

# Impact on P-12 Learning and Development

## *AY 2023-2024*

The Kansas Department of Education (KSDE) does not share any student or teacher data with EPPs. In order to meet CAEP Standard 4, Kansas State University-College of Education (KSU-COE) is in the process of conducting a longitudinal case study in which we will sample from all of our programs. This report reflects year two of this study, and it serves as an addendum to last year's report <https://coe.ksu.edu/about/accreditation/documents/KSU-Impact-AY-19-20.pdf>. The study's methodology and research timeline may be viewed in the initial report.

The data gathered from this research meets CAEP 4.1, which was the basis for the original case study design and rationale: **“demonstrate the impact of our completers on P-12 student learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools, and to better gauge the satisfaction of our completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation” (CAEP 4.1).**

In addition, data gathered also reflects the updated benchmarks set forth for CAEP Standard 4. Completers: **effectively contribute to P-12 student-learning growth AND B. apply in P-12 classrooms the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions the preparation experiences were designed to achieve. In addition, the provider includes a rationale for the evidence provided. AND [completers] apply in P-12 classrooms the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve. In addition, the provider includes a rationale for the data elements provided.**

**Participants:** All participants selected for this case study are completers in their first, second or third year of teaching, who are also recent graduates from one of KSU-COE's teacher licensure programs. Refer to Table 1 for participant demographics:

Table 1. Participant information

| Academic Year 2020-2021  | Academic Year 2021-2022   | Academic Year 2022-2023  | Academic Year 2023-2024  |
|--|---|--|--|
| <b>Follow-up with Cohort 1;<br/>Cohort 2 begins:</b><br><br><b>Cohort 1 (N=23; n=20)</b><br>8 UG Elem (Traditional)*<br>3 MAT Elem<br>1 English<br>4 Social Studies<br>1 Math<br>2 Ag<br>1 Modern Language (Spanish)<br>1 Speech/Theatre<br><br><b>Cohort 2 (N=25; n=23)*</b><br>2 UG Elem (Traditional)<br>3 UG Elem (Distance)<br>6 MAT Elem<br>1 MAT English<br>2 Social Studies<br>2 Math<br>1 Ag<br>1 Music<br>1 Biology<br>1 Chemistry<br>1 FCS<br>1 Early Childhood<br>1 Journalism | <b>Follow-up with Cohorts 1 &amp; 2;<br/>Cohort 3 begins</b><br><br><b>Cohort 1 (N=20; n=4)</b><br>1 UG Elem (Traditional)*<br>1 MAT Elem<br>1 Math<br>1 Modern Language (Spanish)<br><br><b>Cohort 2 (N=23; n=13)</b><br>2 Music<br>2 UG Elem (Distance)<br>4 MAT Elem<br>2 UG Elem (Traditional)<br>1 Math<br>1 Chemistry<br>1 FCS<br><br><b>Cohort 3 (N=25)</b><br>4 UG Elem (Traditional)<br>3 UG Elem (Distance)<br>5 MAT Elem<br>2 English<br>1 Ag<br>1 Music<br>2 Modern Language (French and German)<br>1 Art (TELNR)<br>1 Earth Science<br>1 Physics<br>1 Physical Education<br>1 Business (TELNR) | <b>Follow-up with Cohorts 2 &amp; 3;<br/>Cohort 4 begins:</b><br><br><b>Cohort 2 (N=13; n=1)</b><br>1 UG Elem (Traditional)<br><br><b>Cohort 3 (N=25; n=7)</b><br>1 UG Elem (Traditional)<br>2 MAT Elem<br>1 MAT Foreign Language<br>1 Earth Science<br>1 English<br>1 Music<br><br><b>Cohort 4 (N=25; n=20)</b><br>6 UG Elem (Traditional)<br>3 UG Elem (Distance)<br>1 English<br>1 Ag<br>1 Modern Language (French)<br>2 Social Studies<br>2 Physical Education<br>4 Math | <b>Follow-up with Cohorts 3 &amp; 4;<br/>Cohort 3 (N=25; n=7)</b><br>1 UG Elem (Traditional)<br>2 MAT Elem<br>1 MAT Foreign Language<br>1 Earth Science<br>1 English<br>1 Music<br><br><b>Cohort 5 begins:</b><br><br><b>Cohort 5 (N=6; n=6)</b><br>4 UG Elem (Traditional)<br>1 MAT Elem (Online)<br>1 Modern Language (French) |

*\*data changed from previous report to reflect actual participants*

**Research Questions:** In year 5, researchers asked participants questions based on whether this was their first year of participating in the study (Cohort 5) or if they were returning (Cohorts 3 and 4).

