CENTER FOR URBAN AND MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

INDIANA UNIVERSITY
School of Education
IUPUI

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)
Standards 4.1 -4.4

March 24, 2017

Prepared by the

Center for Urban and Multicultural Education (CUME)

School of Education

Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis

Shanna M. Stuckey, M.S.

Khadijah Siddeeq. M.A.

Introduction

Researchers from the Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) Center for Urban and Multicultural Education (CUME) conducted a case study of IUPUI School of Education Educator Preparation Program (EPP) graduates from 2012-2015 in order to address Standards 4.1 through 4.4 for the Council of the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) review. The case study included two cohorts of graduates. One cohort consisted of graduates who had been teaching for two years; the second cohort included graduates who had been teaching for three years.

Center for Urban and Multicultural Education (CUME)

CUME is a partner-focused organization that strives to deliver the highest quality research and evaluation products for the purpose of building capacity among urban educational and community organizations. CUME researchers employ a translational approach to their research, evaluation, and professional development through meaningful partnerships, cultivating collaborative networks of leaders and organizations, and the use of various methodologies to address important educational issues confronting urban schools and communities.

Methodology

CUME conducted the case study for CAEP using a mixed methods design. The mixed methods research followed a "practical" approach (Creswell & Clark, 2011), which permitted researchers to use all resources and methodologies possible in providing data related to the following components: 4.1 Impact on Student Learning; 4.2 Teacher Effectiveness; 4.3 Employer Satisfaction; and 4.4 Graduate Satisfaction.

Participants

CUME invited 74 IUPUI School of Education EPP graduates from two cohorts to participate in the case study component of the research that was comprised of classroom

observations, interviews, and document review. One cohort consisted of graduates who had been teaching for three years; the second cohort consisted of graduates who had been teaching for two years. IUPUI School of Education EPP graduates from three school districts were invited to participate. Five teachers agreed to participate in the study. Three of the teachers were from Cohort 1 (graduated the IUPUI EPP program in spring 2013), and two of the teachers were from Cohort 2 (graduated the IUPUI EPP program in spring 2014). Two of the participating teachers were elementary school teachers and three were secondary teachers. Of the secondary teachers, two were seventh/eighth grade English/Language Arts teachers; the other teacher taught family and consumer science (teaching outside of initial licensure area). All participating teachers were white females.

Ten principals completed the Indiana Department of Education employer survey providing information about EPP graduates who were current teachers at their school. Of the ten teachers five (50%) were in their first year of teaching, and five (50%) were in their second year of teaching. All 10 teachers had been at their current school for their entire teaching career (one or two years). Two teachers held licenses in elementary (K-6) and middle school/junior high (5-9), one teacher held a middle school/junior high (5-9) and secondary (5-12) license, six teachers held secondary (5-12) licenses, and one teacher held an all grades (P-12) license. Of the ten teachers, all were currently teaching in their licensed area with the exception of one.

Twenty-six IUPUI EPP graduates completed the graduate online survey. Of the 26 respondents, fifteen completed the Elementary Teacher Education Program; five completed the Secondary English Program; two completed the Secondary Social Studies Program; three completed the Secondary Foreign Language Program; four completed the English as a New Language Program; two completed the Reading Program; and four completed the Special

Education Program. In terms of experience after graduation, 22 (85%) graduates have been employed as a teacher or teacher aide, whereas four (15%) graduates have had no teaching related experience. For those that had teaching experience, subjects taught included Spanish, General Education, Elementary General Education, Special Education, Mathematics, English Language Arts-Literacy, Social Studies/Geography/US History, and Reading/Writing/Math/Social behavior. Respondents reported having taught at the Kindergarten, elementary, and middle school levels.

Measures

   Structured classroom observations. CUME researchers observed each of the teachers two separate times during the fall 2016 semester. Each teacher set the date for the classroom observations. Areas of emphasis for the observations included *Classroom Environment* (Domain 2) and *Instruction* (Domain 3). To collect data on these areas, the researchers used an observation rubric based on the Danielson Framework (Danielson, 2014) (see Appendix A). Specifically, within the *Classroom Environment* domain, researchers looked for evidence of a teacher's development in *Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport, Establishing a Culture for Learning, Managing Classroom Procedures, Managing Student Behavior,* and *Organizing Physical Space*. Within the *Instruction* domain, researchers looked for evidence of a teacher's development in *Communicating with Students, Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques, Engaging Students in Learning, Using Assessment in Instruction,* and *Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness*. The researchers followed a non-intrusive hands off, eyes-on approach and did not participate in classroom activities. Researchers took copious notes while observing, which were then used to generate a series of field texts. In addition, the Danielson Framework (Danielson, 2014) rubric was completed during and immediately following each observation.

Interviews. Following the second observation, each teacher participated in an interview that lasted approximately 30-45 minutes. Each interview was voluntary and followed a semi-structured protocol. Interview questions were designed to collect data related to the *Planning and Preparation* and *Professional Responsibilities* areas of the Danielson Framework (Danielson, 2014), as well as additional information related to *Classroom Environment, Instruction,* and metrics related to student achievement that were specific to the school/district. Sample questions included "*Describe how you plan a lesson", "Describe any enrichments/modifications that you include when planning a lesson", "What do you think is important about students' interests and cultural heritage in order to teach effectively?",* and *"Give an example of how you use assessment data for future planning (summative) and to inform decision making during lessons (formative)."* Interviews were audiotaped and transcribed verbatim.

Document review. Participating teachers were asked to submit a lesson plan as part of their participation in the study. These lesson plans typically were the lessons observed by researchers, but there were instances where teachers were not required to create a lesson plan and instead submitted examples of activities or rubrics they used to teach the lesson and grade the students' work.

Employer survey. The Indiana Department of Education administered the employer survey and provided the results to CUME researchers. The employer survey was administered for all graduates who initially received their teaching license in the state of Indiana in the previous two years. The survey included demographic data such as number of years teaching and content areas on initial license, as well as content areas currently taught by the teacher. The remainder of the survey was divided into three domains: knowledge preparation of teacher,

pedagogical preparation of teacher, and professional disposition of teacher. Ten principals completed the survey.

Graduate satisfaction survey. IUPUI School of Education administered the graduate satisfaction survey to IUPUI School of Education EPP graduates who graduated in spring 2015 and provided the data to CUME researchers. The survey was 20 items in length and included four demographic items, 11 Likert scale items (1 = Poor Preparation, 3 = Adequate Preparation, 5 = Strong Preparation), three open ended items, and two items related to future communications.

<div align="center">

Analysis

</div>

CUME collected quantitative and qualitative data to inform program design and implementation in subsequent years. This mixed methods evaluation design allows for stronger validity in interpretations of data through the use of triangulation of multiple methods and sources, as well as detailed elaboration upon quantitative findings through qualitative analysis. Additionally, the opportunity for the discovery of contradictory findings that provide nuance and suggest future questions for further evaluation is a strength of such an experimental design (Greene, Caracelli, & Graham, 1989).

Qualitative data. Qualitative data included classroom observations, individual interviews, document review, and open-ended survey responses. Thematic analysis of the qualitative data was conducted utilizing the constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Researchers applied codes representing the sentiment of each paragraph or data cluster and/or developed codes identifying patterns within the data themes (Creswell, 2008; Hill et al., 2005). NVivo11® qualitative research software was utilized for the coding of themes and reporting prevalence of codes and themes for use in analysis. The

prevalence of topics and themes was tracked by the number of referring entities and number of instances. As a group, the team met to discuss the relationships among codes and to combine similar codes into broader patterns or themes. Next, they divided into groups in order to return to the original data sources to identify representative examples from observations and quotations from interviews. Finally, the entire team met to share findings, which resulted in the creation of specific themes for coding all sources of qualitative data. This process follows the standards of qualitative evaluation (Patton, 2002; Schwandt, 2007; 2008). This type of cooperative relationship creates better overall understanding of the data and leads to more valid conclusions (Creswell, 2007).

Quantitative data. Quantitative data included responses to the graduate satisfaction survey, the employer survey, and classroom observations (Domains 2 and 3 of the Danielson Framework (Danielson, 2014)). Descriptive statistics, including means, frequencies, and standards deviations of respondents' answers were calculated. Prior to classroom observations, four researchers scored sample-teaching videos to ensure they were all scoring in the same manner. After viewing the videos separately and scoring them, the researchers came together, shared scores, and discussed ambiguous terminology until consensus was reached on what the Danielson Framework intended and how that looked in a classroom. During this process, the researchers constantly referred back to the descriptive sections of the Danielson Framework that provided examples of each level (unsatisfactory, basic, proficient, and distinguished) of each component under each domain. For his or her first official observation, a senior member of the research team accompanied each researcher.

Findings

Planning and Preparation

Planning and preparation consisted of six components including demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy, demonstrating knowledge of students, setting instructional outcomes, demonstrating knowledge of resources, designing coherent instruction, and designing student assessment. Data informing this domain consisted of interviews with teachers, classroom observations, review of lesson plans, the graduate student survey results, and the employer survey results.

Knowledge of content and pedagogy. During the interviews, teachers discussed the processes and guidelines put in place by their respective school districts and explained the impact these had on lesson and unit plan creation. Several teachers shared that while there were central themes or standards that must be included within their lesson, they had the freedom to determine how these standards were incorporated. For example, one teacher shared:

> *So our district gives us a calendar. Basically it says within this time range you need to hit this standard. How we hit it is really up to us. They give us some guidance and resources that we could use but really it is kind of up to us the direction that we go.*

Another participating teacher shared, "*But we have our units of study and that is all put in place like which units should be the duration of each unit. They give us some guidelines but we really have the opportunity here to kind of do what we want.*" One teacher in particular discussed how she would prefer to have more input into the curriculum of the reading course. She stated:

> *I feel like we, if you look at my classroom even the kids that you saw here is a really diverse group of kids. And so I feel a little bit pigeon holed in the books that I'm supposed to teach… And so I feel like there is a little bit of lack of cultural awareness as far as I feel like the books should represent the kids that I have here.*

In addition, teachers recognized the importance of knowledge of prerequisite skills and relationships. One teacher explained this the following way:

So every lesson we kind of draw on prior knowledge. We remember we already know how to do this. And then we incorporate it into what we are doing next. Everything builds so specifically with our math, the district starts us at point A and everything builds on top of each other throughout the school year.

When asked about the importance of content-related pedagogy teachers typically described their own personal "style" of teacher rather than any "signature pedagogies" taught in their teacher preparation program.

Principals that employed graduates of the IUPUI School of Education EPP completed a survey to provide their assessment of the quality of instruction by each teacher who received their teaching license in the previous two years. Principals rated their teachers favorably on all items related to knowledge preparation of teacher with mean scores ranging from the Agree to Strongly Agree categories (see Table 1 below). The two items rated most favorably were *"The EPP did an outstanding job preparing this teacher to adhere to ethical requirements of the teaching profession"* (*M* = 3.90), and *"The EPP did an outstanding job preparing this teacher to adhere to the legal requirements of the teaching profession"* (*M* = 3.90). The item with the lowest mean score was "*The EPP did an outstanding job of preparing this teacher to understand how students learn and develop at the grade level they are teaching"* (*M* = 3.30). The mean score for the item related to knowledge of content was 3.40.

