

Model Self-study Reports: Works in Progress

NYACTE/NYSATE
Saratoga, NY
Gideon Putnam
October 20, 2016

Presented by Deborah Eldridge
CAEP Consultant

Goal and Objectives

- **Goal:** To provide examples from self-study reports.
- **Objectives:** Participants will be able to (PWBAT):
 - Describe four key areas of self-study exemplars,
 - Identify characteristics of good quality evidence submissions and presentations, and
 - Examine data analyses and holistic statements for strengths and weaknesses.

Introduction

- Organization of the session:
 - 4 sections
 - Quality evidence submissions;
 - Exemplary evidence presentations;
 - Strong data analyses; and
 - Cross-evidential holistic summaries.
- Presented in:
 - 2 parts (Standards 1 and 2)
- Q&A

What are the common, quality evidence submissions for Standard 1?

- State licensure examinations (Praxis, etc.)
- GPA (content)
- Unit or lesson plans (Impact on P-12 learning)
- Portfolio/edTPA/TWS (assessment, technology, diversity)
- Observation of teaching (to CCRS, to all students, using technology)
- Technology assignment
- Graduate and/or cooperating teacher surveys
- Dispositions survey/evaluation
- Program reviews/approvals
- Miscellaneous

What do the quality evidence submissions for Standard 1 have in common?

- DATA! (outcomes, not just inputs)
- 3 cycles of **current** data (disaggregated for all programs)
- Breadth (coverage of each component)
- Depth (multiple measures per component)
- Comparisons possible (within and across programs, years, etc.)
- Alignment with Standards (InTASC, state, CAEP, etc.)

What are the common, quality evidence submissions for Standard 2?

- Description of partnerships (e.g., copy of MOU) along with documentation that the partnership is being implemented as described
- Schedule of joint meetings between partners and purpose/topics covered in meetings
- Excerpts from meeting minutes that document shared decision making, shared responsibility, etc.
- Field experience handbooks (section[s] specific to component)
- Chart of clinical experiences
- Description of process for developing criteria for candidate expectations during clinical experiences
- Chart showing coherence between curriculum and clinical experiences

What do the quality evidence submissions for Standard 2 have in common?

- Much more descriptive or explanatory documentation, much less data than Standard 1
- Breadth (coverage of each component)
- Depth (multiple sources of evidence per component)
- If reporting data, 3 cycles included
 - Comparisons possible (within and across programs, years, etc.)

Feedback and Question Pause



What makes for a good evidence presentation for Standard 1?

- Title is descriptive
- Context/overview is provided
- EPP-created instrument is included
- Data is presented disaggregated by program with a comparison point
- Alignment with standards is apparent
- Reliability and validity statements for EPP-created assessments are included
- Analysis and interpretation of the data from each evidence source are in evidence

An example of the presentation of evidence for Standard 1

- Evidence Presentation

What makes for good evidence presentation for Standard 2?

- Title is descriptive
- Sections of evidence and/or document are tagged or labeled by component
- Evidence is specific, targeted, and can easily be found by team
 - Selection of evidence is strategic—what evidence provides the strongest support

An example of the presentation of evidence for Standard 2 (an example, tagged to component)

Date	Participants	Location	Agenda Item/ Discussion	Outcome	Component

Table 1 (an example) (tagged to 2.3)

Types of Clinical Experiences	Duration for each type of clinical experience		Experiences in Diverse Settings				
	Name of course and total # of hours	# of days or weeks	Report the % of schools in each of the following categories (Urban/rural; SES – Title I; Race/Ethnicity)				
			Urban	Rural	Race or Ethnicity	Title I	ELL
Class Observations							
Individual student observations							
Tutoring							
Small group							
Teacher Aide							
Clinical Practice (Field work)							
Internship/student teaching							
Teacher of Record							

Table 2 (an example, tagged to 2/3)

Name and Number of clinical experience (class where it is required or a stand alone clinical experience)	Type of clinical experience from the previous chart	Specific objective(s) for each of the listed clinical experiences	Assessments aligned with objectives for each identified clinical experience	Any required use of technology in the clinical experience
Breadth, Depth and Coherence of Experiences for <u>EPP-wide</u> Clinical Experiences				
EDUC 100 – Intro. To Education	Class observations			
EDUC 200 – Reading for the subject area	Individual student tutoring			
EDUC 266 – Working with ELL students	Small group instruction			
EDUC 350 – Field Work	Teacher Aide and whole group instruction			

Feedback and Question Pause



What do the strong data analyses for Standard 1 have in common?

- Each evidence item is analyzed as part of the upload (CAH, Page 22+ the following bullets appear in the rubric for each component)
 - Analysis of data/evidence includes identification of trends/patterns, comparisons, and/or differences.
 - Data /evidence supports interpretations and conclusions.
- A brief summary of scoring and data is provided.
- Data are summarized.
- Strengths and areas of challenge are identified.
- Data use is described.

An example of the data analysis of evidence for Standard 1

- Data Analysis

What do the strong analyses of the evidence for Standard 2 have in common?

- Cites evidence tagged to the standard
- Addresses all components
- Summarizes status of clinical partnerships and clinical practice, using specific examples
- Strengths are identified
- Challenges are discussed honestly
- Plans for future actions are described

An example of a paragraph from the analysis of evidence for Standard 2 (MOU)

In Spring 2015, EPP faculty and representatives from our partner district analyzed the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) currently being used with cooperating school districts. This analysis found that a more substantial, far more detailed instrument was needed. The current template does not clearly reflect the activities that both parties agree should be part of a mutually beneficial relationship. The EPP and its partner districts will begin a series of conversations in Fall 2015 to create a new Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) that will be in place for Fall 2016. It is expected that the new MOA will include provisions for evaluating the coherences across clinical and academic components of the program and the evaluation of all clinical faculty. It is expected that the implementation of the new MOA will enhance and strengthen the partner's shared accountability for all candidate outcomes.

