**2021-2022 Final Case Study Data (Observing our graduates in the field)**

# **Case Study Participants and Demographics of their Schools/Classrooms**

The case study started with 7 alumni. 4 alumni completed the full case study. Below is a table of their information:

| **Alumni Code - Gender - # of years teaching** | **Geneseo SOE Program(s) Completed & Additional Education / Experience** | **School Information** | **Classroom Information** | **Student Information** | **Components of the Case Study Completed** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| #1 - Female - 1 year teaching | Childhood with Special Education ‘21  Experience with students with Autism | Webster CSD  Suburban | Grades K-1, Self-Contained for general education and specials  Own wing in the school building | 6 students (1 F / 5 M)  All identified with Special Needs (Autism and OHI) and receiving AIS  1 ELL  1 Turkish, 1 Russian, 3 African Americans, 1 Biracial  Almost all students are nonverbal (use AAC) | Initial Interview |
| #2 - Female - 1 year teaching | Adolescence Education in Spanish ‘20 | Greece CSD: Odyssey Academy & Olympia MS/HS  Urban  Churchville-Chili CSD MS  Rural | 7th & 9th Grade Spanish  Shares a classroom with other teachers from other subject areas  7th & 8th Grade Spanish | 5 classes at Odyssey Academy  4 classes at Olympia MS/HS  Fairly even split between male and female students in each class  Class size range: 24 - 30 students  IEPs range: 0 - 14 students per class  504s range: 0 - 7 students per class  0 ELLs  Over half of students are non-White. Many classes are primarily students of Hispanic descent or African American students. | Complete except for impact on student learning survey |
| #3 - Female - 6 years teaching | Childhood with Special Education ‘16 and Reading & Literacy B-12 ‘19 | Penfield CSD - Scribner Elementary School (550 students)  Suburban | Grade 2  Interactive instructional classroom using a variety of approaches to engage learners which assist in meeting identified needs. | 18 students (11 F / 7 M)  9 students with special needs  1 ELL  2 Foster students, 1 adopted student  Virtual learning with Covid-19 leveled the diversity in terms of academic levels | Complete |
| #4 - Male - 3 years teaching (previously participated in 2019 - 2020 case study) | Early Childhood / Childhood Education ‘19 | Penfield CSD - Scribner Elementary School (550 students)  Suburban | 3rd Grade Blended Classroom ICOT (Integrated Co-Teach): Alumni #4 is the General Education Teacher so-teaching with a Special Education Teacher and a Teaching Assistant.  Students may be pulled out any time throughout the day to receive speech, PT, and AIS. | 21 - 25 students  Homeroom: 12 F / 9 M  Push-in students: 1 F / 3 M  7 students with special needs including push-in students (Learning Disabled, Autism, Other Handicap Conditions)  AIS: 4 Reading & 3 Math  0 ELLs  2 Gifted & Talented students pulled out for 40 minutes  Very diverse academically  Mix of races: White, Black, Hispanic, Eastern European, and Russian descent | Initial Interview & 1st Observation |
| #5 - Female - 3 years teaching (1 year teaching own classroom) | Adolescence Education in English ‘19  5-6 License extension  SPED cert 7 - 12  Masters in Reading & Literacy from U of Albany | Sewanhaka CSD - HS  Suburban  School district is tracking students, so it is causing greater separation between the “haves and have nots”. This mentality can be concerning, especially given the fact that she is teaching the AIS support courses. | 8th & 9th Grade English  11th Grade English | 8th grade: 20-21 students, 4 sections, reading/writing workshop  9th grade: 5-20 students, 4 sections, AIS, regents prep, 1 section of public speaking (10th -12th, 28 students)  More males than females  Most are ENL or students with disabilities, because these courses are AIS and support courses.  All students receive AIS  Very diverse: mainly Spanish speaking ELLs, Indian, Pakistani, and Black students  81 students in total 4 sections of standard ELA, 1 section of dramatics  Fairly even split between male & female students.  No ENL students, Co-taught class has 12 IEPs and 2 504s, one other class has 3 504s  0 AIS students but push-in support  0 ELLs  Not diverse: 5-6 Hispanic students and 1 Black student | Complete |
| #6 - Female - 3 years teaching | Childhood with Special Education ‘19  Masters at U of Albany | Troy School District - Troy Prep Charter School  Urban  Students come from surrounding districts  This charter school has to follow “Exemplar Key Lessons”, which can be rigid and lack creativity. Alumni #6 stated a personal goal to make lessons more engaging. | 5th & 6th Grade Resource Room and Push-in SPED support (Math & ELA)  Special Education Coordinator at the MS | 5th Grade: 10 students (4 F / 6 M)  6th Grade: 21 students (13 F / 8 M)  All students have special needs (weekly IEP meetings)  Zero students receive AIS as they receive ELA and Math support in the resource room.  1 ELL  Very diverse in terms of academic & emotional need, demographics and background. 90% Black, 8% Hispanic and 2% White. The majority of students are within the Tier 3 instructional area with only 2 identified as “at Risk” students. | Complete |
| #7 - Female - 3 years | Early Childhood / Childhood Education ‘19  Currently in final year for Masters program (Inclusive Early Childhood Education; focus on severe and multiple disabilities) at Nazareth College | Marion CSD  Rural - extremely small town and district  Farming is heart of the community | 1st Grade ICOT (Integrated Co-Teach)  For 2 and a half hours during the morning, I have the support of a special education teacher. For the rest of the day, I have the support of a TA | 17 students (8 F / 9 M)  2 students with special needs  8 students receive AIS  0 ELLs  At the start of the year, the majority of students are below grade level. 35% are at grade level.  My class is not extremely diverse. In regards to race, 15 are white, 1 is black, and 1 is Hispanic.  Within my classroom, there are many academic needs. At any time throughout the day students may be pulled out to receive: speech, OT, PT, reading intervention, or math intervention. | Initial Interview, 1st Observation, and 2nd Observation Pre-Questions |

