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

**Observations of Teacher Candidates**

The total average score on the student teaching evaluation has increased from the first observation in September to the second observation in December, from 2.33 to 2.49 (0.16-points) but has slightly decreased for the third observation to 2.44 (this is not significantly different from the second observation.

Rubric Item 6 (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) has the greatest increase in scores over time as being one of the lowest scoring items in the 1st Observation (1.58) to one of the highest scoring items in the following observations (2.75 and 2.50 for 2nd and 3rd observations respectively). So this item increased in score by about 1.0 points. All individuals also increased in their scores for this item.

All items, except the following, have increased in scores or remained the same over the three observations:

· 8 (The teacher candidate effectively manages classroom routines, transitions, and physical environments)

o 1st Observation: 2.44

o 2nd Observation: 2.50

o 3rd Observation: 2.00

o Decrease of about 0.5 points

· 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)

o 1st Observation: 2.45

o 2nd Observation: 2.50

o 3rd Observation: 2.25

o Decrease of about 0.25 points

· 11 (The teacher candidate facilitates active student engagement)

o 1st Observation: 2.58

o 2nd Observation: 2.50

o 3rd Observation: 2.25

o Decrease of about 0.3 points

· 14 (The teacher candidate demonstrates appropriate and effective use of resources, media,

and technology)

o 1st Observation: 2.50

o 2nd Observation: 2.25

o 3rd Observation: 2.25

o Decrease of 0.25 points

The highest scoring Rubric Item overall is 17 (Demonstrates strong moral character and professionalism) with a score of 3.00 over all 3 observations for all case study participants.

The lowest scoring Rubric Item is (score below Acceptable – 2) is #12 (The teacher candidate uses multiple methods of assessment to plan instruction, monitor progress, evaluate student learning, and adjust instruction), with a score of 1.96. This score has increased by 0.12 points over the three observations.

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

Materials:

* The materials used diversified as the time between observations progressed.
  + During the first observation, all four teachers were reliant on technology as the main source for presenting the lesson (SMART Board, PowerPoint). However, by the third observation, only two teachers relied on technology to present their lessons.
  + During the first two observations, only the high school teacher was relying on a set curriculum to find lesson materials/assign homework. By the third observation, two elementary teachers were doing so as well.
* Teachers consistently used manipulatives for math and reference materials for both math and ELA lessons.

Lesson Objectives/Prior Knowledge:

* Lesson objectives consistently varied between teachers due to variances in grade levels and subject matter.
* Consistently, the more experienced teachers listed multiple learning objectives/sources of prior knowledge while the newer teachers listed only one objective/source of prior knowledge.
* By the third observation, teachers were more adept at stating what prior knowledge students would need for their lessons and how that prior knowledge would have been obtained and/or assessed. For the first observation, the amount of prior knowledge cited varied widely by grade level. For the third observation, three of the teachers cited specific prior lessons/units that would help the students find success in the current lesson. One of them even stated how the lesson currently being taught would help students find success at a subsequent grade level.

Standards:

* The elementary teachers most consistently listed the specific strategies to which their lessons would align.
* The elementary teachers consistently used the Common Core standards when aligning their lessons to the standards.
* Specific standards used by all teachers consistently varied as the grade levels and content being taught varied widely.
* 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.

Assessment:

* Most teachers consistently used questioning as an assessment strategy, but only once (during the first observation) did all four teachers specifically cite their use of questioning 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.
* Entrance/exit tickets were consistently used as an assessment strategy by multiple teachers.

Lesson Activities:

* Mathematics lessons tended to have more activities (particularly hands-on) embedded within them, while ELA lessons tended to have fewer activities.
* Teachers consistently started their lessons with review/warm-up activities, though these took many different forms and went by different names in individual teachers’ classrooms.
* One example of growth over time was the fact that by the third observation, two teachers were specifically citing modeling as a lesson activity/strategy, whereas no teachers did so in the first observation and one teacher did so in the second observation.
* Teachers consistently provided their students with independent practice activities at the end of their lessons. The high school teacher structured her class so that students would complete as much of that activity in class as time allowed and bring the remainder home for homework.
* All teachers who taught ELA lessons consistently noted reading as a lesson activity. Sometimes such reading was done by the teacher, independently by the students, or together as choral reading.
* The different teachers consistently used a wide range of lesson activities. For example, during the third observation, only one teacher used station teaching, only one teacher used partner work during her lesson, and only the high school teacher mentioned that one activity she would conduct would be a short quiz.

