

Completer Impact and Effectiveness Data

Though Connecticut requires standardized testing of students at various points during their school years, CSDE does not share testing data with Schools of Education. Therefore, to demonstrate our completers' effectiveness and impact on student learning, the EPP analyzed a number of alternative data sources. We include data on completers' Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) to demonstrate students' academic growth as well as completers' EdTPA, self-reported state teacher evaluations, student surveys, focus groups, and interviews. Our findings, taken from multiple measures, suggest that our completers are effective and successfully impacting their students' learning and development.

Student Teaching Evaluations: MAT Form D

All MAT candidates Student Teach for a minimum of 50 days (10 weeks) and are supported and assessed through conferences and a variety of observation instruments including Student Teaching Form D (Table 1.1; 1.2). The Form D is completed by candidates' Supervisors (Table 1.1) and Cooperating Teachers (Table 1.2) during Student Teaching in the final semester and assesses candidates on each of the 10 InTasc Standards. It was implemented in its present form with our 2019 cohort. In 2020, we conducted the following correlational analyses which were submitted with our Self-Study Report (SSR):

- Student Teaching Form D: Cooperating Teacher scores and University Supervisor scores
- Student Teaching Form D scores and Educator Disposition Assessment (EDA)
- EDA and edTPA task scores by degree level (4+1 and Graduate MAT) and cohort

When we examined relationships between Supervisor and Cooperating Teacher Form D scores, we found a strong, significant correlation between scores assigned by Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers ($r = 0.839$, $p < 0.001$) that persisted when candidates were disaggregated by 4+1 ($r = 0.766$, $p < 0.001$) and GradMAT (0.944 , $p < 0.001$) tracks as well as by cohort year (data available upon request). Although at that time the Form D instrument had only been implemented for two cohorts, the findings suggest Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers assess candidates similarly.

When we examined the relationship between Internship EDA scores and Form D scores, we found moderate, significant correlations between EDA scores and Cooperating Teacher Form D scores ($r = 0.382$, $p < 0.05$) as well as between EDA scores and Supervisor Form D scores (0.382 , $p < 0.05$) among GradMAT candidates.

An examination of the relationship between Form D scores and EDA *criterion* scores revealed significant correlations among 4+1 MAT candidates' Cooperating Teacher Form D scores and EDA *criterion* averages associated with oral communication ($r = 0.235$, $p < 0.05$) and professionalism ($r = 0.254$, $p < 0.05$). Among the GradMAT candidates, significant correlations between Cooperating Teacher Form D scores and EDA criterion scores emerged, including preparedness ($r = 0.448$, $p = 0.01$), appreciation and value of cultural and academic diversity ($r = 0.612$, $p < 0.01$), self-regulation ($r = 0.470$, $p < 0.01$), and social emotional learning ($r = 0.384$, $p < 0.05$). Similar correlations among GradMAT candidates were observed between EDA criterion scores and Supervisor Form D scores (data available upon request).

Finally, we examined the relationship between these EDA scores and edTPA outcomes among the 2019 cohort, for which there was the most complete edTPA data available at that time. We found EDA scores were significantly correlated with edTPA Planning Task ($r = 0.424$, $p = 0.005$), Assessment Task ($r = 0.399$, $p < 0.01$), and Average Rubric ($r = 0.395$, $p = 0.01$) scores for 4+1 MAT candidates.

Taken together, we believe that the Student Teaching Form D scores, (Table 1.1, 1.2; Measure 3) as well as data collected from EDA instrument (Measure 3) serves as a direct measure our candidates' impact and effectiveness on student learning during Student Teaching, as well as a strong predictor of completers' impact and effectiveness on student learning as classroom teachers of record.

Completers' SLO Data

“At the heart of an SLO is a specific learning goal and a specific measure of student learning used to track progress toward that goal.”¹ Surveys pertaining to SLOs and percentage of students meeting target, were designed by the EPP, vetted by the Advisory Board. Since Spring of 2018, these surveys have been sent to completers hired in CT, MA, NY, and NJ. In Spring 2018 and 2019, surveys were sent to completers from the 2017 and 2018 cohorts. In Spring 2020 and 2021, we reached out to 2014-2019 completer cohorts. Many agreed to submit their 2019-2021 SLO results, but due to challenges around COVID-19 closures, the data was incomplete. In Spring 2022, we initiated a new process whereby we will systematically reach out to the cohorts who graduated in the prior 2-4 years to ask for completer effectiveness data. The first round of that data has been successfully collected and combined with the previously collected data (Table 1.3-1.5). In this way, data can be accumulated over time for future examination of trends.

We will continue to collect and examine completers SLOs going forward and are hopeful that our new approach will provide a yield results which are more representative of proportions of completers from all program areas and tracks within the MAT.

Completers' student growth

Though results of various assessments were collected from 7 completers teaching at one of our urban PDS K-8 were presented in 2019, we have since been unable to collect similar data from our completers. We will continue to use best efforts and new strategies to work with our completers to collect Student Growth Data going forward.

Completers' mandated state teacher evaluations

Since Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) does not provide teacher evaluations or ratings, a sample of our 2017 cohort (from 4 states where completers are most often hired) self-reported ratings earned on state-mandated teacher evaluation during their first year of teaching are shared below. Given different focal criteria and levels to evaluate teachers (Table 1.6; 1.7) comparing ratings across states is not straightforward. In February 2020 we asked completers from 2014-2019 to share their evaluations however COVID-19 closures delayed responses. In 2022, we were able to begin collecting state teacher evaluations from our 2017-2019 cohorts through which 100% of respondents were rated in the top half of their state's scoring rubric. We will continue to accumulate this data over time and will reach out to the 2018-2020 cohorts in Spring 2023.

Completers' student surveys

Though results of Completers' Student Surveys were successfully collected from completers in 2019, we have since been unable to collect similar survey from our completers. We will continue to use best efforts and new strategies to work with our completers and Advisory Board to collect Student Survey Data going forward. The information below is shared to illustrate the type of data available when Student Surveys can be successfully collected.

The SOE and Advisory Board developed surveys (based on InTASC standards) for K-12 students. Students were asked to rate their teacher (an SOE completer) on 10 items, with space for comments (Table 1.8). Student respondents were assured their individual responses would be kept confidential. Elementary and Secondary students rated all completers highly (Table 1.9 & 1.10).

¹ <https://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/communities/slo-targeting-growth.pdf>

Completer Focus Groups

In June 2022, a completer focus group was convened to gather data on how completers perceived their impact on student learning. The Associate Dean facilitated the discussions. Responses from the focus group were transcribed and coded based on InTASC Standards. A summary statement is included (page 9) as well as a table that articulates themes that emerged from completers in their responses. Based on findings from the focus groups, completers appear well prepared to differentiate instruction to support diverse K-12 learners across content areas and grade levels and, among Secondary completers, to use technology. While additional focus on SEL and ELL support was a recurring theme for future focus within our program, the responses from the 2022 focus group suggest the EPP has successfully increased candidates' and completers' preparedness in these areas.