Cohort 3 participants are in their last year of the study. We asked participants more in-depth questions pertaining to their impact on diverse learners. These were the questions that we posted to Cohort 3 participants, who responded in written reflections:

- Regarding the development of your students, how do you ensure student growth happens while still honoring the fact that student needs vary greatly across cultural, cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical domains?
- Regarding your students' learning, how have you been able to use your own understanding of your students' individual differences and/or your understanding of their diverse cultures and communities to create an inclusive learning environment where every student is able to meet high standards?
- Regarding the learning environment of your classroom, in which ways have you been able to create an environment that supports individual and collaborative learning, and that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation with the diverse body of students you teach?
- Regarding your planning for instruction, how have you been able to use your own knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context to plan instruction that supports your diverse group of students in meeting the rigorous learning goals you set for them?
- Regarding your instructional strategies, how have you been able to use your own understanding of various instructional strategies, as well as your understanding of the diverse cultures and abilities represented in your classroom, to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways?
- Regarding your professional learning and ethical practice, how have you been able to engage in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate your practice, particularly the effects of your choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapt your practice(s) to meet the needs of each of the diverse learners in your classroom?

These were the questions posted to returning participants in Cohort 4:

- Thinking back to your first year of teaching, now that you are almost through your second year, has your definition of student academic success changed or shifted?
- Reflecting back to your first year of teaching, what challenges have persisted, or are there new ones to report?
- What would be an/some example(s) from this year you can share with us that you feel demonstrate your impact on student learning growth?
- As a second-year teacher, reflecting back now on your experience within the College of Education, what would you want those people who make curricular decisions within the College of Education to know?

In separate focus groups, Cohort 5 participants were asked to identify and reflect upon the following questions:

- How do you identify student academic success?
- What challenges do you face in helping students achieve academic success?
- What measures do you take to address said challenges?
- Describe three documents/artifacts that would demonstrate your impact on student-learning growth.

**Survey:** This year, we added an additional survey which we sent to all participants for Cohorts 3, 4, and 5 (N= 56; n=35). This included participant members who may have participated in their first cohort focus group, even if they were unable to participate in the focus group this year. Of the 56 participants who engaged at some point in our longitudinal study, we had 35 respondents.

The purpose of the survey was to gather more specific information pertaining to 1) the types of assessment(s) participants used to measure student learning; 2) the types of assessment(s) they found most valuable in informing their practice; and 3) how they compare their teaching practice to that of a “master teacher.” In the survey, a “master teacher” was defined as a teacher who:

consistently and effectively performs in the following three ways: (1) they use a variety of strategies including available technology to engage and challenge students in a variety of learning situations, (2) they incorporate strategies to differentiate and scaffold information, so it is accessible to all students, and (3) they engage students in higher order thinking skills.

### Findings:

Respondents indicated the various forms of assessment that they use to measure student learning. Among our participants, in-class discussions, quizzes, and exit tickets were noted the most frequently. (The table below offers of summary of assessment usage.

Table 2. Summary of assessment usage

| Method used by participants               | Count      | Percent (%) |
|---|------------|-------------|
| Bell ringers                              | 17         | 5.3         |
| Course notes                              | 19         | 5.92        |
| District/State Level standardized tests   | 20         | 6.23        |
| Exit tickets                              | 28         | 8.72        |
| Final Essays                              | 12         | 3.74        |
| Final Performances                        | 3          | 0.93        |
| Final Presentations                       | 13         | 4.05        |
| Final Projects                            | 19         | 5.92        |
| Final Reports                             | 5          | 1.56        |
| In-class discussions                      | 33         | 10.28       |
| Instructor-created final exams            | 21         | 6.54        |
| Interactive notebooks                     | 12         | 3.74        |
| Other                                     | 5          | 1.56        |
| Practice problems                         | 27         | 8.41        |
| Quizzes                                   | 29         | 9.03        |
| Short responses to questions over reading | 23         | 7.17        |
| Student reflections                       | 26         | 8.1         |
| Surveys                                   | 9          | 2.8         |
| <b>Total</b>                              | <b>321</b> | <b>100</b>  |

When asked which methods they deemed most important, respondents noted varying methods; however, in-class discussions were noted most frequently in their responses. One respondent indicated that in-class discussions allow them to “ask specific questions over content to see who is understanding and who is not.”

