

ARS MEASURE 1: IMPACT ON P-6 LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT

This report is prepared in the context of a subsiding, yet ongoing, Covid-19 Pandemic, and all data are impacted by the pandemic. However, given the challenges, the EPP has continued to maintain the high standards for which it is known.

In order to support *ARS Measure 1: Impact on P-6 Learning and Development*, the EPP has made it standard practice to use three to four pieces of evidence. The EPP makes comparisons with completers' performances on the edTPA to discern candidates' abilities to impact student learning and development as they complete these practical experiences. Once the completers enter the workforce, the EPP further utilizes external reviews of completers' abilities as initial teachers using the NYC Annual Evaluations of Teacher Performance as measured on the Danielson framework. Further triangulation is typically done by comparing actual student performances on the grade-level Statewide assessments in ELA and Math prior to and after completers' employment, however this component has been once again suspended since these State data are not yet available.

For 2021 program completers who were hired in Fall 2021, a full year of professional teaching has not yet occurred in order for employers to complete these assessments. It should be noted that there was a temporary hiring freeze due to the budget crisis caused by the pandemic and even then, 47% of program completers were able to get teaching position after they graduated in Spring 2021. With ongoing safety concerns, vaccine mandates, and numerous other pandemic-related personal issues - other program completers chose not to take full-time teaching positions.

The program completers for 2021 also had a disrupted fall 2020 and spring 2021 semester due to the pandemic. Teacher candidates completed "alternative clinical experiences" as outlined by New York State. Medgar Evers School of Education chose to have teacher candidates complete structured video analyses of teaching as an alternative assessment for those unable to teach children during that time. The professors and teacher candidates were given access to high quality databases across ages and subject areas, including ATLAS, which uses videos of Board Certified Teachers as a practical engagement and learning tool for prospective teachers.

With the ongoing constraints of online teaching in NYS schools, the edTPA requirement for certification was waived once again, and teacher candidates could choose to take the edTPA or the Assessment of Teaching Skills- Written (ATS-W). The EPP's completers for 2021 were also granted "Emergency COVID licenses" by the State of New York to give them an additional year to take their certification tests. Therefore, the EPP provides data on the Clinical Practice performances across completers' programs to support this measure as part of its Annual Submission.

The EPP structure requires CSE candidates to complete one semester in a special education placement and the other in a general education setting. During the special education placement, evaluators use CSE assessment measurements that are aligned with CEC Standards, and during the general education semester candidates' placement, assessments are aligned with the CAEP Elementary Standards. For the purpose of this report, we will refer to the general education

semester as CE. There was 1 CE program completer form 2020-2021 (a CE candidate who completed two semesters in a CE placement).

The continued distance learning for P-12 schools and colleges in NYC required several adjustments. The School of Education ensured that its stakeholders – partner students and teachers, as well as candidates and faculty had all the necessary tools, guidance and frequent communication to maintain a smooth completion.

The following measures are used by the EPP to address ARS 1: Impact on P-6 Learning and Development:

(a) Baseline Measures – Performances in Clinical Practice

The clinical practice assessment serves as the culminating learning experience that integrates theory with practice and allows candidates to demonstrate their acquired knowledge, skills and dispositions in the practical classroom setting. Candidates have three major points of evaluation: **Part I—Planning:** candidates plan for four lessons in the area of math, science, social studies, and reading/literacy, which are taught in the PreK-6 classrooms depending on their program. **Part II – Implementation** (enactment of lessons they planned- classroom instruction), and **Part III – Post-Observation (after implementation) Outcomes** (assessment of student learning and candidates’ reflections based on supervisors’ feedback. These points reflect the EPP’s clinical practice model, which is one that begins with conceptualization and ends with reflection. **Part I-** Planning (Conceptualizing essay and lesson plan, as well as **Part II-**Implementation/enactment of lesson, are assessed by the candidate’s college supervisor and cooperating teacher, while **Part III—Outcomes-** Assessment is assessed solely by the college supervisor.

Early Childhood Special Education

ESCE candidates were sampled to assess their clinical practice performance. For each subject, students are expected to teach interdisciplinary lessons as reflected in the NAEYC Standards. Across the four observations, they were to teach the core subjects. Most candidates showed competency and growth across the four observations.

