

4.1.2

Clarion University School of Education
CAEP Standard 4

P-12 Completer Focus Group. As part of our continuous improvement efforts the purpose of this focus group is to determine the impact of Clarion University graduates on PreK-12 student learning and development. Clarion University School of Education students who have graduated between the years of 2015-2018 were be contacted via email to participate in this focus group. Participation in the focus group was available in a face-to-face setting, as well as with the virtual platform, Zoom. During the focus group, the Clarion University graduates were guided through a discussion that is centered on the alumni survey. The participants were also asked to type their answers into on online version of the alumni survey via Baseline.

In addition, focus group participants were asked if they would like to volunteer their Danielson ratings and Student Learning Outcome data required as part of PA Act 82. These data will be used to determine if the teacher’s impact on student learning and development is distinguished, proficient, needs improvement, or failing. The ratings are broken down into the four domains of the Danielson Framework. These domains are (1) planning and preparation, (2) classroom environment, (3) instruction, and (4) professional responsibilities.

Participants

In an effort to ensure our data reflected the range of content areas and developmental levels in which we license teachers, we selected and invited potential participants based on proximity, content area, and developmental level.

Case Study Participants

Secondary	
Biology	Cranberry High School
Social Studies	Brookville High School
Social Studies	Moshannon Valley High School
Middle Level	
Math	Hickory Grove ES (3-6)
Math	Mount Caramel HS (7)
ECH/SPED	
ECH	Clearfield ES
ECH SPED	Oil City ES
ECH SPED	Oil City ES

Danielson Ratings				
N=8	Distinguished	Proficient	Needs Improvement	Failing
Danielson 1		8 (100%)		
Danielson 2		8 (100%)		
Danielson 3		7 (87%)	1 (13%)	
Danielson 4	1 (13%)	7 (87%)		

Program Completers Focus Group
December 8, 2018
10:00 AM – 12:00 PM
208 Stevens Hall

Everyone present submitted Danielson observations. Only one was able to submit SLO data due to having been teaching for more than one year. This data was incomplete, however, and did not clearly document the result of the SLO effort for the year.

Everyone present completed the Alumni survey that was sent out via Baseline.

In addition to the Baseline survey data, this group was asked four questions of interest to faculty about their program at Clarion University. The answers to these questions will be use to improve preparation programs but are extensions to InTASC and CAEP standard language. The questions were:

1. Did your initial certification program prepare you to work with students effectively?
2. Did you initial certification program prepare you to work with parents effectively?
3. Did your initial certification program prepare you to work with supervisors effectively?
4. Did your initial certification program prepare you to effectively apply professional knowledge and dispositions to your work?

A summary of the discussion follows:

1. Did your initial certification program prepare you to work with students effectively?
 - All present overwhelmingly agreed with this premise. The major issue that they all focused on was the lack of behavior management that was taught to them. They agreed that a stand-alone behavior/classroom management course would be advantageous. One mentioned that he needed to buy additional books just to help him through certain situations. Those that had SPED certification felt that the ABA course was extremely beneficial and thought that the course should be required of all School of Education students. The ED students all felt that the 3 online SPED courses were not beneficial at all. All students, especially the SPED certified students felt that there needed to be more collaboration between the SPED and ED departments. They felt that there were inconsistencies in what they were being taught, in particular between the PreK-K block semester and the SPED semester.
2. Did you initial certification program prepare you to work with parents effectively?
 - NO. Two participants said that was one thing that the PreK-K program did well, teach effective communication with the parents/community, but that preparation oftentimes did not lend itself to “real-life” teaching. The ML and Secondary participants felt that this was totally missed in their programs. They offered a few suggestions of allowing time for roundtable discussions with in-service teachers to discuss the intricacies of parental

contact. They did recognize that every situation could not be covered, such as a recent situation where an 8th grade student asked the teacher to call them by a different name and identify him with a different gender. They offered advice as to mimic the current in-service Act 48 system while they are in college. They felt that the teacher candidates can seek out various PD opportunities by attending various specialized meetings on campus (Allies, etc) and use them to bolster their knowledge of diversity that they will undoubtedly encounter while teaching.

3. Did your initial certification program prepare you to work with supervisors effectively?
 - They felt that this did occur. What did not occur, according to the participants, was receiving effective mentorship. Several indicated that they did learn that through specific extra-curricular clubs (Sigma Phi Epsilon, CUCSS). Some mentioned that they learned collaboration through IEP process. They wanted to see a program requirement that would enlist upper classmen serving as program mentors.

4. Did your initial certification program prepare you to effectively apply professional knowledge and dispositions to your work?
 - Most learned what it meant to be “professional” from extra-curricular clubs (Sigma Phi Epsilon, CUCSS, SPSEA, Math Circle). They all have to participate in a PLC in their schools, but had to “learn on the fly”. They all expressed dissatisfaction with the portfolio requirements here stating that they should mirror the expectations for their professional portfolios. All were in favor of a course/seminar that taught job hunting skills, resumes, interview prep. The sentiment was that Clarion University does a great job of teaching what to do when you get there, but they don’t really do anything on how to get there.

I opened the discussion to the room for any of their concerns.

- More emphasis on cross-curricular. We need to see the importance of it in our preparation program because it is essential in the “real-world”.
- Education Psychology is taught at the wrong place in the program (and not taught particularly well). Having it as a freshman and not being able to apply it until you are a senior is extremely inefficient.
- Kudos to the SPED department.