An example of a paragraph from the analysis of evidence for Standard 2 (diverse settings chart)

- Data presented in the tables indicate that candidates are placed in diverse settings which include Title 1 districts, classrooms with English Language Learners, and classrooms with students with disabilities in both urban (26%) and rural (74%) districts. As shown in Table 2 candidates' clinical experiences have been aligned throughout the EPP to include specific objectives and assessment while infusing the use of technology. Table 3 and 4 report the total number of hours that candidates accumulate in the field through observations, practicums, internships, and student teaching. Field experience and clinical practice hours vary based upon the candidates program or pathway to licensure, with a range of 700 total hours (B.S. Secondary Education) to 2,560 (AltCert program).

An example of a paragraph from the analysis of evidence for Standard 2 (clinical experiences chart)

- The EPP will continue to monitor candidates' clinical experiences to ensure quality with an emphasis on diversity and technology. While all candidates (K-12) are in the field for at least 700 hours there is nonetheless a discrepancy among programs. Due to the specialized nature of the AltCert program, which includes a total of 2,560 hours, the EPP will focus on Elementary Education, Early Childhood and Secondary Education to better align and balance the total number of hours among programs as well as the classes/curriculum associated with the field experiences in collaboration with all clinical-related faculty. The EPP will work to ensure that candidates experiences are inclusive of all learners, subjects, and grade levels. Through this curricular mapping initiative, which will begin in the fall of 2016, the EPP will also consider an program and/or course modifications related to clinical experiences.

Feedback and Question Pause



What do the strong holistic summaries for Standard 1 have in common?

- Provide a frame for the argument of meeting the standard, not rainbows and unicorns
- Cite the evidence sources
- Provide cross-evidential analysis
- Include data use and next steps

An example of a strong holistic summary paragraph for Standard 1

- [Holistic Summary Paragraph](#)

What do the strong holistic summaries for Standard 2 have in common?

- Provides a frame for the case for meeting the standard
- Is an accurate description of the current status—not everything is perfect!
- Narrative is supported by tagged evidence
- Multiple sources of evidence are used to make case
- Lessons learned and next steps are described
- Conclusions are supported by evidence

An example paragraph from a summary for Standard 2

- Principals from a local school district, during our quarterly meeting, raised their concern about the need for full national background checks for candidates entering schools at any level of field experience. Candidates are required to submit a full national background check prior to admission to teacher education, however, secondary majors in Early Field Experiences courses were not yet admitted to teacher education. The policy was changed for fall 2016.
- Administrators also shared concerns regarding candidates' lack of interviewing skills and a need for a focus on the Code of Conduct. In response, the EPP is creating a Code of Conduct module which will be implemented at the early field experience point, and prior to student teaching. The EPP will continue discussions with partners to ensure that the areas of weakness they see from candidates are addressed and supported.

An example of a paragraph from a strong holistic summary for Standard 2

- The EPP works to develop and sustain quality partnerships and clinical experiences with school districts at the state, region, national and international levels. The EPP has created a technology-rich communication process that aids in securing mutually beneficial placements. Improvements are ongoing: recent additions are the Diversity Assessment (Ev. #21), Online Professional Development Meetings (Ev. #22), in-person administrative joint meetings with our local school district partner (Ev. #23), and the development of a new survey in the pilot stage for cooperating teachers and university supervisors (Ev. #28). These initiatives hold promise for deepening our partnerships and providing a foundation for future initiatives that impact candidate preparation. University supervisors completed a questionnaire that gathered specialty area, experience, and grade level preferences to better pair candidates and supervisors (Ev.#35).

An example of a paragraph from a strong holistic summary for Standard 2

- For the 2015-2016 academic year, the EPP created several new technology-based applications that help retain and support our clinical educators in the field (See chart in Ev. 29). As part of the first few weeks, joint meetings were held with student teaching candidates and their cooperating teachers. In order to increase stakeholder collaboration, invitations were also sent to university supervisors and cooperating principals. In meetings held at various times to accommodate schedules, in January 2016 there were 275 attendees. During the meetings, the EPP provided online training sessions, introducing the state teacher evaluation protocol and the data collection system. These trainings served as professional development for the cooperating teachers and also provided very specific documentation elements: the an Infographic that outlined stakeholder roles and responsibilities; a detailed guide for the student teaching semester; evaluation due dates; and links to the an online site used as a communication tool for all stakeholder correspondence. (Ev. #19)

An example of a paragraph from a strong holistic summary for Standard 2

- On-line follow-up meetings were also offered throughout the semester to allow for questions, dialogue, concerns and feedback. (Ev. #18) Moving forward, the on-line meetings will be specific to the role of the attendee; for example, cooperating teachers only, or exclusively university supervisors. The goal is to create a learning network tied to the EPP that adds to the professional experience of those who support our candidates. Viewed as a success overall, this type of training serves the candidates well in the field, as information is addressed that directly impacts their experience. The Office of Field Experiences and Licensure received fewer phone calls and emails with questions over the evaluation instrument due to the training stakeholders received before the first evaluation due date. Cooperating teachers felt they had a voice, and the platform in its current state stands to further develop as we work in support of our clinical educators in the field. (See evaluation in Ev. #10)

Final Feedback and Question Pause

