



Looking for a Needle in a Haystack: Finding Inclusive Clinical Field Placements

Kelly Anderson, Ph.D.
JaneDiane Smith, Ph.D.
University of North Carolina at Charlotte

36th Annual ACRES National Conference
(American Council on Rural Special Education)
March 8 – 11, 2017 Asheville, NC

OSEP Grant #H325T090011
The project described in this presentation
was funded by a grant from the
U.S. Department of Education: Office of
Special Education Programs
(CFDA 84-325T Personnel Development Grant).



Session Take-Homes

Participants in this session will learn:

- ▶ the extent to which professional standards and research-based practices integrated into the initial licensure program aligned with urban and rural school initiatives
- ▶ the extent of similarities and differences in urban and rural schools in which candidates were placed for clinical experiences
- ▶ performance data from principals and cooperating teachers in terms of candidates' abilities to demonstrate their knowledge and skills in research-based and professional practices



The Needle in a Haystack

- ▶ Identification of quality inclusive clinical field placements
 - Defining what constitutes 'quality' & a 'good fit'
 - Provide opportunities for candidates to apply and refine knowledge and skills



Challenges & Issues

External

- ▶ Influence of standards (national –CEC, and state–NC) for degree and licensure requirements for teacher preparation programs
- ▶ Program coursework and proficiencies may or may not parallel national and state standards for K–12 student performance expectations
- ▶ District policies and practices related to school placements, teachers' readiness to provide supervision to student teachers, and mobility of principals and teachers within school systems

Challenges & Issues

Internal

- ▶ Identification of quality clinical experiences a 'good fit' in terms of alignment of district and school initiatives and the professional standards and research-based practices teacher candidates are being assessed on in fulfillment of their preparation programs
- ▶ Procedures for clinical experience placements are outside of the preparation program, random and left to the districts to make final assignments

Program Description

- ▶ Integrated dual initial licensure undergraduate program
- ▶ Special Education (General Curriculum) and Elementary Education K–6
- ▶ Established through collaboration with faculty from the departments of Special Education and Elementary Education and our Community Partners Advisory Board
- ▶ 122–125 total credit hours
- ▶ Clinical hours integrated throughout program in General and Special Education settings
- ▶ Split student teaching: one school, two placements – 7.5 weeks in general education, 7.5 weeks in special education

Inclusive Practices Clinical Site Checklist (IPCSC)

- ▶ Developed to identify clinical and student teaching placements that provided candidates completing the dual program course of study an opportunity to apply and refine their knowledge and skills
- ▶ School Partner involvement
- ▶ 3 year process
- ▶ Intentionally aligned with the research-based practices and professional standards that are foundational components of dual preparation
- ▶ Data
 - Demographic Information
 - Rater Information
 - Categories of Professional Standards/research-based practices

Clinical Site Checklist (CSC) Categories and Research-based Practice/Professional Standards

Category	Research–Based Practice/Professional Standard
Collaboration	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Effective co-teaching occurs on a daily basis – best practices utilized and shared instructional planning is supported by administrative approved release time▪ Staff have been trained in multi-tiered systems of academic support (RtI) processes and utilize fidelity procedures for collecting and analyzing student data on a regular basis▪ General and special education teachers participate in collaborative professional learning activities (PLCs) that cross disciplines
Instructional Responsiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Teachers effectively use differentiated instruction in response to diverse needs of students▪ Teachers collaborate to effectively incorporate research-based reading and math instruction and remediation strategies on a regular basis▪ Teachers effectively use technology and other resources to enable all students to access the curriculum and instructional programs
Inclusive Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Administrator encourages collaboration among general and special education teachers in monitoring student progress and sharing in making instructional decisions• Administrators are actively involved on a regular basis in the leadership of PBIS and/or RtI• Opportunities for general and special education teachers to share knowledge and expertise is facilitated by administrators (e.g., PLCs, inservice training)

Note. Professional Development (PD), Professional Learning Communities (PLC), Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS).

IPCSC structure and scoring example.

Standards/Research Based Practices		NOT ACCEPTABLE No Evidence		ACCEPTABLE Some Evidence		TARGET Clear Evidence	
COLLABORATION – INCLUSIVE PRACTICES	Item Points	Each item is worth 0 point	Item Points	Each item is worth 1 points	Item Points	Each item is worth 2 points	Total Points
Effective collaboration among general and special education teachers occurs on a regular basis using the models of co-teaching and consultation surrounding students' needs.	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Co-teaching does not occur at this school. a) No evidence of shared instructional planning occurs a) Co-teaching is not evaluated 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Some co-teaching occurs but is randomly teacher initiated verses an intentional part of the school structure b) Shared instructional planning is informal and not supported by approved release time c) Effectiveness of co-teaching is not formally evaluated 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Effective co-teaching occurs on a regular basis – best practices utilized (all models of CT occur) b) Shared instructional planning is supported by administrative approved release time c) Teachers evaluate the effectiveness of co-teaching using student data, surveys or other methods. 	3/6

Research Questions

- ▶ To what extent do the professional standards and research-based practices integrated into the dual program align with current regional district and classroom initiatives?
- ▶ To what extent are urban and rural schools alike and/or different in terms their implementation of standards and research-based practices that align with the dual preparation program?
- ▶ To what extent do dual candidates' apply their integrated knowledge and skills in general and special education classrooms at sites identified through use of the *Inclusive Practices Clinical Site Checklist* (IPCSC)?

