Introduction

Implemented during the 2017-2018 academic year and repeated during the 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 academic years, these case studies examine the extent to which recent completers of the University of Montevallo EPP are satisfied with their preparation (R.4.2), the extent to which their employers are satisfied with their teachers' preparation (R.4.3), and the extent to which the recent completers are impacting classroom instruction and schools (R4.1) and contributing to an effective level of student learning growth (R.4.1) during their first 3 years of teaching. The case study focused on one local district which has employed recent completers representing the EPP's various programs. The EPP plans to repeat this case study methodology annually in order to capture meaningful data from every program on a continuous basis.

Purpose of the Research

This study is designed to examine how teachers demonstrate effectiveness in their teaching practice and perceive satisfaction with their teacher preparation program at the University of Montevallo. The purpose of this research is to conduct a self-study to collect data to inform program impact of both initial and advanced certification programs for the purposes of program improvement.

Research Design

The University employed case-study methodology to explore how participants demonstrate teaching effectiveness. Using purposive sampling, six participants from a partner K-12 public school district were selected annually to participate in the research process over the course of one academic year. Multiple methods of data collection were used during this study so that the researchers could compensate for the fallibility of any single method (Marshall & Rossman, 2015). Participants worked with researchers to share data related to student-learning, growth, and learning gains (information from Data Dashboard, ACT Aspire summative results, ACT Aspire Interim reports, and grade distribution reports), as well as other evidence related to their teaching practice such as teacher evaluation results, walk- through feedback from administrators, Professional Learning Community (PLC) data, formal interviews, and the administration of *Colorado's Student Perception Survey* from the Colorado Education Initiative (Links to an external site.).

Interview Protocols

Along with sharing quantitative results and reports, each participant engaged/completed an interview/survey so the researcher(s) could further explore the teachers' perceptions regarding effective teaching and teacher preparation. Interview/survey questions included:

(A) What evidence do you have to show your teaching practice has an impact on student learning?

(B) Outside of reports and data, how do you know your teaching practice has an impact on student learning?

(C) In what ways do you measure effective teaching?

(D) In what ways have you proven your teaching practice to be effective?

(E) In what ways do you feel fulfilled in your teaching practice?

(F) How do you support diversity in your work?

(G) What evidence can you use to determine if your employer is satisfied with your work?

(H) How do you make changes to your practice based on feedback from your administrators?

(I) In what ways did your preparation program prepare you for your current position?

(J) For what did your preparation program best prepare you?

(K) In what areas could your preparation program have better prepared you?

(L) How do you best demonstrate your wisdom and effectiveness in relation to teaching and learning?

Instrumentation

Qualitative methodologies require that instrumentation be dependable and credible (Marshall & Rossman, 2015). All EPP and district level instruments, including interview protocols, observation forms, meet the threshold required for qualitative case study.

Data Analysis

All of the data were analyzed, coded, and categorized. Analytic induction (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Erikson, 1986; Patton, 2002) and content analysis (Patton, 2002) were employed in the analysis and interpretation of the data. Together, these approaches allowed us to follow a flexible and recursive process consistent with case study that permitted themes and categories to develop. Attention to internal convergence and external divergence was crucial so that each theme remained internally consistent while being mutually exclusive (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). In addition, the researchers employed a student perception of instruction to triangulate, ensuring patterns and categories repeat (*triangulation*, Patton, 2002) and support the dependability and credibility of findings (Marshall & Rossman, 2015; Plano Clark & Creswell, 2015).

Data Collection and Analysis by Sub-Standard

4.1 Impact of P-12 Learning and Development

The following questions guided the research for Standard 4.1:

1. What influence do you have over your students' learning and development? As a program completer from the University of Montevallo, how do you contribute to an expected level of student-learning and growth? What evidence do you have that demonstrates your impact on P-12 learning?
2. For this component of Standard 4, we ask that you reflect on your influence on students' learning and development and upload related evidence.