# **Envisioned plan to meet diverse and cultural needs of students over the course of the year**

#1: Connections with the home and sharing learning, birthday traditions are celebrated to reflect each student’s culture and background

#2: Currently implementing routines, so she has not had a lot of time to think through this. Will reflect about this later.

#3: As an Integrated ENL classroom the identified student receives core content area (i.e., English Language Arts, Math, Science, or Social Studies) and **English language** development instruction which includes home language supports and appropriate ELL scaffolds by the classroom and the ESOL teacher. Use of SEL strategies to meet emotional needs, and use of AIMS WEB to track student learning data in order to meet student academic needs.

#4: This classroom centers around a positive cultural connection with all students. We focus on a Character Education Program centered around our motto, "Kids Who Care.", developed in conjunction with the District Mission and Theme. The program involves instruction, recognition, communication and school/community activities centered around five pillars of character - and includes all students. Students are supported by 3 teachers (classroom, Sped. Teacher and Teaching Assistant) in order to best meet their needs on a daily basis.

#5: Selecting texts that have better representation, bilingual texts

#6: Use of ELA Data - guides targeted instruction during Resource Room (guided reading) and focus is placed on social emotional learning strategies. Students are involved in push in and pull out instruction.

#7: Although my classroom is not very diverse, I have planned covid friendly ways to involve families in the classroom. Every Friday we have a “mystery reader,” Zoom with our classroom to read a book to the class. Families have had the opportunity to sign up and read a book that their family enjoys to the classroom.

# **Observations of Teacher Candidates**

Case study participants were observed 1 - 5 times using the student teaching evaluation rubric but without Items 16 - 18 which are related to inTASC Standards 9 & 10: Professional Responsibility which cannot be observed in a single lesson.