Completer interviews

Prior to 2020, to examine how completers apply professional knowledge and skills in their teaching practices, a faculty member conducted one-on-one interviews with completers from 5 cohorts (Table 4.2.d.1). Interviews were structured to explore completers' skills and knowledge as well as satisfaction with their preparation and support. Questions were tagged to InTASC standards. Completers detailed the ways in which they make learning experiences and content accessible and meaningful for students, how they use authentic and/or strategic assessment to support student learning and guide instructional practices, and the role of the EPP in developing these skills. Differentiation was widely cited as an important part of their experience in our program. Since overall findings were consistent with findings from focus groups and surveys, completer interviews were paused due to the time and resource intensive nature of collecting this data in order to focus our efforts on collecting data associated with SLO, Surveys, Focus Groups, and Teacher Evaluations. However, we will re-visit Completer Interviews if SLO and Survey data collection become insufficient assessments and/or measures.

Trends and External Benchmarks

In the absence of publicly available state data, and the differences in metrics used to assess student learning by regional Schools of Education (SOEs), we are unable to make direct comparisons in student learning between our SOE and other regional SOEs. We instead present students' individual goals and district goals as external benchmarks for Literacy and Math (Table 1.3-1.5).

We are pleased to report respondents constituted an approximately representative sample of EPP completers (1.3) and that on average, with the exception of Secondary candidates in 2018, the majority of SLOs were met or exceeded (1.5). Additionally, in the majority of instances, more than half of students in classrooms are meeting or exceeding these goals, particularly noteworthy given the large proportion of students classified as ELLs in these classrooms.

The findings also suggest that our completers are successfully impacting their students' learning and development across grade levels and content areas.

We also find from a sample of our 2017 cohort (from 4 states where completers are most often hired), self-reported ratings earned on state-mandated teacher evaluation during their first year of teaching (Table 4.2.e.1) and that 100% of respondents were rated in the top half of their state's scoring rubric. Through the student surveys, we also observed that K-12 learners rated their teachers (completers) highly, with some variation according to grade level and content area (Tables 1.8-1.10).

Based on the focus group data, completers appear well prepared to differentiate instruction to support diverse K-12 learners across content areas and grade levels and, among Secondary completers, to use technology. These findings were triangulated and affirmed through completer interviews where the theme associated with differentiation emerged frequently and was widely cited as an important part of their experience at the SOE.

Quinnipiac University SOE Measure 1. Completer Impact and Effectiveness

These findings suggest to us that our completers are effective teachers and are well prepared to differentiate instruction to positively impact learning among diverse K-12 learners across content areas and grade levels as assessed through multiple measures.

Measure 1: Data Table Guide

Student Teaching Form D

- 1.1 MAT Candidates Assessed by Supervisor.....p. 5
- 1.2 MAT Candidates Assessed by Cooperating Teacher.....p. 6

Completer Reported SLOs

- 1.3 SLO Goals by Completer Program Area.....p. 7
- 1.4 SLO Goals Reported by 2017-2019 Completer.....p. 7
- 1.5 Percent of SLO Goals Met.....p. 7

State Teacher Evaluations

- 1.6 Performance Levels Used in Four Statesp. 8
- 1.7 Self-Reported Performance Level Ratingp. 8

Completer Focus Groups

- Completer Focus Groups Summary Statement.....p. 9
- 1.8 Completer Focus Groups Themes Table.....p. 10

Completer Student Surveys

- 1.9 Background Information on Completersp. 11
- 1.10 Statistics of Secondary Respondentsp. 11
- 1.11 Statistics of Elementary Respondentsp. 12

Completer Interviews

- Completer Interviews Summary Statement.....p. 13
- 1.12 Interviewees by Cohort Year and Program Area.....p. 13
- 1.13 Interview Questionsp. 13

Impact on Student Learning and Development (2019 Data)

- 1.14 SLO Assessments Provided by Completers.....p. 15
- 1.15 Completer and Student Demographicsp. 15
- 1.16 Individual Goals and District Benchmarks at Posttestp. 16
- 1.17 Kindergarten PSF Assessmentp. 17
- 1.18 Kindergarten BAS Assessmentp. 17
- 1.19 Kindergarten Letter Soundsp. 18
- 1.20 Kindergarten CCSS Mathp. 18
- 1.21 Second Grade BAS Assessmentp. 19
- 1.22 Second Grade DSA Assessmentp. 19
- 1.23 Second Grade CCSS Math.....p. 19
- 1.24 Second Grade Math Fact Fluency.....p. 19
- 1.25 Fourth Grade SRI.....p. 20
- 1.26 Fourth Grade BASp. 20
- 1.27 Seventh & Eighth Grade Math Fluency.....p. 21
- 1.28 Seventh & Eighth Grade RI Assessment.....p. 21

Impacts on Student Learning Growth

Student Teaching Form D

Table 1.1. Student Teaching Form D Assessment of Completers by their Student Teaching Supervisors.

		Total	High	Low			
		N	Possible	Score	Score	Mean	Stdev
Elementary	TaskStream Title						
Graduate MAT							
2017	ED 601 Form D Elementary Student Teaching Evaluation: Supervisor	12	3.00	3.00	1.77	2.85	0.37
2018	Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	9	4.00	4.00	2.71	3.74	0.43
2019	Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	9	4.00	4.00	3.73	3.92	0.11
2022	Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	8	4.00	4.00	2.82	3.42	0.44
4+1 MAT							
2017	ED 601 Form D Elementary Student Teaching Evaluation: Supervisor	26	3.00	3.00	2.68	2.96	0.09
2018	Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	31	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.87	0.21
2019	Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	30	4.00	4.00	3.12	3.86	0.23
2022	Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	21	4.00	4.00	2.97	3.58	0.40
Secondary Science							
2017	ED 601 Form D Student Teaching Evaluation: Supervisor Secondary Science	6	3.00	3.00	2.87	2.95	0.06
2018	Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	2	4.00	3.70	3.43	3.57	0.19
2019	Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	1	4.00	2.78	2.78	2.78	-
2022	Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	7	4.00	3.82	3.09	3.35	0.24
Secondary English							
2017	ED 601 Form D Student Teaching Evaluation: Supervisor Secondary English	9	3.00	3.00	2.74	2.94	0.08
2018	Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	2	4.00	4.00	3.98	3.99	0.01
2019	Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	9	4.00	4.00	3.22	3.82	0.26
2022	Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	6	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.33	0.44
Secondary Social Studies							
2017	ED 601 Form D Student Teaching Supervisor Evaluation Supervisor Second	7	3.00	3.00	2.81	2.91	0.09
2018	Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	2	4.00	4.00	3.88	3.94	0.08
2019	Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	10	4.00	4.00	2.60	3.58	0.37
2022	Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	8	4.00	3.70	2.61	3.19	0.42
Secondary Math							
2017	ED 601 Form D Student Teaching Evaluation Supervisor Secondary Mather	8	3.00	3.00	2.74	3.90	0.12
2018	Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	6	4.00	3.90	3.32	3.64	0.22
2019	Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	10	4.00	4.00	2.76	3.66	0.43
2022	Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	3	4.00	3.15	2.91	3.06	0.13
Secondary Spanish							
2017	ED 601 Form D Student Teaching Evaluation: Supervisor Secondary Spanis	2	3.00	3.00	2.61	2.81	0.19
2018	Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	2	4.00	3.73	3.63	3.68	0.07
2019	Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	3	4.00	3.73	3.39	3.55	0.17
2022	Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	-	-	-	-	-	-
EPP Wide							
Graduate MAT							
2017	ED 601 Form D Elementary Student Teaching Evaluation Supervisor	21	3.00	3.00	1.77	2.88	0.26
2018	Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	14	4.00	4.00	2.71	3.76	0.47
2019	Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	20	4.00	4.00	3.39	3.82	0.19
2022	Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	18	4.00	4.00	2.82	3.35	0.39
4+1 MAT							
2017	ED 601 Form D Elementary Student Teaching Evaluation Supervisor	52	3.00	3.00	2.61	2.94	0.18
2018	Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	40	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.83	0.24
2019	Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	52	4.00	4.00	2.60	3.75	0.36
2022	Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	35	4.00	4.00	2.61	3.44	0.42