Table 1
Means and Frequencies from Principal Survey: Knowledge Preparation of Teacher

Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean *(SD)*
The Education Preparation Program (EPP) did an outstanding job of preparing this teacher to….					
…understand how students learn and develop at the grade level they are teaching.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (70.0%)	3 (30.0%)	3.30 (0.55)
…meet expectations of a beginning teacher for content preparation and knowledge.	0 (0%)	1 (10.0%)	4 (40.0%)	5 (50.0%)	3.40 (0.70)
…adhere to the ethical requirements of the teaching profession.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	9 (90.0%)	3.90 (0.32)

…adhere to the legal requirements of the teaching profession.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	9 (90.0%)	3.90 (0.32)

As it related to pedagogical preparation principals rated teachers who graduated from the IUPUI School of Education EPP highly with all means scores ranging from the Agree to Strongly Agree categories (see Table 2). The highest rated items were "*The EPP did an outstanding job of preparing this teacher to work effectively with students with all exceptionalities*" (*M* = 3.50), "*The EPP did an outstanding job preparing this teacher to provide an inclusive learning environment*" (*M* = 3.40), "*The EPP did an outstanding job of preparing this teacher to analyze student assessment data to improve classroom instruction*" (*M* = 3.40), and "*The EPP did an outstanding job preparing this teacher to integrate technological tools as appropriate to advance student learning*" (*M* = 3.40). While still rated favorably, the following items had the lowest mean scores "*The EPP did an outstanding job of preparing this teacher to develop content specific assessments to test for student understanding of the lesson objectives*" (*M* = 3.10), and "*The EPP did an outstanding job of preparing this teacher to differentiate instruction to meet all students' learning needs*" (*M* = 3.10).

Table 2
Means and Frequencies from Principal Survey: Pedagogical Preparation of Teacher

Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean *(SD)*
The Education Preparation Program (EPP) did an outstanding job of preparing this teacher to….					
…provide an appropriate and challenging learning experience.	0 (0%)	1 (10.0%)	6 (60.0%)	3 (30.0%)	3.20 (0.63)
…provide an inclusive learning environment.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (60.0%)	4 (40.0%)	3.40 (0.52)
…provide a rigorous learning environment.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (70.0%)	3 (30.0%)	3.30 (0.48)
…use a variety of assessment methods to guide, adjust, and improve instruction.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (70.0%)	3 (30.0%)	3.30 (0.48)

…develop content specific assessments to test for student understanding of the lesson objectives.	0 (0%)	1 (10.0%)	7 (70.0%)	2 (20.0%)	3.10 (0.57)
…differentiate instruction to meet all students' learning needs.	0 (0%)	1 (10.0%)	7 (70.0%)	2 (20.0%)	3.10 (0.57)
…work effectively with students with all exceptionalities.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (50.0%)	5 (50.0%)	3.50 (0.53)
…analyze student assessment data to improve classroom instruction.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (60.0%)	4 (40.0%)	3.40 (0.52)
…use effective strategies to manage the learning environment.	0 (0%)	1 (10.0%)	6 (60.0%)	3 (30.0%)	3.20 (0.63)
…integrate technological tools as appropriate to advance student learning.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (60.0%)	4 (40.0%)	3.40 (0.52)

Knowledge of students. During the classroom observations, as well as the interviews, teachers consistently discussed the importance of understanding and relating to the students in their classrooms. One teacher shared her experience with the students in her gifted and talented class:

> *So one of the markers of someone who is gifted is that they are probably lazy or unorganized. And so we don't want kids who are just lazy to be able to just get out of the program even if, my thing is I have kids who are failing my class but you would never know it from coming in here. They participate in class. They add to discussion. They have great ideas. They just don't turn their homework in. And I would rather them sit and fail in my class and still be learning something then be moved to another class and sit and fail and not be challenged at all.*

In addition to understanding the current situation and background of the students, teachers also discussed accommodations/modifications and enrichment strategies they used in their classroom. For example, one accommodation included modified notes during lecture:

> *She gets full notes, so that means where the other kids are filling them in, I give her the teacher copy. It is already filled in. And then what I tell these two or three people who have full notes, I'll tell them be sure you circle this information because you have to know that. They just have to circle it. Filling them in takes them too long and they are going to miss the information and* [are] *not going to get it.*

Additional accommodations included Google Read and Write on the 1:1 Chromebooks, allowing students to use calculators during math, folding paper so as not to get overwhelmed by the amount of text on the page, and small group or one on one instruction with students who needed more assistance. In one classroom, a teacher was observed wearing a specific piece of technology that included a microphone for a student who had a hearing disability.

Another teacher discussed how she incorporated enrichments into her reading lesson:

> *Now the difference is the maturity that goes into reading. I would say that is where the biggest gap is. Because even though they can technically read the words and probably understand it at a minimal level, then it is kind of fun to see when I pull a passage and say ok let's just read it. Let's analyze the character. Ok now let's talk about setting. Why keep repeating this word over and over? Then that is kind of where I take it into the enrichment part. I try to pick books and I've been given books that maybe are even a low Lexile like Animal Farm in 7th grade. They have really large meanings. And so that is kind of how I do enrichment with reading.*

Other examples of enrichments included taking an essay written in class (original assignment) and creating a digital book, and having students in higher grades work with the more advanced students during specific times of the day while the teacher was working with students who needed additional help.

With regards to understanding the intellectual development of their students, several teachers discussed other matters that were important for them to understand such as poverty, mental health issues, etc. One teacher shared:

> *Poverty is an issue. I've had homeless kids in here. Because one kid is like asleep all the time so I contact the counselor with, what is it I need to know? Is he on a medication? What is going on in his life that I need to know about? She goes it is probably going to be better because his family has a place to live now. Wow. I actually had this homeless kid. So you know what? Doing the work was not even on his agenda. He didn't know where he was going to sleep. You do have that. You do have to find out what is going on.*

Another teacher shared that she was currently participating in professional development offered by the district related to complex post-traumatic stress disorder and was able to make connections between what she was learning and several of her current students.

One teacher who described the challenges she faced in her family and consumer science (FACS) class shared concerns related to safety. She stated:

> *All things work on paper and the theory of how you talk to students is very interesting. But I got, there are kids in my class I am like really? You put them in my class and I have sharp knives in the kitchen? Their probation officer has an office in the school and you're going to let them have knives in their hands in my kitchen? Yeah, that makes sense. So dealing with some of that real reality.*

Understanding their students' cultural heritage and the importance of making the content relevant were also discussed. Researchers observed flags from various countries in one classroom. When asked, the teacher explained there were flags from the different countries of all her students. She shared how students displayed excitement about these pieces, *"She goes that is where my mom and dad are from. She didn't know that I knew she was Haitian. So they were pretty excited about that."* In addition, another teacher described a writing activity where students had to analyze an article on the Day of the Dead. See section on Culturally Relevant Pedagogy below for additional examples.

Setting instructional outcomes. It is important that teachers have goals/objectives in mind for each activity that they ask students to complete. The teachers in the case study demonstrated their understanding of this through their reflection on their lessons in the interviews, as well as the rubrics and lesson plans that they provided. Each lesson plan began with a stated objective of what students would be able to do at the end of the lesson. This provided students with a clear understanding of what the teacher expected them to accomplish.

For example, one teacher's lesson plan stated, *"[students will be able to] recall fiction signposts and recognize the most important information about each."*

Teachers also demonstrated how they followed through on their goals by providing rubrics that detailed the goals for the lesson and providing feedback to students on where they were developmentally in achieving the stated goal. One teacher described her use of a rubric to ensure instructional outcomes were accessible and easily understood by all students. This specific teacher taught a gifted and talented class where she used a condensed version of the Advanced Placement (AP) rubric and explained how she set realistic goals related to instructional outcomes for her students:

> *I know that a 5 is what I want my seniors to be doing. I know that these kids aren't near that level so I'll give them a goal. Like their first essay, I want you to get a two. A two out of five. If you get a two that means you have ideas that are coming out and you didn't just summarize. And then by 8th grade year I want you to be a three or four. I just set the standard like this is where we are at.*

Her rubric allowed students to see the goal that she set for them, as well as how it related to the larger goal in AP classes. It also allowed them to see where they were in their mastery of the specific skill and provided guidance as to what they needed to achieve in order to move to the next level.

Students also used rubrics to assess themselves with respect to the stated goals. For example, one teacher provided a writing rubric, which students used to assess their writing. After stating the goal for each specific section of the writing and the maximum points possible, the rubric asked the students to explain their decisions to deduct points on the rubric. The fact that the students were expected to use rubrics to assess their progress and their peers' progress underscores how clearly the teacher set instructional outcomes.

Knowledge of resources. Teachers who participated in the case study described a variety of resources they used in their classroom to engage students and enhance their learning. Resources observed during classroom observations and/or described in teacher interviews included textbooks; interactive white board systems; online sites such as Google classroom, IXL.com, and various mathematics learning sites; and apps such as ClassDojo and Kahoot.

Several teachers also discussed the benefit of incorporating individuals from the community into their lessons. One teacher described her plan to have an expert from the community, a woman who owns a cake shop, come in to judge the final project in her family and consumer science class.

In addition to resources that the teacher provided the students, one teacher described a resource that her students created as part of the course that they used to assist them in finding employment. She described the importance of this packet the following way:

> And so I tell them I have a multi colored packet… I went down to the Marion County Health Department and got all these posters. I copied them in these brightly colored packets. These are the rules we follow and we go through this. I tell them when you get to apply for a job, take this with you and tell them. This is what I've already learned. I've had three students come back to me and say hey, this got me the job. It did make a difference. Because it cuts down the employers training time. The kids already know how to use gloves and when to wash their hands.

Another teacher described how she used Google Translate during her instruction. She shared:

> What I have done is I will sit there with my keyboard with Google Translate open and I'm a fast typist so I can type while I talk. So I'm typing while I'm talking and it is right up there on the board. They can see the Spanish version coming up as I'm saying it.

In addition to resources that teachers utilized to assist with student learning, they also described resources that were useful to them as instructors. Teachers in one district described a learning hub for teachers that included information on every subject and unit such as resources,

worksheets, and pre/post test questions. She described the learning hub as, *"So then everything is in the drive together so we're able to borrow each other's stuff."*

While teachers discussed various resources that were available to them and their students, feedback from the graduate student survey revealed this as an area where the IUPUI School of Education EPP could improve. One graduate shared, *"Technology was not incorporated in any of the Education classes."* Another graduate said:

> *Teaching at an online/hybrid school has opened up the world of possibilities when it comes to technology. There are so many softwares and platforms I'd never even heard of that I've since become adept with. I think IUPUI should teach about using technology to show math in action. (Animation is a powerful tool for understanding math concepts, even basic software like ppt can do it).*

The group of graduate students who completed the survey as a whole (see Table 3 below) reiterated this concept of the importance of integrating technology.

Designing coherent instruction. Teachers described how they designed coherent instruction in several ways. They described how they reflected on their teaching and specific activities or assignments and made modifications when necessary. One teacher shared that she often times had so much interesting and relevant content that it was difficult for her to decide what to include:

> *Well I change them all the time mostly because I find really cool stuff. This would be cool to tell them. Throw that in. This would be really neat. And the hard part is every time you add something you really have to drop something. But this stuff is really cool too so it is hard to decide what to cut out but you have to because you don't have enough time.*

While some teachers were given freedom within a particular unit based on district level directives, one teacher described that rather than teach specific topics such as non-fiction, fiction, etc. she chose to organize her instruction by theme. She described her process:

> *Their* [other teachers in the school] *units are set up instead of thematic like mine, they are set up by like non-fiction, fiction, argument, persuasion. I can bring all those in in my concept. We research in every unit. We read poetry in every unit. There is just a lot you*

can bring in if you just have an idea like judgment or alienation. Whatever the concept is I can bring in whatever I want and kind of make it what I need it to be for that time. I like that.