The total average score on the student teaching evaluation has increased over the course of the academic year by 0.6 points and increased progressively between each individual observation! The alum who has only been teaching for 1 year, had the lowest average score, not unexpectedly. Alum 4 and alum 7, who left the case study after the first observation, scored lower than the other alumni.

|  | Alum 1 (SPED)  1 year  Suburban | Alum 2 (AD)  1 year  Urban for first 3 observations  Rural for 4th observation | Alum 3 (CH/SPED)  6 years  Suburban | Alum 4 (CH)  3 years  Suburban | Alum 5 (AD)  3 years  Suburban | Alum 6 (SPED)  3 years  Urban | Alum 7 (CH)  3 years  Rural | Average |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Observation 1 | NA | 1.81 | 2.13 | 1.19 | 2.31 | 2.44 | 1.56 | 1.91 |
| Observation 2 | NA | 2.19 | 2.31 | NA | 2.19 | 2.31 | NA | 2.25 |
| Observation 3 | NA | 2.25 | 2.19 | NA | 2.38 | 2.38 | NA | 2.30 |
| Observation 4 | NA | 2.31 | 2.44 | NA | 2.88 | 2.63 | NA | 2.56 |
| Observation 5 (extra) | NA | NA | NA | NA | 2.88 | NA | NA | NA |
| Average | NA | 2.14 | 2.27 | NA | 2.53 | 2.44 | NA | 2.28 |

|  | Observation 1 | Observation 2 | Observation 3 | Observation 4 | Change Over Time | Average |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part A. PLANNING AND PREPARATION 1. The teacher candidate thoroughly understands the content to be taught reflective of local, state and national standards. inTASC Standard 4 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.75 | 0.25 | 2.59 |
| Part A. PLANNING AND PREPARATION (continued) 2. The teacher candidate knows how to present and organize content aligned with local, state, and national standards so that it is clear and understandable. inTASC Standard 8 | 1.67 | 2.00 | 2.75 | 2.75 | 1.08 | 2.35 |
| Part A. PLANNING AND PREPARATION (continued) 3. The teacher candidate understands and plans for individual students’ development, and learning. inTASC Standard 1 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.75 | 2.75 | 0.75 | 2.41 |
| Part A. PLANNING AND PREPARATION (continued) 4a. The teacher candidate attends to the individual differences and cultural and communal experiences that affect creating an inclusive teaching and learning environment. inTASC Standard 2 | 1.50 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.50 | 1.00 | 2.06 |
| Part A. PLANNING AND PREPARATION (continued) 4b. The teacher candidate attends to the academic factors that affect creating an inclusive teaching and learning environment.  inTASC Standard 2 | 1.50 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.25 | 0.75 | 2.00 |
| Part A. PLANNING AND PREPARATION (continued)  5. The teacher candidate develops and implements supports for student development across content areas.  inTASC Standard 5 | 1.67 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.25 | 0.58 | 2.06 |
| Part A: PLANNING AND PREPARATION (continued) 6. The teacher candidate plans for meaningful instruction for all students by drawing on curriculum knowledge of their discipline and related content areas, as well as on knowledge of students and the community. inTASC Standard 7 | 2.33 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 0.17 | 2.47 |
| Part B. THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT  7. The teacher candidate creates caring, respectful and supportive learning environments for all students. inTASC Standard 3 | 2.00 | 2.25 | 2.25 | 3.00 | 1.00 | 2.35 |
| Part B. THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT (continued) 8. The teacher candidate effectively manages classroom routines, transitions, and physical environments. inTASC Standard 3 | 2.17 | 2.50 | 2.00 | 2.75 | 0.58 | 2.35 |
| Part B. THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT (continued) 9. The teacher candidate sets clear expectations and responds to positive and negative behaviors appropriately and guides students towards self-regulation. inTASC Standard 3 | 2.00 | 2.25 | 2.25 | 2.50 | 0.50 | 2.24 |
| Part C: INSTRUCTION 10. The teacher candidate communicates clearly and effectively. The teacher candidate’s spoken and written language is clear and concise in order to provide directions and explain academic content. | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.50 | 0.50 | 2.12 |
| Part C: INSTRUCTION (continued) 11. The teacher candidate facilitates active student engagement. inTASC Standard 3 | 1.50 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.50 | 1.00 | 1.94 |
| Part C: INSTRUCTION (continued) 12. The teacher candidate uses multiple methods of assessment to plan instruction, monitor progress, evaluate student learning, and adjust instruction. (formative, summative, informal and formal) inTASC Standard 6 | 1.67 | 2.25 | 2.25 | 2.25 | 0.58 | 2.12 |
| Part C: INSTRUCTION (continued) 13. The teacher candidate develops students’ creative and critical thinking skills through questioning and discussion. inTASC Standard 4 | 2.17 | 2.50 | 2.25 | 2.25 | 0.08 | 2.35 |
| Part C: INSTRUCTION (continued) 14. The teacher candidate demonstrates appropriate and effective use of resources, media, and technology. inTASC Standard 3(m) | 1.83 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 0.67 | 2.41 |
| Part D: PROFESSIONALISM 15. The teacher candidate reflects critically and creatively on teaching and learning. inTASC Standard 9 | 2.00 | 2.75 | 2.75 | 3.00 | 1.00 | 2.65 |