Due to ongoing challenges associated with COVID-19, Form D data is not available for 2020 and 2021.

Quinnipiac University SOE Measure 1. Completer Impact and Effectiveness

Table 1.2. Student Teaching Form D Assessment of Completers by their Cooperating Teachers.

TaskStream Rubric Title	N	Total Possible	High Score	Low Score	Mean	Stdev
Elementary						
Graduate MAT						
2017 ED 601 Form D Elementary Student Teaching Evaluation Cooperating Teacher	12	3.00	3.00	1.84	2.83	0.34
2018 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	9	4.00	4.00	2.61	3.70	0.47
2019 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	9	4.00	4.00	3.73	3.92	0.10
2022 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	8	4.00	4.00	2.85	3.47	0.42
4+1 MAT						
2017 ED 601 Form D Elementary Student Teaching Evaluation Cooperating Teacher	26	3.00	3.00	2.65	2.94	0.11
2018 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	31	4.00	4.00	3.32	3.87	0.17
2019 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	29	4.00	4.00	3.41	3.90	0.16
2022 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	17	4.00	4.00	3.21	3.68	0.27
Secondary Science						
2017 ED 601 Form D Student Teaching Evaluation Cooperating Teacher Secondary S	6	3.00	3.00	2.81	2.95	0.07
2018 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	2	4.00	3.68	3.59	3.64	0.06
2019 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	1	4.00	2.54	2.54	2.54	-
2022 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	5	4.00	3.70	3.00	3.26	0.27
Secondary English						
2017 ED 601 Form D Student Teaching Evaluation Cooperating Teacher Secondary E	9	3.00	3.00	2.06	2.84	0.30
2018 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	2	4.00	3.93	3.90	3.92	0.02
2019 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	9	4.00	4.00	2.54	3.73	0.48
2022 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	6	4.00	3.39	3.00	3.12	0.14
Secondary Social Studies						
2017 ED 601 Form D Student Teaching Evaluation Cooperating Teacher Secondary H	7	3.00	3.00	2.72	2.91	0.12
2018 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	2	4.00	4.00	3.68	3.84	0.22
2019 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	9	4.00	4.00	2.30	3.59	0.55
2022 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching		4.00	3.70	2.61	3.19	0.42
Secondary Math						
2017 ED 601 Form D Student Teaching Evaluation Cooperating Teacher Secondary M	8	3.00	3.00	2.77	2.89	0.39
2018 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	6	4.00	4.00	3.24	3.78	0.29
2019 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	10	4.00	4.00	2.85	3.76	0.10
2022 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	5	4.00	3.70	3.15	3.30	0.22
Secondary Spanish						
2017 ED 601 Form D Student Teaching Evaluation Cooperating Teacher Secondary S	4	3.00	2.94	2.71	2.82	0.11
2018 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	2	4.00	3.83	3.66	3.75	0.12
2019 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	3	4.00	3.83	3.10	3.50	0.37
2022 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	1	4.00	3.91	n/a	n/a	n/a
EPP Wide						
Graduate MAT						
2017 ED 601 Form D Elementary Student Teaching Evaluation Cooperating Teacher	20	3.00	3.00	1.84	2.86	0.31
2018 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	14	4.00	4.00	2.61	3.74	0.47
2019 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	19	4.00	4.00	3.10	3.83	0.22
2022 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	19	4.00	4.00	2.85	3.44	0.38
4+1 MAT						
2017 ED 601 Form D Elementary Student Teaching Evaluation Cooperating Teacher	52	3.00	3.00	2.06	2.91	0.28
2018 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	40	4.00	4.00	3.24	3.85	0.19
2019 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	51	4.00	4.00	2.30	3.77	0.39
2022 Form D Rubric - Student Teaching	27	4.00	4.00	2.88	3.47	0.34

Due to ongoing challenges associated with COVID-19, Form D data is not available for 2020 and 2021.

Completer Reported SLOs

1.3. Self-Reported Student Learning Outcomes by Completer Program Area as of Fall 2022.

	2017 (n = 17)	2018 (n = 11)	2019 (n=1)
Elementary program	64.7%	81.8%	100%
Secondary program			
English	11.8%	0%	
Math	11.8%	18.2%	
History	5.9%	0%	
Biology	5.9%	0%	

SLO Goals as Reported by Completers

Table 1.4. Percent of SLO Goals Reported by 2017-2019 Completers as of Fall 2022.

	2017 N	2018 N	2019 N
Elementary			
ELA	6	7	1
Math	8	3	
All Elementary SLOs	14	10	1
Secondary			
English	2	0	
Math	2	2	
History	1	0	
Biology	1	0	
All Secondary SLOs	6	2	

Table 1.5. Percent of SLO Goals Met as Reported by 2017 - 2019 Completers as of Fall 2022.

	2017		2018		2019	
	Did Not Meet	Met or Exceeded	Did Not Meet	Met or Exceeded	Did Not Meet	Met or Exceeded
Elementary						
ELA	16.67%	83.33%	28.6%	71.4%	0%	100%
Math	37.5%	62.5%	33.3%	66.6%		
All Elementary SLOs	28.57%	71.43%	30.0%	70.0%	0%	100%
Secondary						
English	50%	50%				
Math	50%	50%	50%	50%		
History	0%	100%				
Biology	0%	100%				
All Secondary SLOs	33.33%	66.67%	50%	50%		

Self-Reported State Teacher Evaluation

Table 1.6. Self-Reported State Teacher Evaluation: Performance Level Labels Used in Four States

State	Performance Levels				
	1	2	3	4	5
Connecticut	Below standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary	NA
New York	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly effective	NA
New Jersey	Ineffective	Partially effective	Effective	Highly effective	NA
Massachusetts	No progress	Some progress	Significant progress	Met goal	Exceeded goal