This particular teacher provided a lesson plan that demonstrated her use of themes to organize learning. Her stated objective for the lesson was *"*[Students will be able to] *present their group analysis of the theme of justice in both And Then There Were None and To Kill a Mockingbird in a clear and professional manner.*" Instead of focusing on the each book's genre separately, the teacher encouraged the students to see the thematic connection between the books.

The creation of intentional instructional groups was also observed. Teachers discussed how quick checks, one form of formative assessment, helped them create these small groups. One teacher described how she created small groups during a lesson where students rotated around the room to different stations that each had a math word problem:

So when I pulled those groups I made sure I had one to two high kids, one to two low kids and one to two middle kids. Just in order to help bring the group up and to help the ones that are my higher ones that have that concept be able to explain that to the others. So it is kind of a way for them to support each other.

In addition, several teachers created groups and had them work in completely different areas such as adjoining classrooms or the hallway with the Special Education or Title I teacher.

Designing student assessment. Both formative and summative assessments were observed and discussed throughout the case study. Formative assessments included quick checks such as thumbs up or down to show understanding, students writing answers on a dry erase board or piece of paper at their desk, survey questions on the interactive white board that students answered via their laptop computers, exit tickets at the end of the class period, and multiple choice answers using sign language. One teacher described the various formative assessments she incorporated to check for understanding throughout a lesson:

Sometimes we do quick things where I will say write on your desk with the dry erase marker and so I can just walk past real quick and see if they got it or not. And if they don't I will say no, try again. If they do I will erase it for them…That way it is again a quick way for me to turn around and see that most of the kids have the right answer. We can move on. I don't need to hit this any further.

Teachers generally discussed summative assessments as standardized tests that were mandated by the district and state. One teacher described the subjectivity of the standardized tests:

You know if I'm being honest I feel like those kinds of assessments aren't very helpful. Mostly because I feel like they are really subjective. So where my kids think at a really abstract level, if you give them four choices they feel like they can justify and write an essay about each choice and really validate why it could be a correct answer.

She continued by describing the pressure of the standardized tests and how they affected her students, *"I mean these kids don't sleep the night before a test like this. And so I want them to do well. I don't put a lot of pressure. I do use it to see what kind of skills they are missing but as far as giving them the grade for it or putting pressure on them, I don't do that."* Another teacher shared that they only reason she required summative assessments was because it was mandated by her district, *"My assessment is out there and bluntly the paper tests that they do in here I only do because the office requires it."* In general, teachers felt that some of the information they gained from the summative tests was useful; however, they tended to place more emphasis on formative assessments and work throughout the lesson/unit.

One district in the study had teachers work during the summer to review standards and create assessments for each unit. A teacher in this district described the process:

So in the summer they will have us come and do work time where we look at the standards and we really dig deep to make sure that 'are we truly assessing students on what the standard is asking?' Like when we did our content literacy structures, we built units that went with it. So they give teachers a lot of opportunities to not only learn and grow but to use those skills to keep growing.

Another teacher shared the process she and her colleagues used when creating pre/post-tests for their students:

> From their pre-test, we have priority standards that are on the pre-test that we will determine which standards that we need to hit the hardest. We will hit all of them. But which ones do we really, really need to hit?

Creating and using assessments was one area where School of Education EPP graduates shared they wished they had received more training and practice. For example, one graduate described his/her experience:

> We didn't have much training in data and assessment tools. I can only remember talking about running records, but other than that we were told giving letter grades was not good, but that left us all unprepared to meet this professional requirement in our workplaces. Assessing, grading, and logging formal data is definitely one of my weaknesses now because of this.

Another student felt that more focus on assessment should have been incorporated throughout the program, *"The SOE had little focus on teaching about assessment. I believe Block III was the only time we were expected to learn about formative and informative assessments."* The group of graduate students who completed the survey (see Table 3 below) reiterated these sentiments.

Graduate perceptions of preparedness. IUPUI School of Education EPP students who graduated during the 2015-2016 academic year completed a survey pertaining to their perceptions of the degree of preparedness they felt once they became classroom teachers. All items were rated favorably with mean scores ranging from Adequate Preparation (3) to (4) (see Table 3). The highest rated items related to how well the EPP prepared them and included *"Create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation"* and *"Be a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally"* with mean scores of 4.23. The lowest rated items related to how well the EPP prepared them were

"Use formal and informal assessment data to ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of learners" and the EPP prepared me to *"Effectively use technology to facilitate student learning"* with mean scores of 3.42.

Table 3
Means and Frequencies from Graduate Survey: Perceptions of Degree of Preparedness

Item	Poor Preparation (1)	(2)	Adequate Preparation (3)	(4)	Strong Preparation (5)	Mean (SD)
Create learning experiences that make the subject matter meaningful to students.	0 (0%)	3 (11.5%)	6 (23.1%)	8 (30.8%)	9 (34.6%)	3.88 (1.03)
Provide learning opportunities that support students' intellectual, social, linguistic, and personal development.	0 (0%)	3 (11.5%)	8 (30.8%)	4 (15.4%)	11 (42.3%)	4.04 (1.00)
Create instructional opportunities that respond to the needs of culturally diverse learners.	0 (0%)	2 (7.7%)	6 (23.1%)	7 (26.9%)	11 (42.3%)	3.88 (1.11)
Use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students' development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.	0 (0%)	5 (19.2%)	8 (30.8%)	5 (19.2%)	8 (30.8%)	3.62 (1.13)
Create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.	0 (0%)	1 (3.8%)	5 (19.2%)	7 (26.9%)	13 (50.0%)	4.23 (0.91)
Use effective verbal, nonverbal, and, and	0 (0%)	3 (11.5%)	8 (30.8%)	5 (19.2%)	10 (30.8%)	3.85 (1.08)

media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.					
Plan instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.	2 (7.7%)	4 (15.4%)	6 (23.1%)	5 (19.2%)	9 (34.6%)	3.58 (1.33)
Use formal and informal assessment data to ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of learners.	3 (11.5%)	4 (15.4%)	7 (26.9%)	3 (11.5%)	9 (34.6%)	3.42 (1.42)
Be a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.	0 (0%)	1 (3.8%)	5 (19.2%)	7 (26.9%)	13 (50.0%)	4.23 (0.91)
Foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students.	2 (7.7%)	1 (3.8%)	4 (15.4%)	12 (46.2%)	7 (26.9%)	3.81 (1.13)
Effectively use technology to facilitate student learning.	2 (7.7%)	3 (11.5%)	9 (34.6%)	6 (23.1%)	6 (23.1%)	3.42 (1.21)

In addition to the Likert-scale items above, graduates of the IUPUI School of Education EPP were also asked what could be improved about the program. Several of the respondents discussed the need for more emphasis to be placed on the curriculum and content areas. For example, one respondent shared:

> *There was a large focus on teaching to culturally diverse students. This was great information; however, I felt many of the methods classes I took focused on this rather than content. I felt like I didn't have a basic grasp of reading instruction and ways to help students who struggle with reading. I wish I would have learned more strategies to help all students.*

Another program graduate stated, *"We did not look at curriculum maps to help plan. This is something that should be done, so that first year teachers know what to actually look/plan for when preparing a lesson."*

Overall, perceptions of the degree of preparedness graduates felt once they became classroom teachers were positive. Graduates offered several recommendation to improve the program as well.

Classroom Environment

Classroom environment consisted of five components including creating an environment of respect and rapport, establishing a culture for learning, managing classroom procedures, managing student behavior, and organizing physical space. Data informing this domain consisted of interviews with teachers and classroom observations.

Creating an environment of respect and rapport. This component included interactions between the student and the teacher as well as among the students themselves. The level of performance assigned to each teacher based on classroom observations for the two elements of teacher interaction with students and student interaction is illustrated in Table 4. The majority of teachers (n = 8; 80%) were rated proficient in interacting with their students. The

majority of student interactions were also rated proficient (n = 6; 60%). Students were generally

polite and respectful; however, there were a few occasions where negative behavior toward one

another was observed.

Table 4
Observation data for Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport

Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport						
Level of Performance						
	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Not Observed	Mean (SD)
Teacher Interaction with Students	1 (10.0%)	1 (10.0%)	8 (80.0%)	0	0	2.70 (0.67)
Student Interaction	1 (10.0%)	3 (30.0%)	6 (60.0%)	0	0	2.50 (0.71)

The importance of cultivating an environment of respect and rapport was apparent when

talking with the case study teachers. One teacher described her classroom as a family and

explained the sensitive topics she and her students discussed while reading one of the assigned

novels:

> *Luckily my kids are really open and I feel like I have a really good relationship with them. So To Kill a Mockingbird, I mean we talked about everything. Like when is it appropriate to use the N word and when is it not? Or what about can a white person say verses can someone of color say that? And luckily they are really open and honest and we just are kind of like a family so we can talk about things that maybe other people would be shy to talk about with middle schoolers.*

Another teacher described the importance of understanding the individual needs of each student,

and how this knowledge helped her interact in a way that was mutually beneficial. She shared:

> *Just knowing how to manage your kids and knowing that what works with [student name] over here who is going to be fantastic and he is never going to ever say anything will not work with my kid over here who is oppositional defiant and so I have to really understand how to address that student.*

Nearly all the teachers in the case study described the importance of creating a positive

culture in their classrooms. In addition to creating this culture, one teacher described taking

advantage of "teachable moments" with an example of one student making fun of an adult in the

school's accent. She shared the following instance:

> Mr. [teacher name], *I don't know if you've heard of him, his English is hard to understand. He speaks very well, it's just hard to understand with his accent. So I had a kid that was laughing at him and I was a little blunt about it but I said how would you like it if you went to another country and kids were laughing at you when you are trying? And then I tried to turn it around, if you are confused by what he is saying. If you don't understand what he is trying to tell you what can you do? Try to make it that teaching moment because they are going to run into that all the time.*

Teachers also discussed how creating this culture was a two way street and input from

their students was valued and important. One teacher described her process of obtaining student

feedback:

> *I started a new thing: every few weeks kids like to grade me. They tell me how I can do a better job. But like we, you know kids, we started out with you are not going to get in trouble but you need to be honest. There are kind ways to do it and mean ways to do it. Things like that. We talked about the different ways to say things nicer or say things without being mean intentionally. So sometimes I've gotten I wish you had different kids in small groups. Or I wish you changed the seating chart because this person is bothering me.*

Interactions between teachers and students during the classroom observations were

generally positive. The majority of the teachers appeared to have good rapport with their students

and were observed joking back and forth with one another. Researchers observed multiple

instances of affirming physical touch where the teacher would pat a student on the back or give a

student a high five after a correct answer or positive behavior. There were several brief instances

of students talking over the teacher, interrupting, etc. However, there was one instance where the

teacher appeared to be oblivious to the engagement of her students. The students in this

classroom were inattentive and unfocused. The teacher made no real effort to reach them, and

continued teaching as if the students were paying attention. At times students would intentionally

say things that boldly demonstrated their lack of interest/respect for the lesson.

