

CASE STUDIES 23-24

CAEP Standards: R4.1 (Completer Effectiveness), R4.2 (Satisfaction of Employers)

Case Study 5 – Winter 2023 – Case study centered on alumni BH who graduated from SNHU's School of Education Clinical M. Ed. program in 2021 with a major in Secondary Education certification focused on Middle Level Mathematics. She was in her third year of full-time teaching in Middle School Mathematics at the time of the case study. At the time of this case study, BH was a teacher at an EPP partnership school.

This case study was conducted in her classroom and evaluated by her school principal and a trained university supervisor who both used the evaluation tools as aligned with our teacher candidate evaluation system. The evaluations included: Observation and Conference Report which evaluates the observed lesson – completed by administrator and university supervisor; Clinical Competency Inventory which evaluates overall performance across many InTASC areas – completed by administrator and university supervisor; Disposition Survey completed by administrator and self-assessed. In addition, BH provided her supervisor's evaluation upon request and three days of lesson plans.

Results Case Study 5 –

Teacher Effectiveness:

- BH completed a self-assessment on the disposition, along with the administrator. The scores across both of these assessments rate BH as “Competent” or “Accomplished/Capstone”. The administrator noted that “the clinical program prepares candidate from an administrator perspective”.
- On the CCI, both the administrator and the University Supervisor scored BH as “proficient” or “advanced proficient” across most criteria. Any areas not scored in these two categories was scored as “N/A”. It is noted that “N/A” is used when a criteria is not observed or not present due to unavoidable reasons. In some cases, more clearly defining terms such as “technology used”, “literacy in content areas”, and “maintains accurate records” may help for evaluators to better understand how to score these areas. Professional responsibility across both evaluators was scored at “Advanced Proficient”.
- The O&C was scored exactly the same for both the principal and university supervisor. This indicates the interrater reliability was strong and the form was clear. BH scored “Advanced proficient” on 7/11 categories and 4/11 were scored “proficient”.
- BH provided a copy of a recent evaluation done by her supervisor using the district evaluation system that is based on Danielson's model. Within this evaluation, BH scored 6/11 as “Effective”, 2/11 as “Highly Effective”, and 2 were not observed. One area of “highly Effective” was in “Showing professionalism” which aligns with areas marked as “advanced proficient” on the CCI.

Impact on P-12 learning:

- The pre/post assessment scores demonstrate good to great gains. For example, many students went from 0/5 to 4/5 or 5/5.

Case Study 6 – Winter 2023/24 - Case study centered on alumni LD who graduated from SNHU's School of Education Clinical M. Ed. with a dual major of Elementary Education and Special Education in 2021. She was in her third year of full-time teaching in an Elementary Education level classroom at the time of the case study.

This case study was conducted in her classroom and evaluated by her school principal and a trained university supervisor who both used the evaluation tools as aligned with our teacher candidate evaluation system. The evaluations included: Observation and Conference Report which evaluates the observed lesson – completed by administrator and university supervisor; Clinical Competency Inventory which evaluates overall performance across many InTASC areas – completed by administrator and university supervisor; Disposition Survey completed by administrator and self-assessed. In addition, LD provided her supervisor's evaluation upon request and three days of lesson plans.

Results Case Study 6 –

Teacher Effectiveness:

- LD completed a self-assessment on the disposition, along with the administrator. The scores across both of these assessments rate LD "Accomplished/Capstone" in all areas but one – "Candidate uses multiple types of assessment...".
- On the CCI, both administrator and university supervisor scored LD as "proficient" or "Advanced proficient" across all areas. LD self-assessed with all areas in "proficient" or "Advanced proficient". It is noted that the University Supervisor scored LD lower in many areas than administrator. Faculty wondered if this is due to the minimal visit conducted for case study vs. the day-to-day interactions of the administrator with LD.
- The O&C was scored as 7/11 as advanced proficient and 4/11 as proficient by administrator, while the university supervisor scored 4/11 as advanced proficient and 7/11 as proficient.
- Areas of strength that occurred on both the O&C and CCI were professional and ethical practices, leadership and collaboration, and professional responsibility.
- LD provided a copy of a recent evaluation done by her supervisor using the district evaluation system that is based on Danielson's model. Within this evaluation, domain 1 planning and preparation was scored as 6/6 effective. Domain 2 Learning environment was 5/5 effective. Domain 3 instruction was 5/5 effective. Domain 4 Professional Responsibility was 4/6 Highly Effective and 2/6 effective.

Impact on P-12 Learning:

- The pre/post assessment scores show minimal growth as determined by this one assessment. Within question 3, on the pre test only 3 students scored correctly. On the post assessment 13 students scored correctly. This shows significant growth for this question. The remaining questions showed little to no growth.

Case Study 7– Winter 2023/24 - Case study centered on alumni TL who graduated from SNHU's School of Education Clinical M. Ed. with a Secondary Education degree, upper mathematics content area. He was in his first year of full-time teaching High School level mathematics at the time of the case study. TL is currently a “float teacher” which means he does not have his own homebase classroom but instead has his materials on a cart and shifts classrooms throughout the day.

