Completers' Positive Impact on P-12 Student Learning and Development

For the 2030 CAEP Report, the EPP will continue to gather data each year from DESE regarding completers' value-added growth scores on standardized tests and survey results from the Educator Preparation Program Quality Report.

The EPP will also conduct their case study for 2025-2026, 2026-2027, and 2027-2028.

For the 2023 CAEP Report, the EPP has implemented 3 case studies since May 2019.

- Case Study #1 - Completers 2018-2019 - data gathered, analyzed, narrative complete
- Case Study #2 - Completers 2019-2020 - data gathered, analyzed, narrative complete
- Case Study #3 - Completers 2020-2021 - data gathered, analyzed, narrative complete

Overview of Case Study #1

The EPP conducted its first case study in order to provide data with regard to our completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development. In May 2019, the EPP held an orientation meeting with four completers to discuss expectations, timeline, and due dates to gather quantitative and qualitative data. The completers chosen were a kindergarten teacher, 1st grade teacher, 2nd grade teacher, and a high school math teacher.

Data collected to measure the impact on P-12 student-learning growth:

- Quantitative Data
    - State Assessment – ISIP Istation, Renaissance STAR, ACT
    - Observations – from completers' principals and/or by EPP faculty
- Qualitative Data
    - Reflective Journals

Fall 2019 Timeline:

- EPP faculty observed all four completers in their classroom and conducted an evaluation using the TESS instrument.
- Completers wrote two reflections regarding their K-12 students' proficiency levels.
    - Reflection 1 asked candidates to give their initial impression of students' learning and development prior to taking assessments (i.e. starting point from teacher's viewpoint).
    - Reflection 2 asked completers to provide their insight and analysis of data regarding students' learning and development after receiving results from their pre-assessments (i.e. starting point from data results) on the Istation assessment, Renaissance STAR, ACT.
- Also during this semester, the EPP asked completers' principals to provide results from their own observations of the completers in the classroom.

Spring 2020 Timeline:

- In February 2020, the EPP was able to conduct three of the four observations of the completers in the classroom.
- In March 2020, the Governor of the State of Arkansas ordered schools to close because of the coronavirus pandemic. With schools closed, the EPP was not able to observe one completer for the second time.
- Completers wrote one reflection regarding their K-12 students' proficiency levels.
    - Reflection 3 asked completers to provide their insight and analysis of data regarding students' learning and development after receiving results from their interim assessments (i.e. student growth mid-way).
    - The EPP was able to receive three of the four reflections due to the coronavirus pandemic.
- The EPP was not able to collect post assessment data due to schools closing for the remainder of the school year and the cancellation of all state testing. However, in future case studies, completers will complete Reflection 4, which asks completers to provide insight and analysis of data regarding students' learning and development after receiving results from their post-assessments (i.e. overall student growth).

The following narrative provides an analysis of the data collected from three of the four completers.

Completer A, 1st Grade Teacher:

Assessment: ISIP Istation: Pretest given in September, Interim Test given in January
Observation: Fall Observation by EPP, Spring Observation by EPP

Classroom Description:
N = 18, NOTE: began with 19 students, 1 student moved away
Relevant background information: 2 students with 504s, 1 with IEP, 3 receiving RTI, 1 in Foster Care

Analysis of Pretest Reading Scores to Interim Reading Scores and Pretest Math Scores to Interim Math Scores:
A paired-samples *t* tests was calculated to compare the mean pretest reading score to the mean interim reading score and the mean pretest math scores to the mean interim math score.

- The mean on the pretest reading was 213.11 (sd = 12.21), and the mean on the interim reading was 219.78 (sd = 13.38). A significant increase from the pretest reading to interim reading was found ($t(17) = -3.265$, $p < .05$).
- The mean on the pretest math was 2066.89 (sd = 44.9), and the mean on the interim math was 2134.94 (sd = 46.91). A significant increase from the pretest math to interim math was found ($t(17) = -1.638$, $p < .05$).

Teacher Personal Reflection:
"After looking at the results, I believe that some strategies that I am using are working very well, while others need to be revised and revisited. However, I have noticed that some scores do not line up with what I see in the classroom. Some students are performing below

benchmark/showing regression on the test, when I have actually seen the complete opposite in the classroom, small groups, and grading. I believe that many of the students were distracted and doing what we call 'happy clicking.' Although I am seeing these differing results, this has opened my eyes to see who needs more support in the given areas."