Participants provided the evidence listed below to:

- Redacted reports for the Scantron Achievement Series (or ASPIRE) Interim and Summative Assessments, depending on the assessment used at their school site. These data served as evidence related to completer impact on P-12 learning regarding learners' progress.
- Evidence retrieved from the Data Dash Board related to learning gains. These data served as evidence related to completer impact on P-12 learning regarding students' learning gains
- Student pre- and post-data from a learning unit. These data served as evidence related to completer impact on P-12 learning.
- Evidence of PLC work related to student learning. These data served as evidence related to completer impact on P-12 learning and development.

2017-2018 Findings

The majority UM recent completers are performing at proficient levels across data sources.

2018-2019 Findings

Completer data yield extremely high performances across data sources. Of particular note are the results from the student perception survey which indicate responsive, differentiated, and engaged learning with high expectations for student learning.

2019-2020 Findings

Data sources indicate that completers are performing at a developing level.

4.2 Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness

The following questions guided the research for Standard 4.2:

1. What performance measures help you measure your effectiveness as an educator?
2. As a program completer from the University of Montevallo, how do you know you effectively apply professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that your preparation experiences were designed to achieve?

3. What evidence do you have (other than measures of P-12 learning) that demonstrates your effectiveness?

Participants provided the evidence listed below to demonstrate teaching effectiveness:

- A copy of feedback received from a recent walk through (informal observation) from an administrator or supervisor. This information served as data related to your teaching effectiveness.
- Please upload a copy of feedback you received from a recent formal observation from an administrator or supervisor. This information served as data related to your teaching effectiveness.
- Please upload a copy of your most recent evaluation (typically completed near the end of the school year). This information will serve as data related to your teaching effectiveness.
- Work in PLCs that demonstrates completer effectiveness as an educator. This information served as additional data related to your teaching effectiveness.

2017-2018 Findings

Formal and informal observations indicate that participants are "effective" in all areas. Observations indicate that completers are highly effective with collaborative learning and planning as well as professional dispositions. Moreover, evaluators noted that completers provide clear evidence in the following areas: knowledge, planning, instruction, and assessment. Completer interviews support these findings. Specifically, teachers believed their educator preparation program prepared for all areas evaluated.

2018-2019 Findings

Formal and informal observations indicate that participants are "highly effective" in all areas. Observations indicate that completers are highly effective with engaged learning and planning as well as professional dispositions. Moreover, evaluators noted that completers provide consistent and clear evidence in the following areas: knowledge, planning, instruction, assessment, and meaningful technology integrations. Completer interviews support these findings. Specifically, completers believed their educator preparation program prepared for all areas evaluated.

2019-2020 Findings

Formal and informal observations indicate that participants are "developing" in all areas. Observations indicate that completers are effective with collaborative learning and planning as well as professional dispositions, where ratings were consistently "effective." Moreover, evaluators noted that completers provide clear evidence in the following areas: knowledge, planning, instruction, and assessment. An area for improvement included classroom management. This finding from principal observation data triangulates with data found on the

student perception survey and completer interviews. Completers believed their educator preparation program prepared them for "daily tasks," but under-prepared them for other duties (e.g., professional learning community (PLC) engagement). Also, completers noted that clinical placements reflected ideal learning contexts, which under-prepared them to build these learning climates. This also triangulates with findings related to classroom management.

4.3 Employer Satisfaction Survey

The Alabama State Department of Education partnered with the Alabama Association for Colleges of Teacher Education to develop a valid (See Appendix A for process and content validity) and reliable New Teacher Employer Survey. This survey asks principals and other school administrators to evaluate completers who are in their first year of employment.

2017-2018 Findings

These data and findings are housed under Section 4.3 of the EPPs CAEP data dashboard.

2018-2019 Findings

These data and findings are housed under Section 4.3 of the EPPs CAEP data dashboard.

2019-2020 Findings

These data and findings are housed under Section 4.3 of the EPPs CAEP data dashboard.

4.4: Satisfaction of Completers (In-service Graduates)

The following questions guided the research for Standard 4.4:

1. In what ways are you satisfied with your educational preparation?
2. As a program completer from the University of Montevallo, how do you perceive your preparation as relevant to the responsibilities you confront on the job?
3. In what ways do you perceive your preparation was effective?
4. Do you believe you were appropriately prepared for the daily activities you encounter?

Data collected to analyze satisfaction of completer included a satisfaction survey administered to first-year teachers.