Participants and Program/Setting

- ▶ IPCSC ($N = 65$)
 - Sample of convenience
 - Sites were geographically diverse
 - Title I settings were represented
 - Role of the rater varied significantly
 - Raters had extensive familiarity with the school
- ▶ Teacher Candidates ($N = 42$)
 - Caucasian females
 - High GPAs
 - Entrance into dual program
 - Graduation
 - Similar to randomly selected peers in discipline specific programs
 - Clinical Experience & Student Teaching Sites
 - IPCSC scores used to select sites

Participants and Program/Setting

- ▶ Cooperating Teachers ($N = 109$)
 - ▶ Role
 - General Ed (50%)
 - Special Ed (50%)
 - ▶ Geographic Location
 - Rural (20%)
 - Urban (22%)
 - Suburban (58%)
- ▶ Principals ($N = 47$)
 - ▶ Role
 - Principal (94%)
 - Assistant Principal (6%)
 - ▶ Geographic Location
 - Rural (23%)
 - Urban (26%)
 - Suburban (51%)
 - ▶ Familiarity with ST
 - Very (49%) & Moderate (47%)
 - Minimal (4%)
 - ▶ Interaction with ST
 - Frequent (38%) & Moderate (53%)
 - Minimal (9%)

Procedures

- ▶ *Inclusive Practices Clinical Site Checklist (IPCSC)*
 - completed to determine high quality inclusive placements for clinical experiences and student teaching
 - provided evidence of the extent to which
 - (a) professional standards and research-based practices integrated into the dual program aligned with current regional school and classroom initiatives
 - (b) sites afforded participants opportunities to make essential connections between coursework and real applications of teaching with diverse students in general and special education settings

Procedures

- ▶ *Cooperating Teacher Evaluation of Dual Student Teacher*
 - completed by both general and special education cooperating teacher data
 - provided performance data (e.g., how coursework and clinical experiences prepared the student to student teach in inclusive settings)
- ▶ *Principal Evaluation of Dual Student Teacher*
 - completed by the administrator most familiar with dual student teacher
 - provided performance data (e.g., how coursework and clinical experiences prepared the student to student teach in inclusive settings)

Means, Standard Deviations, and Effect Sizes for Target and Acceptable Schools on IPCSC

Category	Target		Acceptable		$t_{\text{difference}}$	ES
	(n = 44)		(n = 21)			
	M	SD	M	SD		
Collaboration Total Score (18 pts)	15.27	2.04	11.00	1.64	8.38*	2.09
Effective Collaboration (6 pts)	5.14	1.03	3.33	1.16	6.37*	1.76
Systematic Collaboration (4 pts)	3.66	0.65	2.62	0.97	5.13*	1.60
Collaboration/PD and PLC (4 pts)	3.34	0.78	2.57	0.75	3.78*	0.99
Collaboration/PBIS (4 pts)	3.14	0.98	2.48	0.87	2.63*	0.67
Instructional Responsiveness Total Score (8 pts)	7.41	0.84	6.10	1.26	4.98*	1.56
Instructional Diverse Learners (4 pts)	3.66	0.53	3.00	0.84	3.88*	1.25
Instructional/Research-based Practices (4 pts)	3.75	0.62	3.10	0.77	3.70*	1.05
Inclusive Leadership Total Score (14 pts)	12.48	1.34	9.38	2.18	7.07*	2.31
Inclusive Leadership/Collaboration (6 pts)	5.20	0.95	3.71	1.31	5.20*	1.57
Inclusive Leadership/School Initiatives (4 pts)	3.70	0.59	3.05	0.83	3.61*	1.10
Inclusive Leadership/Pre- and Referral (4 pts)	3.57	.82	2.76	1.14	3.27*	0.99
Overall Total Score (40 pts)	35.16	3.06	26.48	3.23	10.51*	2.84

IPCSC: Target Sites

Rural	Urban	Suburban
80%	77%	61%

	Rural (<i>n</i> = 4)	Urban (<i>n</i> = 17)	Suburban (<i>n</i> = 23)
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>
Collaborative/ Inclusive Practices (18 pts)	14.25 (1.89)	15.59 (1.97)	15.22 (2.13)
Instructional Responsiveness (8 pts)	7.75 (0.50)	7.24 (1.09)	7.48 (0.67)
Inclusive Leadership (14 pts)	12.00 (1.83)	12.35 (1.58)	12.65 (1.07)
IPCSC Total Score (40 pts)	34.00 (2.58)	35.18 (3.21)	35.35 (3.10)

