



Measure 1: Completer Effectiveness

Each year, the Department of Education at RMU completes two case studies of recent graduates to ascertain the program's effectiveness in creating prepared and effective teachers. Below is an overview of both case studies as well as the guidelines for the case studies.

Case Study Overview – Teacher #1 Spring, 2022

OVERVIEW

The student graduated from Robert Morris University in fall 2022 with a B.S. in Secondary Education specializing in social studies education. The former RMU student is a teacher at a small private school in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. She teaches. The teacher started at the school in the fall of 2020.

According to an interview with the building principal, the teacher has met all performance standards. They were particularly impressed with her classroom management, attention to her students' needs, and ability to collaborate with her colleagues at the school.

Based on classroom observations by the school, they indicated that the teacher is “knowledgeable, engaging and in command of her classroom (School Observation notes). The school further noted that the teacher “supplemented the lecture with hands-on activities, using technology (QR Code, Google Form)...social media Twitter and hashtags” (School Observation notes).

The school suggested she continues to look for professional development opportunities “to expand her already developed knowledge for technology in the classroom. Overall, she scored “Accomplished very well” in all areas of her school’s observation form which included organization, professionalism, interactions, and content knowledge/relevance.

The student survey results further confirmed the teacher’s impact with scores ranging from “most of the time” to “always” across multiple indicators including: being engaged in the class thinking critically, comfort with teacher, enhancement of learning, and help with assignments among other indicators. Students indicated that their teacher was “engaged in class, found the study guides helpful, the timing of learning was beneficial is very kind and patient” (Student Survey).

Finally, the teacher’s pre and post-assessment indicated growth in learning for the students as it related to a unit on the 1920s. This corresponds to two observations by faculty members at RMU using the ND Common Metrics-Skills of Teaching Tool (STOT) in which she scored proficient and distinguished in all applicable areas.

CONCLUSION

Overall, the teacher has done an outstanding job at the school. This is demonstrated not only by classroom observations, student progress, and input from her colleagues, but by the students themselves.

Case Study Overview – Teacher #2 J.H Spring, 2022

OVERVIEW

The teacher graduated from Robert Morris University in May, 2020 with a B.S. degree in Business Computer and Information Technology. She is employed at a large public suburban school outside of Pittsburgh, PA teaching computer science courses.

Her lesson plans are well organized and professionally executed attending not only to PA standards and course objectives, but attends to the needs and interests of her students. Due to the nature of the course, the class is student centered with a heavy focus on experiential learning. During one observed lesson students were coding using stacks. This was a continuation of a prior lesson. After an overview of the upcoming lesson, she walked around classroom answer questions and giving examples of how to overcome any barriers the students were facing while coding. Her delivery was concise and instructions were clear throughout the lesson. It was obvious the students respected and appreciated her feedback while working on their projects based on the observed interactions she had with her students. Both faculty observers, using the ND Common Metrics-Skills of Teaching Tool (STOT), ranked her teaching as proficient or distinguished in all applicable areas. One faculty member noted that students actually thanked her as they were leaving class.

Her colleagues indicated that she was very professional and collaborates with her team on a regular basis. This included ‘revamping’ an existing course and creating a new course (Colleague Interviews). Her colleague also indicated that they collaborate on student issues and/or communications with parents. It was noted that the teacher consistently reaches out to parents and has great communication skills in working with parents. Finally, her colleagues indicated that they do have a number of students with IEPs and she has successfully differentiated her instruction to meet the needs of all of her students.

The annual review from her administrator indicated the teacher was doing excellent work and identified as being proficient in all areas including student knowledge and engagement of students. The evaluator noted, “The teacher understands how her student learn and attains information about levels of development for individual students.” And, “This lesson offered the opportunity for students to intellectually engage with and reflect upon their learning” (Formal Observation form, 2022). The evaluator did not note that the teacher needs to develop her formative assessment during the lesson. The devised a plan of notetaking in lessons to address this concern.

