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Quantitative Study as Block 3 Program Development

Explaining the phenomena: “How are the planning and instructional elements in Block 3 preparing teacher candidates for future employment?” “What factors are influential or are not working according to data compared in percentage form?”

Research question: Does edTPA preparation in block 3 impact candidate employment?

Research hypothesis: Candidates that have had edTPA preparation are more employable.

We hypothesize that the teacher candidates will confirm the impact that elements of the edTPA in block 3 of their preparation has had in securing their employment.

Method: Survey distribution. Results analyzed in percentages.

N = 41
edTPA & Block 3 Focus

edTPA is:

- A student-centered multiple measure performance assessment of teaching
- It is designed to be educative and predicting of effective teaching and student learning
- Stanford University faculty and staff at Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE) developed edTPA.

Block 3 Focus: Meeting the Needs of all Students:

- Special Education
- Struggling Readers
- Cultural Responsiveness
- Differentiation
- RTI
- Accommodations/Modifications
The content in block three courses and seminars helped prepare me for what I needed to know to “talk my practice.”
## Rubric 1: Planning for Literacy Learning

### How do the candidate’s plans build students’ literacy skills and an essential strategy for comprehending or composing text?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate’s plans focus solely on literacy skills without connections to any strategy for comprehending or composing text.</td>
<td>Plans for instruction support student learning of skills with vague connections to strategies for comprehending or composing text.</td>
<td>Plans for instruction build on each other to support learning of skills with clear connections to the essential literacy strategy for comprehending or composing text.</td>
<td>Plans for instruction build on each other to create a meaningful context that supports learning of skills with clear and consistent connections to the essential literacy strategy for comprehending or composing text.</td>
<td>Level 4 plus: Plans build an authentic connection between reading and writing. Candidate explains how s/he will use learning tasks and materials to lead students to independently apply the essential strategy and identified skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Rubric 10: Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness

### How does the candidate use evidence to evaluate and change teaching practice to meet students’ varied learning needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate suggests changes unrelated to evidence of student learning.</td>
<td>Candidate proposes changes that are focused primarily on improving directions for learning tasks or task/behavior management.</td>
<td>Candidate proposes changes that address students’ collective learning needs related to the central focus.</td>
<td>Candidate proposes changes that address individual and collective learning needs related to the central focus.</td>
<td>Level 4 plus: Candidate justifies changes using principles of research and/or theory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The content in block three courses and seminars helped prepare me for what I needed to know to “talk my practice.”

Rubric 1

- edTPA Overall Results:
  - 3.2 out of 5

Rubric 10

- edTPA Overall Results:
  - 3.3 out of 5
I felt prepared to design and develop lessons that would showcase my ability to differentiate and plan interventions.
### Rubric 2: Planning to Support Varied Student Learning Needs

**How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her students to target support for students’ literacy learning?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is little or no evidence of planned supports.</td>
<td>Planned supports are loosely tied to learning objectives or the central focus of the learning segment.</td>
<td>Planned supports are tied to learning objectives and the central focus with attention to the characteristics of the class as a whole.</td>
<td>Planned supports are tied to learning objectives and the central focus. Supports address the needs of specific individuals or groups with similar needs.</td>
<td>Level 4 plus: Supports include specific strategies to identify and respond to common developmental approximations or misconceptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Candidate does not attend to requirements in IEPs and 504 plans.</td>
<td>AND Candidate attends to requirements in IEPs and 504 plans.</td>
<td>AND Candidate attends to requirements in IEPs and 504 plans.</td>
<td>AND Candidate attends to requirements in IEPs and 504 plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rubric 3: Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning

**How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her students to justify instructional plans?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Candidate’s justification of learning tasks is either missing OR represents a deficit view of students and their backgrounds. | Candidate justifies learning tasks with limited attention to students' prior academic learning OR personal/cultural/community assets. | Candidate justifies why learning tasks (or their adaptations) are appropriate using:  
  - examples of students' prior academic learning  
  - examples of personal/cultural/community assets | Candidate justifies why learning tasks (or their adaptations) are appropriate using:  
  - examples of students' prior academic learning  
  - examples of personal/cultural/community assets | Level 4 plus: Candidate’s justification is supported by principles from research and/or theory. |
I felt prepared to design and develop lessons that would showcase my ability to differentiate and plan interventions.