All items have increased in score over the four observations. Items 2, 4a, 7, 11, and 15 have the greatest increase over time of 1 point or more. Items 1, 6, and 13 have the least increase over time of 0.08 - 0.25 points increase.

The highest scoring Rubric Items overall are 1 (Understands the content to be taught reflective of local, state, and national standards) and 15 (Reflects critically and creatively on teaching and learning). Rubric Item 1 increased only slightly over time whereas Rubric Item 15 significantly increased over time.

The lowest scoring Rubric Items are 4a, 4b, 5 and 11. Three of these items are related to Planning and Preparation and specifically two are related to inTASC 2 (Learning Differences). Even though Rubric Items 4a (Attends to the individual differences and cultural and communal experiences that affect creating an inclusive teaching and learning environment) and 11 (Facilitates active student engagement) were the lowest scoring, they did significantly increase over time.

# **Summary of Thematic Analysis from Pre-Observations**

Materials:

* The materials used diversified as the time between observations progressed.
  + All four teachers utilized a combination of technology (slideshow, videos, Chromebooks, Google classroom, Xtra Math, QR codes, digital math files, SuperKids) and printed materials (examples, note sheets, printed lessons, exit ticket, text, graphic organizer, chart paper, packets, white boards) as the main source for presenting/completing the lesson. Two teachers utilized hands-on activities to facilitate lessons. However, one teacher tended to use the same materials for each lesson observed
  + One teacher utilized posters, worksheets, and games throughout her observed lessons.

Lesson Objectives/Prior Knowledge:

* Lesson objectives varied between teachers due to variances in grade levels and subject matter.
* Consistently, the more experienced teachers (3 and 6 years) listed more learning objectives/sources of prior knowledge than the newer teachers listed.
* All four teachers had at least one lesson where prior knowledge included a justification of students still struggling on a previous lesson rather than just listing knowledge already gained (restate reteaches).
* The teacher with six years of teaching experience cited several specific prior lessons/units that would help the students find success in the current lesson. This could also be due to the grade level and subject area.
* Three of the teachers noted a connection to future units/learning (transition, set the stage, and “as we enter an independent reading unit”).

Standards:

* Specific standards used by all teachers consistently varied as the grade levels and content being taught varied widely.
* The elementary teachers consistently used the Common Core standards when aligning their lessons to the standards.
* The elementary teacher who graduated the earliest cited the highest number of standards and demonstrated an understanding of how standards at her grade level connected to standards from higher grade levels.
* The foreign language teacher referenced both World Readiness Standards for Learning Languages and NYS World Language Standards and Performance Indicators.

Assessment:

* All four teachers consistently used informal observation or an observational checklist as an assessment strategy.
* Summative assessments tended to only be used at the adolescent level. The elementary teachers consistently used a wider range of informal, formative assessment strategies.
* Exit tickets were used as an assessment strategy by three teachers.
* Two teachers referenced rubrics as assessment strategies.

Lesson Activities:

* Overall, the teachers consistently used a wide range of lesson activities. For example, during the third observation, the high school teacher used a game, one teacher used reading with the class, and one teacher mentioned that one activity they would conduct would be whiteboard practice.
* Three of the teachers started their lessons with review/warm-up activities, though these took different forms and went by different names in individual teachers’ classrooms.
* One example of growth over time was the fact that by the fourth observation, one teacher was specifically citing modeling as a lesson activity/strategy, whereas no teachers did so in the first three observations.
* The teacher with six years of teaching experience utilized four stations for one of the lessons.
* Three teachers provided their students with independent practice activities within their lessons.
* The teacher who taught ELA lessons noted reading as a lesson activity as well as listening to a musical and watching a movie. The students then made comparisons to literature they were reading.