Table 1.7. Self-Reported State Teacher Evaluation: Self-Reported Performance Level Rating (Respondents from 2017-2019 Cohorts as of 2022)

		Performance Level Rating				
		1	2	3	4	5
Connecticut (SEED) (n = 14)	Completers	0%	0%	88.2%	11.8%	NA
	State ^b	-	-	-	-	NA
New Jersey (ACHIEVE) (n = 2)	Completers	0%	0%	100%	0%	NA
	State ^d	0.1%	1.0%	60.9%	38.0%	NA
New York (Teacher Evaluation and Development System) (n = 1)	Completers	0%	0%	100%	0%	NA
	State ^b	-	-	-	-	NA
Massachusetts (MMSEE) (n = 3)	Completers	0%	0%	33.33%	66.67%	
	State ^c	-	-	-	-	
Percent at Performance Level				80%	20%	

- a. Comparison data not available for CT or NY
- b. MA provides average scores on their summative (1-4) but not on the formative (1=5) rating scale.
- c. Statewide all 2016-2017 NJ teachers.
<https://www.nj.gov/education/AchieveNJ/resources/201516EducatorEvaluationImplementationReport.pdf>

Focus Group: Completer Effectiveness and Impact

In Summer 2018, a sample of 2017 completers (N=7) from elementary, secondary, urban, and suburban schools volunteered to participate in a focus group. In Summer 2019, a second focus group was convened (N=9) from various cohorts who teach at the same urban K-8 school (91% URM; 54.7% ELL).

Participants in the first group included 2 completers in ELA, 3 in Elementary, and 2 in Secondary Science. When asked how they ensure inclusive learning environments that enable learners to meet high standards, completers discussed various approaches to differentiation including small groups, strategic pairing, the importance of supporting “leveled” groups according to students’ needs, and specific supports for ELLs and students with special needs. Participants also shared their experiences and perspectives on the importance of approaching differentiation from a socio-emotional lens to support students’ emotional and academic development.

Unprompted, 71.4% of participants described incorporating technology into their teaching (e.g., Google Classroom, Listenwise, Plickers, simulations). Participants who did not spontaneously discuss technology were Elementary teachers whose reflections focused on their use of Total Physical Response (TPR) in the classroom to engage learners and deepen students’ understanding of content.

In Summer 2022, we convened a volunteer focus group of 2018 and 2020 completers (n=7), all from our Elementary program area. The participants were asked the same questions as the 2018 focus group. When asked how they ensure inclusive learning environments that enable learners to meet high standards, completers again discussed various approaches to differentiation including small groups, strategic pairing, partner and half-partner work, the importance of supporting “leveled” groups according to students’ needs, as identified from assessment data, and specific supports for ELLs and students with special needs. Participants also shared a variety of strategies for supporting students’ social-emotional learning, which was increasingly important in the 2021-2022 academic year. Additionally, a significant theme that emerged this year was providing students choices in how they approach their learning and increasing students’ self-efficacy, but creating a wide variety of opportunities for students to engage in self-assessment strategies across content areas. Completers noted that this approach not only helped students identify areas of success and areas where growth was needed, but also increased student buy-in, by meaningfully engaging students in their own learning and growth. Technology was a common through-thread for supporting students and is being leveraged across content areas through scaffolded activities, dual language programs, and increased options for choice in accessing content and modality. Completers also highlighted their role in helping students become critical consumers of online information and responsible users of technology.

While participants in the 2018 focus groups identified differentiation as an area where they could have benefited from additional support during their time in the EPP and highlighted the need for SEL strategies to support students, this was not found to be true in the 2022 focus group. Participants in the 2022 focus group were able to articulate a wide variety of ways they have successfully incorporated differentiation and SEL supports into their teaching practices. Indeed, these two themes were highlighted throughout the discussions. While only a small sample, we are pleased to know we are supporting our candidates in developing skills based on implementing feedback from prior years’ focus groups.

Quinnipiac University SOE Measure 1. Completer Impact and Effectiveness

Table 1.8 Themes identified from 2022 Focus Group Responses.

Section 1: Learner & Learning	Respondent 1	Respondent 2	Respondent 3	Respondent 4
<i>Can you give an example of a lesson you designed and implemented that was both a developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experience for your learners?</i>	rigor in content, student choice in what to focus on within a topic and how to access the material - increased student ownership	approach rigor by building up background knowledge, working on texts above grade level by building up background knowledge, working across content areas	trauma informed teaching practices, SEL is build into the curriculum, guided inquiry discussions, connecting SEL in school to real world events to help the kids process traumatic news events in developmentally appropriate ways using SEL curriculum	additional supports in writing were needed post-pandemic, building in student choice, access to resources that were developmentally appropriate so students could build background skills, technology scaffolds to support all learners (including especially ELLs)
<i>Tell us how you ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.</i>	student choice, self assessment, make better choices for themselves, reviewing preassessment data, varying levels of challenge in student tasks (on same sheet so kids choose and teachers guide),	offer audio (different ways to access material) providing choice gives students opportunities to learn who they are as learners and eventually begin using the supports that are best suited to them. 'half partners' where they work independently next to someone (to bounce ideas)	many gaps in student learning from covid, wide ranges of reading levels, flexible groupings for readings, student tracking their own progress was motivating	80% ELL in classroom, small groups, lots of catch up from covid
<i>Tell us about how you integrate individual and collaborative learning into your classroom.</i>	choice in work, choice in partner (when possible/appropriate), choice to work alone or with a partner, students will often redirect themselves if they find working with friends isn't successful	grouping (work independently, half partner, partner, or group) in writing work with a group for part of it and independently for other parts	centers, choice of activities, multi modal learning,	collaborative work with younger kids doesn't always work as well as it might with older kids, but they do work together a lot in literacy and math, 2nd grade is in a tough position from 2 years of pandemic learning
Section 2: Content Knowledge	Respondent 1	Respondent 2	Respondent 3	Respondent 4
<i>Explain how you make content meaningful for your students.</i>	connecting the work to students (putting their names into math problems), focusing on the 'why' of learning and the impacts on people around them and the world, connecting it to what's going on outside themselves	encouraging kids to reflect on themselves and their skills (in writing) before diving into the content to build skills to make it personally meaningful. UBD approach to teaching, backwards mapping with the kids,	giving real world examples in math, the why around why they are learning certain skills (connecting fractions to cooking or decimals to money, etc.)	hands on work with younger kids, connecting across content (social studies and science with butterflies and maps),
<i>How do you know that your students have mastered the content you teach?</i>	create criterial charts with the students around success criteria, self assessment, peer assessment, teacher assessment, compare against success criteria	student self assessment, student checking in on their own growth, mini conferences with kids, review notes in books, listen in on book club discussions,	noticing students supporting their friends, giving students opportunities to 'teach' the class, even asking the question provides an indication of who is feeling confident to teach that material	end of unit assessments, progress monitoring, observation, conferring with students on success criteria, etc.
<i>How do you encourage critical thinking in any of the content areas you teach?</i>	building self-efficacy, setting high standards	critical reading through text analysis (symbolism, etc.)	using texts to build critical thinking skills	asking lots of questions "what do you think..." "how would you do something" instead of directing them what to do next
Section 3: Instructional Practice	Respondent 1	Respondent 2	Respondent 3	Respondent 4
<i>Give an example of how you use assessment to guide your decision-making.</i>	to guide groupings, prepare stations, identifying who needs support and how much	informs small group work and groupings	grouping, grouping across classrooms (also preparation for middle school)	use it to inform grouping and what is available in centers work
<i>Tell us about one of your best instructional strategies that you use to improve student learning.</i>	different settings with the whole group, small group, partners, independent to boost student engagement	QTA - Question the author strategies, increases student buy in	made a YouTube channel during pandemic that she continues to use because they can use it for additional support and learning especially at home	manipulatives and Elkonin boxes
<i>How do you use technology to improve student engagement and learning?</i>	one-to-one with laptops, adobe spark, epic, audio books, teaching research skills to identify credible sources, teaching videos, intervention math program, google suite for collaboration	virtual notebooks, speech to text, makes thinking visible, google slides, podcasts,	(no response to this question)	reading choice board, imagine learning, epic, Spanish language materials, boom cards for math,
Section 4: Professional Responsibility	Respondent 1	Respondent 2	Respondent 3	Respondent 4
<i>Can you share any opportunities you have taken to engage in professional growth to improve teaching and learning?</i>	Online Coaching offered through district at University of Pittsburgh, engaging in coaching cycles, PD, volunteered to review curriculum for CSDE.	Online Coaching offered through district at University of Pittsburgh, UDL and trauma informed practice PD, Summer pathways program	PD around new math programs (first year teacher)	AVMR course, Phonological awareness training,
<i>Tell us about a time you collaborated with colleagues, or other school professionals to improve instructional practice.</i>	weekly meetings with math and literacy coach, Grade level team meetings often, collaborating around curriculum units and lesson planning	coaching cycles, coaching meetings, co-teaching	observations of teaching from in the school, sit in on team members lessons, across grade levels, opportunities to observe different teaching styles and classroom management strategies	coaching cycles with math or literacy coach, collaborative planning times (twice weekly) once for reading and once for math
<i>Tell us about one time you modeled ethical behavior for your students or colleagues.</i>	morning meetings is an important part of the day for modeling ethical behavior and discussing strategies around issues that come up (on playground, how to have problem solving conversations, etc.)	high levels of student frustration this year, modeling ethical behavior through emotional regulation, practicing breathing, mindfulness when feeling frustrated or overwhelmed	teachers felt like 2021-2022 was the hardest year, even harder than 2020-2021, lots of behavioral issues, teaching students responsible citizenship especially around technology and internet usage, engaging in civil discourse even when people disagree	helping students identify the impacts of tone and mood when having discussions because they've not been able to practice that after almost two years of online school, modeling interactions and 'how things should look' when another teacher is in the room

