with his students while meeting their needs. He plans differentiated activities for his students. Mr. Wright has an effective classroom management system in place. He collaborates with students to follow through on these procedures. The classroom is organized in small groups and is highly efficient and a well-designed learning environment. Instructional time is maximized and the expectation for work is very clear. Students are engaged and participate in active, self-directed learning as a part of the classroom of learners. The students participate and are part of a learning community within Peter’s classroom.
* Peter collaborates with his students and uses an extensive variety of effective instructional strategies to deliver content. Technology is utilized extensively for both the teacher and the students. Peter facilitates student-led learning activities and provides students extensive opportunities to collaborate and peer assess in their problem solving and learning experiences. He modifies instruction to meet the needs of all students, uses scaffolding as well as differentiating instruction. Both formative and summative assessments are given and real time instructional decisions are made to meet the needs of the students.
* Peter attends professional development for school/county/state as well as the national level to investigate best practices. He extensively implements those within his classroom and shares these with other teachers at PMS. Peter participates in the 6th grade team and uses knowledge and skills gained within his classroom. He contributes to group learning in most situations that he attends.
* Peter is a leader within The Leader in Me initiative and is positively helping to change the school culture for PMS. He communicates effectively with parents and the community through IEPs, SAT meetings, 504 meetings, field trip planning, team meetings and the like. He creates several positive connections between the school and the community, attending PMS events, fund raising, and talking to our students/parents. Peter identifies areas within his own classroom and the school that can be changed to further benefit our school and community.
* Peter is an asset to PMS. His leadership through The Leader in Me and the Leadership Event Action Team Leader have been a wonderful addition to PMS for the 2018-19 school year. Peter’s willingness to go above and beyond for his students in the classroom has helped to bring a different focus to testing and relationships for our school this year.

The following comments were made by the principal of Nikki (first year participant):

The following comments were made by the principal of Eva (first year participant):

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. Standard 6 on the WVERT is based on two goals that the teacher establishes at the beginning 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. 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. These qualities also are important for teachers who impact their students’ learning.

Evidence: Classroom Observation - WVERT (Second Year Participants)

Janet

**WVTPS Standard 1 Curriculum and Planning (InTASC 4, 6, 8)**

Janet has provided detail lesson plans, which are linked to the WV College and Career Ready Standards for Mathematics. Her lesson focus is on M.3.23-Solve real world and mathematical problems involving perimeters of polygons, including finding the perimeter given the side lengths, finding an unknown side length and exhibiting rectangles with the same perimeter and different areas or with the same area and different perimeters. Janet has planned a variety of informal and formal assessments for the lesson.

**WVTPS Standard 2 The Learner and the Learning Environment (InTASC 1,2, 3, 5)**

Janet’s room is welcoming, and the learning space is well organized. Janet walks around the classroom interacting with different students. She helps students get their materials ready for the lesson. She calls on students by name and praises those who are ready to work.

**WVTPS Standard 3 Teaching (InTASC 5, 6, 8)**

Janet began instruction by working with her class on finishing a GoMath lesson. The topic of the lesson was perimeter and area. The students first worked independently on the page of their math journals. Janet walked around the room and answered student questions if needed. When the students finished, they checked their answers as a whole group. Janet made sure the units were included in the students’ answers. Some of the problems they were working involved multiple step directions. The students had to add the numbers they were given and subtract that sum from the total area they were given to find the length of the missing side. Janet modeled this process for them, giving explicit directions and answering any questions the students had. The students continued to work on this problem until all had been able to do it. Janet then gave the students a blank sheet of paper and told them they were being “quizzed” on the material. Janet worked through another example on the board before having the students complete their quiz. She drew a shape on the board and labeled three out of four of the sides. She then called on student volunteers to walk through the steps of solving the problem. Once this problem had been thoroughly explained, Janet put two figures on the board and labeled all but one side of each. Both figures were given a total perimeter and students had to find the length of the missing side. Janet walked throughout the room to monitor students as they took the quiz. She quietly provided support to those who needed it as they worked through the problem. Students who completed the quiz early were guided to independent reading. Throughout the lesson, Janet kept students on task through verbal and nonverbal cues. She called on a variety of students to participate, quietly redirected those students who were inattentive, and offered support for students when they did not readily provide an answer to the questions she posed. She was positive and encouraging at all times.

Peter

**WVTPS Standard 1 Curriculum and Planning (InTASC 4, 6, 8)**

Peter presented lesson plans that used the WV College and Career Readiness Standards for Mathematics. For this lesson, Peter focused on CCRS M.6.4-Interpret and compute quotients of fractions and solve word problems involving division of fractions by fractions by using visual fraction models and equations to represent the problem. Peter explained that he was using a method that transitions across grade levels in preparation for more advanced concepts of teaching percentages. He then presented a list of mathematical concepts that are sequential in nature that he has created to address the variety of student abilities in his classes, which include practice that promotes student collaboration and problem solving.

**WVTPS Standard 2 The Learner and the Learning Environment (InTASC 1, 2, 3, 5)**

Peter maintains extensive notes on his students’ social, emotional, and academic needs. He planned differentiated activities with his students based upon his understanding of his students’ needs. His classroom is well-designed with the small groups set up. He has a specific routine that begins the class, and today he reviewed his classroom management plan. He has his lesson goal written and an outline of the class procedure with clear criteria for each activity. Throughout the lesson, students were provided with opportunities to collaborate within their small groups as well as during the teacher-led instructional time. During this observation, all students were engaged and actively participating. Students seemed to feel comfortable sharing information and their ideas in the safety of Peter’s classroom.

**WVTPS Standard 3 Teaching (InTASC 5, 6, 8)**

Peter used a variety of instructional strategies. Today’s lesson incorporated technology from Khan Academy, the use of guided notes, and teacher lead instruction all focused on ways to set up and solve percent problems. Scaffolding techniques were used and instruction was differentiated through the “I Do, You Do, and We Do” practice. Students read and participated during all practice and instruction. Peter used math vocabulary in all of his demonstrations, and he encouraged students to ask questions and discuss the problems in similar ways. He Students were actively engaged, even students who appeared to not normally participate. Students were quick to respond to Peter’s questions, many of which required students to use higher order thinking skills. Peter provided feedback to help students solve problems in a step by step procedure. Peter gave a quick review before moving on to next steps and allowed students to collaborate in pairs. Throughout the lesson, he monitored student behavior and time on task. At one point, he used proximity to get students who were talking back on task. He also planned and implemented many checks for understanding. Students would work on solving problems, and Peter would walk around the room checking each student’s solution. He would point out missed steps in their problem solving. At the conclusion of the lesson, Peter presented students with a problem related to percent as an exit slip. Students gave their exit slips before leaving class. Peter will use these to know where to begin instruction the next day.

**Conclusion**

Based on the evidence available, completers do contribute to an 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 is not only to provide exemplary evidence of completer impact on student learning, but also to correlate program effectiveness to teacher effectiveness.