INFORMED CONSENT:

UNIVERSITY AFFILIATION: Clarion University of PA IRB Administrative Office,
Carlson125, Clarion University, Clarion, PA 16214, [814-393-2343](tel:814-393-2343)

STUDY TITLE: CAEP Standard 4 Focus Group

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jesse A. Haight

jhaight@clarion.edu
205 Stevens Hall

CO-INVESTIGATOR: Gwyneth A. Price

gprice@clarion.edu
202 Stevens Hall

This consent form will give you the information you will need to understand why this research study is being done and why you are being invited to participate. It will also describe what you will need to do to participate as well as any known risks, inconveniences or discomforts that you may have while participating. We encourage you to ask questions at any time. If you decide to participate, you will be asked to sign this form and it will be a record of your agreement to participate. You will be given a copy of this form to keep.

DESCRIPTION: You are invited to participate in a research study to identify the impact of Clarion University graduates on P-12 student learning and development. The information gathered will be used to better understand how effectively Clarion University graduates apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that were learned throughout their preparation experience at Clarion University. You are being asked to participate because you are a Clarion University graduate from 2015-2018 that is currently teaching in a Pennsylvania public school.

We will invite 8 to 10 people to meet together to discuss their perceptions of their P-12 impact. The principal investigator will help guide the discussion. To protect the privacy of focus group members, all transcripts will be coded with pseudonyms and we ask that you not discuss what is discussed in the focus group with anyone else. The focus group will last about two hours. During the focus group, you will be asked to voluntarily share your Danielson ratings and Student Learning Outcome data as evidence of your P-12 impact.

RISK AND BENEFITS: There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts anticipated of your focus group involvement. There will be no direct benefit to you from participating in this study. However, the information that you provide may help guide the educator preparation program at Clarion University towards continuous improvement.

COST AND PAYMENTS: There is neither a cost nor a payment for participating in this focus group.

CONFIDENTIALITY: Reasonable efforts will be made to keep the personal information in your research record private and confidential. Any identifiable information obtained in connection with this study will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission or as required by law. The members of the research team and the School of Education may access the data.

Your name will not be used in any written reports or publications which result from this research. Data will be kept for three years (per federal regulations) after the study is complete and then destroyed.

DISCLOSURE: I understand that any information about me obtained from this research will be stored in a secure location. It has been explained to me that my identity may be revealed in any description or publication of this research only after receiving my permission. Therefore, I consent to publication for scientific purposes.

RIGHT TO REFUSE OR END PARTICIPATION: I understand that I may refuse to participate in this study or withdraw any time. I also understand that I may be withdrawn from the study any time by the investigator(s).

DOCUMENT OF CONSENT: I have read this form and decided that I will participate in the project described above. Its general purposes, the particulars of involvement and possible risks have been explained to my satisfaction. I understand I can withdraw at any time. I have received a copy of this form.

Signature of Subject: _____

Signature of Investigator: _____

IRB Research Approval # 12-18-19

CLARION UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA
Institutional Review Board

DATE: November 7, 2018

FROM: Karl Sprenger, Chairperson
Institutional Review Board

TO: Dr. Jesse A. Haight

RE: ARA Approved

Your application for Research Approval, CAEP Standard 4 Focus Group, Project 12-18-19, has been reviewed and approved as exempt. **Be sure that you include your IRB project number in your project cover letter and in any correspondence with the Administrative Office. Also, please include your approval number from the initial application, if submitting an addendum. Your IRB project number should appear on your informed consent and/or your survey instrument.**

Please review the following IRB policy guidelines, which cover your responsibilities as primary investigator:

You must file written permission, which serves as consent, from the institution or facility with the Administrative Office (included in your IRB application). You must also retain all signed consent forms, if required for participation, for a period of three years after the end of the research approval period.

If your research extends beyond one year, you must submit a request for extension and an annual progress report.

Principal investigators are responsible for reporting the progress of the research to the Administrative Office no less than once per year. Problems involving risks or changes in the research must be reported immediately.

You must promptly report injury and/or unanticipated problems involving risks. Principal investigators are responsible for promptly reporting (in writing) to the Administrative Office, through their department heads, any injuries to human subjects and any unanticipated problems, which involve risks to the human research subjects or others.

You must report changes in the research.

Research investigators are responsible for promptly reporting (in writing) to the Administrative Office, through their department heads, any proposed changes in a research activity.

Changes in research during the period for which IRB approval has already been given **shall not be initiated** by the research investigators **without IRB review and approval**,

except where necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to the subject. In such occurrence the IRB is to be notified as soon as possible.

You must report noncompliance with this assurance.

Research investigators and department heads are responsible for reporting promptly to the Administrative Office and the IRB any serious or continuing noncompliance with the requirements of this assurance or the determinations of the IRB.

If your project is under continuing review (Expedited and Full-Board Applications), you may be requested to produce evidence that your research is following the guidelines provided in your application. If your project is chosen for an audit, you will be notified.

You must submit a research conclusion form, available on the IRB site, once your research project is completed. Please submit the research conclusion form to irb@clarion.edu.

Clarion University of Pennsylvania
840 Wood Street, Clarion, PA 16214
814-393-2774 (Phone)
814-393-2825(Fax)