2017-2018 Findings

These data and findings are housed under Section 4.4 of the EPPs CAEP data dashboard.

2018-2019 Findings

These data and findings are housed under Section 4.4 of the EPPs CAEP data dashboard.

2019-2020 Findings

These data and findings are housed under Section 4.4 of the EPPs CAEP data dashboard.

Student Perception of Instruction

Researchers employed a student perception of instruction to triangulate and support the dependability and credibility of findings (Marshall & Rossman, 2015; Plano Clark & Creswell, 2010).
Colorado's Student Perception Survey from the Colorado Education Initiative (Links to an external site.) was used to gauge students' perceptions about their classroom experiences. The survey relates to students' perceptions of effectiveness as a teacher/educator regarding student learning, classroom environment, classroom community, and classroom management.

Teachers administered the following age appropriate surveys to their students:

Student Perception Survey Grades 3-5

Student Perception Survey Grades 6-12

Results were uploaded to the UM Case Study Canvas course. Responses were aggregated by question. Data were represented by mean, median, and standard deviation for each question.

References

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods* (5th ed.). Needham Heights: Allyn & Bacon.

Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 119- 161). New York: Macmillan.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2015). *Designing qualitative research* (6th ed.)*.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

 Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (3rd Edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Plano Clark, V.L. & Creswell, J.W. (2015). Understanding research: A consumer's guide (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Appendix A

ALACTE Survey Development Process

I. Initial Meeting - July 2015 (Samford University)

Following the release of the CAEP standards, CAEP Coordinators met to discuss their progress on the new CAEP requirements. This meeting was held at Samford University. Participants included members from ALACTE's 27-member institutions as well as members from the Alabama State Department of Education, including Dr. Anna Kozlowski. The agenda for this meeting was to discuss among Alabama institutions the three following items:

1. What does CAEP require?

    Participants discussed all CAEP requirements based on initial programs. Specific language in the CAEP manual was examined to ensure that we all were aware of the requirements.

2. What are we doing to meet these requirements?

    Institutions were able to participate in small groups to discuss what each institution was doing to meet this requirement.

3. How can we collaborate to meet these requirements?

    Participants began to discuss how to meet the CAEP Framework for EPP Created Assessments. This appeared to be an area to focus on for future meetings.

The meeting also requested that EPP's share current assessments of Alumni, Employers, Exit Surveys; Field and Clinical Evaluations, Disposition Evaluations, and Impact on Student Learning Assessments.

II. Follow-up Meeting - August 2015 (University of Montevallo Regional In-service Center)

A full day meeting was held that focused on CAEP Standards for anyone that needed more information and participation from state partners. Also discussed were the eight annual reporting measures.

There was an increased focus at this meeting on the requirements specific to Standard 4. Program impact data is difficult to attain as our state and school partners are unwilling to share any student data.

The CAEP Framework for EPP created assessments were also discussed again with specific attention to achieving reliability and validity.

The result of the meeting included a common alumni and employer survey of the institutions aligned to the InTACS standards that could be sent across the state to survey graduates from the various EPPs on a common instrument.

III. Meeting - October 2015 (ALACTE)

This was a regular meeting of ALACTE (state chapter of AACTE). EPPs from across the state shared some of the assessments and evaluation instruments in order to give members of ALACTE an idea of where to start. Originally, it was thought that items across institutions could be used to help facilitate the creation of a statewide instrument that could be incorporated by the institutions.

However, after discussion, buy-in for state administered assessments could be difficult to implement with programs. Therefore, EPPs agreed to work on developing statewide employer and alumni surveys that could potentially address standard 4 CAEP requirements.

IV. November 13, 2015 - Instrument Development (Samford University)

After discussion of the alignment of the ALACTE statewide alumni and employer survey, it was determined that the content of the survey should not be based on any single survey that was currently used by EPPs in Alabama, but focus on the items with in the 10 InTASC Standards. Dr. Lou Ann Worthington suggested EPPs create surveys using the 21 InTASC Learning Progressions.

