SUNY Potsdam Educator Preparation Programs

Executive Summary of Observation Case Studies

(Pilot AY 2022-2023)

Table of Contents

Introduction & Overview

This executive summary represents the efforts of SUNY Potsdam EPP to address and remedy Completer Teaching Effectiveness as a Result of Preparation. This was a significant area of concern noted in our Accreditation Action Report received from CAEP Accreditation Council in May 2022 with the following stipulation:

> The EPP provides no evidence through structured validated observation instruments and/or P-12 student surveys that completers teaching in the field effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve (component 4.2).

Effective teaching is a major strand in our educator preparation programs. Our candidates must demonstrate initial and ongoing growth in pedagogical content knowledge and professionalism. They must also display continuous actions and evidence of teacher excellence from their early field experiences throughout student teaching, which we hope will be transferred to their practice as beginning teachers. While the EPP was unable to fully establish this evidence in our self-study report, and in the absence of available state data, we have since collected observation data to verify that our completers are maintaining excellence and demonstrating teaching effectiveness in current classrooms.

This executive summary details a pilot case study methodology that the EPP implemented to verify our observations and to support our meeting of CAEP Std. 4.2 components. Included in this document is the data analysis, summary, and conclusions of our pilot case study which answers the question: Do you produce quality educators and how do you know?

In responding to this question, we sought to show that our completers:

1. Contribute to P-12 student-learning growth.
2. Apply professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions in the P-12 classroom.

Fulfilling CAEP Std. 4.2 components will also address the gap in our EPP's Quality Assurance System (QAS) that is designed to represent important features of our programs including the evidence that all our candidates are prepared to exit our programs with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to meet the needs of different learners. In so doing, the EPP can also support the claim that we have established high-quality programs and the preparation of excellent completers.

Contextual and Demographic Information

The Regional Context

St. Lawrence County is in Northern New York close to the Canadian Border near the Canadian cities of Ottawa and Montreal. The county nestles between the Adirondack Mountains to the east and the Thousand Islands region in the south. The famous St. Lawrence River runs to the Northeast. The county is comprised of thirty-two towns, thirteen villages, and one city inundated with hills, ponds, lakes, rivers, and wetlands. Primarily agricultural in economy, the county is home to about 108,505 residents, according to the 2020 population census and makes up 2% of New York State population. The region is called the 'North Country.'

St. Lawrence County School Districts

As of 2022, current school data indicated that St. Lawrence County is home to 41 public schools with a population of 13,508 students from kindergarten to 12th grade. Of the 13,508 students, 12,494 are white (93%), 209 are Hispanic (2%), 285 are American Indian or Alaska Native (2%), 193 are multiracial (1%), 113 are Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (1%), and 113 are Black or Africa American (1%). The student count is approximately 50% for both K-6 and 7-12th with 51% male, 49% female and 9% non-binary. Other student groups are:

English language learners at 52 (0%), student with disabilities at 2,350 (18%), economically disadvantaged at 6,847 (51%), migrants at 167 (1%), homeless at 247 (2%) foster care at 120 (1%) parents in armed forces at 32 (0%). The highest enrollment numbers can be found in the 9th grade (9%) and the lowest in K through 6th grades at 7% respectively. The number of full-time teachers is around 1,272 with 37 full-time principals and 4 full-time assistant principals. Many of these teachers and school administrators are graduates from SUNY Potsdam. The 41 public schools are distributed into 18 school districts, with the largest school district having 5 separate school buildings. Most districts (13) have an average of 1 to 3 separate school buildings that serve grades PK-12.

Case Study Context

The case study was conducted in a school district with a population of about 328 students and a student /teacher ratio of about 11.7 to 1. Located in a rural, scenic community, the school serves grades K-12 in one multi leveled building and has been designated as a district in Good Standing in all performance goals. The district also has a 94% student attendance rate and 94% high school graduation. Similar to district trends, the highest enrollment figures are in 10th and 12th grade (10%; 9%) and the lowest in K through 3rd grade each at 6%. There are approximately 40 teachers across all grade levels. Also, similar trends for the St. Lawrence County schools are noted in the demographics for this district. Of the overall student population, 49% are male and 51% female. The student demographics by ethnicity is white (97%) with Hispanic (1%), Multiracial (1%), and American Indian or Alaska Native and Asian or Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander indicated at 1%. 45% are described as economically disadvantaged and 18% as students

with disabilities. Other student groups have been identified as second language learners (2%), migrant (4%), homeless (7%), and foster care (2%).