Table 1.1: Clinical Practice Rubrics across Observations for ECSE Program Completers (Random Sample from Clinical Practice 2020-2021)

Assessment area	# of students evaluated	mean	Unsatisfactory (0.00-0.99) %	Emerging (1.00-1.99) %	Competent (2.00-2.99) %	Exemplary (3.00-3.99) %
Planning section of the rubric: Observations #1-4 (interdisciplinary)						
Planning Obs. #4	10	2.20	0%	20%	20%	50%

Planning Obs.#3	10	1.80	0%	30%	50%	20%
Planning Obs.#2	10	2.00	0%	20%	50%	30%
Planning Obs.#1	10	1.81	0%	40%	50%	10%
Implementation section of the rubric: Observations #1-4 (interdisciplinary)						
Implementation Obs. #4	10	2.38	0%	10%	30%	60%
Implementation Obs. #3	10	2.15	0%	30%	20%	50%
Implementation Obs #2	10	2.18	0%	30%	20%	50%
Implementation Obs #1	10	2.09	0%	30%	30%	40%
Outcomes & Assessment Learning section of the rubric: Observations #1-4 (interdisciplinary)						
Outcomes & Assessment Learning #4	10	2.26	0%	0%	60%	40%
Outcomes & Assessment #3	10	2.05	0%	20%	50%	30%
Outcomes Evaluation #2	10	1.89	0%	30%	50%	20%
Outcomes & Assessment Evaluation #1	10	1.79	0%	30%	40%	30%

Analysis of Data by Program: ECSE Random Sample

When examining the data for the teacher candidates, the EPP will look at lesson #4. Candidates teach a total of four lessons and receive feedback from their college supervisor and cooperating teacher after each lesson – lesson #4 reflects where the candidate stands after receiving thorough feedback. An examination of the ECSE data shows that, teacher candidates scored slightly higher on implementation when compared with planning and outcomes/assessment. In each area (planning, implementation, and outcomes/assessments), scores on the fourth observation were significantly higher than on the first observation. These data suggest that candidates continue to use feedback from post observation conferences to improve their teaching throughout the semester.

Overall Analysis of Data

Of the three areas on the rubrics, teacher candidates scored the highest on implementation (mean fourth observation = 2.38) and lowest on planning (mean fourth observation = 2.20). Although these trends are somewhat different that trends seen nationally on the edTPA for these categories, they are not significant. These non-significant differences are likely due to pandemic driven efforts of the EPP to ensure candidates were prepared to implement lessons virtually and

in a hybrid (part-virtual/part-in-person). Our programs will continue to further target instruction on assessment, data analysis, and student feedback in our methods courses and clinical seminars.

Table 1.2: Rubric Dimensions - Three Areas Divided into Criterion for ECSE Clinical Practice Rubric

Area	Criterion
Planning	Basic planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration
	Intermediate planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • multimodal and developmentally appropriate practices • Developmentally appropriate central focus • Challenging curriculum for all • Meaningful challenging curriculum • Developmentally effective strategies for language development and communication • Understanding of curriculum • Understanding of developmental theories • Understanding of standards and content knowledge
	Advanced planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for content <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ social studies, math, science, writing or the arts ○ instructional strategies ○ family/community relationships ○ Academic language ○ Language and literacy • differentiated instruction • Using background knowledge information and assessments • Understanding of child development
	Overall planning
	Culturally responsible teaching strategies
	Creating a positive learning environment
	Accommodates appropriate educational transitions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problem solving techniques and strategies
	Engaging children in differentiated learning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • knowledge and understanding of instructional strategies • instructional decisions based on varying rates of early development • utilizes specific accommodations • typical and atypical development making connections between family and communities
	Implementation

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> interdisciplinary framework literacy activities supported with math, science, social studies, writing and literacy with arts
	Pedagogical content knowledge- interdisciplinary connections
	Analyzing children’s learning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> appropriate assessment tools reflection on informal and formal documentation
	Outcomes of student assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> feedback to guide further learning evidence of language understanding and use using assessment to inform instruction
	Overall evaluation of teacher candidate assessment of children’s learning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> healthy environment reflections whether assessments were responsibility reflects on practice analytical ability
Outcomes and Assessment of Student Learning	Overall Evaluation of TC Assessment of Children’s Learning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> reflects whether assessments were responsible feedback to guide further learning analytical ability reflects on practice healthy environment
	Outcomes of Assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Using assessment to inform instruction Reflection on informal and formal documentation Reflection on practice Evidence of language understanding and use
	Outcomes- analyzing children’s learning – appropriate assessment tools

Within the criteria for planning, for the fourth observation, ECSE program teacher candidates scored the highest in ‘meaningful challenging curriculum’ (mean 2.65, median 3.00, SD 0.57) and the lowest in ‘understanding of developmental theories’ (mean 1.84, median 2.00, SD 0.67). Many of the other lowest scores were in the “advanced planning categories,” which would be expected.