Originally progressions were put into rubric form, but we had some concerns about the length and complexity of the rubric. A sub-group of the committee/task force was created to draft an instrument and then solicit feedback from all CAEP Coordinators. Members of the task force included:
1. Dr. Lou Ann Worthington - University of Alabama Birmingham
2. Dr. Rhonda Morton - Auburn University Montgomery
3. Dr. Diana Cheshire - Samford University
4. Dr. Rosemary Hodges - Athens State University
5. Dr. David Crowe - Auburn University

V. Spring 2016
The CAEP Committee met physically and virtually several times to develop a draft of the surveys. Draft copies of the employer and alumni surveys were presented to CAEP Coordinators. This draft featured a rating scale instead being in a rubric format. General agreement was established by CAEP Coordinators to move forward with the rating scale format.

VI. Spring/Summer 2016

In Spring and Summer of 2016, Samford University piloted the employer and alumni surveys. Findings revealed that the length of the survey was appropriate. Feedback also indicated the survey content and terminology was clear and understandable. Responses from employers as well as alumni were informative primarily for CAEP Standards 1 and 2.

VII. August 9-10, 2016

In August of 2016, a State-wide stakeholder meeting was convened with:
- ALACTE Representatives from 7 IHEs
- ALSDE Representatives
- A Representative of the School Superintendent's of Alabama Organization
- A CLAS Representative
- An AACTE Representative

During this two-day workshop, rich discussion of the surveys and processes took place. The purpose and intended results of the surveys were discussed. The outcomes of the meeting resulted in:
- refinement of survey format based on all stakeholders
- determination that the ALSDE would disseminate the survey via Survey Monkey to Employers and first year teachers from all 27 Alabama Institutions of Higher Education based on a data base maintained by the Alabama State Department of Education of all teachers/employers within the state
- development of a process for content validation of the surveys
  - All 7 IHEs present at the workshop agreed to send both the Employer and the In-Service surveys to individuals who had completed their teacher prep programs as well as employers of graduates from those IHE's to determine the content validity of the survey items using the Lawshe method

VIII. February 8, 2017 - Final Development of the Employer and In-Service Surveys

Following the 2-day retreat, Alabama's State Department of Education took the Employer Survey and the In-service Survey (alumni) back to the State Department and surveys were created using Survey Monkey.

A State Department representative met with CAEP coordinators to review and finalize the surveys after content validity for each item had been established. At this time, ALACTE representatives were told that once the State Department has been given the "OK" from ALACTE, the surveys will be published.

IX. February 28, 2018

The State Department communicated on this date that surveys had been sent out to mentor teachers with directions to provide surveys to first year teachers and the person responsible for evaluating those first-year teachers (employers).

The State Department indicated they will periodically keep IHEs apprised of response rates.

No deadline for completion of the surveys was provided.

Employer Survey Results

	N – Essential	% - Essential	*N* – Useful, but not Essential	% – Useful, but not Essential	*N* – Not Necess.	%– Not Necess.	*N*
Learner Development 1.1 The teacher uses understanding of how learners grow...	19	95%	1	5%	0	0%	20
Learning Differences 2.1 The teacher uses understanding of learners common...	17	85%	3	15%	0	0%	20
Learning Environments 3.1 The teacher collaborates with others to build a p...	20	100%	0	0%	0	0%	20
Learning Environments 3.2 The teacher manages the learning environment to e...	19	95%	1	5%	0	0%	20
Content Knowledge 4.1 The teacher understands the central concepts, tools o...	20	100%	0	0%	0	0%	20
Content Knowledge 4.2 The teacher creates learning experiences that make th...	19	95%	1	5%	0	0%	20

	N – Essential	% - Essential	N – Useful, but not Essential	% – Useful, but not Essential	N – Not Necess.	%– Not Necess.	N
Application of Content 5.1 The teacher connects concepts, perspectives from...	17	85%	3	15%	0	0%	20
Application of Content 5.2 The teacher engages learners in critical thinkin...	20	100%	0	0%	0	0%	20
Assessment 6.1 The teacher uses, designs, or adapts multiple methods of ass...	19	95%	1	5%	0	0%	20
Assessment 6.2 The teacher uses assessment to engage learners in their own...	16	80%	4	20%	0	0%	20
Assessment 6.3 The teacher implements assessments in an ethical manner and...	20	100%	0	0%	0	0%	20
Planning for Instruction 7.1 The teacher selects, creates, and sequences le...	20	100%	0	0%	0	0%	20
Planning for Instruction 7.2 The teacher plans instruction based on informa...	20	100%	0	0%	0	0%	20
Planning for Instruction 7.3 The teacher plans instruction by collaborating...	16	80%	4	20%	0	0%	20