Positive interactions between students included sharing resources such as the Chromebooks, picking up a pencil that a classmate dropped on the floor during instruction, and physical touch such as hugs and high fives. While student-to-student interaction was generally positive, there were some minor instances of disrespectful interactions. These instances were generally during transitions from class to class, activity to activity, or in common areas such as the hallway. When the teachers observed these instances, they typically redirected the students to the current task. In addition, some of these disrespectful comments between students appeared to be more of the type of banter back and forth that is standard for this age range based on reactions from the students involved.

Establishing a culture for learning. The level of performance assigned to each teacher based on classroom observations for the component of establishing a culture for learning is illustrated in Table 5. This component included three elements: importance of the content, student pride in work, and expectations for learning and achievement. The majority of teachers were rated basic or proficient in all three components. Importance of content and expectations for learning and achievement each had one teacher score at the distinguished level. Student pride in work was the lowest rated item ($M = 2.40$). None of the participating teachers were rated as unsatisfactory in the three elements of establishing a culture for learning.

Table 5
Observation data for Establishing a Culture for Learning

Establishing a Culture for Learning						
Level of Performance						
	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Not Observed	Mean (SD)
Importance of the Content	0	5 (50.0%)	4 (40.0%)	1 (10.0%)	0	2.60 (.70)
Student Pride in Work	0	6 (60.0%)	4 (40.0%)	0	0	2.40 (.52)
Expectations for Learning	0	4 (40.0%)	5 (50.0%)	1 (10.0%)	0	2.70 (.67)

and Achievement						

The importance of the content and expectations for learning and achievement were observed in various ways. Teachers expressed enthusiasm for the content and the lessons, as well as posted classroom goals for learning and student roles. Some teachers had expectations listed on posters or paper that were hanging on the classroom walls in additional to verbalizing these throughout the lesson in order to convey the importance of expectations for student learning. Others used rubrics or scoring guides to ensure that expectations were explicit and available for all the students. One teacher even used the rubric she planned to use to grade a final assessment the day before the test in order to ensure her students knew exactly what to expect on the exam.

Another teacher described how providing expectations helped motivate her students, *"I'll say if you get to a four and my goal is a three, I'll give you extra credit. And so for some kids just the idea of like wondering if I can get to a four."*

In addition to ensuring expectations for learning and achievement were deliberately created and shared with students, teachers described the importance of the learning being student driven and providing choice in order to establish a culture for learning. One teacher described the importance of students driving the learning:

> *They drive the learning. So like the day that we were researching and they saw that it was called that, we stopped class and we just researched about that topic because that is what they were the most interested in. Why were there no African American characters or Hispanic characters? They bring that up a lot which is great.*

The importance of allowing choice within the curriculum was a theme that emerged throughout the case study. One teacher shared, *"For example, we just started a new novel. And so we let them, we showed the movie trailer for each book that we're going to be reading and they got to pick which one they were most interested in. So that was a little bit of choice."* Choice

was described as choice in assignments/projects as well as group work. One teacher shared her philosophy on allowing students to choose their groups, *"I don't care if they work together on it because they are talking, they are listening, they are learning more than they think."*

Student commitment to learning and pride in work varied from classroom to classroom. Students typically appeared to want to complete assignments/projects, but demonstrated frustration when they were unable to do so. Some students took initiative to ask clarifying questions of the teacher or fellow classmates, while others engaged in off task behaviors when they struggled to comprehend the assignment. One instance where researchers observed a student taking pride in work occurred during a day where students were presenting their final projects for a unit. During the presentation, a student realized that there was a word misspelled on his PowerPoint slide and shyly apologized to the teacher and his classmates for the oversight.

Managing classroom procedures and student behavior. The following section includes information from the components of managing classroom procedures and managing student behavior. Managing classroom procedures included the elements of management of instructional groups, management of transitions, management of materials and supplies, performance of non-instructional duties, and supervision of volunteers and paraprofessionals. Managing student behavior included the elements of expectations, monitoring of student behavior, and response to student misbehavior. The level of performance assigned to each teacher based on classroom observations for these two components is illustrated in Table 6. For managing classroom behaviors the lowest scored item was management of instructional groups ($M = 2.29$), and the highest scored item was supervision of volunteers and paraprofessionals ($M = 3.40$). It is important to note that three of the five elements had multiple instances of Not Observed with supervision of volunteers and paraprofessionals not being observed 50% of the

time. For managing student behavior, expectations and response to student misbehavior were

rated most favorably with each having a mean of 3.00.

Table 6

Observation data for Managing Classroom Procedures and Student Behavior

Managing Classroom Procedures and Student Behavior						
Level of Performance						
	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Not Observed	Mean (SD)
Managing Classroom Procedures						
Management of Instructional Groups	2 (20.0%)	2 (20.0%)	2 (20.0%)	1 (10.0%)	3 (30.0%)	2.29 (1.11)
Management of Transitions	0	4 (40.0%)	4 (40.0%)	2 (20.0%)	0	2.80 (.79)
Management of Materials and Supplies	0	3 (30.0%)	3 (30.0%)	4 (40.0%)	0	3.10 (.88)
Performance of Non-Instructional Duties	1 (10.0%)	3 (30.0%)	1 (10.0%)	1 (10.0%)	4 (40.0%)	2.33 (1.03)
Supervision of Volunteers and Paraprofessionals	0	0	3 (30.0%)	2 (20.0%)	5 (50.0%)	3.40 (.55)
Managing Student Behavior						
Expectations	0	3 (30.0%)	4 (40.0%)	3 (30.0%)	0	3.00 (.82)
Monitoring of Student Behavior	1 (10.0%)	4 (40.0%)	3 (30.0%)	2 (20.0%)	0	2.60 (.97)
Response to Student Misbehavior	0	3 (30.0%)	4 (40.0%)	3 (30.0%)	0	3.00 (.82)

All teachers in the study stated the importance of classroom management and the impact

on student behavior. One teacher shared:

> *The biggest thing is if you told any new teacher the most important thing is to establish classroom procedures. Your classroom management has to be the most important thing because if you don't have it, you will never teach anything. So you can have great lessons, great planning, great everything but if you cannot manage your class nothing is going to get done.*

This was reiterated by explaining the importance of establishing these classroom procedures early on, *"So starting, we start from day one. We practice the procedures. We practice, practice, practice. We get it engrained. They buy into it. It becomes a way of life. It just makes things easier for everyone."*

Some teachers displayed these procedures visually throughout the classroom. For example, one teacher had an extensive list of instructions on each step of washing dishes. Another teacher had a sign in the classroom with different numbers students could raise their hand with indicating whether they needed to get a pencil (one finger), go to the library (two fingers), use the restroom (three fingers), or get a tissue (four fingers). This allowed the teacher to continue the lesson without unnecessary interruptions for these types of instances.

Management of instruction groups was observed in the majority of the classrooms during the case study. During small group work time students were generally on task at the beginning of the activity but this engagement typically decreased as the amount of time in small groups increased. In addition, as proximity of the teacher to the small group increased engagement increased as well.

Other than the occasional redirection there was only one instance of a written referral observed by the researchers, and this actually occurred immediately before the observation began. One teacher described her team's process as it related to repercussions for negative behavior:

> *I don't have a lot of write ups that I do. Most things we deal with in-house, like on our team, which is really great. So let's say that a kid misbehaves instead of sending them to ISS or doing an after school detention, we just do lunch detentions in our room or and this doesn't happen in my room but sometimes someone else off the team will be struggling in the class that they are in so we'll just send them to a different class. A lot of times they come to my room because I have smaller classes and most of my kids are really good at ignoring behavior problems. I have a place in my room that I sit kids if they need it.*

Transitions between classes or from activity to activity within the same class were generally seamless with little loss of instructional time. In several instances, students were given specific roles, such as paper passer, and automatically moved around the room without the teacher prompting when told to collect or use certain materials. During these transitions, several teachers used classroom procedures such as hand signals and volume level to diminish the chances of student misbehavior. Bathroom breaks were observed as the least efficient transition during observations.

Not all teachers were observed interacting with volunteers or paraprofessionals. For those who were, these interactions appeared to be mutually beneficial. In several instances Special Education or Title I teachers were observed pulling small groups of students to provide additional assistance with assignments. In one instance, a Title I teacher was observed presenting a subject and was the lead teacher for a portion of the lesson. While the interactions observed were typically positive, one teacher described the challenges of working with multiple colleagues and sharing resources when it came to Special Education:

> *To be honest, there has been some struggle between in the planning because we only have one SpEd teacher between two language arts classes. There has been a lot of give and take on what I might give up to let her have, like if she designs a lesson and she has her own style.*

Organizing physical space. The following section includes information from the component of organizing physical space that included the elements of safety and arrangement of furniture and accessibility to learning and use of physical resources and is illustrated in Table 7. All teachers were rated proficient or distinguished in both elements with a mean score of 3.10 for safety and arrangement of furniture, and a mean score of 3.30 for accessibility of learning and use of physical resources.

Table 7

Observation data for Organizing Physical Space

Organizing Physical Space						
Level of Performance						
	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Not Observed	Mean (SD)
Safety and Arrangement of Furniture	0	0	9 (90.0%)	1 (10.0%)	0	3.10 (.32)
Accessibility to Learning and Use of Physical Resources	0	0	7 (70.0%)	3 (30.0%)	0	3.30 (.48)

All participating teachers arranged the furniture in their classrooms in a proficient and inclusive manner that was suitable for the learning activities. There were several instances where students were able to make decisions about where they would sit and would reposition chairs and desks. Most classrooms were organized in rows, some as individual desks and some in pairs. In one classroom students used an exercise ball in lieu of a chair. These balls were conducive to the student's desire to move around but were not disruptive or noisy. All classrooms observed were safe and accessible to all students.

Instruction

Instruction consisted of five components including communicating with students, using questioning and discussion techniques, engaging students in learning, using assessment in instruction, and demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness. Data informing this domain consisted of interviews with teachers, classroom observations, and review of lesson plans.

Communicating with students. The level of performance assigned to each teacher based on classroom observations for communicating clearly and accurately is illustrated in Table 8. This component was comprised of the elements of expectations for learning, directions and

procedures, use of oral and written language, and explanation of content. The majority of

teachers were rated proficient or distinguished in this component. Communicating directions and

procedures clearly and accurately was rated most favorably (*M* = 3.40) with communicating

expectations for learning clearly and accurately rated least favorably (*M* = 3.00).

Table 8
Observation data for Communicating Clearly and Accurately

Communicating Clearly and Accurately						
Level of Performance						
	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Not Observed	Mean (SD)
Expectations for Learning	0	2 (20.0%)	6 (60.0%)	2 (20.0%)	0	3.00 (.67)
Directions and Procedures	0	1 (10.0%)	4 (40.0%)	5 (50.0%)	0	3.40 (.70)
Use of Oral and Written Language	0	0	7 (70.0%)	3 (30.0%)	0	3.30 (.48)
Explanation of Content	0	0	8 (80.0%)	1 (10.0%)	1 (10.0%)	3.11 (.33)

Teachers regularly communicated with students, both orally and in writing, regarding

expectations for learning, directions for classroom activities and assignments, and explanations

of content. As mentioned above (see Establishing a Culture for Learning section), expectations

and goals for learning were clearly communicated to students visually on posters and signs

throughout the classrooms, as well as verbally during the lessons.