Pilot Case Study Participants

Our case study teacher-participants were completers from 4 of our 10 initial programs: 1 from our Childhood MST and 3 from our adolescence MST programs. All 4 teacher-participants are residents of the North Country and graduated from our initial programs between 1-3 years (See Table 1).

Table 1: SUNY Potsdam, EPP Case Study Data Grid-fall 2022

Completers Participants	Employment: Grade or Content Area	No. of Students	Degree Program	Demographic	Lesson Plan and P-12 pre-post impact self-analysis write up	Participant Classroom Observation (Knowledge, skills, dispositions)	Location/ District
Participant 0002	Elementary Grade 1	23 students (7-AIS)	MST Childhood	F, W, Trad	X	X	Rural
Participant 0003	Middle & High School Grade 7-12	61 students (2-AIS)	MST Math	M, W, Non-Trad	X	X	Rural
Participant 0004	Middle & High School Grade 7-12	29 students (4-AIS)	MST-Social Studies	M, W, Trad	X	X	Rural
Participant 0001	Middle & High School Grade 7-12	88 students (14-AIS)	MST-Science	F, W, Trad	X	X	Rural

Key: F-Female; M-Male; Trad-Traditional College student; Non-Trad - Non-Traditional
AIS-Academic Intervention Services (504 plans & IEPs)
X-Task Completed

Evidence of sufficiency was determined using the following sources of evidence and summarized in Table 2:

1. Direct observations of classroom teaching
2. Interviews (pre and post)

3. Case Study Observation & Evaluation rubric
4. Physical artifacts-lesson plans, worksheets, exit tickets, etc.

Table 2: SUNY Potsdam, EPP Case Study Summary of R4.2 Evidence of Sufficiency

Implementation semesters	**CAEP 4 strands**	**Potsdam EPP-Initial programs**	**Evidence**
Began in the fall 2022 through spring 2023 with rural school district	Contribute to P-12 student learning growth	Case study methodology- 4 completers	Interview write-ups (pre and post), lesson plans, P-12 student work samples and other classroom artifacts based on lessons observed
	Apply professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions (e.g., teacher evaluations	Direct observations by the ***EPP* Assistant Dean** of completers during classroom instruction using *pilot case study observation and evaluation form*	Ratings on 4 domains from the Framework for Teaching based on Danielson's Framework (2007, 2014) *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching.*
		Direct observations by the ***building principal*** of completers during classroom instruction using *APL Teaching Framework rubric.*	Ratings on district level APL Teaching Framework based on the Danielson's Framework (2007, 2014) *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching.*
		Beginning Teacher Perception (PSI) survey	Beginning Teacher Perception (PSI) survey responses

Teaching Performance of Recent Initial Program Completers

Observation Data Across Two Semesters Results

Each completer was evaluated two times, once in the fall and then again in the spring using the four domains from the Danielson (2007, 2014) *Enhancing Professional Practice*, *A Framework for Teaching*. The four domains were individually scored to capture how each teacher-candidate performed on each domain indicator. A summary of the data is presented in Tables 3a-3d for all four teacher-participants.

Table 3a. Observation of Planning & Preparation

Domain: Planning & Preparation								
Completer	Time	1a K. of content and pedagogy	1b. K. of students	1c. Setting instructional outcomes	1d. K of resources	1e. Designing coherent instruction	1f. Designing student assessments	Mean per completer
Elementary Education	Fall	**3**	**3**	**3**	**3**	**3**	**3**	**3.0**
	Spring	**3**	**3**	**3**	**3**	**3**	**3**	**3.0**
Adolescence Math	Fall	**4**	**4**	**4**	**3**	**4**	**3**	**3.7**
	Spring	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**3**	**3.8**
Adolescence Science	Fall	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4.0**
	Spring	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4.0**
Adolescence Soc. Studies	Fall	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4.0**
	Spring	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4.0**
Mean per criteria	Fall	**3.8**	**3.8**	**3.8**	**3.5**	**3.8**	**3.5**	**3.7**
	Spring	**3.8**	**3.8**	**3.8**	**3.8**	**3.8**	**3.5**	**3.7**

Table 3b. Observation of Classroom Environment

Domain: Classroom Environment							
Completer	Time	2a. Creating an environment of respect and rapport	2b. Establishing a culture for learning	2c. Managing classroom procedures	2d. Managing student behavior	2e. Organizing physical space	Mean per completer
Elementary Education	Fall	**3**	**3**	**2**	**2**	**3**	**2.6**
	Spring	**3**	**3**	**3**	**3**	**3**	**3.0**
Adolescence Math	Fall	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**3**	**3.8**
	Spring	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**3**	**3.8**
Adolescence Science	Fall	**4**	**4**	**3**	**4**	**4**	**3.8**
	Spring	**4**	**4**	**3**	**3**	**4**	**3.6**
Adolescence Soc. Studies	Fall	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4.0**
	Spring	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4.0**
Mean per criteria	Fall	**3.8**	**3.8**	**3.3**	**3.5**	**3.5**	**3.6**
	spring	**3.8**	**3.8**	**3.5**	**3.5**	**3.5**	**3.6**

