

Impact on P-12 learning and development

Teaching performance and its impacts on student learning gains

Below are the results of qualitative data related to teaching performance and its impacts on student learning gains. The data were obtained through the case study that was designed to meet CAEP Standard 4.

All the program completers discussed how their performance of teaching have contributed to student learning gains. Interestingly the completers provided different evidence in this matter. For two of them (case 3 and 5), helping students by using diverse teaching strategies and observing students learning process was a good achievement for being a teacher, as one said,

“I apply a lot of teaching strategies and teaching methods. I also take into account individual differences. For example I use different visualized strategies...you know, some students are visual, some are auditory, some like hand on experiences. So I use all of that to deliver information well to students. To instill an information through visual and auditory means, we could watch a video. That’s sufficient to instill information in a student’s mind. That affect the student in that it improves their performance.” (Case 5)

For some teachers (case 4 and 6), increased scores is a good evidence and achievement,

“the proof is the increase in student scores, which is evident by the fact of the significant decrease in the percentage of students who failed” (Case 4)

For the two teachers (case 1 and 2) working in the area of early childhood, they observed student growth as an achievement of both teaching and learning,

“I have only been here for a month and I haven’t managed a class yet. But I tried to make the shy students who never speak to speak and interact. There was a student who never spoke when I first got here, but now she does and she’s more social now.” (Case 1)

Interviews with the supervisors further confirmed the effect of completers’ performance on student learning outcome, either progression or grades. As they said,

Supervisor of case 3: “The top proof is that her class was the lowest-performing, which is 3rd grade. Their grades were low in the midterm exam, but that’s not because of her. The reason is that they have trouble in reading. And they have an additional value of 14% in the final exam. That’s a very high value that she was able to increase. That’s an achievement that the academic vice principal and we have thanked her for this. And she earned it.”

Supervisor of case 4: “the way she interacts with students...she made her students solve problems without feeling that the subject is difficult. Some of them are sitting there, so involved in solving a problem. There is also a simplicity in her teaching. She doesn’t make the subject complicated, her students feel comfortable and they love her. She has taken an almost full score, even though she’s just

started. You wouldn't say that that report is by a new teacher. That's even her first semester in training."

Supervisor of case 5: "She starts treatment plans for low-performing students continuously. So the percentage of success in her classes is high."

Supervisor of case 6: "The proof is in their grades. Their grades went up. And she creates support plans for students that are behind. She tries to simplify information to students. So moves gradually in her questions. She uses a variety of teaching methods with students while taking into consideration their individual differences."

Assessment Analysis results 2017-2018

Table 1. Fall 2017

B. Ed. in Primary Education							
Group Name	Rubric Criteria	Authors evaluated	Average for Group (Raw)	# Authors Scoring Level 1	# Authors Scoring Level 2	# Authors Scoring Level 3	# Authors Scoring Level 4
BRIM	Data collection	63	3.57	0	6	28	29
BRIM	Data display	63	3.25	0	2	36	25
BRIM	Data analysis	63	3.62	0	5	25	33
BRIM	Data interpretation	63	3.07	0	5	47	11
BRIM	Implications for instruction	63	3.49	0	4	39	20
BRIM	overall average		3.40				
B.Ed. in Secondary Education							
Group Name	Rubric Criteria	Authors evaluated	Average for Group (Raw)	# Authors Scoring Level 1	# Authors Scoring Level 2	# Authors Scoring Level 3	# Authors Scoring Level 4
BSEC	Data collection	16	3.49	1	2	2	11
BSEC	Data display	16	3.51	1	0	7	8
BSEC	Data analysis	16	3.62	0	1	5	10
BSEC	Data interpretation	16	3.14	1	1	8	6

BSEC	Implications for instruction	16	2.98	1	2	8	5
BSEC	overall average		3.35				

Diploma in Secondary Education

Group Name	Rubric Criteria	Authors evaluated	Average for Group (Raw)	# Authors Scoring Level 1	# Authors Scoring Level 2	# Authors Scoring Level 3	# Authors Scoring Level 4
DSEC	Data collection	4	4	0	0	0	4
DSEC	Data display	4	4	0	0	0	4
DSEC	Data analysis	4	4	0	0	0	4
DSEC	Data interpretation	4	3	0	0	4	0
DSEC	Implications for instruction	4	3	0	0	4	0
DSEC	overall average		3.6				

Diploma in Primary Education

Group Name	Rubric Criteria	Authors evaluated	Average for Group (Raw)	# Authors Scoring Level 1	# Authors Scoring Level 2	# Authors Scoring Level 3	# Authors Scoring Level 4
DPRIM	Data collection	7	3.43	0	0	4	3
DPRIM	Data display	7	3.43	0	0	4	3
DPRIM	Data analysis	7	3.43	0	0	4	3
DPRIM	Data interpretation	7	3.43	0	0	4	3
DPRIM	Implications for instruction	7	3.29	0	0	5	2
DPRIM	overall average		3.4				