One teacher described how she used different strategies in her mathematics class in order

to help students make connections, as well as tie the content to their personal experiences. She

included acronyms such as KFS and M&M while explaining the content to help them remember

the order of operations for various mathematics equations and functions. In addition to using

various strategies to explain content teachers were also observed pushing students to not only be

able to find the correct answer but to understand the process they went through to get that answer. One teacher explained to her class, *"I don't want to know the answer, but how to find the answer."*

Teachers participating in the case study were regularly observed anticipating possible questions or misunderstandings from the students. Multiple times teachers would discuss issues that had occurred in a previous class period and used this information to mitigate the issues in the current class. Vocabulary used throughout the lessons observed was age appropriate and precise.

Scaffolding was observed throughout the case study. The process of the teacher describing how to solve a problem, working through a problem as a class, and then allowing students to work through problems individually or in small groups was a common practice. Teachers, as well as paraprofessionals in some cases, frequently walked around the room and provided additional assistance to students as needed.

Using questioning and discussion techniques. The following section includes information from the component of using questioning and discussion techniques that included elements of quality of questions, discussion techniques, and student participation and is illustrated in Table 9. Using discussion techniques was the lowest rated item ($M = 1.29$) with five teachers being rated unsatisfactory and three being rated not observed. Quality of questions ($M = 2.44$) was the highest rated item.

Table 9
Observation data for Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques

Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques						
Level of Performance						
	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Not Observed	Mean (SD)
Quality of Questions	1 (10.0%)	4 (40.0%)	3 (30.0%)	1 (10.0%)	1 (10.0%)	2.44 (.88)
Discussion Techniques	5 (50.0%)	2 (20.0%)	0	0	3 (30.0%)	1.29 (.49)

Student Participation	1 (10.0%)	3 (30.0%)	2 (20.0%)	0	4 (40.0%)	2.17 (.75)

Teachers used a variety of techniques to facilitate classroom discussions and encourage student participation. Teachers used both high and low cognitive level questions based on the content and activity presented during the classroom observation.

One example of high cognitive level questioning was observed during a small group assignment. Each group was asked to discuss and answer questions based on the novel that they were currently reading. Examples of the questions included, "*What philosophies does the character share or accept?*" and "*Where has he been (literally and/or figuratively?"* There were also instances where students were observed asking questions that enhanced the classroom discussion and allowed them to deepen and extend their understanding of the readings and make connections among concepts. For example, one teacher described how her students asked why there were no African American or Hispanic characters in a specific reading.

Overall, student participation was high in the classrooms observed as part of the case study. When a teacher would ask the students a question there were very few instances where students did not respond. Teachers used different strategies to engage students that did not openly volunteer during class discussions such as calling on students who did not have their hands raised. This strategy worked in some situations and was unsuccessful in others where the same handful of students dominated the discussion.

There were multiple instances where observers noted that teacher questions could have been higher on Bloom's Taxonomy (Armstrong, 2017) to get students to engage in more abstract thinking. These questions asked students to remember (recall facts or concepts), understand (explain basic ideas or concepts), or apply (use information in new situations) rather than analyze

(draw conclusions among ideas), evaluate (justify a stand or decisions), or create (produce new or original work). Many times no true discussion was observed and call and response, recitation, or closed-ended questions with one specific answer were more prevalent.

Engaging students in learning. The level of performance assigned to each teacher based on classroom observations for engaging students in learning is illustrated in Table 10. The component included the elements of activities and assignments, grouping of students, instructional materials and resources, and structure and pacing. Engaging students in learning using instructional materials and resources was rated highest ($M = 3.40$), while engaging students in learning using activities and assignments was rated lowest ($M = 2.70$).

Table 10
Observation data for Engaging Students in Learning

Engaging Students in Learning						
Level of Performance						
	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Not Observed	Mean (SD)
Activities and Assignments	0	4 (40.0%)	5 (50.0%)	1 (10.0%)	0	2.70 (.67)
Grouping of Students	0	2 (20.0%)	3 (30.0%)	2 (20.0%)	3 (30.0%)	3.00 (.82)
Instructional Materials and Resources	0	0	6 (60.0%)	4 (40.0%)	0	3.40 (.52)
Structure and Pacing	0	3 (30.0%)	6 (60.0%)	1 (10.0%)	0	2.80 (.63)

As mentioned in examples previously explained above, there were instances where teachers emphasized the importance of depth of knowledge rather than breadth of knowledge. For example, the teacher who stopped the lesson and allowed students to conduct their own research on the original title of a novel they were reading in class.

In one classroom the teacher had an activity where she created four stations with a math word problem that students had to solve. She created four small groups of five to six students and

each student had to solve the problem on a sticky note that was provided and explain how they solved the problem. This example highlights the importance of encouraging students to explain their thought process rather than simply solving a problem and moving to the next.

During one observation, students were presenting their final projects. During this time, the teacher had all students answer the following questions related to the presentation: 3 ideas you learned from each presentation, 2 ways your group could have improved your presentation, and 1 group you believed did the best. This allowed students to remain engaged and think critically even when they themselves were not presenting.

Teachers were observed grouping students during activities throughout the class period in a variety of ways. Researchers observed students working individually, in pairs, and in small groups most often. There were times when teachers would allow students to choose their own groups, as well as times where the teacher specifically grouped the students based on skill/ability level. For example, during one observation the teacher allowed the students to choose the members of their small group for an assignment at the end of the class period. Researchers observed one group of three male students telling another male student that he could not be in their group because he was always "goofing off" and not contributing to the group. During this instance the teacher talked with the male student and asked why he thought that the other students did not want him in their group. After some hesitation, he explained that there were times that he was not a productive group member. The teacher then talked to the group of male students and asked if this student could join the group with one requirement: he contributed and stayed on task. The male students agreed and all four students began working on the assignment.

Instructional materials and resources were used often. Teachers used technology such as laptops, Google classroom, and Google translate to impact student's experiences. In addition,

they used textbooks, markers, post-it notes, etc. to assist as needed (See Knowledge of Resources

section above). Overall, lessons were well structured and pacing was appropriate.

Using assessments in instruction. The following section includes information from the

component providing feedback to students that included elements of assessment criteria,

monitoring of student learning, feedback to students, and student self-assessment and monitoring

of progress and is illustrated in Table 11. Student self-assessment and monitoring of progress

was rated lowest ($M = 2.22$) and had two instances of teachers being rated unsatisfactory.

Monitoring of student learning was rated highest ($M = 3.00$).

Table 11
Observation data for Providing Feedback to Students

Providing Feedback to Students						
Level of Performance						
	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Not Observed	Mean (SD)
Assessment Criteria	0	3 (30.0%)	5 (50.0%)	0	2 (20.0%)	2.63 (.52)
Monitoring of Student Learning	0	3 (30.0%)	4 (40.0%)	3 (30.0%)	0	3.00 (.82)
Feedback to Students	1 (10.0%)	0	9 (90.0%)	0	0	2.80 (.63)
Student Self-Assessment and Monitoring of Progress	2 (20.0%)	4 (40.0%)	2 (20.0%)	1 (10.0%)	1 (10.0%)	2.22 (.97)

Teachers in the case study understood the importance of using assessments in instruction

and talked about different formative and summative assessments they used in their classrooms.

Assessment criteria was described throughout the lesson, as well as displayed in writing (rubrics)

or posters hung around the room. In several instances, teachers hung exemplar

projects/assignments throughout the class in order to provide students with a concrete example.

Other teachers provided examples they had created in order to help students better understand how their projects/assignments would be graded.

Teachers were observed monitoring student learning in several different ways to gauge whether students grasped the content being taught or required additional explanation. Quick checks such as thumbs up/thumbs down and other techniques (see Designing Student Assessment above) were used often. Teachers used entry and exit tickets in order to "take the pulse" of the classroom. Approximately half of the teachers observed ended the lesson with a general reflection or activity. This was observed in multiple ways such as a brief whole class discussion, as well as exit tickets (hand written and on the computer). One teacher described her process:

> *But as far as building on their prior knowledge, we do entry tickets. We look at what we've already done. I keep records of how they do with things so this is how I put them into their math groups today. I do an exit ticket every day for whatever lesson I'm teaching. I do a 4-3-2-1 and then that helps me know the next day who to pull. So like a lot of times when it is a regular math lesson they will have about 5-10 minutes at the end after they do a quick check I will have them either continue practice skills or do an enrichment and then I'm able to pull the kids who are still having some issues.*

Another teacher described an online math program that she used as a type of quick check where she could track students' progress and make modifications based on need such as providing additional time or shortening their time to answer the prompts. Multiple teachers discussed the pre/post-tests students took at the beginning of each unit to monitor student learning. In yet another classroom, in a lesson that dealt with opinions and facts the teacher had the students move to one side of the classroom if they felt the statement she read was a fact, and the other side of the classroom if they felt the statement was an opinion. In instances where students were on opposite sides she asked them to explain why they chose the side they did.

Teachers were observed providing feedback to students related to grades on assignments, projects, journal entries, etc. Students in multiple classes were familiar with the rubrics used for assignments, especially those that were repeated (i.e. journal entries). In one classroom, the teacher reviewed the grading rubric for an exam the following day and explained to the students how to grade themselves through the rubric activity. In the same classroom, the teacher allowed students to grade their own assignment based on the rubric. One teacher was observed asking students to reflect on their learning by asking *"Did you improve from yesterday?"*

Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness. The level of performance assigned to each teacher based on classroom observations for demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness is illustrated in Table 12. This component included the elements of lesson adjustment, response to students, and persistence. Mean scores ranged from basic to proficient with the highest rated element being lesson adjustment ($M = 2.88$), and the lowest rated element being persistence ($M = 2.22$).

Table 12
Observation data for Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness

Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness						
Level of Performance						
	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Not Observed	Mean (SD)
Lesson Adjustment	1 (10.0%)	1 (10.0%)	4 (40.0%)	2 (20.0%)	2 (20.0%)	2.88 (.99)
Response to Students	1 (10.0%)	3 (30.0%)	5 (50.0%)	0	1 (10.0%)	2.44 (.73)
Persistence	1 (10.0%)	5 (50.0%)	3 (30.0%)	0	1 (10.0%)	2.22 (.67)

One teacher described the importance of being flexible and allowing the students the opportunity to drive the learning and the instruction. She shared how there were times

throughout the class period where they decided to stop what they were doing and learn more about the topic that the students were interested in. She explained:

> They drive the learning. So like the day that we were researching and they saw that it was called that, we stopped class and we just researched about that topic because that is what they were the most interested in.

While some adjustments to the lesson were changed immediately, there were instances where a teachable moment was overlooked and the teacher continued as planned and did not adjust the lesson to engage the students and build connections. In addition, several teachers reflected on how they would adjust and change a specific lesson or assignment for the next class or the next year. One teacher explained:

> I've changed that with my observations back there going oh man, they don't get it. I've got to add something in here. And so the next year I do change it to add that extra step and they are just getting better and better. Or I'm getting better and better. Something is working.

Researchers observed several activities that were dependent on student input. In these instances, the teacher smoothly integrated the input of the students to move forward with the lesson. Teachers were observed displaying flexibility by eliminating items on the agenda due to timing constraints and student misunderstanding.

Professional Responsibilities

Professional responsibilities consisted of six components including reflecting on teaching, maintaining accurate records, communicating with families, participating in the professional community, growing and developing professionally, and showing professionalism. Data informing this domain consisted of interviews with teachers, classroom observations, review of lesson plans, the graduate student survey, and the employer survey.