K-12 Student Surveys from 2014-2019 Cohorts

Table 1.9. Background Information on Completers* Who Distributed Student Surveys

Completer ID	Grade/s Completer Currently Teaches and Discipline (if applicable)	Year Graduated from QU	Number of Students Completing the Survey	Number of Students Identified as English Learners	Number of Students with IEPs/504s
Abigail	Kindergarten	2014	37	33	NA
Molly	Kindergarten	2017	18	14	IEP=4/504=1
Lynn	Kindergarten	2017	17	NA	IEP=1
Celia	Second grade	2014	25	12	IEP=4
Sasha	Third grade	2018	20	0	IEP=2
Julie	Fourth grade	2018	19	5	IEP=1/504=3
Naomi	Fourth grade	2017	18	18	IEP=4
Amy	Fourth/Fifth grade	2019	17	0	IEP=1
Serena	Fifth grade	2015	21	NA	NA
Valerie	Middle School English	2015	66	“most”	504=12
Gina	High School Spanish	2018	62	NA	NA
Vonetta	High School History	2014	16	0	IEP=1

*All completers were assigned pseudonyms

Table 1.10. Statistics of Student Surveys Responses from Secondary Completers

	Gina (HS Spanish) Mean (SD)	Valerie (MS English) Mean (SD)	Vonetta (HS History) Mean (SD)	Average Across Completers Mean (SD)
Item 1: My individual needs are met by my teacher	4.63***a (.61)	3.99 (.81)	4.69**b (.48)	4.35 (.77)
Item 2: My teacher frequently relates the content to something I already know	4.39*a (.71)	3.93 (1.13)	4.75**b (.45)	4.22 (.94)
Item 3: My teacher respects us and works with us to establish a positive and supportive learning environment	4.74*a (.44)	4.49 (.72)	4.94*b (.25)	4.65 (.59)
Item 4: My teacher encourages students to analyze ideas from diverse perspectives	3.98 (.93)	4.44**c (.69)	4.38 (.89)	4.23 (.85)
Item 5: My teacher uses clear and concise language to explain concepts and content	4.26 (.85)	4.46 (.76)	4.81*d (.40)	4.41 (.78)
Item 6: My teacher values a flexible learning environment where we are encouraged to explore and discover	4.34*e (.85)	3.95 (.85)	4.44 (.73)	4.17 (.86)
Item 7: My teacher use assessments that are fair and accurately represent student knowledge	4.66 (.65)	4.39 (.77)	4.94*b (.25)	4.57 (.70)
Item 8: I feel prepared when my teacher gives us a project or quiz at the end of a unit	4.56***a (.62)	3.87 (1.10)	4.88***b (.50)	4.28 (.94)
Item 9: My teacher does not always lecture, but plays a different role in each lesson	4.23 (.82)	3.90 (1.09)	4.38 (.72)	4.09 (.96)
Item 10: My teacher works collaboratively with my family to set goals	3.02 (.83)	3.44 (1.20)	3.25 (1.39)	3.24 (1.09)
	4.27 (.44)	4.13 (.52)	4.54 (.37)	4.24 (.49)

~p ≤ .10; *p ≤ .05; **p ≤ .01; *** p ≤ .001

- a. To be interpreted that Gina’s students rated her significantly higher than Valerie’s students on that item.
- b. To be interpreted that Vonetta’s students rated her significantly higher than Valerie’s students on that item.
- c. Valerie’s students rated her significantly higher than Gina’s students on Item 4.
- d. Vonetta’s students rated her significantly higher than Gina’s students on Item 5.
- e. Gina’s students rated her significantly higher than Valerie’s students on Item 6.