Analysis of TESS Evaluations and EPP Faculty Reflection:

- Observer 1: Overall Score: 3.29 Effective
    - Domain 1: 3.17 Effective
    - Domain 2: 3.80 Effective
    - Domain 3: 3.20 Effective
    - Domain 4: 3.00 Effective
    - Feedback: "Outstanding classroom environment! Positive, warm, inviting and safe! Students took responsibility for implementing station work and they remained on task for the entire hour of instruction."

- Observer 2: Overall Score: 2.78 Effective
    - Domain 1: 2.67 Effective
    - Domain 2: 3.00 Effective
    - Domain 3: 2.80 Effective
    - Domain 4: 2.67 Effective
    - Feedback: "Teacher successfully accommodated students' questions. She identified her low performing students and placed them in a group of higher performing students. The low performing students mastered the objective. She was very pleased, having the students go to smartboard and mark perfect beside their picture."

Conclusion:
Due to the Governor canceling all state assessments in the Spring of 2020, data results from the post assessment could not be collected. However, the mean scores from pretest to interim tests for both the reading and math tests increased with a significant difference found with the reading and math assessment. Results from the TESS evaluations indicate that the teacher is implementing effective practices in her classroom.

Completer B, 2nd Grade Teacher:

Assessment: Renaissance STAR: Pretest given in September, Interim Test given in December
Observation: Fall Observation by EPP, due to coronavirus pandemic – unable to observe in Spring

Classroom Description:
N = 7, NOTE: began with 8 students, 1 student unable to test in December
Relevant background information: 4 students identified with exceptionalities: Stuttering, Speech and Sensory Disorder, Dyslexia, ADHD

Analysis of Pretest Reading Scores to Interim Reading Scores and Pretest Math Scores to Interim Math Scores:

A paired-samples *t* tests was calculated to compare the mean pretest reading score to the mean interim reading score and the mean pretest math scores to the mean interim math score.

- The mean on the pretest reading was 129.00 (*sd* = 100.98), and the mean on the interim reading was 190.14 (*sd* = 97.42). A significant increase from the pretest reading to interim reading was found ($t(6) = -4.292$, $p < .05$).
- The mean on the pretest math was 337.57 (*sd* = 83.31), and the mean on the interim math was 384.57 (*sd* = 79.44). A significant increase from the pretest math to interim math was found ($t(6) = -3.712$, $p < .05$).

Teacher Personal Reflection:

"All my students are very hyper. This can cause some problems in the classroom, as their attention spans are very short. Most of my students come from broken homes and most of them live in poverty. Many of them have several siblings and parents that work late. Because of this, they are starved for attention from adults. I incorporated a lot of movement and brain breaks in my teaching this year. My students are unable to focus when they are asked to sit, so we do a lot of activities while standing in our chairs or exercising. I also used technology every day in the classroom. I utilized IXL because it is aligned with standards. Because most of my students are below grade level in reading, I had to read their assignments and tests aloud to them so they would not get frustrated."

Analysis of TESS Evaluations and EPP Faculty Reflection:

- Observer 1: Overall Score: 3.00 Effective
    - Domain 1: 3.00 Effective
    - Domain 2: 3.00 Effective
    - Domain 3: 3.00 Effective
    - Domain 4: 3.00 Effective
    - Feedback: "When designing instruction, the teacher incorporated reading standup, hands-on methods, variety of questioning opportunities, and differentiation. Teacher provided one-on-one assistance to each student and restructured questions."

Conclusion:

Due to the Governor canceling all state assessments in the Spring of 2020, data results from the post assessment could not be collected. However, the mean scores from pretest to interim tests for both the reading and math tests increased with a significant difference found with the reading and math assessment. Results from the TESS evaluation indicate that the teacher is implementing effective practices in the classroom.

Completer C, High School Math Teacher:

Assessment: ACT: Pretest given in September, Interim Test given in February
Observation: Fall Observation by EPP, Spring Observation by EPP, Informal Feedback from Principal

Classroom Description:
N = 15, NOTE: began with 27 students, 11 students unable to take interim test due to coronavirus pandemic
Relevant background information: 16 ESOL, 1 with IEP

Analysis of Pretest Math Scores to Interim Math Scores:
A paired-samples *t* tests was calculated to compare the mean pretest math scores to the mean interim math score.

- The mean on the pretest math was 16.20 ($sd = 2.04$), and the mean on the interim math was 16.07 ($sd = 1.94$). No significant difference from pretest math to interim math was found ($t(14) = .219$, $p > .05$).
- NOTE: the pretest math and the interim test did not follow the same formatting. See teacher description below.