Differentiation:

## All teachers consistently cited methods of differentiation, but each teacher described different methods for differentiating their lessons.

* Most of the differentiation done at the adolescence level came in the form of accounting for learning differences not related to subject matter including lessons read out loud, virtual, hands-on, and presenting on the board. One teacher also included getting up and moving around. One also noted that Google classroom provides different versions to the student based on the assessments of ability.
* The elementary teacher who graduated the earliest consistently demonstrated an ability to group students by ability level in subject matter.
* One teacher planned to change instruction to reach a variety of different learning styles/methods. One teacher had a challenging activity for the group that reached understanding.
* The newest elementary teacher was the only one to note what he would do to differentiate instruction for students working above grade level.

# **Summary of Thematic Analysis from Post-Observations**

Successes:

* All four teachers consistently felt that their lessons were successful overall across the observations.
* Success meant a variety of things to the teachers observed. For example, it might have been successful because it gave the teacher insight into where students were struggling, or success was engagement of students.
* The least experienced teacher stated that “this lesson definitely could have gone better!”
* The high school teacher referenced the benefit of practicing skills for the NYS Regents Exam.

Specific Successful and Unsuccessful Events:

* Three teachers mentioned time as a reason for the lesson to not be as successful.
* One teacher pushed back an exam one day after gaining insight into some areas the students were still struggling.

Do Differently:

* Three teachers consistently stated different strategies that they would use such as more scaffolding beforehand, a more engaging activity, articulating instructions more clearly, prompting, or “re-stamping”.
* Two teachers stated that they would have kept to the original plan for the lesson.
* Two teachers stated, on more than one occasion, they would have taken note of struggling students, checked in one-on-one with students, or graded papers in the moment to go back and view data.

Did students learn what was intended?

* All four teachers consistently claimed that all or most students had learned what was intended, although each teacher used different evidence to support his/her claim depending on the grade level and/or content being taught.

Plan of action for those that did not learn what was intended:

* Three teachers planned to provide one-on-one support/instruction for the students still struggling. One teacher, in the final observation, provided separate plans for “low students” and “high students”.
* One teacher’s plan was related to classroom behavior and expectations for a student who refused to complete the activity.
* Three teachers planned to provide additional time practicing strengthening learning.

Artifacts of Student Learning:

* The two elementary teachers consistently cited observation of students as an informal assessment. One also referenced charted growth from initial assessment data to current assessment data.
* Three teachers consistently referenced exit tickets as artifacts of student learning. Three teachers utilized handouts or packets completed by the students.
* The two adolescence teachers utilized an exam or pre and post assessments.

Depart from Plan:

* With each lesson, at least half the teachers departed from their lesson plan. This was due to spending more time on one activity, a fire drill, how each group was performing, taking time to address student concerns, and redirecting a student with behavioral outbursts. One teacher departed from the lesson plan to include more higher-level thinking questions.

# **P-12 Survey of Impact on Student Learning**

In Spring 2021, a P-12 impact on student learning survey was created, piloted, and approved. The survey was given to teachers (alumni of Geneseo) to give to their students again in Spring 2022. No student information was collected, and data has been aggregated. Three of the case study alumni and three other alumni agreed to participate and had their students complete the survey:

* Alum #1 (Undergraduate Adolescence English ‘19 & Reading & Literacy, ‘20): 7th grade ELA teacher at Binghamton City School District, 19 of 65 students completed the P-12 impact on student learning survey (29% response rate)
* Alum #2 (Undergraduate Early Childhood/Childhood, ‘20): 4th grade teacher at Marcy Elementary, 13 of 14 students completed the P-12 impact on student learning survey (93% response rate)
* Alum #3 (Childhood with Special Education, ‘17): 6th grade teacher at East Meadow, 12 of 12 students completed the P-12 impact on student learning survey (100% response rate)
* Alum #4 (Childhood with Special Education ‘16 and Reading & Literacy B-12 ‘19) 2nd grade teacher at Penfield School District, 18 students in class (97% response rate)
* Alum #5 (Adolescence Education in Spanish ‘20): 7th and 9th grade Spanish teacher at Greece (Odyssey and Olympia) Central School District, then Churchville-Chili, 25-30 students in classes – (89% response rate)
* Alum #6 (Childhood with Special Education ‘19): 5th/6th SPED teacher at Troy Prep School, 9 of 31 students completed the P-12 impact on student learning survey (29% response rate)