	N – Essential	% - Essential	N – Useful, but not Essential	% – Useful, but not Essential	N – Not Necess.	%– Not Necess.	N
Instructional Strategies 8.1 The teacher understands and uses a variety of...	20	100%	0	0%	0	0%	20
Instructional Strategies 8.2 The teacher encourages learners to develop dee...	19	95%	1	5%	0	0%	20
Professional Learning and Ethical Practice 9.1 The teacher engages in conti...	20	100%	0	0%	0	0%	20
Professional Learning and Ethical Practice 9.2 The teacher uses evidence to...	20	100%	0	0%	0	0%	20
Professional Learning and Ethical Practice 9.3 The teacher practices the pr...	20	100%	0	0%	0	0%	20
Leadership and Collaboration 10.1 The teacher collaborates with learners, f...	19	95%	1	5%	0	0%	20
Leadership and Collaboration 10.2 The teacher seeks appropriate leadership...	17	85%	3	15%	0	0%	20
Standard 4(o): The teacher has deep knowledge of current and emerging state...	14	70%	6	30%	0	0%	20

	N – Essential	% - Essential	*N* – Useful, but not Essential	% – Useful, but not Essential	*N* – Not Necess.	%– Not Necess.	*N*
Standard 6(q): The teacher possesses knowledge of Alabama's state assessmen...	14	70%	6	30%	0	0%	20
Standard 7(h): The teacher communicates with students, parents, and the pub...	13	65%	6	30%	1	5%	20
Standard 7(g): The teacher integrates Alabama-wide programs and initiatives...	14	70%	6	30%	0	0%	20
Standard 9(o): The teacher understands the expectations of the profession i...	18	90%	2	10%	0	0%	20

In-Service Teacher Survey (Alumni)

	N – Essential	% - Essential	N – Useful, but not Essential	% – Useful, but not Essential	N – Not Necess.	%– Not Necess.	N
Learner Development 1.1 The teacher uses understanding of how learners grow...	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	10
Learning Differences 2.1 The teacher uses understanding of learners common...	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	10
Learning Environments 3.1 The teacher collaborates with others to build a p...	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	10
Learning Environments 3.2 The teacher manages the learning environment to e...	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	10
Content Knowledge 4.1 The teacher understands the central concepts, tools o...	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	10
Content Knowledge 4.2 The teacher creates learning experiences that make th...	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	10
Application of Content 5.1 The teacher connects concepts, perspectives from...	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	10

	N – Essential	% - Essential	N – Useful, but not Essential	% – Useful, but not Essential	N – Not Necess.	%– Not Necess.	N
Application of Content 5.2 The teacher engages learners in critical thinkin...	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	10
Assessment 6.1 The teacher uses, designs, or adapts multiple methods of ass...	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	10
Assessment 6.2 The teacher uses assessment to engage learners in their own...	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	10
Assessment 6.3 The teacher implements assessments in an ethical manner and...	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	10
Planning for Instruction 7.1 The teacher selects, creates, and sequences le...	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	10
Planning for Instruction 7.2 The teacher plans instruction based on informa...	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	10
Planning for Instruction 7.3 The teacher plans instruction by collaborating...	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	10
Instructional Strategies 8.1 The teacher understands and uses a variety of...	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	10

	N – Essential	% - Essential	N – Useful, but not Essential	% – Useful, but not Essential	N – Not Necess.	%– Not Necess.	N
Instructional Strategies 8.2 The teacher encourages learners to develop dee...	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	10
Professional Learning and Ethical Practice 9.1 The teacher engages in conti...	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	10
Professional Learning and Ethical Practice 9.2 The teacher uses evidence to...	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	10
Professional Learning and Ethical Practice 9.3 The teacher practices the pr...	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	10
Leadership and Collaboration 10.1 The teacher collaborates with learners, f...	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	10
Leadership and Collaboration 10.2 The teacher seeks appropriate leadership...	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	10