Implementation scores for the fourth observations were comparable to planning scores, however, teacher candidates scored the highest in ‘content knowledge – broaden children’s language use’ (mean 2.52, median 3.00, SD 0.56) and the lowest in ‘engaging children in differentiated learning’ (mean 1.97, median 2.00, SD 0.72). This may be due to challenges differentiating instruction in an online learning environment – especially given limited access to IEPs and IFSPs (it should also be noted that the pandemic led to many children having outdated IEPs and IFSPs)

For Outcomes and Assessment of Student Learning, teacher candidates scored the highest in ‘evidence of language understanding and use (mean 2.26, median 2.00, SD 0.55) The teacher candidates scored the lowest in ‘reflects whether assessments were responsible’ (mean 1.68, median 2.00, SD 0.86). This might be a function of varying interpretations of what the term ‘responsible’ means. It is noted that clinical faculty need to reword this portion of the rubric.

Childhood Special Education: Random Sample - Clinical Practice 2020-2021

Similarly, a random sample of Clinical Practice evaluations conducted by field supervisors were used to evaluate the performance of 2021 program completers. During Clinical Practice, candidates plan for and implement four formal observations, which are taught in the PreK-6 classrooms depending on their program. The EPP uses three rubrics to evaluate candidates’ performance on all four observations: Planning, Implementation, Outcomes. For this ARS, the EPP focuses on Planning, Implementation and Outcomes Assessments.

Giving candidates the opportunity to teach four different lessons allows evaluators to assess their growth over the course of the semester and eventually the year, which is broken down into specific areas that accessed on the edTPA and Danielson rubric.

The Childhood Special Education teacher candidates conduct a semester of student teaching in a special education classroom (inclusive or self-contained) and a general education (or inclusive classroom). For each setting, they are matched with a certified teacher in that area. Below is a summary of the rubric scores for the special education semester of the childhood special education program. The teacher candidates are required to teach each of the core subjects.

Table 1.3: Clinical Practice Rubrics across Observations for CSE Semester for Program Completers (Random Sample from Clinical Practice 2020-2021)

Assessment area	# of students evaluated	mean	Unsatisfactory (0.00-0.99) %	Emerging (1.00-1.99) %	Competent (2.00-2.99) %	Exemplary (3.00-3.99) %
Academic Content ELA	10	2.71	0%	10%	50%	40%
Academic Content Mathematics	10	2.30	0%	10%	70%	30%
Academic Content Science	10	2.23	0%	10%	70%	20%
Academic Content Social Studies	10	2.00	0%	20%	50%	30%
Planning section of the rubric: Observations #1-4 (science, social studies, math, ELA)						

Planning Obs. #1	10	2.00	0%	20%	60%	20%
Planning Obs. #2	10	2.15	0%	20%	50%	30%
Planning Obs.#3	10	2.41	0%	20%	40%	40%
Planning Obs.#4	10	2.53	0%	20%	40%	40%
Implementation section of the rubric: Observations #1-4 (science, social studies, math, ELA)						
Implementation Obs.#1	10	1.96	0%	30%	50%	20%
Implementation Obs.#2	10	2.27	0%	20%	50%	30%
Implementation Obs.#3	10	2.34	0%	20%	50%	30%
Implementation #4	10	2.40	0%	10%	50%	40%
Post Observation, Outcomes, Assessment section of the rubric: Observations #1-4 (science, social studies, math, ELA)						
Post Observation, Outcomes, Assessment of Student Learning Obs.#1	10	1.65	10%	30%	60%	0%
Post Observation, Outcomes, Assessment of Student Learning - Obs.#2 - CSE	10	1.97	10%	10%	60%	20%
Post Observation, Outcomes, Assessment of Student Learning - Obs.#3	10	1.94	10%	10%	70%	10%
Post Observation, Outcomes, Assessment of Student Learning	10	2.14	0%	10%	60	30%

- Obs.#4						
----------	--	--	--	--	--	--

Even with this smaller sample size, there are similar trends in the data to the ESCE candidates. When considering the fourth lesson - the highest scores are in the implementation domain and the lowest scores are in assessment and planning. This provides further support for the notion that the EPP’s focus on candidate instruction in an online and hybrid environment impacted results.

The CSE rubrics were revised during the 2020-2021 academic year to align better with the CE rubrics, so that comparisons could be more easily made across the semesters to monitor teacher candidate growth. The rubrics are now done by content area to better assess content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge for each of the course subjects in childhood education.