Differentiation:

All teachers consistently cited methods of differentiation, but each teacher described different methods for differentiating his or her lessons.

* Most of the differentiation done at the adolescence level came in the form of scaffolding questions and providing as much time as needed to complete independent practice problems. This was consistent throughout all three observations.
* The elementary teacher who graduated the earliest consistently saw the need to account for learning differences not related to subject matter. Specifically, she described how she would differentiate instruction for a student with behavioral challenge and for an ELL student in her classroom. She also consistently provided the most methods of differentiation, clearly showing how she would group by ability and how she chose certain activities/methods for their accessibility to all learners.
* The elementary teacher with the second-most experience demonstrated an ability to group students by ability level in subject matter.
* The newest elementary teacher was the only one to note what he would do to differentiate instruction for students working above grade level.

Research-Based Strategies:

* The high school teacher consistently cited the fewest research-based strategies. In the second observation, she cited no research-based strategies at all, and cited only one in the first and third observation.
* The elementary teachers consistently cited a wider range of specific research-based strategies and methods.
* The elementary teacher who graduated the earliest consistently showed proficiency at citing and applying research-based strategies and methods.
* One consistently-used research-based method was that of explicit instruction.
* The teachers at both the elementary and secondary levels consistently used visuals and manipulatives (e.g. anchor charts, math manipulatives) to support their students’ learning of the content.

Professional Development:

There was an overall decline in the use of learning from professional development courses/seminars as the observations progressed.

* In the first observation, three out of four teachers cited specific strategies/methods they had adopted for that lesson from professional development seminars.
* In the second observation, only two teachers did so.
* By the third observation, only one teacher reported doing so.

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

Successes:

* All four teachers consistently felt that their lessons were successful overall across the observations.
* The high school teacher consistently asserted that success in her lessons was due to students’ use of prior knowledge and learning.
* The most experienced elementary teacher consistently used multiple forms of assessment as well as ecological considerations in determining whether her lesson had been successful; success, for her, came from a variety of factors.

Did students learn what was intended?

* All four teachers consistently claimed that their 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.

Artifacts of Student Learning:

* The three elementary teachers consistently cited observation of students as an informal assessment.
* The use of questioning as an assessment method was reported as inconsistent across the three observations. In the first observation, all teachers did so; in the second observation, two teachers did so; in the third observation, no teachers directly reported using questioning as an assessment method.
* The most experienced elementary teacher consistently cited the most formal/informal assessment methods as artifacts of her students’ learning.
* Two teachers consistently used student writing samples as a form of assessment.

Depart from Plan:

* The number of teachers who departed from their lesson plan fluctuated over time. In the first observation, two teachers reported departing from their lesson plan due to insufficient time. In the first observation, all four teachers reported departing in some way from their initial lesson plan, with the high school teacher specifying that her reasoning was due to time constraints and the fact that some problems proved too difficult for students. In the third observation, only two elementary teachers reported departing from their original lesson plan.

Specific Successful and Unsuccessful Events:

* The elementary teachers consistently cited the motivational factor of their lessons as successful. They sometimes reported that their students were excited to learn the material presented.
* Across all observations, a primary aspect of the lessons consistently identified as unsuccessful was off-task behavior.

Do Differently:

* Three teachers consistently stated that they would break the lesson up so that a more extended period of time could be spent on it.

Informal Assessment:

* Most of the teachers consistently stated that the data they gathered from their informal assessments would impact their future instruction.

Student Behavior:

* Student behavior became a greater consideration for the teachers as time went on. During the first observation, all four teachers stated that student behavior did not have much impact on their teaching decisions. During the second observation, two teachers cited planning in advance for setting up groups helped them during the lesson. During the third observation, two teachers stated that they planned carefully in advance for student behaviors.

**Impact on Student Learning**

All case study participants completed the Impact on Student Learning assignment in spring 2020 (March – May). All participants received a score of 2 (Acceptable) or 3 (Adept) for all criteria on the Impact on Student Learning rubric. The average rubric score for all participants is 2.67 with individual scores ranging from 2.50 – 3.00. Scores increase for individuals the longer they have been working in the field.

The highest scoring criteria are 1b (Context for Learning: Cites examples of students’ prior engagement and understanding in order to justify learning goals) and 2 (Instructional Planning) with scores of 3.00.

All participants used pre-assessments and data of their students as well as understanding of the curriculum being taught to justify the learning goals of their lesson. All participants made modifications based on students’ prior learning and understanding in their instructional planning to ensure differentiation.