Teacher Personal Reflection:
"When comparing the interim-assessment with the pre-assessment, the interim-assessment had time limitations in place, where the pre-assessment did not. There were also several reasoning problems, so for my ELLs, that could have made it difficult for them to discern what the question was asking. Also, they tested all morning long, so mental stamina could have potentially been down. Moving forward, I will have students practice more reasoning problems, develop a homework policy with higher expectations, and spiral concepts more effectively. I also need to deepen my question asking and focus on embedding vocabulary instruction."

"My principal called me last week and asked for me to be our collaborative team lead, and they also let me know that I'm teaching all pre-AP next year, so that will be really fun! They sent me to a conference this summer to be trained on preparing students for college, so I'm excited to see what this next year holds."

Analysis of TESS Evaluations and EPP Faculty Reflection:

- Observer 1: Overall Score: 3.42 Effective
    - Domain 1: 3.33 Effective
    - Domain 2: 4.00 Highly Effective
    - Domain 3: 3.00 Effective
    - Domain 4: 3.33 Effective
    - Feedback: "Teacher was name the September 'Educator of the Month' for her high school! This is a very large school and quite an honor as a first year teacher! The announcement noted her dedication to her students success and her availability to them. Congratulations!"

- Observer 2: Overall Score: 3.77 Highly Effective
    - Domain 1: 3.83 Highly Effective
    - Domain 2: 3.80 Highly Effective
    - Domain 3: 3.60 Highly Effective
    - Domain 4: 3.83 Highly Effective
    - Feedback: "I was able to visit with Mr. Y, Principal. He reports that Ms. X is a 'rock star' teacher. She is mature and effective way beyond other first year

teachers. During 2nd semester, she began leading staff development for other teachers, some with over 20 years of experience. He said they have observed her room over 25 times and the high level of instruction is always present!"

Principal Informal Feedback:
"We love having X on our staff. She is performing very effectively and making a big impact with students. She was recently named 'Most valuable educator of the month.'"

Conclusion:
Due to the Governor canceling all state assessments in the Spring of 2020, data results from the post assessment could not be collected. Results from the TESS evaluations indicate that the teacher is implementing highly effective practices in the classroom. This result is supported by the informal feedback from the principal and the teacher with regard to receiving the Educator of the Month award, being assigned as a collaborative team leader, and being observed by her peers and administration over 25 times.

Overview of Case Study #2

Completers chosen for the second case study were 2nd grade, 5th grade, HS critical reading, and HS math teachers. The EPP followed a similar timeline as case study #1.

Data collected include the following (some limitation due to COVID):

- 2nd Grade: All applicable reflections, pre/post assessments, principal feedback, university supervisor feedback
- 5th Grade: All applicable reflection, pre/post assessments, university supervisor feedback
- HS critical reading: All applicable reflections, pre/post assessments, principal feedback, university supervisor feedback
- HS math teacher: All applicable reflections, pre/post assessments, university supervisor feedback

Completer A, 2nd Grade Teacher:

Assessment: NWEA Map: Pretest, Interim, and Post Test given
Observation: Observation by EPP, Observation by Principal

Classroom Description:
N = 18 (only 17 completed tests results reported)
Relevant background information: 4 students with IEPs, 3 virtual students, 1 mental health, 1 ELL

Analysis of Pretest Reading Scores to Post-test Reading Scores and Pretest Math Scores to Post-test Math Scores:
A paired-samples *t* tests was calculated to compare the mean pretest reading score to the mean post reading score and the mean pretest math scores to the mean post math score.

- The mean on the pretest reading was 165.24 (*sd* = 16.192), and the mean on the post reading was 188.47 (*sd* = 16.610). A significant increase from the pretest reading to post reading was found ($t(16) = -9.163$, $p < .001$).
- The mean on the pretest math was 172.65 (*sd* = 11.624), and the mean on the post math was 190.12 (*sd* = 9.591). A significant increase from the pretest math to post math was found ($t(16) = -14.475$, $p < .001$).

Principal's Evaluation:
"Create a collaborative learning environment for student participation., Engage students in familiar oral language routines., Facilitate meaningful discourse between/among students., Model the use of academic language."

