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# Who we are

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dawn Milner, M.Ed., A.B.D. May 2017</th>
<th>Christine Knaggs, Ph.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Director of Clinical &amp; Field Experiences, Lourdes University, Sylvania, OH</td>
<td>• Assistant Professor, Adrian College in Adrian, MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Co-President of Ohio Field Directors Assoc.</td>
<td>• Director of the Institute for Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Co-Advisor of Collegiate Middle Level Association at Lourdes University</td>
<td>• Former Dean, Chair, and Director at Lourdes University in Sylvania, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Doctoral student in Curriculum &amp; Instruction at Mercer, University in Macon, GA</td>
<td>• Former high school science teacher at Notre Dame Academy in Toledo, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Formerly an Intervention Specialist &amp; Regular Education Teacher for 20 years in Toledo, OH</td>
<td>• Former International Baccalaureate (IB) Coordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CAEP Standard 2

- Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements for clinical preparation and share responsibility for continuous improvement of candidate preparation.
- Partnerships for clinical preparation can follow a range of forms, participants, and functions.
- They establish mutually agreeable expectations for candidate entry, preparation, and exit; ensure that theory and practice are linked; maintain coherence across clinical and academic components of preparation; and share accountability for candidate outcomes.
What does a mutually beneficial partnership look like?

- Determine the needs of all constituents
  - K-12 Partner School and Students
  - University Program
  - Pre-Service Teachers
- Create a program that addresses all needs
- Evaluate effectiveness of program and make adjustments, as needed
What are the needs?

- P – 12 partners
- Ohio grading of schools
- School improvement plans
What are the needs?

• P-12 Students?
• CAEP Standard 4 – Measuring p-12 student growth & development
• Reading comprehension of informational text
• CCSS
What are the needs?

- University Teacher Prep Programs?
- Clinical experiences must be of sufficient, depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration, be tightly integrated with coursework and mentored by capable professionals (CAEP; Darling-Hammond, 2014; Childre & Van Rie, 2015)
What are the needs?

• Pre-service teachers?
  • Multiple opportunities to practice before entering field (DeMonte 2016)
  • CAEP Standard 2 – Preservice teachers need to “develop, practice and demonstrate evidence based pedagogical practices that improve student learning and development” (CAEP)
  • Clinical work raises new teacher effectiveness, increases skill development, and provides opportunity to apply theory to support student learning (Darling Hammond, 2014; DeMonte, 2016; Childre & Van Rie, 2015)
Based on general needs a partnership was sought who could enrich our clinical experiences by simultaneously meeting a need of our partner school.

Our K-12 school partner was recently named a Watch School in Ohio:

- Has a “D” or “F” on report card measure for two years, or subgroups are not making adequate achievement and progress.
- Required to develop Academic Improvement Plan based on Student Data.
OHIO IMPROVEMENT PROCESS (OIP)

STAGE 0 Preparing for the OIP
Preparing for the OIP provides the basics on establishing the collaborative structures and processes necessary to develop, implement, monitor and evaluate the OIP. In addition to defining the necessary collaborative structures, it describes the practices of communication and engagement, decision-making and resource management that are threaded throughout the OIP.

STAGE 1 Identify Critical Needs of Districts and Schools

**How**
do these teams work in districts and schools?
Teams use data to identify critical needs

**How**
do these teams work in districts and schools?
Review data
Gather evidence of implementation and impact

STAGE 2 Develop a Focused Plan

**How**
do these teams work in districts and schools?
Develop goals, strategies, indicators, and action steps focused on stage 1 critical needs

STAGE 3 Implement and Monitor the Focused Plan

**How**
do these teams work in districts and schools?
Implement strategies and action steps to achieve district goals
Monitor fidelity of implementation and effect on changes in adult practice and student learning

STAGE 4 Evaluate the Improvement Process

**Who Is Involved?**
- District and Community School Leadership Team (DLT/CSLT)
- Building Leadership Teams (BLTs)
- Teacher-Based Teams (TBTs)

**OHIO 5-STEP PROCESS**

STEP 1 Collect and chart data

STEP 2 Analyze data

STEP 3 Establish shared expectations for implementing specific changes

STEP 4 Implement changes consistently

STEP 5 Collect, chart, and analyze post data

## School District Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>District Percentage</th>
<th>School Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabilities</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reciprocal Teaching

- Teachers model, then help students learn to guide group discussions using four strategies: summarizing, question generating, clarifying, and predicting.
- Involves “training students to use four strategies that are associated with both improving reading comprehension and self-monitoring of comprehension while reading” (Carter, 1997, p. 4).
- Supports multiple strategy instruction.
- “Has been demonstrated as an effective teaching practice in a variety of settings by countless researchers (Piloneta & Medina, 2009, p. 121).
- Offers a “relatively natural forum for the teacher to provide a model of what it is that expert readers do when they try to understand and remember texts” (Palincsar & Brown, 1984, p. 168).
Reciprocal Teaching

- Easy to use and learn by both teachers and students
- “Effective in helping students improve their reading ability in pre-post trials or research studies” (Carter, 1997, p. 65)
- Continue pulling from paper
- RT became the Intervention for this study
Intervention Plan

- Need to expand clinical experiences
- Received a small grant to create an intervention to meet the needs of a P-12 school
- Tied RT strategy to an existing course
- Designed expectations for pre-service teachers (both learning and applying the strategies through both observation and teaching)
- Taught strategy to both practicing and preservice teachers
  - Designed 3 one hour PD sessions after school for all content teachers AND pre-service teachers (beginning, middle, and end)
    - Taught by university faculty versed in the strategy (former reading specialist and intervention specialist)
  - Students received additional instruction through course meetings
  - Teachers were encouraged to apply the strategy 2 – 3 x per week, not just in reading but in all content areas
  - Pre-service teacher requirements embedded in course
  - Sharing of experiences in the classroom at the PDs
Study Outcomes

- To improve reading scores of k-12 students using an exemplary teaching method for reading
- To increase shared knowledge regarding an exemplary teaching method for reading
- To improve quality of clinical experiences for pre-service teachers
Data Collection Points

- IRB Assent and Parental Consent
- Quantitative: repeating measures ANOVA (measuring growth over time)
  - STAR Reading (Outcome 1)
    - Fall, Winter, Spring
- Qualitative:
  - Pre/post perceived level of knowledge of RT (Outcome 2)
  - Practicing and Pre-Service Teacher Reflections of perceived benefit and application (Outcome 2 and 3)
Quantitative Results

Time Key:
1 = Win. ‘15
2 = Spr. ‘15
3 = Fall ‘15
4 = Win. ‘16
5 = Spr. ‘16
Quantitative Results: sample component
Qualitative Results

Perceived Level of Knowledge with RT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th></th>
<th>End</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bystander</td>
<td>8/18</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>0/15</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>5/18</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>1/15</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jogger</td>
<td>4/18</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>12/15</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runner</td>
<td>1/18</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2/15</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Qualitative Results
Pre-Service Teacher Reflections

• Felt knowledge base regarding reciprocal teaching had increased
• “Students can use so many different ‘deeper thinking’ skills in which they may not normally utilize during a non-reciprocal teaching lesson.”
• “I liked that each student had a chance to share their prediction, this involved and engaged each student from the beginning.”
Significance

• What does this mean for…
  • P-12 students
  • P-12 partners
  • University Teacher Preparation Programs
  • Pre-service Teachers
Future Steps

• Additional quantitative analysis
• Continue model with more quality control
• Seek additional partnerships with other p-12 districts