The lowest scoring criteria are 3 (Assessment Strategies) and 5 (Evaluation) with scores of 2.25.

Areas for participants to improve in assessment and evaluation are the following:

* Take into consideration specific learner needs when crafting ongoing assessment tools especially for students who have already mastered the learning targets set
* Be sure to use assessment data to more purposefully differentiate instructional practices and crafting tailored instruction (this can be done through small-group instruction)
* Use re-teaching opportunities that are based off of student performance and ongoing assessment data

**Supervisor Comments on Impact on Student Learning**

1a. Context for Learning: Synthesizes the characteristics of the classroom, school, and community and is able to demonstrate their impact on the learning environment.

* All teachers had a knowledge base of the diversity of their students.
  + Two teachers were cited as having a “thorough and comprehensive understanding of their students’ backgrounds and the community.”
  + One teacher was described as having a “clear understanding of school, district, and community.”
  + One teacher was described as being “aware of [students’] needs, levels, and family/community in which they live.”
* Two teachers demonstrated an ability to plan meaningful instruction that effectively reflects student diversity.
* One teacher was described as planning effective lessons that align with district goals and standards.
* It was noted that one teacher did not have students with diverse instructional or linguistic needs.

1b. Context for Learning: Cites examples of students’ prior engagement and understanding in order to justify learning goals

* All teachers were able to situate an individual lesson within overall current learning/units, building upon prior lessons and building toward future ones.
* All teachers used some form of pre-assessments to gauge student progress within a set of lessons or within a set curriculum.
* Three teachers demonstrated understanding of a pre-made curriculum adopted by the school, but at the same time used assessments to make necessary modifications based on student needs.
* Two teachers stated clearly the ways in which they differentiated their instruction based on students’ prior knowledge and assessments.

2. Instructional Planning

* While two teachers closely adhered to the stated goals of a pre-made, district-selected curriculum, they made modifications as needed based on their students’ abilities and needs.
* Two teachers used varying modes of differentiation to guide their students toward success.
* One teacher used scaffolding and repetition to guide their students toward success.

3. Assessment Strategies

* All four teachers used multiple assessment strategies, both informal and formal.
* All four teachers used at least some self-created assessments, although some were more reliant on pre-made assessments than were others.
* It was suggested for two teachers that they delve deeper into the data to make decisions based on individual learners’ needs.
* It was suggested that one teacher provide stronger feedback.
* One teacher was cited as clearly defining the assessments to students and providing effective feedback.

4. Analysis

* Three teachers were described as providing some form of additional instruction based on assessment results.
* Two teachers were able to show, through their assessments, that their students had either reached the learning objectives or were making progress at a level commensurate to their needs.
* Two teachers competently used assessments to determine what supplemental instruction was needed.
* One teacher was described as having excellent knowledge of the content, which helped them identify what skills their students would need to be successful.

5. Evaluation

* Two teachers were described as having strong “in-the-moment” flexibility to adapt during their lessons.
* Two teachers were described as effectively planning for current and future instruction based on their thorough knowledge of their students.
* Two teachers were highly reflective following their lessons, noting specific strengths and areas for improvement. Both mentioned that there was not enough time for some parts of their planned lessons.
* It was suggested that two teachers plan for re-teaching and reinforcement in a more data-driven manner. One other teacher was praised for doing this effectively.

**Post-Interview Case Study Meeting Thematic Analysis:**

Rubric Items:

* *Candidate Observations, “Planning 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 in the community,” had the greatest increase in scores over time. Why do you think this is and how can we help candidates be better prepared to do this in September?*
  + Three teachers said that curriculum changes at the start of the year often cause teachers to have to relearn content and implementation, making this criterion hard to prepare for.
  + Three teachers said that it is harder to achieve this objective earlier in the school year because more attention is focused on building relationships and trust with students.
  + One teacher expected improvement over time in this area because it was his first year of teaching.
  + One teacher mentioned that this low score at the start of the year could have been due to an emphasis on reviewing previously-learned skills during that time.
* *Candidate Observations, “Demonstrating strong moral character and professionalism,” was the highest scoring item. If and how did Geneseo prepare you for competency in this area?*
  + Two teachers believed that the caliber and reputation of Geneseo’s teacher preparation program naturally attracted strong candidates who were passionate about teaching.
  + Two teachers felt that the SOE faculty and staff both displayed and continually reiterated the characteristics of professionalism, making that easy to emulate.
* *Impact on Student Learning: The highest scoring items in this rubric were context for learning (citing examples of prior engagement and understanding) and instructional planning. If and how did Geneseo prepare you in these areas?*
  + Three teachers felt that this came naturally to them now because instruction at Geneseo focuses so heavily on knowing students, identifying clear purposes for lessons, carefully planning lessons, purposefully assessing students, and tying it all together.
  + One teacher felt especially confident in this area from the preparation she received to complete the edTPA.
* *Impact on Student Learning, “Using multiple methods of assessment to plan instruction, monitor progress, and evaluate student learning in adjusted instruction,” was the lowest scoring item and is currently the lowest rated item for student teachers. How can we do better in this area?*
  + Two teachers said that having teachers come in and model lessons or being able to complete in-school observations focusing specifically on assessment is beneficial because it helps teachers focus on all the little things that can be considered assessment. **One supervisor agreed with this suggestion, and extended it to include discussion of the assessments used in commonly used curricula in NYS, as doing so would prepare candidates not only to gather data but also to understand how to act on that data. This supervisor suggested adding a course in assessment to all education programs at Geneseo.**
  + One teacher suggested reframing talk about assessment to go beyond pencil-and-paper tests, and for this concept to be reinforced frequently. She said this was a difficult area for her because she felt least prepared in this area.
  + One teacher suggested having more instructional time devoted to designing, administering, and scoring assessments, and mentioned that he only felt prepared in this area by taking the SPED 382 course (outside of his certification in Early Childhood/Childhood).
  + One teacher felt that the types of assessment discussed at Geneseo were not reflective of the types of assessment adopted by local schools and districts.
  + **One supervisor noted that learning a new curriculum, as many of the teachers noted with regard to the first question, also comes with learning new assessment types and strategies.**
* *Impact on Student Learning, Evaluation was also the lowest scoring item. Are there ways that we can better prepare candidates to perform well in this area?*
  + Two teachers noted that this score was likely low because of pressure from other teachers and administrators to stay on pacing guides within the curriculum, regardless of whether students had mastered the material.
  + Two teachers noted that evaluation was easier to execute with smaller groups than with whole-class instruction, so maybe more guidance on whole-group evaluation would be beneficial.
  + One teacher noted that being highly reflective was helpful in this area, so maybe increasing the number and quality of reflective assignments would be beneficial.

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

* All four teachers stated that having their particular assigned supervisor, especially if they had been one of their student teaching supervisors, observe their lessons and provide feedback was an excellent experience.
  + The teachers felt more comfortable having these supervisors observe them than they would having a principal observe.
  + The teachers felt that they received feedback they never would have otherwise.
* **One supervisor said that it was beneficial to her to be able to see the classroom of someone she had supervised during student teaching. She suggested that, wherever feasible, supervisors should do this more often to see the impact of student teaching on graduates.**

How could the case study be improved? What suggestions do you have that could make it better for everyone?

* Two teachers could not readily identify any suggestions for improving the experience.
* Two teachers felt that the pre-observation questionnaire added undue strain to their workload. They noted that their supervisors allowed them to talk through the questions as part of an interview rather than typing their answers to the questions, and they found this beneficial.
* One teacher felt that the rubric used to evaluate the lessons was limiting and promoted the creation of certain types of lessons over others. **This teacher’s supervisor agreed, especially because the lessons were observed in isolation rather than as part of an authentic unit.**
* **One supervisor mentioned that it was sometimes difficult to find time for the necessary collaboration between supervisor and teacher before and after observations. She suggested recording the questionnaires as oral conversations, which would decrease the amount of work on everyone’s part.**

What else would you like to share?

* **One supervisor felt that undergraduate candidates need earlier field experiences, and saw firsthand that principals would be eager to have this kind of collaboration. She believes that doing so would allow candidates to see what kind of curricula are being taught and would help them connect theory to practice.**

Would you consider using a Google Form survey that gauges how students feel you impact their learning?

* Two elementary teachers felt that their students would love a survey like that. One even mentioned an activity she had done describing the ways students might feel about classroom activities and that it is acceptable to bring concerns to the teacher.
* The high school teacher mentioned that, especially during the period of online learning, it is hard to get her students (particularly seniors) motivated to do activities like that. She thought only three students per class would respond.
* One elementary teacher echoed these thoughts, saying that parents were generally overwhelmed by online learning with everything else happening in their lives.