**Rubric 2**

- edTPA Results Overall: 3.3 out of 5

**Rubric 3**

- edTPA Results Overall: 3.0 out of 5
Going into the classroom prior to beginning full time field experience enabled me to get to know students, the routine, ask questions and provide an easy transition to being there everyday.
### Rubric 1: Planning for Literacy Learning

How do the candidate’s plans build students’ understanding of an essential literacy strategy for comprehending OR composing text and the skills that support that strategy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate’s plans for instruction <strong>focus solely on</strong> literacy skills without connections to any strategy for comprehending OR composing text. <strong>OR</strong> There are significant content inaccuracies that will lead to student misunderstandings.</td>
<td>Candidate’s plans for instruction <strong>support student learning</strong> of skills with vague connections to strategies for comprehending OR composing text.</td>
<td>Candidate’s plans for instruction <strong>build on each other</strong> to support learning of the essential literacy strategy for comprehending OR composing text with a clear connection to skills.</td>
<td>Candidate’s plans for instruction <strong>build on each other</strong> to create a meaningful context that supports learning of the essential literacy strategy for comprehending OR composing text with clear AND consistent connections to skills.</td>
<td>Level 4 plus: Candidate’s plans build an authentic connection between reading and writing. Candidate explains how s/he will use learning tasks and materials to lead students to independently apply the essential strategy AND identified skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rubric 10: Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness

How does the candidate use evidence to evaluate and change teaching practice to meet students’ varied learning needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate suggests changes unrelated to evidence of student learning.</td>
<td>Candidate proposes changes to teacher practices that are superficially related to student learning needs (e.g., task management, pacing, improving directions).</td>
<td>Candidate proposes changes that address students’ collective learning needs related to the central focus. Candidate makes superficial connections to research and/or theory.</td>
<td>Candidate proposes changes that address individual and collective learning needs related to the central focus. Candidate makes connections to research and/or theory.</td>
<td>Level 4 plus: Candidate justifies changes using principles of research and/or theory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The content in block three courses and seminars helped prepare me for what I needed to know to “talk my practice.”

Rubric 1

- edTPA Results Overall:
  - 3.2 out of 5

Rubric 10

- edTPA Results Overall:
  - 2.8 out of 5
I felt prepared to meet the needs of all learners through formative assessments, interventions and accommodations.
## Rubric 11: Analysis of Student Learning

How does the candidate analyze evidence of student learning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The analysis is superficial or not supported by either student work samples or the summary of student learning.</td>
<td>The analysis focuses on what students did right OR wrong using evidence from the summary or work samples.</td>
<td>The analysis focuses on what students did right AND wrong and is supported with evidence from the summary and work samples. Analysis includes some differences in whole class learning.</td>
<td>Analysis uses specific examples from work samples to demonstrate patterns of student learning consistent with the summary. Patterns are described for whole class.</td>
<td>Analysis uses specific evidence from work samples to demonstrate the connections between quantitative and qualitative patterns of student learning for individuals or groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The content in block three courses and seminars helped prepare me for what I needed to know to “talk my practice.”

edTPA Results: Rubric 11

2.9 out of 5
My instruction/activities on RTI allowed me to be involved in planning for RTI grouping/instruction/assessment collection.
I can use data to inform instruction.
# Rubric 15: Using Assessment to Inform Instruction

How does the candidate use the analysis of what students know and are able to do to plan next steps in instruction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Next steps do not follow from the analysis.</td>
<td>Next steps focus on repeating instruction, pacing, or classroom management issues.</td>
<td>Next steps propose general support that improves student learning related to the essential literacy strategy OR requisite skills</td>
<td>Next steps provide targeted support to individuals or groups to improve their learning relative to the essential literacy strategy OR requisite skills</td>
<td>Next steps provide targeted support to individuals and groups to improve their learning relative to the essential literacy strategy OR requisite skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Next steps are not relevant to the standards and learning objectives assessed.</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Next steps are loosely connected with research and/or theory.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The content in block three courses and seminars helped prepare me for what I needed to know to “talk my practice.”

edTPA Results: Rubric 15

- 3.0
Implications

1. Unpacking the standards/rubrics as faculty

2. Digging deeper into the rubric to dissect how our instruction is designed both at a block level as well as individual

3. Redesign the survey for candidates for more in depth questions
Limitations

1. Only one semester of data

2. First year of full implementation

3. Faculty are still in the process of developing their understanding of the rubrics.