This case study was conducted in a classroom within the high school and evaluated by his school assistant principal (who is trained as a university supervisor) and a trained university supervisor who both used the evaluation tools as aligned with our teacher candidate evaluation system. The evaluations included: Observation and Conference Report which evaluates the observed lesson – completed by administrator and university supervisor; Clinical Competency Inventory which evaluates overall performance across many InTASC areas – completed by administrator and university supervisor; Disposition Survey completed by administrator and self-assessed. In addition, TL provided his supervisor's evaluation upon request and three days of lesson plans.

Results Case Study 7 –

Teacher Effectiveness:

- TL completed a self-assessment on the disposition, along with the administrator. When self-assessing TL scored himself 7/10 as competent and 3/10 as accomplished. His administrator scored him with 6/10 at competent and 4/10 as accomplished.
- On the CCI, both the administrator and the university supervisor scored TL as proficient or advanced proficient in all areas but one. TL completed a self-assessment on the CCI and scored himself as proficient or advanced proficient in all areas except 7.2 – “the clinical intern models and integrates technology using a variety of modalities into the lesson plan to promote effective learning for all learners” where he scored himself as “novice.” This area was not identified by the administrator as such but was the one area that the university supervisor scored as “novice” as well.
- The O&C was scored as 9/11 proficient and 2/11 as advanced proficient by the administrator. The university supervisor scored 9/11 proficient and 2/11 as novice. Areas of novice included: Instructional strategies and application of content. Areas of strength as identified by the administrator included Professional Learning and Ethical Practice and Professional Responsibility.

- TL provided a copy of his recent evaluation done by his supervisor at his school. There are no scores to align with EPP's evaluations, but comments on his evaluation included "Mr. L creates a class environment that balances student individuality and positive learning culture" and a recommendation to "work towards including the lesson objective such as 'students will demonstrate their knowledge of rules of exponents'".
- Faculty reviewing this case study wonder if TL would score higher as a 3rd year completer as opposed to this being halfway through year one.

Impact on P-12 Learning:

- The pre/post information included TL's reflections on each of his 3 days of lessons and why the data showed what it showed. On day 1 of his lessons, he did a check in with students about how far they got through the practice problems. Out of 26 students, 19 were only "halfway done" or "less than halfway done." TL noted that students did not get as far as he expected and wondered if it was because this was right after February break and he gave them too many problems to complete. TL made adjustments to the next day's lesson plans by using the incomplete worksheet from the previous day to drive the lesson. On the assessment conducted on this day, students scored a median of 8.52/10. For day three, he noted that he reduced the number of problems provided to students. On the assessment check in, with his 26 students, 15/26 were "halfway done" or "less than halfway done" while 11/26 were done or more than halfway done.

Case Study 8 – Winter 2023/24 - Case study centered on alumni EM who graduated from SNHU's School of Education undergraduate program with a dual major of Elementary Education and General Special Education in 2021. She was in her third year of full-time teaching at the time of the case study. EM did year 1 in SpEd, year 2 in a regular education classroom, and in year 3 is now in SpEd again. She has been in two different districts during these three years of teaching.

This case study was conducted in her classroom and evaluated by her school principal and a trained university supervisor who both used the evaluation tools as aligned with our teacher candidate evaluation system. The evaluations included: Observation and Conference Report which evaluates the observed lesson – completed by administrator and university supervisor; Clinical Competency Inventory which evaluates overall performance across many InTASC areas – completed by administrator and university supervisor; Disposition Survey completed by administrator and self-assessed. In addition, EM provided her supervisor's evaluation upon request.

Results Case Study 8 –

Teacher Effectiveness:

- EM completed a self-assessment on the disposition, as did her administrator. EM scored herself as 4/10 competent and 6/10 accomplished, while her administrator scored her as 6/10 competent and 4/10 accomplished.
- On the CCI, EM self-assessed with most areas falling in proficient and advanced proficient. She rated herself as Novice for 2.3 – “intern creates a learning community where individual language development needs and differences are respected and met (ELL, ASL, other)”, 3.4 – “learners are engaged in positive peer relationships through instructional activities”. She also marked N/A for many areas within Standard #5 – Application of Content. Her administrator and the university supervisor scored her in most areas as proficient or advanced proficient. Some areas scored as novice by her administrator included; 2.2 – “intern reflects upon their own personal biases and as a result thoughtfully includes diverse cultures, communities, and perspectives into the lessons”, 4.2 – “intern designs and implements lessons that allow learners to demonstrate development of critical thinking and problem-solving within the content areas”, 5.1 – “intern implements learning experiences that allow learners to integrate knowledge from several content areas that reflect a diverse perspective within the curriculum”, 5.3 – “learners use current resources for content exploration, which may include technological applications”, 6.2 – “the clinical intern provides meaning and specific feedback to learners to improve their learning”, 8.2 – “interns vary their role in the instructional process in relation to the content”. It is noted that Standard 9 – Professional Learning and Ethical Practice and Standard 11 – Professional Responsibility were scored as highest areas by her administrator and the university supervisor with all indicators in advanced proficient.
- The O&C was scored 7/11 as proficient and 4/11 as advanced proficient, while the university supervisor scored 4/11 as proficient, 6/11 as advanced proficient, and 1/11 as novice (application of content).
- Trends across all evaluations show content areas as the areas of novice for EM. Faculty reviewing the data wondered if the lesson was based on scripted curriculum that must be followed?

Impact on P-12 Learning:

- Pre-assessment data was provided but no post assessment data was collected.