In addition, participants were asked to rate themselves on a Likert scale, indicating how would you rate themselves compared to a Master Teacher, based on the operationalized definition above. Their response options ranged were: (1) I’m not there yet, and I need to focus on other areas of my teaching practice before I

can consider these three; (2) I'm not there yet, but I am actively focusing on these areas; (3) I've focused on these three areas, and I have seen growth in my teaching practice as a result; and (4) I consider myself approaching or at the level of a Master Teacher. While no respondents, rated themselves as a 1, 92% of respondents did rate themselves at a 2 or 3, indicating that they were working towards improving their teaching practice, although they acknowledge that they are not at the level of a Master Teacher yet. See Table 3.

Table 3. Summary of participant ratings

| Self-rating | 1  | 2   | 3   | 4  | Total |
|-------------|----|-----|-----|----|-------|
| Count       | 0  | 15  | 17  | 3  | 35    |
| Percent     | 0% | 43% | 49% | 9% | 100%  |

### Findings for Focus Groups and Participant Written Reflections

While their experiences as early-career completers are varied, three significant themes emerged that embody how participants framed their impact on student academic success and growth. Participants shared the various ways in which they assess their students' academically, and how they use that information to make informed decisions about practice.

**Rationale for data provided:** The data presented in this addendum offers a rich, albeit broad, overview of our participants adapted their perspectives and instructional practice to meet their students' needs and attend to their academic success, accordingly.

### *Student Engagement: Informal Observation*

Throughout the focus groups, as well as written responses, participants shared that observation of student engagement was important in assessing student comprehension, as well as adapt their own teaching practices to better differentiate for students as a result.

Below are three examples of how our completers engaged in informal observation to better assess their students' engagement.

*The best way for me to figure out if I'm running a successful classroom is based off my students' eagerness to learn. And I feel like that can be really hard to do especially if you are teaching math,[or] teaching a subject that... can be hard to get students to really engage with. But when I hear things like, I understand or I'm actually having fun in math... that is my cue to know that I am doing something right.*

— Recent Completer, Elementary Education Cohort 5

*For me, it's looking at how willing they are to actually communicate, like if they're feeling more confident, if they're feeling like they actually understand the content... that is showing me that they're actually going to be successful.*

-- Recent Completer, Secondary Education, Cohort 5

*[Students] believe that these struggles that they are having academically are things that they're always going to experience. They believe that they can't learn in those areas. And it shows when I'm teaching, and their heads are down.*

— Recent Completer, Elementary Education Cohort 5

Participants were open about their informal observations of their students, and how their ability to infer from their students' body language, and willingness to discuss the content. At times this helped them in being able to pivot and change their instruction in real time to better support their students. For some participants, while they were able to identify the lack of engagement, they did not always know how to address or pivot their instruction to better support their candidates.

**Progress monitoring.** Participants discussed the importance of progress monitoring—starting with a pre-assessment/inventory of skills followed by continuous formal and informal assessment of student progress. This also allows them to differentiate their instruction to ensure they are helping students grow in identified areas.

*I take care and time at the beginning of the year to identify where each student is in their abilities, talents, and content knowledge. That is how I assess them in each category for the rest of the year.*

— Recent Completer, Secondary Education Cohort 3

*In my first-grade classroom, ensuring student growth occurs with frequent progress monitoring. At the beginning of the school year each student is formally tested in a variety of grade level reading and math standards. By rigorously analyzing the data, students are put into three categories: high risk, low risk, meeting standards. Every student is then progress monitored, however, the frequency of progress monitoring depends on the academic risk.*

— Recent Completer, Elementary Education Cohort 3

*I ensure student growth is happening while addressing a varying array of students' needs by doing frequent daily check-ins during each subject/lesson. This may look different depending on the day and subject, but I do this in multiple different ways. One way I ensure student growth can be as simple as a conversation or a verbal answer to a question. It can also be as complex as a test or assessment of some kind.*

— Recent Completer, Elementary Education Cohort 3

Much like previous cohorts, our participants frequently situated their own impact on student academic success within the frame of student growth—the degree to which a student improved academically, not compared to their peers, but rather in connection to their initial performance. This means that participants focused heavily on how they monitored their students' progress throughout the year. They use a multitude of assessment forms to do this, from informal observations to more formal data collection, including proprietary instruments and standardized exams. Ultimately, participants approached assessment in much the same way in which they described their instructional practices—as something that needs to be differentiated to best meet the academic needs of their students.