Diploma in Special Education

Group Name	Rubric Criteria	Authors evaluated	Average for Group (Raw)	# Authors Scoring Level 1	# Authors Scoring Level 2	# Authors Scoring Level 3	# Authors Scoring Level 4
DSPED	Assessment Design	13	3.62	0	0	5	8
DSPED	Data collection	13	3.62	0	0	5	8
DSPED	Data analysis	13	3.85	0	0	2	11
DSPED	Implications for instruction	13	3.69	0	0	4	9
DSPED	Presentation	13	4	0	0	0	13

DSPED	overall average		3.76				
--------------	-----------------	--	------	--	--	--	--

Table 2. Spring 2018

Group Name	Rubric Criteria	Authors evaluated	Average for Group (Raw)	# Authors Scoring Level 1	# Authors Scoring Level 2	# Authors Scoring Level 3	# Authors Scoring Level 4
BRIM	Data collection	79	3.49	0	2	49	28
BRIM	Data display	79	3.71	0	1	30	48
BRIM	Data analysis	79	3.35	0	5	35	39
BRIM	Data interpretation	79	3.08	0	10	54	15
BRIM	Implications for instruction	79	3.28	0	13	51	15
BRIM	overall average		3.38				
Group Name	Rubric Criteria	Authors evaluated	Average for Group (Raw)	# Authors Scoring Level 1	# Authors Scoring Level 2	# Authors Scoring Level 3	# Authors Scoring Level 4
BSEC	Data collection	50	3.47	0	3	20	27
BSEC	Data display	50	3.73	0	1	13	36
BSEC	Data analysis	50	3.76	0	1	14	35
BSEC	Data interpretation	50	3.14	0	4	34	12
BSEC	Implications for instruction	50	3.15	0	10	28	12
BSEC	overall average		3.45				

* Data was only available for B.Ed. programs in Spring 2018 because Diploma programs did not have Internship in Spring 2018. The data for this assignment is collected from Internship students.

Teacher effectiveness as demonstrated by a comparison of their class grade means in the midterm exam and class mean grades in the final exam

Table 3. Class grade means for primary school teachers

Primary school teachers - Total = 20		
	Midterm exam grades	Final Exam grades
Arts track teachers		
Islamic studies		
T1	83.7	84.4
T2	90.0	94.1
T3	79.9	94.7
T4	97.6	97.0
T5	86.2	91.1
T6	87.1	93.5
Arabic		
T1	85.8	92.0
T2	75.8	75.1
T3	63.0	82.0
T4	91.5	86.2
Science track teachers		
Math		
T1	89.3	85.9
T2	85.6	78.0
T3	99.3	95.5
T4	75.5	88.9
T5	63.5	62.6
Science		
T1	99.0	99.6
T2	96.8	94.5
T3	96.5	97.4
T4	84.4	92.0
T5	93.3	90.8

Table 3. Class grade means for secondary school teachers

Secondary School Teachers - Total = 32		
	Midterm exam grades	Final exam grades
English teachers		

T1	69.9	79.7
T2	77.7	65.0
T3	61.5	65.1
T4	78.0	76.7
T5	69.6	73.2
T6	81.3	75.0
Math teachers		
T1	79.0	84.0
T2	71.6	74.0
T3	76.7	54.9
T4	74.1	74.1
Science teachers		
T1	68.5	66.8
T2	100.0	69.7
T3	96.7	70.3
Biology teachers		
T1	58.1	67.5
T2	71.0	70.7
T3	68.3	74.8
Arabic teachers		
T1	78.3	82.1
T2	69.7	75.1
T3	57.1	60.8
T4	51	61.8
T5	61.2	68.4
T6	65.6	57.4
Social studies teachers		
T1	64.2	62.9
T2	73.2	67
T3	76.4	79.2
T4	83.1	84.2
T5	88.1	80.4
T6	76	73.7
T7	46.9	54.3
T8	69.2	68.6
T9	93	84
T10	95.4	84.8

The data presented in Tables 3 and 4 were provided by the Ministry of Education and Higher Education. Teachers were randomly selected; however, the sampling was made to ensure that teachers from the different CED undergraduate program concentrations were included.

For 9 out of 20 primary school teachers, the class grade means in the final exam were lower than in the midterm exam. For 16 out of 32 secondary school teachers, the class grade means in the final exam were lower than in the midterm exam. These findings seem to point to a lack of effectiveness of almost half of the primary school teachers and the secondary school teachers in the sample selected by the Ministry of Education and Higher Education. Nevertheless, students' results might not be solely attributed to, or impacted by, teacher effectiveness. Other factors might have influenced students' results. Next year, the College will try to identify other measures of teacher's effectiveness and impact on student achievement, such as teacher evaluations by their supervisors in the schools.