Reflecting on teaching. The teachers in the study exhibited different reflection strategies including informal reflections, formal reflections, and reflections led by a third party. Teachers

mentioned the natural thought process they had after teaching which led them to reflect on their

lessons and think about how to improve them. Teachers also mentioned formal strategies for

reflecting on their teaching. One teacher shared how their entire district met to look at

longitudinal student data and how she used that to make decisions and changes in her day-to-day

lesson plans. Although formal data meetings were designed to encourage teacher reflection that

translated into improved instruction, one teacher exhibited the paradox of participating in data

gathering and meetings as she did not use the meetings to inform her instruction. She admitted

that it was all very time consuming, and that she only completed it because it was mandatory.

The meticulous data gathering requirement of her school did not translate into true reflection for

her teaching. However, this teacher did use several methods for reflecting on her teaching

including the assistance of an instructional coach and involvement of her students. She stated:

> *I started a new thing every few weeks kids like to grade me. They tell me how I can do a better job. But like we, you know kids, we started out with you are not going to get in trouble but you need to be honest. There are kind ways to do it and mean ways to do it. Things like that. We talked about the different ways to say things nicer or say things without being mean intentionally. So sometimes I've gotten I wish you had different kids in small groups. Or I wish you changed the seating chart because this person is bothering me. Just things like that. That is a really nice way to see their perception of me. What they are getting. That is one way. I try to reflect on that is not just me you know.*

Maintaining accurate records. The teachers in the study shared a variety of ways they

maintained accurate records. Teachers stated that they had strategies for organizing computer

usage, missing homework, student data, accommodations, and attendance. They use tools such as

Skyward for attendance and digital gradebooks for grades. When asked about records one

teacher stated:

> *The biggest thing we have is the Chromebook usage because if they switch to another Wayne school, I'm expected to produce that…I have a file right under my desk where I keep all of their pre and post tests also. I put that all in…a folder. I am able to keep important things that I get or if we are deciding to start tracking data. I even will sometimes, if it is something that they are going to take home, I take pictures of it and*

then just save it in a file for them…And then as far as like permission slips, I save those just in case. I just keep them all together. I have never actually needed them again but I keep them for the year.

One teacher did identify this as an area of growth. She stated, *"I think this could be a weakness for me."* Another noted how she and her team collaborated in the upkeep of the parent contact log, *"We also have a log so if I call a parent good or bad, I can log exactly what I say and the whole team shares it."* Teachers mentioned various ways they maintained accurate records. From the most basic form using paper to the technology of learning management systems.

Communicating with families. When asked about communicating with families teachers indicated that they communicated in-person, over the phone, through newsletters, through emails, and through social media. One teacher stated:

Every Friday we have in skyward the ability to email what is called a progress report which is: here is the report card so far. It's a mass email to all the parents…I actually keep a file of word documents so I remember what I told them last time…I type out: here is what we did last week, here is what is coming up next week, and then some reminders you need to be aware of like ask your child about their project. It's due next month. Don't let them wait until next month to start it. Every single Friday… Monday morning my inbox is pretty full once mom sees that report card. I get a few responses back with questions or thanks for the info or whatever. And when I send it out, it is English and Spanish.

Another teacher provided an example of the weekly newsletter that she sent home. The newsletter served to connect the parents with what the students were learning in her elementary school classroom. The teacher included the weekly/unit learning goals for science, math, grammar, spelling, reading, and writing. She also helped parents to continue the learning at home by including specific instructions on how parents could help their children get the most out of the lessons for the week. For example, the teacher stated in her newsletter, *"Later this week, students will use a study guide to review all that they've learned and then take a Fractions/Decimal Unit Test. To better prepare them for the test, please review the study guide at home with him/her.*"

The teacher also provided a list of the spelling words for the week and the theme of the spelling list (words with "ou" or "o" vowel sound) and then stated, *"Various assignments, activities, and homework will be given throughout the next two week[s] to help students practice these words. Please make sure your child is studying the words at home also. The spelling [test] will be given next Friday."* The teacher stated that she periodically translated the newsletter into Spanish for the Spanish speaking families in her class.

In addition to the traditional parent and teacher conferences, phone calls, and newsletters sent home, teachers utilized email, Twitter, and Class Dojo to keep families abreast of what was happening in the classroom. The contents of the communication efforts ranged from student misbehavior and praise to assignments, due dates, and grades. One teacher stated, *"As needed I will call home for discipline problems or for praise. Your kid did a great job today. They were selected as student of the month."* Teachers also used parent communication to explain the academic programs in which their children participated. One teacher stated:

> *They will come in and we'll talk about ways we can support them. Sometimes it is really just walking a parent through what it means for their kids to be gifted because they've either just been selected or most of them were just selected...And so we walk parents through what this looks like. Middle school is not a time to step back and give your kids more room. It's a time to help hold them up here. And we do lots of things too to help. We do have a homework journal so for kids that are struggling they have to bring us the journal. Write down what their homework is. We sign off on it. Then they go home and they do it and their parents sign off on it. That kind of helps with communication.*

In the above quote, a teacher in the gifted and talented program shared how she communicated with families about the rigor of the program and how to help parents adjust to the new rigorous work that their children would be receiving. This was one of the many ways teachers communicated with families.

Participating in the professional community. During the interviews, teachers spoke of

their professional involvement in their school and district communities. Teachers mentioned their

weekly meetings with their teams and seasonal district wide professional development days. One

teacher described her collaboration with another teacher who taught the same subject:

> *Once a week...we meet and we plan out a whole week together. I kind of already have the units built...And then she is really good at like finding cool interactive videos or us talking about how can we change it up and make it more interesting. It's like a dream team. I love working with her. And she is just, it is fresh. It's not just me. When I was...by myself I kind of get into a rut...so she pushes me to kind of make each day a little more interesting and then I'm really good at the big picture of what I want them to learn overall…We kind of balance each other out.*

In addition to working with individuals who taught the same subject, teachers described

working with colleagues who were part of the same team or grade level. One teacher described

her team:

> *I am lucky. I have a great team. I have one of our teachers, she is actually retiring this year so she has years of experience and great depths of knowledge and then I have another teacher who is about an 8-10 year teacher and then a new teacher. As far as working together as a team, we plan but don't plan together because we do have the freedom to kind of choose which route we go. We plan a goal of this is what we want to get done for this nine weeks. We do a nine weeks at a glance. I do it for my team where we look at everything we want to hit for the nine weeks... And so we share strategies...I think definitely we work together for that and then we work for the school goal. We want our school to definitely achieve.*

Some districts had weekly professional development meetings before school, after

school, or during prep periods. In addition to these weekly professional development

opportunities, districts and schools offered training in the summer and during teacher

professional days. In some instances, teachers were able to choose the topics that were most

relevant to their own professional growth and/or classroom. One teacher shared that the district

wide professional development appeared helpful, but due the size of the district, she rarely could

get into a session in which she truly wanted to receive professional development.

Although several recommendations where mentioned to improve the district wide professional development, all of the teachers expressed appreciation for the opportunity to participate in the professional circles of their schools and districts.

Growing and developing professionally and showing professionalism. The teachers had a variety of ways to stay current in their field. One teacher attended the AP Tip IN training to be qualified for her school's gifted and talented program. Others participated in professional reading groups which collectively read a book relevant to their teaching. Another teacher maintained contact with professionals around the country. One teacher described the professional development in the following way:

> And I would say my district is really good about if I say I really want to go to this like when we did the AP-TIP IN. they sent me the first one and I loved it so I thought I would do all the courses. Can you send me every time? So every summer, they said yes we will find the funding or write a grant for you and we'll send you. And then like I also get to go to IAG Indiana or maybe I switched those letters but the gifted association. There is a conference downtown. So I'll go to that. I've got to go to like a big convention in Baltimore before that they sent me to.

Responses relevant to the showing professionalism component indicated that there was room for growth in the teachers. For example, one teacher passionately identified an area where students needed an advocate; however, when asked had she pushed for change, she conceded that she had not.

> I: It seems like there are times when things you are asked [to do] and may not necessarily directly benefit the kids. Like how do you decide when to advocate and make a change and when to kind of just get it done and have you done that?
> R: I don't think I have as far as things like this. There is no option for this. ...
> R: It's frustrating. I wish I could advocate change but it's just so hard because there are so many places where there is just no push. This is what it is. This is how it is going to be.

Principals that employed graduates of the IUPUI School of Education EPP completed a survey to provide their assessment of the quality of professional disposition by each teacher who

received their teaching license in the previous two years. Principals rated their teachers favorably

on all items related to professional disposition of teacher with mean scores ranging from the

Agree to Strongly Agree categories (see Table 13 below). The item rated most favorably was

"The EPP did an outstanding job preparing this teacher to exhibit ethical practice expected of

educators" (*M* = 3.70). The item with the lowest mean score was "*The EPP did an outstanding*

job of preparing this teacher to work effectively with other professionals" (*M* = 3.30).

Table 13
Means and Frequencies from Principal Survey: Professional Disposition of Teacher

Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean *(SD)*
The Education Preparation Program (EPP) did an outstanding job of preparing this teacher to….					
…openly accept suggestions/constructive feedback.	0 (0%)	1 (10.0%)	4 (40.0%)	5 (50.0%)	3.40 (0.70)
…exhibit ethical practice expected of educators.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (30.0%)	7 (70.0%)	3.70 (0.48)
…work effectively with other professionals.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (70.0%)	3 (30.0%)	3.30 (0.48)
…work effectively with parents/guardians	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (60.0%)	4 (40.0%)	3.40 (0.52)
…work effectively with school leaders.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (60.0%)	4 (40.0%)	3.40 (0.52)
…work effectively within the school culture.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (50.0%)	5 (50.0%)	3.50 (0.53)

Teachers in the case study participated in various forms of professional development in

order to grow and develop as a professional in their field including local and national trainings,

and reading groups. Principals of IUPUI School of Education EPP graduates responded

positively to preparation provided to develop teachers with the professional disposition needed in

their current roles as teachers.

Culturally Relevant Pedagogy

IUPUI's School of Education EPP has a special interest in preparing teachers to implement culturally relevant pedagogy. Irvine (2010) defined culturally relevant pedagogy in the following way, *"Culturally relevant pedagogy builds on the premise that learning may differ across cultures and teachers can enhance students' success by acquiring knowledge of their cultural backgrounds and translating this knowledge into instructional practice"* (p. 58). When asked on the graduate survey how well IUPUI's School of Education EPP prepared them to *"create instructional opportunities that respond to the needs of culturally diverse learners"* 42% of the respondents said they had strong preparation while 0% said they had poor preparation (see Table 3 above). The mean score for respondents was 3.88 on a five point Likert-scale. On average, teachers felt that they were at least adequately prepared to meet the needs of culturally diverse students.