Analysis of TESS Evaluations and EPP Faculty Reflection:

- Observer 1: Overall Score: 3.35 Effective
    - Domain 1: 3.00 Effective
    - Domain 2: 3.75 Highly Effective
    - Domain 3: 3.60 Highly Effective
    - Domain 4: 3.00 Effective

- Observer 2: Overall Score: 3.87 Highly Effective
    - Domain 1: 4.00 Highly Effective
    - Domain 2: 3.80 Highly Effective
    - Domain 3: 4.00 Highly Effective
    - Domain 4: 3.67 Highly Effective

- Feedback: "Great classroom management along with social distancing with desks. Respectful exchanges between teacher and students. Students helping each other with a strong learning community."

Conclusion:
The mean scores from pretest to post tests for both the reading and math tests increased with a significant difference found with the reading and math assessment. Results from the TESS evaluations indicate that the teacher is implementing effective practices in her classroom for both in person and virtual students.

Completer B, 5th Grade Teacher:

Assessment: Teacher Work Sample: Pretest and Post Test given
Observation: Observation by EPP

Classroom Description:
N = 17 (only 14 completed tests results reported, moved to new district or resource room)
Relevant background information: 4 students with IEPs, 2 virtual students, 1 new student

Analysis of Pretest Scores to Post-test Scores:

A paired-samples *t* tests was calculated to compare the mean pretest score to the mean post score.

- The mean on the pretest was 34.14 (*sd* = 16.105), and the mean on the post was 69.14 (*sd* = 24.782). A significant increase from the pretest to post was found ($t(13) = -6.662$, $p < .001$).

Teacher's Personal Evaluation on Unit:
"I think that my teaching strategies worked for the overall process of adding and subtracting fractions and I plan to use those again next year. However, I did notice that the reason many of the students who had lower scores did so poorly was because they did not simplify their fractions. After reviewing their tests, I found that the majority of them knew how to accurately add and subtract fractions, they just forgot to simplify. I counted off ½ credit on the questions they answered correctly but did not simplify on. Had I not counted off at all for simplifying, everyone would have scored much higher. So, for next time, I would make sure to spend more time on the process of simplifying. I did cover it, but not as much as I feel that I should have after seeing these test scores. I am pleased that everyone's score did improve from the pre-test to the post-test. However, I am displeased with myself for not having spent more time on simplifying."

Analysis of TESS Evaluations and EPP Faculty Reflection:

- Observer 1: Overall Score: 3.33 Effective
  - Domain 1: 3.20 Effective
  - Domain 2: 3.60 Highly Effective
  - Domain 3: 3.20 Effective
  - Domain 4: 3.33 Effective

- Observer 2: Overall Score: 3.10 Effective
  - Domain 1: 3.20 Effective
  - Domain 2: 3.20 Effective
  - Domain 3: 3.00 Effective
  - Domain 4: 3.00 Effective

- Feedback: "Mrs. X is very well organized, very well prepared, and a great communicator with parents/guardians. She is also showing amazing use of technology in the classroom amid the COVID 19 pandemic. You're doing a wonderful job."

Conclusion: The mean scores from pretest to post tests increased with a significant difference. Results from the TESS evaluations indicate that the teacher is implementing effective practices in her classroom with great use of technology and communication. The teacher is a reflective practitioner and strives to improve and grow as an educator.

Completer C, HS Critical Reading:

Assessment: Teacher Work Sample: Pretest and Post Test given
Observation: Observation by EPP, Observation by Principal

Classroom Description:
N = 12 (only 9 completed tests results reported, moved to new district)
Relevant background information: All ELL, 2 with IEPs

Analysis of Pretest Scores to Post-test Scores:
A paired-samples *t* tests was calculated to compare the mean pretest score to the mean post score. Note: students' reading levels were coded into numerical value, i.e. A=1, B=2, etc.)

- The mean on the pretest was 6.111 (sd = 1.285), and the mean on the post was 9.111 (sd = .935). A significant increase from the pretest to post was found ($t(8) = -3.182$, $p < .05$).

Principal Evaluation:
"I told her that I loved the way she started the class. X said it allows students time for the bathroom and gives her a chance to take attendance too. I also brought up her rapport and classroom culture. I am in her class a lot but being in there for a full lesson made it ever more apparent. The card game was a great example of this. When I brought it up she said that this class is full of upperclassmen who all know each other from last year and that it is also her most diverse class. Since they all speak different languages English is the only thing they have in common! X did a great job of connecting language to the outside world. We discussed making time in every lesson for an exit or closing. We talked about time getting away especially in that class. She is going to focus on that in the future. She brought up that having so many different levels makes this tricky. We ended by talking about how well the lesson went! X is an amazing teacher!"

