

## **IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING PHONE INTERVIEWS CASE STUDY**

**TAG:** CAEP 1.5, 4.1, 4.2, 4.4, 5.1

### **Description**

The Mississippi Department of Education does not provide teacher effectiveness data to educator preparation programs at Mississippi colleges or universities. As an alternative plan, a phone interview was conducted by faculty who had supervised completers from 2016-2017 in year two of their teaching career.

### **Analysis of Data Findings**

Thirty-three year two completers were sent invitations to participate in our pilot study on impact on P-12 student learning. Of these, twenty-nine completed the study for a response rate of 88%. One supervisor combined responses for two respondents as one and AC treated these as one response.

#### **Q1**

Most respondents responded that they were doing well and progressing (n=8, M=29%). Two were teaching out of area (PE majors working as SPED M=7%), six switched grade levels or schools in first two years (M=21%), and one would be going to graduate school at the conclusion of the school year (M=4%). One respondent stated that she had been chosen by the principal to be part of the Vision Team for the school.

#### **Q2**

The two highest categories were content and methods (n=8, M=29%) and classroom management preparation (understanding student behavior, set-up, and management n=8, M=29%). Others responded that the evaluations from student teaching and diverse clinical setting was invaluable (n=7, M=25%). Another strength was writing a standards based curriculum, detailed lesson plan, using higher-order thinking questions, and planning for multiple age groups (n=6, M=21%). Elementary Education majors responded that learning to interpret test data (n=4, M=14%) was beneficial because it prepared them to read data, chart data, and use data. Additional strengths mentioned were relationships with instructors (n=3, M=11%), TAP program (work and learn n=2, M=7%), literacy (identifying where students were struggling (n=1, M=4%), confidence in teaching (n=1, M=4%), conducting (n=1, M=4%), and preparation of SPED law (n=1, M=4%).

#### **Q3**

Respondents would like more preparation with IEPs, behavior interventions, identifying and dealing with students with disabilities, differentiation of instruction, and knowledge of services offered (n=8, M=29%). Specifically, secondary respondents commented on the weakness of the Test and Measurements class: learn what needs to be assessed, connecting data to instruction, writing tests, how to interpret data, and just overall the class needs re-working (n=6, M=21%). Respondents would also like better preparation in learning how to deal with situations in the classroom such as working with students that cannot read, parents/students committing suicide, new students in the classroom, behavior, student motivation, parents, and positive reinforcement

(n=5, M=18%). Other topics mentioned were less time learning theories and more time in the classroom (n=4, M=14%), unrealistic lesson plans (too detailed, n=2, M=7%), practice completing paperwork required in a school (n=2, M=7%), curriculum planning (what to teach and when, n=2, M=7%), exposure to upper grades (Elementary Education, n=1. M=4%), more software training (grading, lesson plans, n=1. M=4%), teaching writing (n=1. M=4%), write an appropriate rubric (n=1. M=4%), collaboration with teachers (n=1. M=4%), did not like HIS 110 & HIS 111 (n=1. M=4%), how to work in big classrooms (n=1. M=4%), dealing with kids in a cell phone age (n=1. M=4%), other duties as assigned (behind the scenes, state testing, starting the school year, n=1. M=4%), and having a licensure advisor (n=1. M=4%).

#### Q4

Most felt very comfortable with technology in the classroom and were prepared to use technology (n=21, M=75%). Several stated that they learned how to use the smart board/Promethean while student teaching (n=6, M=21%). Others identified themselves as self-taught (n=5, M=18%) and still others wanted more exposure about resources and other applications (Google Classroom, Kahoot, Jimkit, Nearpod, and Schoolology, n=5, M=18%). Some identified that their school had limited technology and one stated that she had to buy a projector because there was no technology in the classroom (n=4, M=14%). When asked what type of technology that was used at the school, five (M=18%) identified Google Classroom and one (M=4%) uses VR classroom (videos the lesson so that the student can replay at home). When it came time to upload a video to Tk20 during student teaching, two stated that they had problems because they did not know how to edit and compress a file, but quickly learned (n=2, M=7%).

#### Q5

Respondents answered that they were comfortable with evaluation because of student teaching and that the Professional Growth System (PGS) had similar domains as the TIAI Evaluations (n=17, M=61%). Principals are in and out of the classrooms often so that when there are formal evaluations, it is not stressful. A few mentioned that they were more nervous when evaluated during student teaching than when they are now. Two respondents stated that their districts still use the MSTAR (M=7%), and two others stated that they were not exposed to the PGS while at USM, but would have liked more instruction on each standard (M=7%). (*Note: The TIAI has the same domains and is aligned to the PGS.*) Other responses were prepared to work hard for a higher rating (n=1. M=4%), is peer evaluated (n=1. M=4%), and collaborated with classroom teachers who will help her meet the expectations of the rubric (n=1. M=4%).

#### Q6

As stated earlier, novice teachers are usually not placed in a testing grade. These results are evident in the responses from the completers. Other than testing, growth is demonstrated through performance, speaking, and verbal interviews (n=5, M=18%). Five (M=18%) stated that they use benchmark testing or other programs like Star Reading, Start Math, ELS, Star Snapshot, Data Chart, Edulastic, MAP, Case 21, MWEA, or Star testing to gage growth. Growth is also measured through pre- and post-tests and class grades (n=4, M=14%). Because some are working with SPED, growth are also measured in a variety of ways such as personal or social growth (n=2, M=7%) or use of low tech skills like Kahoot and Quizlet (n=1. M=4%).