Table 1.11. Statistics of Students Survey Responses from Elementary Completers

	Molly's Mean (SD)	Abigail's Mean (SD)	Lynn's Mean (SD)	Celia's Mean (SD)	Sasha's Mean (SD)	Amy's Mean (SD)	Julie's Mean (SD)	Naomi's Mean (SD)	Serena's Mean (SD)	Mean Overall (SD)
Grade level	K	K	K	2nd grade	3rd grade	4/5th grade	4th grade	4th grade	5th grade	
Item 1: My teacher gives me work that is challenging, but gives me the support I need to complete the task	5.00*** a (.00)	3.97 (.87)	5.00*** (.00)	4.92*** (.40)	4.55* (.83)	4.47 (.72)	4.95*** (.23)	4.72** (.67)	4.57* (.75)	4.62 (.71)
Item 2: My teacher gives many different kinds of activities to show what we know.	5.00*** a (.00)	4.22 (.75)	5.00*** (.00)	4.96*** (.20)	4.60 (.75)	4.77* (.56)	4.84** (.38)	4.72* (.46)	4.62 (.81)	4.70 (.61)
Item 3: I feel safe and respected in the classroom.	5.00*** a (.00)	4.30 (.74)	5.00** (.00)	4.88* (.60)	4.60 (.82)	4.83 (.39)	4.74 (.73)	4.44 (.70)	4.57 (.68)	4.67 (.66)
Item 4: We work in groups and by ourselves.	4.89 (.47)	4.51 (.69)	5.00* (.00)	5.00* (.00)	4.65 (.93)	4.77 (.56)	4.95 (.23)	4.83 (.51)	5.00* (.00)	4.82 (.54)
Item 5: My teacher explains things in many different ways	5.00* a (.00)	4.38 (.79)	4.53 (.87)	4.80 (.58)	4.74 (.45)	4.59 (.62)	4.58 (1.01)	4.67 (.69)	4.71 (.56)	4.64 (.70)
Item 6: My teacher encourages the students to listen to other students' different ideas and opinions	4.77 (.66)	4.35 (.89)	5.00* (.00)	4.76 (.88)	4.80 (.41)	4.82 (.39)	4.90 (.32)	4.89 (.47)	4.43 (.93)	4.70 (.70)
Item 7: My teacher helps us practice talking to each other to explain our ideas and opinions.	5.00 (.00)	4.41 (.64)	5.00 (.00)	4.64 (1.11)	4.50 (.61)	4.53 (.72)	4.84 (.50)	4.33 (1.14)	4.43 (.81)	4.60 (.76)
Item 8: I feel prepared when my teacher gives us a project or quiz at the end of a unit.	5.00*** b (.00)	4.43 (.77)	4.77* (.66)	4.84** (.37)	4.75* (.55)	4.82** (.39)	4.74* (.81)	3.94 (1.30)	4.33 (.66)	4.60 (.74)
Item 9: When students are confused, my teacher changes the way he/she is teaching to help us understand better.	5.00*** b (.00)	4.73** (.61)	5.00*** (.00)	4.96*** (.20)	4.70* (.98)	4.71* (.59)	4.89*** (.32)	3.94 (1.43)	4.76** (.70)	4.75 (.72)
Item 10: My teacher communicates with my family often	4.94*** c (.24)	4.65*** (.63)	4.77*** (.66)	4.76 (.60)	4.70*** (.57)	4.47** (.80)	4.52*** (1.02)	4.33* (.91)	3.48 (1.12)	4.52 (.84)
Average Score Across Items	4.96 (.08)	4.40 (.43)	4.91 (.13)	4.85 (.23)	4.67 (.39)	4.68 (.24)	4.80 (.41)	4.48 (.40)	4.49 (.33)	4.66 (.38)

~ p ≤ .10; * p ≤ .05; ** p ≤ .01; *** p ≤ .001

a. To be interpreted as this completer's mean student ratings on the item were significantly higher than Abigail's student ratings.

All other significance levels on this item indicate a significantly higher score than Abigail on this item.

b. This completer's mean student ratings on this item were significantly higher than Naomi's student ratings; all other significance levels on this item indicate a significantly higher score than Naomi on this item.

c. This completer's mean student ratings on this item were significantly higher than Serena's student ratings; all other significance levels on this item indicate a significantly higher score than Naomi on this item.

Completer Interviews from 2014-2019 Cohorts

Completer Interviews Summary Statement

To examine how completers apply professional knowledge and skills in their teaching practices, an EPP faculty member conducted one-on-one interviews with completers from 5 cohorts (Table 4.2.d.1). Interviews were structured to explore completers' skills and knowledge as well as satisfaction with EPP preparation and support. Questions were tagged to InTASC standards (4.2.d.2). One theme that emerged from reviewing the interviews was the variety of strategies for differentiation in the classroom and differentiation was widely cited as an important part of their EPP experience. Consistent with our observations from surveys, supporting ELLs and classroom management emerged as areas where the EPP can enhance support. Completers also detailed the ways in which they make learning experiences and content accessible and meaningful for students, how they use authentic and/or strategic assessment to support student learning and guide instructional practices, and the role of the EPP in developing these skills. Overall, findings were consistent with themes that emerged from focus groups and surveys.

1.12 Completer Interviewees (n) by Cohort Year and Program Area

Cohort	2014	2015	2017	2018	2019	Total
Elementary	2	0	3	2	1	8
Secondary	1	1	0	1	0	3
Total	3	1	3	3	1	11

1.13 Completer Interview Questions

INTERVIEW WITH: *Completer Name*

Program Area and Cohort Year

1) Tell me about the goals & content of the classes where you distributed the student surveys.
2) Can you tell me a little bit about your students? Is there a different makeup of students in different classes? In what ways?
3) Now I am going to ask you some questions that are related to the questions you were asked on the survey, covering topics ranging from differentiation and classroom climate.
4) I would love to hear a little bit about what you do in your classes to foster a supportive learning climate. <i>InTASC: Standard 3</i>
5) How do you differentiate instruction to meet the needs of each student? <i>InTASC Standard 2</i>
5a) Where did you learn this?
5b) Were there any specific classes or experiences from QU that supported acquisition of that skill?
5c) Were there specific things QU could do better to prepare you to do this?

Quinnipiac University SOE Measure 1. Completer Impact and Effectiveness

6) Tell me a little about your approach to instruction... <i>InTASC Standards 1, 5 & 7</i>
6a) How do you make content meaningful for students? <i>InTASC Standard 8</i>
6b) Can you give me an example of a lesson you designed and implemented that supported students' agency or autonomy? <i>InTASC Standards 2 & 8</i>
6c) Where did you learn to do this
6d) Were there specific classes or experiences from QU that supported acquisition of that skill?
6e) Were there specific things that QU could do better to prepare you to do this?
7) Tell me how you assess your students' learning? <i>InTASC Standard 6</i>
7b) How do you use assessment to guide your decision making? Can you give me examples? <i>InTASC Standard 6</i>
7c) Where did you learn how to do this?
7d) Were there any specific classes or experiences that supported acquisition of that skill?
7e) Were there specific things QU could do better to prepare you to do this?
8) Talk about how you make meaningful home-school connections. <i>InTASC Standard 10</i>
8a) Are there ways that you collaborate with families to help set goals for students? <i>InTASC Standard 10</i>
8b) Where did you learn to do this?
8c) Were there any specific classes or experiences from QU that taught you how to do this?
8d) Were there specific things QU could do better to do this?
9) Is there anything else you would like to share with me?