Childhood Education Component – Clinical Practice 2020-2021

There was only one program completer in the Childhood Education program. In order to exam performance for the CE component the EPP took data from that one candidate and randomly selected data for CSE candidates from their CE semester (recall: all CSE candidates complete a CE semester because they are working toward a dual certification). Giving candidates the opportunity to teach four different lessons allows evaluators to assess their growth over the course of the semester and eventually the year, which is broken down into specific areas that accessed on the edTPA and Danielson rubric.

The Childhood Education teacher candidates conduct two semester of student teaching in a general education classroom, whereas the Childhood Special Education teacher candidates conduct one semester of teaching in a general education classroom. Below is a summary of the rubric scores for the general education semester of 10 teacher candidates (1 CE and 9 randomly selected CSE). The teacher candidates are required to teach each of the core subjects.

**Table 1.4: Clinical Practice Rubrics across Observations for CE Semester for Program Completers
(Random Sample from Clinical Practice 2020-2021)**

Assessment area	# of students evaluated	mean	Unsatisfactory (0.00-0.99) %	Emerging (1.00-1.99) %	Competent (2.00-2.99) %	Exemplary (3.00-3.99) %
Academic Content ELA	10	2.65	0%	20%	60%	20%
Academic Content Mathematics	10	2.30	0%	20%	60%	20%
Academic	10	2.23	0%	10%	70%	20%

Content Science						
Academic Content Social Studies	10	2.00	0%	20%	50%	30%
Planning section of the rubric: Observations #1-4 (science, social studies, math, ELA)						
Planning Obs. #1	10	2.09	0%	20%	60%	20%
Planning Obs. #2	10	2.12	0%	20%	50%	30%
Planning Obs.#3	10	2.45	0%	20%	50%	30%
Planning Obs.#4	10	2.56	0%	20%	30%	50%
Implementation section of the rubric: Observations #1-4 (science, social studies, math, ELA)						
Implementation Obs.#1	10	2.01	0%	30%	60%	10%
Implementation Obs.#2	10	2.17	0%	20%	60%	20%
Implementation Obs.#3	10	2.34	0%	20%	40%	40%
Implementation #4	10	2.59	0%	10%	50%	40%
Post Observation, Outcomes, Assessment section of the rubric: Observations #1-4 (science, social studies, math, ELA)						
Post Observation, Outcomes, Assessment of Student Learning Obs.#1	10	1.84	0%	50%	50%	0%
Post Observation, Outcomes, Assessment of Student Learning - Obs.#2 - CSE	10	2.00	0%	20%	60%	20%
Post Observation, Outcomes, Assessment of Student Learning	10	2.03	0%	20%	70%	10%

- Obs.#3						
Post Observation, Outcomes, Assessment of Student Learning - Obs.#4	10	2.14	0%	10%	60%	30%

Even with this smaller sample size, there are similar trends in the data to the ECSE and CSE candidates. When considering the fourth lesson - the highest scores are in the implementation domain and the lowest scores are in assessment and planning. As with the ECSE and CSE programs, the data from the CE semester suggest that the EPP’s focus on candidate instruction in an online and hybrid environment impacted results.

(b) Clinical Practice Comparison with edTPA Performances:

With the constraints of online teaching, the edTPA requirement for certification was waived again in 2021 and teacher candidates could choose to take the edTPA or the Assessment of Teaching Skills- Written (ATS-W). Most candidates went with this option. The EPP’s completers for 2021 were granted “Emergency Covid licenses” by the State of New York to give them an additional year to take their certification tests. Therefore, the EPP provides data on Clinical Practice performances across completers’ programs to support this measure as part of its Interim Submission.

No program completers chose to take the edTPA in 2021. Therefore, the performances on the Clinical Practice Assessments (EPP) for this student and the edTPA (external) are used as a comparison measure to inform the EPP:

(c) Candidate Impact on P-6 Student Learning Outcomes on NYS Standardized Tests in ELA and Math (Data Not Yet Available)

(d) 2020 Program Completers – NYC Evaluation Data – Danielson Not Available as yet for NYCDOE due to COVID

Due to COVID restrictions, clinical experiences provided by the Medgar Evers College School of Education were online. For student teaching (Clinical Practice I and II) most students were placed in fully online classrooms, while others were placed in hybrid classrooms. In the hybrid settings, typically, the teacher candidates worked with the students who were online or worked as a “distance teacher” via a computer center in the classroom.

Additional experiences engaged candidates in the use of ATLAS (Accomplished Teaching and Learning at Schools) database and other online video libraries to conduct video analyses of teaching to supplement their limited face-to-face clinical experiences.