Table 3c. Observation of Instruction

Domain: Instruction							
Completer	Time	3a. Communicating with students	3b. Using questioning and discussion techniques	3c. Engaging students in learning	3d. Using assessment in instruction	3e. Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness	Mean per completer
Elementary Education	Fall	**3**	**2**	**3**	**2**	**2**	**2.4**
	Spring	**3**	**3**	**3**	**3**	**3**	**3.0**
Adolescence Math	Fall	**4**	**3**	**4**	**3**	**3**	**3.4**
	Spring	**4**	**3**	**4**	**3**	**3**	**3.4**
Adolescence Science	Fall	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4.0**
	Spring	**3**	**3**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**3.6**
Adolescence Soc. Studies	Fall	**3**	**3**	**4**	**3**	**4**	**3.4**
	Spring	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4.0**
Mean per criteria	**Fall**	**3.5**	**3.0**	**3.8**	**3.0**	**3.3**	**3.3**
	spring	**3.5**	**3.3**	**3.8**	**3.5**	**3.5**	**3.5**

Table 3d. Observation of Professional Responsibilities

Domain: Professional Responsibilities								
Completer	Time	4a. Reflecting on teaching	4b. Maintaining accurate records	4c. Communicating with families	4d. Participating in a professional community	4e. Growing and developing professionally	4f. Showing Professionalism	Mean per completer
Elementary Education	Fall	**2**	**2**	**N/A**	**2**	**2**	**3**	**2.8**
	Spring	**2**	**2**	**N/A**	**2**	**2**	**3**	**2.8**
Adolescence Math	Fall	**4**	**3**	**N/A**	**3**	**3**	**4**	**3.4**
	Spring	**4**	**3**	**N/A**	**3**	**3**	**4**	**3.4**
Adolescence Science	Fall	**4**	**3**	**N/A**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**3.8**
	Spring	**4**	**3**	**N/A**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**3.8**
Adolescence Soc. Studies	Fall	**3**	**3**	**N/A**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**3.6**
	Spring	**3**	**3**	**N/A**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**3.6**
Mean per criteria	**Fall**	**3.3**	**2.8**	**N/A**	**3.3**	**3.3**	**3.8**	**3.3**
	Spring	**3.3**	**2.8**	**N/A**	**3.3**	**3.3**	**3.8**	**3.3**

Data Analysis

Generally, teacher-participants' performances across domains were commendable. The highest score that could be obtained on the Danielson's Teaching Framework rubric is a 4.0 which indicates performance at the exemplary level. On average our teacher participants scored at the proficient level (3.0) or higher in all domains.

Noteworthy were the overall average scores above the proficiency level (3.7) in fall and spring semesters for the *planning and preparation* domain. All teacher-participants consistently demonstrated strengths in *knowledge of content and pedagogy, knowledge of the students, setting instructional outcomes and designing coherent instruction.* Individual scores for *designing student assessment* varied, but the teacher-candidate's score was above the proficient level (3.5) overall.

For the *classroom environment* domain, the overall scores were above the proficiency level at 3.6 for both the fall and spring semesters. Specifically, teacher-participants demonstrated strengths in *creating an environment of respect and rapport* (3.8) and *establishing a culture for learning (3.8)*. Other indicators had an overall score of a 3.5 for *managing classroom procedures*, *managing student behaviors*, and *organizing physical space*. Although the overall average was a 3.6, we can conclude this domain is an observed strength for teacher-participants.

The *instruction domain* was an area where scores varied across indicators. Teacher-participants demonstrated a strength in *Engaging students in learning* with an overall average score of 3.8. While scores of other indicators were just above the proficiency level, the inconsistency may indicate a need to improve in such areas *as communicating with students, using questioning and discussion techniques, using assessment in instruction,* and *demonstrating*

flexibility and responsiveness. Improvements were noted in the spring overall scores (3.5) when compared with the fall scores (3.3).