When considering the teachers' practices as shared through their interviews, they exhibited a range of culturally relevant teaching practices. Banks' (1994) levels of integration of multicultural content offers a way to see the range of culturally relevant teaching practices exhibited by the teachers in the case study. Banks' (1994) framework has four levels:

> *Level 1: The Contributions Approach- Focuses on heroes, holidays, and discrete cultural elements*; *Level 2: The Additive Approach- Content, concepts, themes, and perspectives are added to the curriculum without changing its structure*; *Level 3: The Transformative Approach-The structure of the curriculum is changed to enable students to view concepts, issues, events, and themes from the perspectives of diverse ethnic and cultural groups*; *Level 4: The Social Action Approach-Students make decisions on important social issues and take actions to help solve them*. (p. 233)

On the most basic level teachers seized opportunities to incorporate students' foods and cultural expressions into the classroom. For example, one teacher stated, "*It was actually the kids*

who brought up my first year that we should do something for black history month. Good idea.

Soul food day was born in my advanced class."

In another instance, a teacher stated, "*Also if you've noticed like my flag right there has all of the students' countries that they are coming from.*" Teachers also were cognizant of reducing the language barrier for the English Language Learners (ELLs). In referencing how she engaged a new student from Venezuela who spoke no English, a teacher said:

> *Ok, so what I have done is...I'll sit there with my keyboard with Google Translate open and I'm a fast typist so I can type while I talk. So I'm typing while I'm talking and it is right up there on the board. They can see the Spanish version coming up as I'm saying it. They feel very involved.*

However, three teachers exhibited efforts to move beyond superficial expressions of culture by making the texts and the work culturally relevant to the students in their classes. One teacher stated, *"When we were working on comparing and contrasting authors and their point of view[s]...I used Dr. King and Nelson Mandela. Using those two people caused the kids to be more interested.*" Another teacher stated:

> *I live in Carmel. The kids in Carmel have a way different background and experience things like that you know than kids here? We try to find things that we know will interest more of our learners. That is the biggest thing that we try to do. We try to find something that will engage and interest them.*

One teacher not only worked for cultural relevancy in the curriculum, but she also made efforts to address issues of prejudice and racism. In a literature unit in which her middle school class was reading *And Then There Were None* the students researched and found that the original title was offensive to Native Americans and African-Americans. The teacher said:

> *When we read And Then There Were None it was previously called Ten Little Indians. And before that it was Called Ten Little Niggers. When the kids found that out, which I didn't even know, they are like why was it called that? And so we went back and we looked at the heritage of the book. Not only when it was written but what was it ok to say?*

Overall, the teachers exhibited some level of culturally relevant teaching. However, the teachers mostly remained on the more superficial end of the spectrum.

Limitations

One limitation of the study was the timeline in which to collect data. All data collection for this study was completed from August 2016 to December 2016. This shortened timeline made it difficult to obtain the number of participants that researchers had originally hoped to include in the study. Researchers at CUME contacted 74 teachers to participate in the observation and interview portion of the study. Participants were contacted via email between one and four times based on their responses. Participants chose to not respond, respond and explain that they did not wish to participate, or respond and say that this was not a good time of the year for them to participate in the study due to other obligations, testing, etc. Of the 74 that were invited, five agreed to participate in the study. In addition to the small sample size the fact that all participants were white females is also a limitation of the current study.

A second limitation of the study, particularly as it relates to the analysis of the data, was that the information from the various measures of this study (observations, interviews, graduate student survey, and employer survey) were derived from different cohorts of students. The observation and interview data was collected with graduates of the IUPUI School of Education EPP in 2012-2013 and 2013-2014. The graduate student survey data was from students who graduated in 2014-2015. The principal survey included data from teachers who graduated the IUPUI School of Education EPP in 2013-2014 and 2014-2015.

A third limitation was that one of the five participants who agreed to allow researchers to observe her classroom and participate in an interview was not currently teaching in the area that she held her teaching license. This teacher was a history teacher by state license; however, she

was teaching family and consumer science in her current position. While she had real world experience as a caterer, when asked how she prepared to teach this content area she shared, "*We have a textbook over there that we never use in class but I pulled it out and it is like ok that is a good chapter. We'll go over that and so I made the PowerPoint outline thing for it. I just winged it from the first day.*"

The fourth limitation of the study was the use of the Danielson Framework (Danielson, 2014) as the sole tool used in classroom observations. While this instrument has been decreed a valid and reliable tool, it does not take into account the developmental process that is generally used by principals in the classroom. Observations using rubrics like the Danielson Framework (Danielson, 2014) tend to take place throughout the year and growth is hopefully seen after reflection, additional resources, and feedback.

The final limitation of the study was the lack of current objectives for the IUPUI School of Education EPP. The current objectives are outdated and do not reflect the social justice mission of the School of Education. This was difficult because the focus of the teaching in the EPP was not easily matched to the information collected from the participants during the interviews.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are representative of feedback from graduates of the EPP at the School of Education at IUPUI, principals of current teachers, and researchers.

- Provide training/education on how to:
  - Analyze data
  - Create and use formative and summative assessments

- o Teach gifted/talented students and integrate enrichments

- o Create and use classroom management strategies

- o Create and use behavior management strategies

- o Create and maintain processes on record keeping

- Create a more critical screening process for coaches

  - o Ensure that coaches are knowledgeable, available, and encouraging

- Provide teacher candidates in the EPP resources related to:

  - o Burn-out and how to combat this

  - o Conflict resolution with colleagues and parents of students

- Include information in coursework related to expectations for teacher evaluations

- Revise and publish School of Education EPP objectives for students to revisit throughout the program

- Provide more opportunities for hands-on application of skills

  - o Emphasis on creating and implementing lesson plans

- Include additional focus on content and less on how to teach subsets of students and pedagogy

- Include examples in coursework of how to infuse technology and blended learning into the curriculum

- Assist students in building intentional connections with school systems prior to graduation

- Future evaluations should include the following:

  - o Longer timeline for data collection

  - o Additional observations throughout the entire school year

- More diverse group of participants in terms of gender, race, ethnicity, subject, grade level

- Same cohort of students for all measures of data collection

References

Armstrong, P. (2017). Bloom's Taxonomy. Vanderbilt University Center for Teaching. Retrieved from https://cft.vanderbilt.edu/guides-sub-pages/blooms-taxonomy/

Banks, J. (1994). Multicultural education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *45*(5), 375-378.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. New York, NY: Prentice Hall.

Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research.* (3rd ed.) Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.

Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research,* 2nd edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Danielson, C. (2014). *The framework for teaching: Evaluation instrument*. Princeton, NJ: Danielson Group.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing Company.

Greene, J. C., Caracelli, V. J., & Graham, W. F. (1989). Toward a conceptual framework for mixed-method evaluation design. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 11,* 255-274.

Hill, C. E., Knox, S., Thompson, B. J., Williams, E. N., Hess, S. A., & Ladany, N. (2005). Consensual qualitative research: An update. *Education faculty research and publications, Marquette University.* Retrieved January 10, 2016 from http://epublications.marquette.edu/edu_fac/18

Irvine, J. J. (2010). Culturally relevant pedagogy. *Education digest: Essential readings condensed for quick review*, *75*(8), 57-61.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

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

Schwandt, T. A. (2007). On the importance of revisiting the study of ethics in evaluation. In S. Kushner & N. Norris (Eds.), *Dilemmas of engagement: Evaluation and the new public management*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Schwandt, T. A. (2008). Educating for intelligent belief in evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, *29*(2), 139-150.

Date of Observation: _____ Teacher Name _____ Cohort_____ Number of Students in the Classroom: _____

Appendix A

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Component 2a: Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport</th><th></th></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">ELEMENT</td><td colspan="4">LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE</td><td rowspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td>UNSATISFACTORY</td><td>BASIC</td><td>PROFICIENT</td><td>DISTINGUISHED</td><td>NOTES/COMMENTS</td></tr>
<tr><td>Teacher Interaction with Students</td><td>Teacher interaction with at least some students is negative, demeaning, sarcastic, or inappropriate to the age or culture of the students. Students exhibit disrespect for teacher.</td><td>Teacher-student interactions are generally appropriate but may reflect occasional inconsistencies, favoritism, or disregard for students' cultures. Students exhibit only minimal respect for teacher.</td><td>Teacher-student interactions are friendly and demonstrate general warmth, caring, and respect. Such interactions are appropriate to developmental and cultural norms. Students exhibit respect for teacher.</td><td>Teacher demonstrates genuine caring and respect for individual students. Students exhibit respect for teacher as an individual, beyond that for the role.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Student Interaction</td><td>Student interactions are characterized by conflict, sarcasm, or put-downs.</td><td>Students do not demonstrate negative behavior toward one another.</td><td>Student interactions are generally polite and respectful.</td><td>Students demonstrate genuine caring for one another as individuals and as students.</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Component 2b: Establishing a Culture for Learning</th><th></th></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">ELEMENT</td><td colspan="4">LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE</td><td rowspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td>UNSATISFACTORY</td><td>BASIC</td><td>PROFICIENT</td><td>DISTINGUISHED</td><td>NOTES/COMMENTS</td></tr>
<tr><td>Importance of the Content</td><td>Teacher or students convey a negative attitude toward the content, suggesting that the content is not important or is mandated by others.</td><td>Teacher communicates importance of the work but with little conviction and only minimal apparent buy-in by the students.</td><td>Teacher conveys genuine enthusiasm for the subject, and students demonstrate consistent commitment to its value.</td><td>Students demonstrate through their active participation, curiosity, and attention to detail that they value the content's importance.</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Date of Observation: _____   Teacher Name _____   Cohort_____   Number of Students in the Classroom: _____

Student Pride in Work	Students demonstrate little or no pride in their work. They seem to be motivated by the desire to complete a task rather than do high-quality work.	Students minimally accept the responsibility to "do good work" but invest little of their energy in the quality of the work.	Students accept teacher insistence on work of high quality and demonstrate pride in that work.	Students take obvious pride in their work and initiate improvements in it, for example, by revising drafts on their own initiative, helping peers, and ensuring that high-quality work is displayed.	
Expectations for Learning and Achievement	Instructional goals and activities, interactions, and the classroom environment convey only modest expectations for student achievement.	Instructional goals and activities, interactions, and the classroom environment convey inconsistent expectations for student achievement.	Instructional goals and activities, interactions, and the classroom environment convey high expectations for student achievement.	Both students and teacher establish and maintain through planning of learning activities, interactions, and the classroom environment high expectations for the learning of all students.	

Component 2c: Managing Classroom Procedures					
	LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE				
	UNSATISFACTORY	BASIC	PROFICIENT	DISTINGUISHED	NOTES/COMMENTS
Management of Instructional Groups	Students not working with the teacher are not productively engaged in learning.	Tasks for group work are partially organized, resulting in some off- task behavior when teacher is involved with one group.	Tasks for group work are organized, and groups are managed so most students are engaged at all time.	Groups working independently are productively engaged at all times, with students assuming responsibility for productivity.	
Management of Transitions	Much time is lost during transitions.	Transitions are sporadically efficient, resulting in some loss of instructional time.	Transitions occur smoothly, with little loss of instructional time.	Transitions are seamless, with students assuming	

				some responsibility for efficient operation.	
Management of Materials and Supplies	Materials are handled inefficiently, resulting in loss of instructional time.	Routines for handling materials and supplies function moderately well.	Routines for handling materials and supplies occur smoothly, with little loss of instructional time.	Routines for handling materials and supplies are seamless, with students assuming some responsibility for efficient operation.	
Performance of Non- Instructional Duties	Considerable instructional time is lost in performing non-instructional duties.	Systems for performing non-instructional duties are fairly efficient, resulting in little loss of instructional time.	Efficient systems for performing non-instructional duties are in place, resulting in minimal loss of instructional time.	Systems for performing non- instructional duties are well established, with students assuming considerable responsibility for efficient operation.	
Supervision of Volunteers and Paraprofessionals	Volunteers and paraprofessionals have no clearly defined duties or do nothing most of the time.	Volunteers and paraprofessionals are productively engaged during portions of class time but require frequent supervision.	Volunteers and paraprofessionals are productively and independently engaged during the entire class.	Volunteers and paraprofessionals make substantive contribution to the classroom environment.	