Analysis of TESS Evaluations and EPP Faculty Reflection:

- Observer 1: Overall Score: 3.35 Effective
    - Domain 1: 3.60 Highly Effective
    - Domain 2: 3.40 Effective
    - Domain 3: 3.40 Effective
    - Domain 4: 3.52 Highly Effective

- Observer 2: Overall Score: 3.62 Highly Effective
    - Domain 1: 3.40 Effective
    - Domain 2: 3.80 Highly Effective
    - Domain 3: 3.60 Highly Effective
    - Domain 4: 3.67 Highly Effective

- Feedback: "Warm, inviting classroom! Very approachable and kind, strong individualized instruction. Very proud of the work Mrs. X is doing to meet the learning needs of these English learners."

Conclusion:
The mean scores from pretest to post tests increased with a significant difference. Results from the TESS evaluations indicate that the teacher is implementing effective practices in her classroom even among challenging circumstances from COVID effects and language barriers. The teacher is a reflective practitioner and strives to improve and grow as an educator.

Completer D, HS Math Teacher:

Assessment: MAPS test: Pretest and Interim Test given
Observation: Observation by EPP (virtual lesson)

Classroom Description:
N = 16 (only 13 completed tests results reported)
Relevant background information: 5 students with IEPs, 2 with 504s

Analysis of Pretest Scores to Interim Test Scores:
A paired-samples *t* tests was calculated to compare the mean pretest score to the mean interim score.

- The mean on the pretest was 224.462 (*sd* = 8.618), and the mean on the interim was 226.308 (*sd* = 11.101). No significant difference from the pretest to interim was found ($t(12) = -1.465$, $p > .05$).

Principal Evaluation: "Mrs. X has continued to grow throughout her first year realizing the importance of preparedness."

Analysis of TESS Evaluations and EPP Faculty Reflection:

- Observer 1: (due to COVID restrictions, only able to see a pre recording of virtual lesson)
    - Domain 3: 2.80 Effective

- Observer 2: (due to COVID restrictions, only able to see a recording of in person lesson)
    - Domain 2: 3.00 Effective
    - Domain 3: 2.80 Effective

- Feedback: "For a virtual learning experience, Mrs. X used some effective techniques to reach her students. She used clear, color coded direct instruction for each example, good pacing for students to follow at home, and remembered to not skip any steps so that non one would be lost."

Conclusion:
The mean scores from pretest to interim tests did not show a significant difference. However, there were several students whose scores did increase. Due to covid limitations, she was not able to administer the post assessment in order to see if there was any additional growth. Results from the TESS evaluations indicate that the teacher is continuing to learn and grow as a first year teacher and is showing promise for positively impacting her students' growth and development.

Overview of Case Study #3

Completers chosen for the third case study were 1st grade, 5th grade ELA, and HS math teachers. The EPP followed a similar timeline as case study #1 and 2.

Data collected include the following (some limitation due to COVID):

- 1st Grade: All applicable reflections, pre/post assessments, university supervisor feedback
- 5th Grade: All applicable reflection, pre/post assessments, principal feedback, university supervisor feedback
- 5th Grade: All applicable reflections, pre/post assessments, principal feedback, university supervisor feedback
- HS math teacher: All applicable reflections, pre/post assessments, principal feedback, university supervisor feedback

Completer A, 1st Grade Teacher:

Assessment: Renaissance Star Assessment (Star Early Literacy and Star Math)
Observation: Observation by EPP

Classroom Description:
N = 12
Relevant background information: 2 students with IEPs, 1 virtual student last year, 1 ELL

Analysis of Pretest Reading Scores to Post-test Reading Scores and Pretest Math Scores to Post-test Math Scores:
A paired-samples *t* tests was calculated to compare the mean pretest reading score to the mean post reading score and the mean pretest math scores to the mean post math score.

- The mean on the pretest reading was 764.83 (*sd* =37.98), and the mean on the post reading was 831.00 (*sd* =64.71). A significant increase from the pretest reading to post reading was found ($t(11) = -3.832$, $p < .001$).
- The mean on the pretest math was 783.25 (*sd* = 45.24), and the mean on the post math was 827.17 (*sd* = 39.61). A significant increase from the pretest math to post math was found ($t(11) = -4.411$, $p < .001$).

Analysis of TESS Evaluations and EPP Faculty Reflection:

- Overall Score: 3.38 Effective
    - Domain 1: 3.20 Effective
    - Domain 2: 3.60 Effective
    - Domain 3: 3.40 Effective
    - Domain 4: 3.33 Effective

- Feedback: “The teacher had her objective stated clearly, developmentally appropriate, and built upon prior knowledge. She used multiple resources which helped the lesson flow and build off of the I do, We do, You do. Students were required to apply learning to application.”