The overall average for the *professional responsibility* domain was slightly above the proficiency level at 3.3 for both the fall and spring semesters. The highest and most consistent score was for showing *professionalism* with an overall average score of 3.8. The lowest score was for *maintaining accurate records* (2.8) which represented the teacher-participant's system for recording students' completion of in-class assessments and attainment of learning goals. While a fair number of work samples were provided, more consistency in having this evidence available is needed. Other indicators, *reflecting on teaching, participating in a professional community,* and *growing and developing professionally* received an overall average of 3.3, a little above the proficiency level. The indicator, *communicating with families* was difficult to assess in the case study format. We believe that adding an additional question in the pre-interview can provide some worthwhile evidence of how our teacher-participants communicate with families.

Evidence of Impact and Effectiveness

Impact on Student Learning

The impact of their teaching on student learning was observed in all four teacher-participants classroom practices. Measures focused on formative and summative assessments throughout lesson implementation.

MST Childhood Education: The teacher-participant was consistent in utilizing grade-appropriate measures to determine the impact on student learning. Formative measures were observed during warm-up and turn and talk activities when the teacher-participant elicited feedback from

students about the content being explored. Summative measures such as exit tickets and worksheets were utilized at the end of each lesson. The teacher-participant provided students with descriptive feedback on each worksheet activity completed.

Adolescence Education Math MST: The teacher-participant engaged in formative assessment, circulating each group, confirming answers, or explaining missed concepts. At the end of each class, students were given exit tickets to respond to the math content. Student responses were based on the specific concept explored in each lesson. Homework tasks were another way of checking students' understanding, which usually took place with a review at the start of each lesson. The observations made of students' attempts at the homework extended into the topic for the day. Examples were demonstrated on the whiteboard with the teacher-participant allowing wait-time and circulating 'pods' to observe. The emphasis of authentic assessments (bellringers, exit tickets) as recommended by the APL Teaching Framework was also observed in this case.

Adolescence Education Science MST: In the science education case study, formative and summative forms of assessment (bell ringers, exit tickets, post-lab questions) were used to measure learning outcomes for the science content. This teacher-participant emphasized how the meeting of learning outcomes facilitated planning for future lessons. Careful attention to students' post-lab questions was observed as a summative form of assessment of meeting learning goals by this teacher-participant.

Adolescence Education Social Studies MST: In the social studies education case, the teacher-participant utilized formative forms of assessment (bellringers, quick writes, pair and share

strategies) in lessons which impacted instructional decisions during the lesson and opportunities for teachable moments. In our pre-interview, the teacher-participant shared additional assessments that demonstrated student learning throughout the year. These include quizzes, tests, and projects.

Teaching Effectiveness

All four teacher-participants showed they were using a variety of effective instructional practices. In my observations, a few of these instructional practices frequently observed were:

- **Checking for Understanding (CFT**)-Teacher-participants were observed reviewing, or re-teaching concepts with intentionality.
- **Effective Room Arrangements-**Teacher-participants managed the physical space of the classroom by attending to seating arrangement which influenced student focus. For example, in the science lesson, the room was organized for individual and group work on lab experiments, the elementary classroom was organized for easy monitoring of students needing support with the concept. In the math class, furniture was organized as pods to facilitate group work on math problems and for the teacher-participant to assess learning and provide more direct support when math concepts were not fully understood by a student. This model also provided an opportunity for partner work on solving math problems.
- **Bellringers-**Teacher-participants consistently used bellringers to begin their lessons.
- **Posting Objectives**-Teacher-participants posted their lesson objectives on dry erase or jam boards.
- **Posting Agendas, Reviewing Homework-**At the middle and high school levels each teacher-participant posted agendas and addressed homework tasks.

- **Exit Tickets-**At all levels, exit tickets were included in lesson delivery.

The above instructional strategies are consistent with the APL Teaching Framework approach that all beginning teachers are expected to utilize in the district to design and plan for effective implementation of a lesson. The APL Teaching Framework as proposed consists of three major parts in a lesson, with each part serving a specific function. For example, the Beginning Block included a *bellringer, sharing the agenda, sharing the objectives, and reviewing homework.* The Middle block focused on *identifying each objective with a related anticipatory set, checking for understanding and guided practice.* The Ending Block focused on the *lesson closure*, usually use of an *exit ticket*, *assigning homework* and *getting it started.* These strategies are promoted as being rooted in research-based practices that impact student outcomes. (Sharer, T., Anastasio, J., & Perry, D. (2007). Teaching: The Book Instructional Skills and Strategies for the Experienced and Novice Teacher. *APL Associates, Camillus*, N.Y)
These instructional strategies are expected and scored using the APL Teaching Framework domains when evaluated by the building administrator.