All items are rated “always” or “mostly” more than half the time (58% or greater). This is two percentage points higher than the previous year. The highest rated items (86% or more rated “always” or “mostly”) are related to InTASC Standards 1, 2, 3 (The Learner and Learning), and 4 (Content Knowledge).

Our goal is to continue to increase this sample to be representative of all our SOE programs.

# **Post-Interview Case Study Focus Group Thematic Analysis:**

## Meeting diverse and cultural needs of students over the course of the year:

* Lacking confidence: One teacher spoke of having large classes and not being able to meet everyone’s diverse learning needs.
  + “I’m still working on that.”
  + Testing group to see what works best
* Continuing to work on and grow: Trying to understand the students’ culture and use that to support them in the classroom
  + Diversity is more than racial and cultural diversity
  + Really challenging to build relationships when the students have very different cultural backgrounds
  + Very open dialogue: “If I say something that is not like right or culturally like you need to correct me in the moment because, like I’m growing as a teacher, I like I want you to teach me too.”
  + Bridge home and school: open communication with students and parents
  + “Create a culture where they feel comfortable in the classroom.”
  + COVID: students coming in with vastly different needs, social emotional learning
  + Coming up with consistent systems in classroom: students know what to expect and then teacher can focus on the curriculum rather than behaviors
  + Strong classroom management, differentiation, resource room, and small group time
  + Track data, monitor growth, and respond
  + “I do, we do, you do” model: Identify gaps
  + Different strategies to differentiate, using more flexible groupings
* “The more you get to know your kids as academic students and then just as humans being able to tailor everything that you do to their needs, as best as possible.”
  + Support: Figuring out behaviorally - what did these kids need?
  + Focus on other students who may be impacted by another student’s behavior (academics, happiness, safety, content, comfortable)

## How would you assess your impact on student learning, looking back over the last year? Were there any particular strategies used to help increase impact?

* Continual growth chart - where they started, where they were in the middle of the year, where they are now (compared to the norm)
* Hearing students reminisce about the year
* To know the students felt cared about
* Monitoring data in the moment
* Immediate opportunities to replicate a skill learned
* “Stamping after discourse” - clear up misconceptions through discourses and then “stamp” a misconception through takeaways
* “No opt out” - a student “can always call on a friend or ask for help, but then you still go back to that student”

## Areas of growth for Geneseo

* Teaching candidates to monitor data in the moment and respond to that data immediately (going around with a chart and tallying during exit ticket) - “if there’s a trend that we immediately identify, we stopped in the moment, we just stopped the kids and address it immediately.”
* One teacher thought candidates need more opportunities to really engage in classroom management before they go into their own classroom.
* One teacher suggested students recording themselves when they went to practicum to then watch themselves and not some things they did really well and areas of growth.
* One teacher mentioned how challenging it was to have mentors for student teaching that were in a different area/certification.