Data from 2019 Focus Group

SLO Assessment Descriptions

Table 1.14. Student Growth: SLO Assessments Provided by Completers

Literacy Assessments	Math Assessments
Phoneme Segmentation Fluency (PSF)	Common Core State Standard (CCSS) ^b Math Test
Letter Sounds (LS)	Fact Fluency (FF)
Developmental Spelling Assessment (DSA)	Math Fluency-Subtraction (MF-S) ^c
Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) ^d	Math Fluency-Division (MF-D) ^e
Benchmark Assessment System (BAS) ^a	
Reading Inventory (RI)	

- The goal of BAS is to determine the level of text that the student can read at an instructional level (90-94% accuracy and comprehension). It has no district benchmarks but is used to set individual goals.
- At all points, a score of 0-69 is *Basic*, 70-79 is *Proficient*, and 80-100 is *Goal*.
- On MF-S students are given five minutes to complete 25 subtraction questions (Benchmark 20-25 correct).
- SRI is a computer-adaptive assessment designed to measure how well students read texts of varying difficulties. The score is a lexile level, and the expectation is to reach the 740-940L range in fourth grade. Due to the large proportion of ELLs, growth is a more meaningful indication of learning.
- On MF-D students are given five minutes to complete 50 division questions (0-34 *Basic*; 35-39 *Proficient*; 40-50 *Goal*).

Impact on Student Learning and Development

Table 1.15. Completer and Student Demographics - Fair Haven School: Student Growth

Completer ID ^a	Grade/s Completer Currently Teaches and Discipline (if applicable)	Year Graduated from QU	Number of Students Completing the Survey	Percent of Students Identified as English Learners	Number of Students with IEPs/504s
Lynn	Kindergarten	2017	17	NA	IEP = 1
Abigail	Kindergarten	2014	37	89.1	NA
Molly	Kindergarten	2017	18	77.7	IEP= 4/504 = 1
Celia	Second grade	2014	25	48.0	IEP=4
Naomi	Fourth grade	2017	18	100.0	IEP=4
Julie	Fourth grade	2018	19	26.3	IEP=1/504=3
Valerie	Seventh and Eighth Grade English	2015	66	"most" ^b	504=12

- Note that all completers have been given pseudonyms.
- This completer did not provide the actual number of English learners in her classroom. In a focus group, she said "most" of the students in her classroom are English learners

Quinnipiac University SOE Measure 1. Completer Impact and Effectiveness

Table 1.16. Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Individual Goals (IND) and District (DST) Benchmarks at Posttest

	Kindergarten						Second grade		Fourth grade				7 th & 8 th grade English	
	Lynn		Abigail		Molly		Celia		Naomi		Julie		Valerie	
	IND	DST	IND	DST	IND	DST	IND	DST	IND	DST	IND	DST	IND	DST
Literacy														
PSF	53	52	80	60	56	50								
LS			53											
DSA							46							
SRI									60		36	41		
BAS		41 ^a		100		44	100	73	86					
RI													83	72
Mathematics														
CCSS -math	82	53	67	98	100	75	100	58						
FF			100	100										
MF-S							87	63						
MF-D									68	73			50	

a. For the BAS in kindergarten, participants did not provide individual goals—rather, the goal for all children was to be reading at the district benchmark by posttest (Level D). Therefore, no data is provided for the percent of children meeting individual goals for this assessment.

Kindergarten

More than 50% of students met or exceeded their individual and district PSF goal, (Table 4.1.b.3), between 35-83% moved out of the lowest reading levels (BAS; Table 4.1.b.4), and 53% of students met their individual LS goal (Table 4.1.b.5). By posttest, on average, all classes met, or were within 0.5 points of, goal CCSS-math scores (Table 4.1.b.6.) and 66%-100% of students met or exceeded individual goals. One completer provided FF data for 8 students who scored at or above 99 on the mid-year CCSS-math (no district benchmark).

Table 1.17. Completers’ Student Scores, Growth, and Progress Toward Goals on Phoneme Segmentation Fluency (PSF^a) Assessment at Pretest, Mid-Year, and Posttest

	Pretest	Mid-Year	Posttest	Average Growth from Pretest to Posttest Mean (SD, range)	Percent of Students Meeting/ Exceeding Individual Goal	Percent of Students Meeting/ Exceeding District Goal
District Benchmark Scores	4-11	10-19	25-39			
Lynn (n = 17)	2.82 (4.07, 0-12)	10.76 (8.44, 0-30)	26.71 (14.76, 1-45)	23.88 (13.95, 1-43)	53%	52.94%
Abigail (n = 5) ^a	2.60 (3.05, 1-8)	16.60 (7.64, 11-30)	31.40 (14.88, 18-57)	28.80 (15.64, 17-56)	80%	60%
Molly (n = 16)	4.25 (9.17, 0-35)	12.31 (8.09, 3-37)	30.38 (13.87, 6-48)	26.13 (12.90, 6-43)	56%	50%

a. PSF evaluates students’ fluency with a specific aspect of phonemic awareness, segmentation, which a key foundation for beginning reading and writing.

b. Abigail only provided scores for five students on the PSF Assessment because they comprised a subgroup of students that met their Letter Sound goals by mid-year and were therefore ready for this more difficult assessment. These five students were included in the Letter Sound data for Abigail found later in this report.

Table 1.18. Percent of Students Reading at Varied Levels at Mid-Year and Posttest on the Benchmark Assessment System (BAS^a) and Average Increase in the Number of Reading Levels from Mid-Year to Posttest

	Mid-Year			Posttest			Mean Growth in Reading Level from Mid-Year to Posttest (SD, Range)
	Levels A-C	Levels D-F	Level G and Above	Levels A-C	Levels D-F	Level G and Above	
Lynn (n = 17)	94% ^a	0%	5.8%	59%	17%	24%	2.41 levels (1.87, 0-7)
Abigail (n = 6)	83%	17%	0%	0%	67%	33%	3.17 levels (1.33, 2-5)
Molly (n = 16)	100%	0%	0%	56%	44%	0%	1.56 levels (.81, 0-3)

a. On BAS, teachers provide a leveled text to students, record the student’s accuracy reading this text, and ask the student questions to evaluate comprehension of the text. Text levels increase in difficulty from A to Z.

b. All percents are to be interpreted as the percent of students reading at that level within the assessment period; so, for example, 94% of Lynn’s students were reading Levels A-C at the mid-year assessment.