Other effective teaching strategies observed that are emphasized in individual EPP programs and is also in keeping with the spirit of APL Teaching Framework are:

- **Gradual Release of Responsibility (GRR) model**-All teacher-participants provided grade appropriate instruction with opportunities for engagement through guided instruction, collaboration, and independent practice.
- **On-the-Clock**-Teacher-participants often used a timer and encouraged students to remain on task and be focused. The importance of time was emphasized in the middle and high school level more frequently than at the elementary level.

- **Classroom Management**-Teacher-participants reminded students about classroom expectations. For example, in the science lab lesson when safety procedures were reviewed. Also, behavioral expectations were reinforced at all levels with verbal reminders given or positive behavior affirmed at the elementary level.
- **Use of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) Principles-**Teacher-participants incorporated choice and collaboration in their lesson, provided opportunities for practice and used different formats to display and interact with the content. These principles are included in the unit wide lesson plan and expected to be addressed in all lesson plans across programs.
- **Use of Academic Language-**Teacher-participants were observed modeling the academic language using key vocabulary and syntax so that students could apply the content in written form or orally. This is also included in the unit wide lesson plan used across programs.
- **Technology Use-**Each teacher-participant utilized technology/digital tools and software in the lessons observed. For example, presentation software such as Google slides and power-points were used to create and present on lesson topics. Content-specific information was displayed on SMART boards and jam boards which allowed for student engagement and collaboration. Internet resources such as videos were utilized during the social studies lesson on WWII.

Similarly, there were areas where teacher-participants should be encouraged to strengthen:

- **Input Activities-**The APL Teaching Framework encourages the use of 'Serial Positioning' during the instructional procedure to influence focus and retention. Increasing modeling would be valuable, particularly for new skills.
- **Learning Assessment-**There is a need for more creative means of evaluating students. While teacher-participants utilize the bellringers and checking for understanding for

formative assessments, activities were often passive. The importance of these activities for assessment purposes should involve more teacher feedback to students, teacher reflection and documentation.

- **Lesson Reflection-**Teacher-participants could benefit from more in-depth reflection on lesson outcomes based on observed responses by students with reference to its benefits in considering the different abilities of students and their diverse needs.

Teacher-Participants' Perceptions of Preparation

Ratings by teacher-participants about their perception of their preparation on question 67 of the PSI Beginning teachers survey results corroborate evidence of impact and teacher effectiveness. We noted that our teacher-participants **strongly agree** (50%) and **somewhat agree** (25%) that they were prepared *to effectively instruct learners* and *for developing clear procedures* in [the] classroom. Also favorable was the perception that they **strongly agree** (75%) that they were both prepared *for working in a professional learning community* and *for formative assessment of student learning.* Likewise, the teacher-participants also **somewhat agree** (50%) **strongly agree** (25%) they were prepared both *for teaching students with special learning needs* and *for using technology in [the] classroom*.

There were areas the teacher-participants perceived as unprepared in their programs. For example, half (50%) **neither agree nor disagree** and **somewhat agree** that they were not prepared *to effectively communicate with parents*. Another 50% indicated that they **somewhat agree** they were not prepared *for working with disruptive students in the classroom.* Significant, was the teacher-participants' perceptions of being unprepared *to interpret standardized test data for [the] class.* At least 75% indicated that they **neither agree or disagree** to **somewhat**

disagree about their preparation. When responding to whether they felt prepared *for teaching students who are English as Second Language learners,* a range of opinions were observed. Our teacher-participants **strongly agree** (25%), **somewhat agree** (25%), **neither agree or disagree** (25%) and **somewhat disagree (25%)** that they were prepared for this area. While some of these areas were not observed during classroom observations, it is important that our programs consider how we can facilitate our completers' needs, so they are more fully prepared for their classrooms (**see Appendix 1**).

Pilot Case Study Considerations

Reliability Actions

Each lesson was also observed by the building administrator using the APL Teaching Framework domains. The alignment of the APL with the Pilot Case Study Observation and Evaluation rubric used by the Assistant Dean allowed for comparison of scores assigned to teacher-participants. After each lesson, both the building administrator and Assistant Dean met with each teacher-participant to debrief on the lesson observed. There was no significant disagreement when scoring across domains, although the faculty researcher tended to score higher in some cases using Danielson's Framework. Whereas the APL Teaching Framework provided specific guidance for scoring based on the number of domain indicators observed. For improvement, this aspect of the case study should be revisited to ensure that the process for member checking and reliability with scoring across domains is clearly outlined for future case study projects.