## Rubric Items:

* *Candidate Observations, “Reflecting critically and creatively on teaching and learning,”* was the highest scoring item. If and how did Geneseo prepare you for competency in this area?
  + One teacher felt very well prepared for this portion - specifically because of EdTPA which require them to reflect on their instruction. It was something that was really emphasized throughout the whole Geneseo curriculum.
  + One teacher said professors utilized reflection feedbacks any time they taught a lesson or observed and there was constructive feedback as well.
* *Candidate Observations, “Facilitating active student engagement,”* had the greatest increase in scores over time. Why do you think these scores increased over time and how could we potentially help candidates be better prepared starting in September, if possible?
  + One teacher said there was a lot of instruction on how to create a unit and lesson plans for the unit, along with scope and sequence; but less instruction in terms of day to day engagement (“do nows” and “aim situation” that New York State requires)
  + Two teachers commented on the natural progression of getting to know the kids in the classroom and encouraging students by getting to know them is a vital part of being a teacher. Getting a classroom set in routines and procedures at the beginning is important. “It’s okay to slow down and just get to know where they are first.”
  + One teacher thought Geneseo put engagement as fun hands-on activities. However, they notice the most engagement when the rigor is there - when students are feeling challenged but successful. “It’s about balancing the rigor with engagement and ways the teacher can work to implement both of those in their lesson.”
  + One teacher talked about using parent communication and student insights to create engagement (ie. “glow” the students with their parents).
  + One teacher mentioned how classroom/behavior management was a struggle and this made it difficult to figure out what the needs of all the students were. They did not feel prepared in how to manage a class of a lot of varying needs.

## How much do you think the number of years teaching has impacted your scores? How could we account for that when we’re looking at the data that we’re collecting?

* One teacher said the more they’ve been in the classroom the better prepared they are. However, “there’s really nothing that can prepare you better than just jumping in headfirst.” The more responsibility and pressure, the better prepared the candidate is.
* One teacher spoke of being more confident the longer they teach, learning from mistakes, and naturally navigating teaching.
* One student thought the first year of teaching should be focused on classroom management.

## What curriculum, programs, or other resources would have benefited you at Geneseo for your current teaching? What were some gaps in your education that you had to learn out in the field?

* Three teachers mentioned learning about and using Google classroom and at least an introduction to platforms/programs most used (for reading, writing, or math).
* In addition to lesson plan format, what types of things to anticipate with students.
* Practice communicating with parents: Creating a general email or script
* Multiple opportunities to write an IEP - the format, when to bullet, when to summarize, what to include
* **One supervisor commented that cooperating teachers, students, and teachers all share quite frequently that it’d be great if candidates came with more experience in IEPs.**
* **One supervisor commented that cooperating teachers have said they “would have assumed student teachers had a little more experience in what an annual review entails, even if that is just watching.” Candidates need to know their role, what it looks like, and how they should be involved when they are a classroom teacher.**

## What do you think would be beneficial for the Geneseo SOE to focus on in educating teacher candidates, especially considering changes with the pandemic?

* Classroom routine and structure: Students were sort of pushed through in previous courses and now they are very surprised of the rigor of Regents, classroom etiquette.
* Two teachers mentioned understanding social emotional learning (SEL): having certain materials and lessons (and access to certain students still homeschooled).
* SPED: Behavioral strategies (remaining emotionally constant, when to engage with a student). “It wasn’t a piece of the classroom management that we had learned about in Geneseo.”
* One student suggested continuing to find ways to integrate technology and learn about it more, possibly a course devoted to technology (ways to integrate academics or even assess).

## What is the most valuable thing you have gained through doing this case study experience?

* One teacher talked about the support that was provided (mentor relationship) and how much they appreciated that as a new teacher
* Two teachers shared how much they enjoyed reflecting more on what they were doing every day and how they can change to make the next lesson better (a skill they hadn’t picked up beforehand).
* One teacher said the best part of participating was the focus group discussion itself.
* The amount of work is quite sustainable/doable.

## How could the case study be improved? What suggestions do you have that could make it better for you, your supervisors, the School of Ed, or your students?

* Two teachers wondered if it would be possible to include the candidates still in college in the focus group discussion (for them to hear the type of issues that they’re going to encounter in the future) or opportunities to speak with new teachers in the field.
* One student mentioned it would be helpful to have a refresher for what each course was and what projects they entailed to reflect on it and comment on what specific project was helpful.
* One teacher offered a suggestion to show Geneseo students the observation videos from the case study and allow the candidates to analyze them.
* **One supervisor agreed that it would be beneficial for student teachers to hear from recent alumni right before starting their first teaching placement.**

## How about the student surveys? How the students feel like doing those and how did you feel receiving feedback?

* One teacher talked about being honest with their students about not having access to the responses - framing it that way helps the students know that it won’t affect their relationship in any way.
* One teacher mentioned that their kids were a little confused by it.