Quinnipiac University SOE Measure 1. Completer Impact and Effectiveness

Table 1.19. Completers' Student Scores, Growth, and Progress Toward Goals on Letter Sounds

	Pretest	Mid-Year	Posttest	Average Growth from Pretest to Posttest Mean	Percent of Students Meeting/Exceeding Individual Goal	Percent of Students Meeting/Exceeding District Benchmark
	Mean (SD, range)	Mean (SD, range)	Mean (SD, range)	Mean (SD, range)		
Abigail (n = 34)	2 (3.03, 0-10)	15.65 (8.93, 0-25)	21.27 (6.93, 1-26)	19.27 (6.64, 1-26)	53%	N/A

Table 1.20. Completers' Student Scores, Growth, and Progress Toward Goals on the Common Core State Standard Math Assessment at Pretest, Mid-Year, and Posttest

	Pretest	Mid-Year	Posttest	Average Growth from Pretest to Posttest Mean	Percent of Students Meeting/Exceeding Individual Goal	Percent of Students Meeting/Exceeding District Benchmark
	Mean (SD, range)	Mean (SD, range)	Mean (SD, range)	Mean (SD, range)		
Lynn (n = 17)	22.21 (16.35, 1-65)	60.03 (25.77, 11-89.5)	79.62 (18.79, 40-100)	57.41 (16.03, 30-77)	82%	53%
Abigail (n = 35)	16.42 (14.82, 0-61)	77.94 (22.85, 20-100)	95.26 (4.19, 87-100)	80.91 (7.07, 55-97)	66.67%	98%
Molly (n = 16)	27.06 (15.66, 5-62)	69.09 (22.65, 29-100)	89.41 (10.02, 73-100)	62.34 (12.46, 38-81)	100%	75%

Second Grade

All students met or exceeded individual BAS goals (Table 4.1.b.7.) and 73% met or exceeded district benchmark. On DSA, 46% met or exceeded individual goal, administered to a subset of students (Table 4.1.b.8) the majority of whom were ELLs and not ready for BAS. On CCSS-math (4.1.b.9), 58% of students achieved *Goal* at posttest and all met their individual goal. Over 60% of students met benchmark and almost 90% met their individual goal on MS-F (Table 4.1.b.10).

Table 1.21. Average Student Growth from Pre- to Posttest on the Benchmark Assessment System for Celia

Participant	Growth from Pretest to Posttest Mean Reading Level (SD, Range)	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Individualized Goal	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding District Benchmark at Posttest
Celia (n = 22)	3.55 levels (1.28, 2-7)	100%	73%

Table 1.22. Student Scores, Growth, and Progress Toward Goals on the Developmental Spelling Assessment (DSA^a) at Pretest, Mid-Year, and Posttest

	Pretest	Mid-Year	Posttest	Average Growth from Pretest to Posttest Mean (SD, range)	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Individual Goal
	Mean (SD, range)	Mean (SD, range)	Mean (SD, range)		
Celia (n = 11)	11.27 (5.44, 0-21)	14.64 (5.89, 0-24)	16.46 (6.07, 3-24)	5.18 (3.13, 0-11)	46%

a. The DSA is an assessment of student’s ability to accurately hear, and record the sounds they hear, in a series of words.

Table 1.23. Student Scores, Growth, and Progress Toward Goals on the Common Core State Standard Math (CCSS-Math) Assessment at Mid-Year and Posttest

	Mid-Year	Posttest	Average Growth from Mid-year to Posttest Mean (SD, range)	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Individual Goal	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding District Benchmark
	Mean (SD, range)	Mean (SD, range)			
Celia (n = 12)	66.08 (14.64, 44-84)	84.08 (10.02, 69-100)	18 (8.28, 4-34)	100%	58%

Table 1.24. Student Scores, Growth, and Progress Toward Goals on the Math Fluency-Subtraction Assessment at Pretest, Mid-Year and Posttest

	Pretest	Mid-Year	Posttest	Average Growth from Mid-year to Posttest Mean (SD, range)	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Individual Goal	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Benchmark Goal
	Mean (SD, range)	Mean (SD, range)	Mean (SD, range)			
Celia (n = 32) ^a	10.09 (5.66, 0-18)	17.94 (5.89, 3-25)	18.54 (6.12, 2-25)	9.75 (6.33, 0-19)	87.5%	63.5%

a. Scores were not provided for students who scored a 24 or 25 (n=8) at the mid-year assessment as they appeared to have reached a ceiling on the assessment at that time. As a result, the number of students included in the posttest mean for this class is 24.

Fourth Grade

On average, SRI scores increased (Table 4.1.b.11). Figure 4.1.b.1 shows the increase is due to overall growth among the class. Note that one student (scored 137) was not eligible for the SRI at pre- or mid-year and was excluded from the box plots. Naomi reported 60% of her students met or exceeded individual SRI goal (no data). One completer provided BAS data for students who scored 0 on SRI. Table 4.1.b.12 indicates over 85% of students met their individual BAS goal. One completer provided individual FF-D data (Table 4.1.b.13). Over 70% of her students met district benchmark and 68% of students met their individual goal. The other completer reported 50% of her students met FF-D district benchmark.

Table 1.25. Student Scores, Growth, and Progress Toward Goals on the Scholastic Reading Inventory at Pretest, Mid-Year and Posttest

	Pretest	Mid-Year	Posttest	Average Growth from Mid-year to Posttest	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Individual Goal	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Benchmark Goal
	Mean (SD, range)	Mean (SD, range)	Mean (SD, range)	Mean (SD, range)		
Julie (n = 22)	557.33 (180.78, 164-904)	575.05 (181.21, 209-922)	613.59 (212.37, 137-887)	81.59 (87.89, -46-257)	36.4%	41%

Table 1.26. Average Student Growth from Pre- to Posttest on the Benchmark Assessment System for Naomi

Participant	Growth from Pretest to Posttest Mean Reading Level (SD, Range)	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Individualized Goal
Naomi (n = 8)	4.75 levels (1.58, 2-7)	85.7%

7th and 8th Grade

More than 80% of students met or exceeded individual RI goals in both classes (Table 4.1.b.14) and over 70% met or exceeded district benchmark. Figures 4.1.b.2 and 4.1.b.3 suggest the increase is the result overall growth among the class. Given the high proportion of ELLs (and students with IEPs) in her class, this growth is noteworthy.

Table 1.27. Completer’s Student Scores, Growth, and Progress Toward Goals on the Math Fluency-Division Assessment at Pretest, Mid-Year and Posttest

	Pretest	Mid-Year	Posttest	Average Growth from Mid-year to Posttest	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Individual Goal	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Benchmark Goal
	Mean (SD, range)	Mean (SD, range)	Mean (SD, range)	Mean (SD, range)		
Nina (n = 22)	11.41 (12.95, 0-50)	28.14 (16.87, 4-50)	39.5 (14.92, 2-25)	28.09 (14.15, -1-47)	68%	73%

1.28. Completer’s Student Scores, Growth, and Progress Toward Goals on the RI Assessment at Pretest and Posttest

	Pretest	Posttest	Average Growth from Mid-year to Posttest	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Individual Goal	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding District Benchmark Goal
	Mean (SD, range)	Mean (SD, range)	Mean (SD, range)		
7 th Grade RI Scores (n = 43)	887.67 (201.84, 247-1216)	985.21 (207.39, 257-1333)	118.19 (116.77, -80-513)	86%	72%
8 th Grade RI Scores (n = 47)	952.89 (186.95, 559-1343)	1039.38 (246.29, 148-14-7)	127.04 (152.71, -158-526)	81%	72%