Table 4. Comparative Overall Scores

Comparative Overall Scores																
Domains for Danielson Framework Domains (DF)	Domain 1 Planning and Preparation				Domain 1I Classroom Environment				Domain 1II Instruction				Domain 1V Professional Responsibilities			
APL Teaching Framework Domains (APL)	Domain 1: Planning				Domain IV: Classroom Management Domain VI: Classroom Environment				Domain III: Instructional Delivery Domain V: Time Management Domain VII: Assessment				Domain II: Instructional Organization			
Semester	Fall	Fall	Spr	Spr	Fall	Fall	Spr	Spr	Fall	Fall	Spr	Spr	Fall	Fall	Spr	Spr
Frameworks	DF	APL	DF	APL	DF	APL	DF	APL	DF	APL	DF	APL	DF	APL	DF	APL
Teacher-Participant (Patti-Ann)	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.6	3.0	3.0	3.5	2.4	2.6	3.0	3.3	2.8	3.0	2.8	3.0
Teacher-Participant (Jacob)	3.7	3.0	3.8	3.0	3.8	3.5	3.8	3.5	3.4	4.0	3.4	4.0	3.4	4.0	3.4	4.0
Teacher-Participant (Jude)	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.8	2.0	3.6	3.5	4.0	2.3	3.6	2.6	3.8	3.0	3.8	3.0
Teacher-Participant (William)	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	3.5	3.4	3.6	4.0	4.0	3.6	4.0	3.6	4.0
Total Average Scores-DF	**3.7**		**3.7**		**3.6**		**3.6**		**3.3**		**3.5**		**3.4**		**3.4**	
Total Average Scores- APL		**3.0**		**3.0**		**3.0**		**3.5**		**3.1**		**3.5**		**3.5**		**3.5**

Key: Proficiency Levels

Scoring guide for DF	Exemplary 4	Proficient 3	Basic 2	Unsatisfactory 1
Scoring Guide for APL	Highly Effective Demonstrates use of all applicable planning indicators (6 or more Indicators)	Effective Demonstrates use of most of applicable planning indicators (5 out of 7 Indicators)	Developing Demonstrates use of half or less of applicable planning indicators (4 out of 7 Indicators)	Ineffective Insufficient evidence of the applicable planning indicators (3 or Fewer Indicators)

Sustainability of Research with Program Completers

As evidenced, this case study pilot provided valuable information about our completers' teaching effectiveness and student impact. The process has also provided the EPP with insight on ways to formalize the process as an annual unit-wide assessment procedure. Different completers from all programs will be observed during a 3-year timeline (**see Appendix 2**). Results will be shared and discussed by program faculty for each discipline with a larger discussion during the teacher education assessment meetings to inform future program decisions. Obtaining completers information will be ongoing. Working with the Center for School Partnership and Teacher Certification directors, the EPP's vision is to develop a process for mentoring recent graduates who could be utilized in future case study projects.

Our greatest challenge is recruiting faculty as researchers/observers for their program completers. While they acknowledge the benefit of such an activity, current workloads and teaching modalities have limited sustained involvement. Additionally, the overall fiscal climate of the campus has resulted in limited financial resources to provide an honorarium to faculty. However, for the 2023-2024 academic year, the Dean approved hiring an adjunct faculty who will help the Assistant Dean collect data from completers across school districts (**see Appendix 3**). A review of the instruments utilized in this case study will be updated to address gaps in the data. Also, more documentation to clarify the faculty-researcher's role has been created to outline a clear and consistent protocol for data collection (**see Appendix 4**).

Appendix 1 - Survey Question 67 - Perceptions of Success Inventory for Beginning Teachers (PSI-BT)

Q67 - Teacher Education Program prepared me...

#	Field	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
1	for effectively communicating with parents.	0.00% 0	50.00% 2	25.00% 1	25.00% 1	0.00% 0	4
2	for effectively instructing learners.	50.00% 2	25.00% 1	25.00% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	4
3	for teaching students with special learning needs.	25.00% 1	50.00% 2	0.00% 0	25.00% 1	0.00% 0	4
4	for teaching students who are English as Second Language learners.	25.00% 1	25.00% 1	25.00% 1	25.00% 1	0.00% 0	4
5	for developing clear procedures in my classroom.	50.00% 2	25.00% 1	25.00% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	4
6	for working with disruptive students in my classroom.	25.00% 1	25.00% 1	0.00% 0	50.00% 2	0.00% 0	4
7	for working in a professional learning community.	75.00% 3	25.00% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	4
8	for formative assessment of student learning.	75.00% 3	0.00% 0	25.00% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	4
9	to interpret standardized test data for my class.	25.00% 1	0.00% 0	25.00% 1	50.00% 2	0.00% 0	4
10	for using instructional technology in my classroom.	25.00% 1	50.00% 2	0.00% 0	25.00% 1	0.00% 0	4