Concerning impact on learning, the teacher conducted a pre-/post-assessment. Students were given a Free Response Question (FRQ) Practice question from their AP CS A Exam. Students were to complete the question, the teacher would grade it as the pre-assessment. The Lesson consisted of the students grading each other’s questions. Students would be given a grading rubric to grade the question, and the teacher would go over the rubric with them. Then they were given the question again to see how their score improved. Eight out of Nine students’ scores increased, while one student score remained the same. There was not decrease in scores after instruction.

CONCLUSION

After 1 year of teaching, the teacher has shown to be an effective teacher across all domains. She is well prepared for her lessons, effectively teaches the lessons, and creates an exciting and engaging learning environment for her students.

The following guidelines are used to guide the case studies.

1. Each September – Assessment Coordinator calls a meeting with the members of the assessment Case Study Standard 4 committee to select a pool of 4-5 potential case study participants.
 - The certification and accreditation specialist creates a list of all program completers within the last 3 years. Data on the program completer is pulled from the Education database and includes:
 - Completion Date
 - Gender
 - GPA
 - PDE ratings during student teaching
 - Area of certification
 - Current Employment/Employer
 - The Case Study Standard 4 committee then uses the list provided and the following criteria to identify potential participants:
 - Completed within the last 3 years
 - Student is employed as a full-time teacher or permanent substitute teacher
 - Employment is geographically central to RMU (within 50 mile radius)
 - This list of potential participants is further examined for diversity of the case study group considering the following factors:
 - Gender
 - GPA
 - PDE 430 ratings during student teaching
 - Area of certification
 - Awards/honors/recognitions
 - Ethnic and racial
 - School type
 - Location of employment
2. From the potential case study participants, the committee selects the first two to contact.
3. The Dept. Head drafts a letter to the principal or superintendent explaining the rationale for the case study and requesting RMU alumni teacher and district participation.
4. Once approval from the district has been obtained, the Dept. Head or assessment coordinator makes further contact with the alumni/program completer to request inclusion in the case study. If they do not wish to continue as a case study participant, they are thanked for their consideration.
5. Upon approval by the school or district and participant, the assessment coordinator sets a time to meet the case study participant to review the data collection and case study procedures.
6. The following data are collected over a 4-8 week period:
 - *Two lesson plans provided by the case study participant and two observations from faculty qualified in the corresponding certification area (observations are conducted on separate dates) using the NDACTE observation form.
 - *Evidence of a formal observation by a director or principal within last 12 months using the district observation instruments
 - **Student pre/post assessment data (teacher created or commercial {i.e., AimsWeb, DIBELS, CBM}) OR benchmark data over a period of time on a whole class or period {9 weeks}
 - *An interview with the participant conducted by the faculty person overseeing the case study. There were three general questions used to initiate reflection and discussion:
 - i. What was one or two things that you needed to know or have more practice in during your teacher education program?
 - ii. Based on what you learned in the teacher education program, what do you think is your strength in teaching?
 - iii. Is there anything else that you want to add?
 - *Two interviews with school team or grade level colleagues. Interview questions originated from items on the NDACTE observation form that were not scored with the observation alone (i.e.

professionalism, commitment to the profession, collaborates with colleagues from InTasc Standard 9 and 10).

- K-12 student survey results https://www.ets.org/s/pps/pdf/student_survey.pdf
 - Other data that the case study participant would like to share:
 - Family/Parent contact log or notes
 - Discipline referrals
 - MTSS data
 - Reflection logs
 - Lesson plan
 - Grant work
 - Extracurricular activities
 - Other
7. Once the data are collected, the assessment coordinator calls a meeting with the Case Study Standard 4 Committee to review.
8. The assessment coordinator writes a collective summary.
9. The collective summary is used as a data source and included in reports and the EPP's continuous improvement cycle.
10. By May of the academic year, there are 2 case studies completed.