Case Study Teaching Effectiveness Indicators (CAEP 4.2, 5.4)

The Harding University College of Education compiled this case study to track willing participants in Arkansas schools. These participants provided their annual evaluation scores from the state-wide Arkansas assessment tool – Teacher Excellence Support System (TESS). The faculty in the College of Education determined that the measure of success for all teachers trained at Harding University would be an overall Proficient rating.

From the case study narrative,

> Indicators of Teacher Effectiveness. Using the Teacher Excellence and Support System (TESS) adopted by the state of Arkansas and based on Charlotte Danielson's work, building administration, university faculty, and completers will observe and evaluate how well the completers "effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experience were designed to achieve" (4.2). Scores from the evaluation rubrics will be compiled, analyzed, and reported. For any Danielson Domain components that are identified as a concern, the UACC will track where that component is taught within the curriculum, compare with other data sources tied to the component, and make a determination on a course of action in response. The benchmark for the study is that the teacher of record will have an overall Proficient rating on the TESS evaluation each year of the 3-year tracking for the study.
>
> (Danielson, C. (2013). The framework for teaching: Evaluation instrument. Princeton, NJ: The Danielson Group, LLC)

Since the beginning of the case study, the Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) has changed two policies that have affected data collection for our case study. TESS is no longer the state-mandated evaluation tool. Although most school districts are continuing to use TESS as current teachers are trained and familiar with the tool, the ADE is no longer providing state-wide training. This will return the training on the instrument back to the EPP for those using the tool in our case study. In addition, it is possible that a teacher in a school district included in the case study would be evaluated using another evaluation tool.

The second change made by the ADE is that school administrators are not required to complete an evaluation on a novice teacher until the third year in a classroom. The EPP was reliant upon gathering what was available evidence to inform CAEP 4.2, which indicates teacher effectiveness in the classroom. Therefore, the EPP has had to adjust the data collected to include information from the Professional Growth Plan (PGP) for the teacher. It is fortunate that IF the EPP was able to collect data on teacher effectiveness as part of the case study, all were using either the evaluation tool OR PGP tied to TESS (Danielson Frameworks). In order to make an adjustment for the resulting data compiled in the case study, PGP scores were averaged by Danielson Domain and reported as if ratings in formal TESS observations.

All teachers that have participated in the case study have achieved overall Proficient ratings by their building principals within the first year of teaching (completers in 2016-2017) and in the first two years of teaching (completers in 2015-2016), with Domain ratings ranging from 2.70 to 3.20 on the 4-point performance level created by Danielson. Within the four individual domains, candidates have achieved an overall Proficient rating with the exception of one score of "Basic" within Domain 3 –

Instruction and one component score of "Basic" within Domain 4 – Professional Responsibilities for all data collected thus far in the case study . (Please see note above regarding the compiling of data from 2015-2016 to 2016-2017 due to policy changes from the ADE.) The Danielson domain and overall averages by preparation program are listed in Table 1.

Table 1

The Four Danielson Domains and Overall Averages by Preparation Program

	Domain 1	Domain 2	Domain 3	Domain 4	
	Planning and Preparation	Classroom Environment	Instruction	Professional Responsibilities	Overall Average
Traditional route					
2015-2016 (YR1)	2.89	2.93	2.87	2.94	2.91
2015-2016 (YR2)	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
2016-2017 (YR1)	3.08	2.90	3.20	3.00	n/a
Alternate route					
2015-2016 (YR1)	2.84	2.80	2.70	2.92	2.82
2015-2016 (YR2)	2.84	3.00	2.70	2.92	n/a
2016-2017 (YR1)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Note. The numbers in this table are based on Danielson's 4-point performance levels: 4 = Distinguished, 3 = Proficient, 2 = Basic, and 1 = Unsatisfactory. From the TESS evaluation reports, a 2.67 is considered proficient according to the rating noted.

In addition, as part of the case study requirements, teachers were asked to: (a) reflect on the level of student engagement to a unit or lesson, (b) provide a list of resources used to assist in teaching the unit or lesson and their effectiveness, (c) document how the classroom culture impacted student learning for the unit or lesson, and (d) outline what changes might be made before teaching that particular unit or lesson again in the future. Responses for the four components were as follows:

(a) Reflect on Student Engagement – Adjectives were used to describe the level of engagement and and many teachers described why or how the students were engaged – through activities, interactive lesson, hands-on work, group or pair work, technology use to clarify lesson concepts, ability to see life application, etc. One teacher did mention that engagement waned through the

progression of teaching the lesson and how the teacher could change lesson activities in future instruction for better engagement.

(b) Provide List of Resources – various specific technologies mentioned (Promethean Board, Chromebooks, etc among those listed), websites for instruction, websites for lesson ideas, books, hands-on activities for student use

(c) Document Classroom Culture's Impact – comments made, include: understanding various student learning styles through relationship with students in delivering lessons, strong understanding of expectations for learning, rules and procedures in place and mutual respect to allow class to run smoothly and easily transition, and trust of teacher to guide learning (mistakes are ok and teacher wants the students to learn).

(d) Outline Changes for Next Unit or Lesson – comments made, include: timing of instruction (spring testing and other school activities), more time with hands-on activities, vary lesson assignments targeting student interests more, adding additional technology for students, providing more immediate feedback to correct mistakes by teacher even in group-work, and to skip some content to keep focus on specific outcomes.