Appendix 2
SUNY Potsdam Case Study for Completer Effectiveness Timeline and Schedule
(Initial Programs)

Year 1 (pilot) AY2022-2023	Year 2 AY2023-2024	Year 3 AY2024-2025	Year 4 AY2025-2026
Adolescence Math (BA, MST)	Childhood/Early Childhood-B-2	Adolescence Math (BA, MST)	Art Education
Adolescence Science (BA/MST, MST)	Childhood/Early Childhood-1-6	Adolescence Science (BA/MST, MST)	Childhood/Early Childhood-B-2
Adolescence Social Studies (BA, MST)	Adolescence English Ed (BA, MST)	Adolescence Social Studies (BA, MST)	Childhood/Early Childhood-1-6
MST Childhood Education (1-6)		MST Childhood Education (1-6)	Adolescence English Ed (BA, MST)

Note: Each data collection cycle will comprise completers from each program identified in the given year who volunteered to be a participant when surveyed.

Schedule for Case studies- Initial Programs

Note: 1. Identify school districts that hired most of our completers prior to the semester data is to be collected.

2. Case study teacher-participants can be completers in their 1st, 2nd & 3rd years of teaching due to small districts.

Completers in years….	**Semester Planned**	**Action to be taken**	**Observer/data collector**	**CAEP Data cycle year Requirement=3 cycles**
PHCS **2019, 20, 21**	Fall 2022	Structured Interviews Participant Classroom Observation	Assistant Dean	Pilot Case Study (AY 2022-2023)
PHCS **2019, 20, 21**	Spring 2023	Structured Interviews Participant Classroom Observation	Assistant Dean	
	Summer 2023	Case study data write up	Assistant Dean	
AY 2020, 21, 22	Fall 2023	Structured Interviews Participant Classroom Observation	Faculty	Data Cycle # 1 (AY 2023-2024)
	Spring 2024	Structured Interviews Participant Classroom Observation	Faculty	
	Summer 2024	Case study data write up	Assistant Dean & Faculty	

AY 2021, 22, 23	Fall 2024	Structured Interviews Participant Classroom Observation	Faculty	Data Cycle # 2 (AY 2024-2025)
	Spring 2025	Structured Interviews Participant Classroom Observation	Faculty	
	Summer 2025	Case study data write up	Assistant Dean & Faculty	
AY 2022, 23, 24	Fall 2025	Structured Interviews Participant Classroom Observation	Faculty	Data Cycle # 3 (AY 2025-2026)
	Spring 2026	Structured Interviews Participant Classroom Observation	Faculty	
	Summer 2026	Case study data write up	Assistant Dean & Faculty	

Appendix 3

Proposal for Adjunct Hire for Data Collection
RE: Case Study Project Beginning Fall 2023

Qualifications

- Experience with the Danielson rubric, the Marzano rubric or district level Teacher Evaluation Forms organized in four domains Planning and Preparation; Classroom Environment; Instruction; and Professional Responsibilities.
- Work at administrative or leadership levels (teacher leader, building principal etc.) in a local school district.
- Long term adjunct working in our programs and have use our student teaching evaluation rubric.

Hiring Period

- 1 school year (Fall & Spring) part time position.

Roles/Responsibilities & average # of hours on task

Roles / Responsibilities	**Hours to complete**	**Per completer/district/semester**	**Total**
Summer orientation with Assistant Dean	3-4 hours	n/a	3-4 hours
CITI-Training – Summer IRB	4-5 hours	n/a	4-5 hours
Districts Administration Team Meetings	3-4 hours	TBD – possibly 2-3 districts - Per district per semester	6-12 hours
Scheduling interviews and observations (emails, calls, arrangements)	1 hour	5-8 completers per semester	5-8 hours
Travel Time to School	Varies	Depends on school district	2-3 hours
Preparation for meetings, interviews, observations	1 hour	5-8 completers per semester	5-8 hours
Completer Initial Interview, paperwork	30 minutes	5-8 completers per semester	2.5-4 hours
Completer Pre-Interview	45 minutes	5-8 completers per semester	4-6 hours
Write up for pre-interview descriptions, demographics information	30 minutes	5-8 completers per semester	2.5-4 hours
Classroom Observation	1-1.5 hour	5-8 completers per semester	5-12 hours
Write up for classroom observation. Noting classroom setting, student impact (work samples), teaching effectiveness, evaluation based	2 hours	5-8 completers per semester	10-16 hours