Conclusion:
The mean scores from pretest to post tests for both the reading and math tests increased with a significant difference found with the reading and math assessment. Results from the TESS evaluations indicate that the teacher is implementing effective practices in her classroom.

Completer B, 5th Grade Teacher 1:

Assessment: iReady Diagnostic
Observation: Observation by EPP, Observation by Principal

Classroom Description:
N = 24
Relevant background information: 3 students with dyslexia, 2 ELL

Analysis of Pretest Scores to Post-test Scores:
A paired-samples *t* tests was calculated to compare the mean pretest score to the mean post score.

- The mean on the pretest was 554.33 (*sd* = 48.227), and the mean on the post was 574.76 (*sd* = 42.347). A significant increase from the pretest to post was found ($t(23) = -3.952$, $p < .001$).

Principal Feedback:
"Ms. X is fabulous. She has a heart for students and very relationship-based. Strong performance during referral conferences. She knows her students! Our counselor and other teachers also speak highly of Ms. X's performance with students. She is a natural."

Analysis of TESS Evaluations and EPP Faculty Reflection:

- Observer 1: Overall Score: 3.71 Highly Effective
    - Domain 1: 3.20 Effective
    - Domain 2: 4.00 Highly Effective
    - Domain 3: 3.80 Highly Effective
    - Domain 4: 3.83 Highly Effective

- Feedback: "I was very impressed by her teaching skills and connection with students. She is making a difference in the lives of students at XX."

Conclusion:
The mean scores from pretest to post tests increased with a significant difference. Results from the TESS evaluations indicate that the teacher is implementing effective practices in her classroom with great use of respect and rapport.

Completer C, 5th Grade Teacher 2:

Assessment: iReady Diagnostic
Observation: Observation by EPP, Observation by Principal

Classroom Description:
N = 23
Relevant background information: 3 students with 504/dyslexia services

Analysis of Pretest Scores to Post-test Scores:

A paired-samples *t* tests was calculated to compare the mean pretest score to the mean post score.

- The mean on the pretest was 564.00 (*sd* = 41.86), and the mean on the post was 586.65 (*sd* = 35.32). A significant increase from the pretest to post was found ($t(22) = -5.687$, $p < .001$).

Principal Feedback:
"Her students know she loves them and they want to perform well for her. She is very engaging and is excellent with "hard" students. Very concerned for the welfare of her students"

Analysis of TESS Evaluations and EPP Faculty Reflection:

- Observer 1: Overall Score: 3.66 Highly Effective
    - Domain 1: 3.40 Effective
    - Domain 2: 3.80 Highly Effective
    - Domain 3: 3.60 Highly Effective
    - Domain 4: 3.83 Highly Effective

- Feedback: "She is making a valuable and intentional contribution each day at XX. So proud of her and her work"

Conclusion:
The mean scores from pretest to post tests increased with a significant difference. Results from the TESS evaluations indicate that the teacher is implementing effective practices in her classroom with great use of engaging students in learning.

Completer D, HS Math:

Assessment: Teacher Work Sample
Observation: Observation by EPP, Observation by Principal

Classroom Description:
N = 15 (only 13 completed tests results reported, moved to new district or absent for one test)
Relevant background information: 2 with IEP/504s

Analysis of Pretest Scores to Post-test Scores:

- The mean on the pretest was 51.69 (*sd* = 16.99), and the mean on the post was 77.66 (*sd* = 19.82). A significant increase from the pretest to post was found ($t(12) = -4.802$, $p < .001$).

Principal Evaluation:

- "I am very pleased with her performance. She has brought energy and success to the department. She is collaborative and well-liked by her team and students. Her co-workers have reported that she seeks out guidance from veteran teachers and is open to their mentoring."

Analysis of TESS Evaluations and EPP Faculty Reflection:

- Observer 1: Overall Score: 3.38 Effective
  - Domain 1: 3.40 Effective
  - Domain 2: 3.60 Highly Effective
  - Domain 3: 3.20 Effective
  - Domain 4: 3.33 Effective

- Feedback: “Good, solid instruction! 45 minute class, students were engaged the entire class time”

Conclusion:

The mean scores from pretest to post tests increased with a significant difference. Results from the TESS evaluations indicate that the teacher is implementing effective practices in her classroom and outside her classroom.