2d is grouped with Domain 3 for the purpose of Observations

Date of Observation: _____ Teacher Name _____ Cohort_____ Number of Students in the Classroom: _____

Component 2e: Organizing Physical Space					
ELEMENT	**LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE**				
	UNSATISFACTORY	**BASIC**	**PROFICIENT**	**DISTINGUISHED**	**NOTES.COMMENTS**
Safety and Arrangement of Furniture	The classroom is unsafe, or the furniture arrangement is not suited to the lesson activities, or both.	The classroom is safe, and classroom furniture is adjusted for a lesson, or if necessary, a lesson is adjusted to the furniture, but with limited effectiveness.	The classroom is safe, and the furniture arrangement is a resource for learning activities.	The classroom is safe, and students adjust the furniture to advance their own purposes in learning.	
Accessibility to Learning and Use of Physical Resources	Teacher uses physical resources poorly or learning is not accessible to some students.	Teacher uses physical resources adequately, and at least essential learning is accessible to all students.	Teacher uses physical resources skillfully, and all learning is equally accessible to all students.	Both teacher and students use physical resources optimally, and students ensure that all learning is equally accessible to all students.	

Date of Observation: _____ Teacher Name _____ Cohort_____ Number of Students in the Classroom: _____

	Component 3a: Communicating Clearly and Accurately				
ELEMENT	**LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE**				
	UNSATISFACTORY	**BASIC**	**PROFICIENT**	**DISTINGUISHED**	**NOTES/COMMENTS**
Expectations for Learning	The instructional purpose of the lesson is unclear to the students.	The teacher's attempt to explain the instructional purpose has only limited success.	The instructional purpose of the lesson is clearly communicated to students, including where it is situated within broader learning.	The teacher links instructional purpose of the lesson to the larger curriculum.	
Directions and Procedures	Teacher directions and procedures are confusing to students.	Teacher directions and procedures are clarified after initial student confusion or are excessively detailed.	Teacher directions and procedures are clear to students and contain an appropriate level of detail.	Teacher directions and procedures are clear to students and anticipate possible student misunderstanding.	
Use of Oral and Written Language	Teacher's spoken language is inaudible, or written language is illegible. Spoken or written language may contain many Vocabulary may be inappropriate, grammar and syntax errors. vague or used incorrectly, leaving students confused.	Teacher's spoken language is audible, and written language is legible. Both are used correctly. Vocabulary is correct but limited or is not appropriate to students' ages or backgrounds.	Teacher's spoken and written language is clear and correct. Vocabulary is appropriate to students' age and interests.	Teacher's spoken and written language is correct and expressive, with well-chosen vocabulary that enriches the lesson.	
Explanation of Content	The teacher's explanation of content contains major errors and does not include any explanation of strategies students might use.	The teacher's explanation of content may contain minor errors; some portions are clear, others are difficult to follow. The teacher's explanation does not invite students to engage intellectually or to understand strategies they might use when working independently.	The teacher's explanation of content is scaffolded, clear, and accurate, and it connects with students' knowledge and experience. During the explanation, the teacher focuses on strategies students can use when working independently and invites student intellectual engagement.	The teacher's explanation of content is thorough and clear, developing conceptual understanding through clear scaffolding and connecting with students' interests. Students contribute to extending the content by explaining concepts to classmates and suggesting strategies that might be used.	

Date of Observation: _____ Teacher Name _____ Cohort_____ Number of Students in the Classroom: _____

Component 3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques					
ELEMENT	**LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE**				
	UNSATISFACTORY	**BASIC**	**PROFICIENT**	**DISTINGUISHED**	**NOTES/COMMENTS**
Quality of Questions	Teacher's questions are virtually all of poor quality.	Teacher's questions are a combination of low and high quality. Only some invite a response.	Most of teacher's questions are of high quality. Adequate time is available for students to respond.	Teacher's questions are of uniformly high quality, with adequate time for students to respond, Students formulate many questions.	
Discussion Techniques	Interaction between teacher and students is predominantly recitation style, with teacher mediating all questions and answers.	Teacher makes some attempt to engage students in a true discussion, with uneven results.	Classroom interaction represents true discussion, with teacher stepping, when appropriate, to the side.	Students assume considerable responsibility for the success of the discussions, initiating topics and making unsolicited contributions.	
Student Participation	Only a few students participate in the discussion.	Teacher attempts to engage all students in the discussion, but with only limited success.	Teacher successfully engages all students in the discussion.	Student themselves ensure that all voices are heard in the discussion.	

Component 3c: Engaging Students in Learning					
ELEMENT	**LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE**				
	UNSATISFACTORY	**BASIC**	**PROFICIENT**	**DISTINGUISHED**	**NOTES/COMMENTS**
Activities and Assignments	Activities and assignments are inappropriate for students in terms of their age or backgrounds. Students are not engaged mentally.	Some activities and assignments are appropriate to students and engage them mentally, but others do not.	Most activities and assignments are appropriate to students. Almost all students are cognitively engaged in them.	All students are cognitively engaged in the activities and assignments in their explorations of content. Students initiate or adapt activities and projects to enhance understanding.	

Date of Observation: _____   Teacher Name _____   Cohort_____   Number of Students in the Classroom: _____

Grouping of Students	Instructional groups are inappropriate to the students or to the instructional goals.	Instructional groups are only partially appropriate to the students or only moderately successful in advancing the instructional goals of the lesson.	Instructional groups are productive and fully appropriate to the students or to the instructional goals of a lesson.	Instructional groups are productive and fully appropriate to the instructional goals of a lesson. Students take the initiative to influence instructional groups to advance their understanding.	
Instructional Materials and Resources	Instructional materials and resources are unsuitable to the instructional goals or do not engage students mentally.	Instructional materials and resources are partially suitable to the instructional goals, or students' level of mental engagement is moderate.	Instructional materials and resources are suitable to the instructional goals and engage students mentally.	Instructional materials and resources are suitable to the instructional goals and engage students mentally. Student initiate the choice, adaptation, or creation of materials to enhance their own purposes.	
Structure and Pacing	The lesson has no clearly defined structure, or the pacing of the lesson is too slow or rushed, or both.	The lesson has a recognizable structure, although it is not uniformly maintained throughout the lesson. Pacing of the lesson is inconsistent. The lesson may not provide students the time needed to be intellectually engaged.	The lesson has a clearly defined structure around which the activities are organized. Pacing of the lesson is consistent.	The lesson's structure is highly coherent, allowing for reflection and closure as appropriate. Pacing of the lesson is appropriate for all students.	

Date of Observation: _____ Teacher Name _____ Cohort_____ Number of Students in the Classroom: _____

ELEMENT	LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE				NOTES/COMMENTS
	UNSATISFACTORY	**BASIC**	**PROFICIENT**	**DISTINGUISHED**	
Assessment Criteria	The teacher gives no indication of what high quality work looks like.	There is little evidence that the students understand how their work will be evaluated.	The teacher makes the standards of high quality work clear to students.	Students indicate that they clearly understand the characteristics of high-quality work, and there is evidence that students have helped establish the evaluation criteria.	
Monitoring of Student Learning	The teacher makes no effort to determine whether students understand the lesson.	The teacher monitors understanding through a single method, or without eliciting evidence of understanding from the students.	The teacher elicits evidence of student understanding.	The teacher is constantly "taking the pulse" of the class; monitoring of student understanding is sophisticated and continuous and makes use of strategies to elicit information about individual student understanding.	
Feedback to Students	Students receive no feedback, or feedback is global or directed to only one student.	Feedback to students is vague and not oriented toward future improvement of work.	Feedback includes specific and timely guidance, at least for groups of students.	High-quality feedback comes from many sources, including students; it is specific and focused on improvement.	
Student Self-Assessment and Monitoring of Progress	The teacher does not ask students to evaluate their own or classmates' work.	The teacher makes only minor attempts to engage students in self- or peer assessment.	Students are invited to assess their own work and make improvements; most of them do so.	Students monitor their own understanding, either on their own initiative or as a result of tasks set by the teacher.	

Table heading (spanning top of table): **Component 3d: Providing Feedback to Students**

Date of Observation: _____ Teacher Name _____ Cohort_____ Number of Students in the Classroom: _____

<table>
<tr>
<td colspan="5">Component 3e: Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td rowspan="2">ELEMENT</td>
<td colspan="4">LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE</td>
<td rowspan="2">NOTES/COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSATISFACTORY</td>
<td>BASIC</td>
<td>PROFICIENT</td>
<td>DISTINGUISHED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Adjustment</td>
<td>Teacher adheres rigidly to an instructional plan, even when a change will clearly improve a lesson.</td>
<td>Teacher attempts to adjust a lesson, with mixed results.</td>
<td>Teacher identifies ways to make minor adjustments to a lesson, and the adjustment occurs smoothly.</td>
<td>Teacher successfully makes a major adjustment to a lesson.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to Students</td>
<td>Teacher ignores or brushes aside students' questions or interests.</td>
<td>Teacher attempts to accommodate students' questions or interests.

The effects on the coherence of a lesson are uneven.</td>
<td>Teacher successfully accommodates students' questions or interests.</td>
<td>Teacher seizes a major opportunity to enhance learning, building on a spontaneous event.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td>When a student has difficulty learning, the teacher either gives up or blames the student or the home environment for the student's lack of success.</td>
<td>Teacher accepts responsibility for the success of all students but has only a limited repertoire of instructional strategies to use.</td>
<td>Teacher persists in seeking approaches for students who have difficulty learning, possessing a moderate repertoire of strategies.</td>
<td>Teacher persists in seeking effective approaches for students who need help, using an extensive repertoire of strategies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</table>

Date of Observation: _____ Teacher Name _____ Cohort_____ Number of Students in the Classroom: _____

ELEMENT	LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE				
Component 2d: Managing Student Behavior					
	UNSATISFACTORY	BASIC	PROFICIENT	DISTINGUISHED	NOTES/COMMENTS
Expectations	No standards of conduct appear to have been established, or students are confused as to what the standards are.	Standards of conduct appear to have been established for most situations, and most students seem to understand them.	Standards of conduct are clear to all students.	Standards of conduct are clear to all students and appear to have been developed with student participation.	
Monitoring of Student Behavior	Student behavior is not monitored, and teacher is unaware of what students are doing.	Teacher is generally aware of student behavior but may miss the activities of some students.	Teacher is alert to student behavior at all times.	Monitoring by teacher is subtle and preventive. Students monitor their own and their peers' behavior, correcting one another respectfully.	
Response to Student Misbehavior	Teacher does not respond to misbehavior, or the response is inconsistent, overly repressive, or does not respect the student's dignity.	Teacher attempts to respond to student misbehavior but with uneven results, or no serious disruptive behavior occurs.	Teacher response to misbehavior is appropriate and successful and respects the student's dignity, or student behavior is generally appropriate.	Teacher response to misbehavior highly effective and sensitive to students' individual needs, or student behavior is entirely appropriate.	