on the Danielson's Teaching Framework Domains			
Completer Post-observation interview. Send to completer ahead of time the questions, meet for discussion and any clarifications.	45 minutes	5-8 completers per semester	4-6 hours
Write up for post-observations, lesson reflection, future planning using submitted responses	1.5 hours	5-8 completers per semester	8-12 hours
Send students PSI-BT survey. Reviewing data questions prior to sending. Monitoring for responses.	30 minutes	5-8 completers per semester	2.5-4 hours
Administrative Focus Group preparation. Arranging schedules, sending questions.	30 minutes	TBD – possibly 2-3 districts - Per district per semester	1-1.5 hours
Executive Summary – write up, creating data charts and adding pre and post descriptions.	1 hour	5-8 completers per semester	5-8 hours
Weekly Team meetings with Assistant Dean	1 hour	Per semester – 15 weeks	15 hours
		Total Hours:	**84.5 - 128.5 hours**

Appendix 4

SUNY Potsdam

Protocol, Timeline, and Instrumentation for

Case Study Cycle 1–3-year plan (Fall 2023-Spring 2026)

Faculty Participation

1. Faculty will complete CITI Training and meet with Assistant Dean to review timeline and case study instruments.

2. Faculty member will contact teacher-participant to schedule context information.

3. Faculty member will conduct three interviews with a teacher-participant as well as one in-class observation, at minimum.

NOTE: Additional time is needed for gathering case study context information, reviewing artifacts, compiling of evidence, data analysis and summarization and commentary related to the findings using the Case Study Protocol.

4. Faculty member will meet with Assistant Dean after collecting context information to determine next step and problem solve any concerns observed.

5. Faculty member is encouraged to apply effective and appropriate technology tools throughout this process, where appropriate (i.e., video conferencing).

Note: Faculty is encouraged to apply rigor to this process in keeping with "action research" methodology and explore scholarly outlets for dissemination following the case studies. Collaboration across programs will be facilitated to explore outcomes applicable across the Teacher Education Unit.

Timeline

Fall Semester

Faculty conducts first interview with teacher-participant	Mid-September
Faculty provides brief summary of data sources to Assistant Dean	End- September
Faculty conducts pre-observation interview with teacher-participant	Early October
Faculty conducts classroom observation of effective practice & impact on students.	Mid-October -Nov.
Faculty conducts post-observation interview with teacher-participant.	End-November
Faculty meets with to with Assistant Dean to review artifacts, code data, and analyze and summarize results and write up Case Study using Executive Summary template.	Mid-January
Assistant Dean provides feedback to CAEP assessment workgroup about process.	Early February

Spring Semester

Faculty conducts first interview with teacher-participant.	Mid- February
Faculty provides brief summary of data sources to Assistant Dean.	End-February
Faculty conducts pre-observation interview with teacher-participant.	Mid- March
Faculty conducts classroom observation of effective practice & impact on students.	March – April
Faculty conducts post-observation interview with teacher-participant.	Mid-May
Faculty meets with to with Assistant Dean to review artifacts, code data, and analyze and summarize results and write up Case Study using Executive Summary Template.	End May
Assistant Dean provides feedback to CAEP assessment workgroup about process.	Early June

Case Study Instruments

1. ***Interview Questions for Impact on Student Learning Case Studies***
   Three individual interview questionnaires to be used with the teacher-participant during the case study process. Structured questions will be used for each interview.

2. ***Case Study Observation and Evaluation Form***
   This form is aligned with a rubric from Danielson's Framework which is also mapped to both the Effective Teaching Framework (APL) and SUNY Potsdam Student Teaching Evaluation Form (STE) Education that is aligned to the InTASC Standards. The rubric will be used while observing program completers (teacher-participants) during instruction and when conferencing with the teachers following the observation. The following detailed rubric descriptions are attached as Appendices:
   i. Danielson Framework Rubric provided by ASCD, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching, 2nd ed.*
   ii. Effective Teaching Framework (APL) provided by local school district.
   iii. Student Teaching Evaluation Form (STE) provided by the SUNY Potsdam Center for School Partnership and Teacher Certification Office.

3. ***Case Study Template***
   This template is a report form that each adjunct faculty will use to report their case study findings. This tool will be as a "case study report" and includes 7 sections to be completed by the faculty.

4. ***Executive Summary Template***

   This template will be used by the Teacher Education Unit (e.g., Assessment Committee and/or Assistant Dean for Assessment and Accreditation) to evaluate the findings as an entire unit and examine ways the results may be generalizable.

Note: A TEAMS site will be created to house documents and record documentation.