IPCSC: Acceptable Sites

Rural	Urban	Suburban
20%	23%	39%

	Rural (<i>n</i> = 1)	Urban (<i>n</i> = 5)	Suburban (<i>n</i> = 15)
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>
Collaborative/ Inclusive Practices (18 pts)	10.00 (0.00)	12.00 (1.23)	10.73 (1.71)
Instructional Responsiveness (8 pts)	7.00 (0.00)	6.60 (1.14)	5.87 (1.30)
Inclusive Leadership (14 pts)	11.00 (0.00)	10.40 (1.67)	8.93 (2.28)
IPCSC Total Score (40 pts)	28.00 (0.00)	29.00 (1.23)	25.00 (3.34)

CT Evaluation of Dual Student Teacher

	Rural (n = 22)		Urban (n = 24)		Suburban (n = 63)	
	<i>M (SD)</i>	Rating	<i>M (SD)</i>	Rating	<i>M (SD)</i>	Rating
Collaboration Inclusive Practices (65 pts)	56.91 (8.82)	Agree	55.92 (6.41)	Agree	51.98 (10.51)	Agree
Instructional Responsiveness (40 pts)	37.64 (3.08)	Strongly Agree	36.92 (3.50)	Strongly Agree	35.78 (5.33)	Agree
Inclusive Leadership (10 pts)	8.95 (0.95)	Agree	8.58 (1.61)	Agree	8.94 (1.16)	Agree
Overall Total Score (115 pts)	103.50 (12.16)	Strongly Agree	101.42 (9.59)	Agree	96.70 (15.08)	Agree

CT Evaluation of Dual Student Teacher

- ▶ Future Support of Dual ST
 - Yes (91%)
 - No (2%)
 - Maybe (7%)
- ▶ *“A model candidate. Effective Teacher. Excellent social skills. A joy to have.”* (CT in a Rural Setting)
- ▶ *“...she goes above and beyond her call. She’s showed grade level ideas of implementation and school wide collaborating during meetings.”* (CT in a Urban Setting)
- ▶ *“..very knowledgeable about pedagogy and special education. She was a wonderful asset in the classroom.”* (CT in a Suburban Setting)

Principal Evaluation of Dual Student Teacher

	Rural (n = 11)		Urban (n = 12)		Suburban (n = 24)	
	<i>M (SD)</i>	Rating	<i>M (SD)</i>	Rating	<i>M (SD)</i>	Rating
<i>Participation & Involvement (35 pts)</i>	<i>32.18 (2.68)</i>	Strongly Agree	<i>31.33 (5.31)</i>	Agree	<i>30.46 (4.35)</i>	Agree
<i>Application of Knowledge & Skills (10 pts)</i>	<i>8.64 (0.67)</i>	Agree	<i>8.92 (1.08)</i>	Agree	<i>8.25 (1.62)</i>	Agree
Overall Total Score (45 pts)	<i>40.82 (3.06)</i>	Strongly Agree	<i>40.25 (6.19)</i>	Agree	<i>38.71 (5.32)</i>	Agree

Principal Evaluation of Dual Student Teacher

- ▶ Future Support Dual ST
 - Yes (100%)
- ▶ Dual ST Rank in Comparison to other STs
 - Top 2% (30%)
 - Top 10% (33%)
 - Top 25 % (15%)
- ▶ *“...has a clearer understanding of the varying needs of children and how to meet these needs compared to other student teachers”* (Principal in a Rural Setting)
- ▶ *“...well prepared for her student teaching experience”* (Principal in a Urban setting)
- ▶ *“Knowledge of content and strategies. Ability to collaborate effectively.”* (Principal in a Suburban Setting)

Conclusions



- ▶ IPCSC data suggest that the professional standards and research-based practices align with the current school initiatives across all geographic settings.
- ▶ Urban and rural schools appear to be more alike than different based on the IPCSC data. Anecdotal data from student teachers suggest there may be differences within some categories of professional standards and research-based practices.
- ▶ Cooperating teachers and principals agree or strongly agree that dual candidates' effectively apply their integrated knowledge and skills (i.e., general and special education) in inclusive classrooms across all geographic settings.

What to do with the needles?

- ▶ Moving to clinical-based models in partnership with schools is challenging
- ▶ If you find school sites that are a 'good fit', how do you sustain partnerships given external factors?



Contact Information

- ▶ For additional information please contact:

Dr. Kelly Anderson @ keanders@uncc.edu

Dr. JaneDiane Smith @ jdianesm@uncc.edu

- ▶ The IPCSC may be downloaded in paper form or accessed electronically on the University of North Carolina at Charlotte's Center for Educational Measurement and Evaluation (CEME) website (<http://ceme.uncc.edu/>). The IPCSC is a product developed as part of the [H325T090011] resulting in no cost to use the paper or electronic versions.