

## **Section IV: Evidence for Meeting Standards**

### **Assessment 4: Assessment of Student Teaching**

#### **Observation and Progress Report**

- **Section One: Lesson Indicators**
  - **Planning**
  - **Action**
    - **Implementation**
    - **Content**
    - **Climate**
    - **Classroom Management**
- **Section Two: Capsule Rating of Observed Lesson**
- **Section Three: Post Observation**
  - **Reflection**
- **Section Four: Ongoing Progress (evaluated by Cooperating Teacher only)**
  - **Professional Behavior**
  - **Technology**

#### **1. Description and Use of Assessment:**

The purpose of this instrument is to provide instructive feedback about the teacher candidate's teaching performance to the teacher candidate, the college supervisor, and the teacher candidate's cooperating teacher during the teacher candidate's student teaching. College supervisors and cooperating teachers conduct three formal observations using this instrument, roughly corresponding to the beginning, middle, and end of student teaching. The instrument is to be completed following each formal observation of classroom instruction. Prior to the lesson, the observer will review the teacher candidate's lesson plan. During the lesson, the observer takes notes and completes SECTIONS ONE and TWO of this instrument. The observer completes SECTION THREE following a post-observation conference with the teacher candidate. Only the cooperating teacher completes SECTION FOUR, which reflects cumulative performance to the date of the observation. After each observation, the college supervisor and cooperating teacher recommend one of three actions: candidate continues with preparation for a teaching license; or candidate completes an individualized contract to remedy deficiencies; or candidate discontinues preparation for a teaching license.

This assessment, like the Teacher Candidate Work Sample, was designed and revised by the FSEHD Assessment Committee with feedback from faculty, and is viewed as a living document that can be changed as needed. Elements in each section address the state standards for teachers (RIBTS) and NCTE standards.

## **2. Description of How the Assessment Specifically Aligns with NCTE Standards:**

For the purposes of this Assessment #4 (Assessment of Student Teaching), our Program evaluates Teacher Candidate performance using the Observation and Progress Report. The Observation and Progress Report aligns with specific indicators within NCTE 2.0 (Candidate Attitudes), 3.0 (Candidate Knowledge), and 4.0 (Candidate Pedagogy), as indicated below.

- Section One: Lesson Indicators (NCTE 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6,3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8, 4.10)
- Section Three: Reflection (NCTE 2.3)

The Capsule Rating (see Observation and Progress Report, page 5) is a summary rating of Section One. This rating is not intended to be an average of all the previous ratings, but should encapsulate the observer's overall assessment of the quality and likely impact of the lesson.

The complete Observation and Progress Report is uploaded as a separate document due to the length of the instrument and formatting issues.

### 3. Analysis of Data:

<b>Section One: Lesson Indicators</b>	<b>Fall 2009 College Supervisor  (Obs. 3)</b>	<b>Fall 2009 Cooperating Teacher  (Obs. 3)</b>	<b>Spring 2010 College Supervisor  (Obs. 3)</b>	<b>Spring 2010 Cooperating Teacher  (Obs. 3)</b>
Planning	5.5	5.27	4.79	4.8
Action: Implementation	5.3	5.11	4.70	4.91
Action: Content	5.48	5.17	4.96	5.28
Action: Climate	5.5	5.32	4.94	5.33
Action: Class Management	5.35	5.26	4.84	4.93
<b>Section Two: Capsule Rating</b>	5.85	6	5	5.16
<b>Section Three: Post Observation Reflection</b>	5.74	5.57	5.06	5.31
<b>Section Four: Ongoing Progress (only teachers assess)  Professional Behavior</b>	N/A	5.75	N/A	5.65
Technology	N/A	4.99	N/A	4.96

For the sake of clarity and brevity, we are using data from the third (last) formal observation from both college supervisors and cooperating teachers. We feel this is an appropriate measurement of student teaching because it occurs after 12-14 weeks in the placement.

The Observation Progress Report was first implemented as a pilot in spring 2009, and we did not have enough data to analyze so did not include it. For Fall 2009 and Spring 2010, the data is somewhat inconsistent for the following reasons. First, the Unit (FSEHD) is still perfecting an online database for both supervisors and cooperating teachers to input their data. Not all teachers were familiar with the system, and thus there is some missing data from them. Second, English Education faculty are still familiarizing themselves with the instrument and calibrating their scores in order to achieve inter-rater reliability. Third, the instrument is a living document, and the Assessment Committee is still perfecting it, which may account for some differences in scores between semesters. Fourth, there is a large difference in student numbers between cohorts (seven in Fall 2009 versus 16 in Spring 2010). For the smaller cohort, extremely high or low numbers skew the data.

That being said, the data do offer significant feedback about our English Education program:

- Our teacher candidates' scores are in the Acceptable (3-4) and Target (5-6) ranges for each section, according to the scoring rubrics for the Observation Report. This, we believe, is evidence of how well our candidates perform in their professional placements and how well our college supervisors and cooperating teachers model and mentor our candidates.
- The data indicate that inter-rater reliability exists between college supervisors and cooperating teachers within each cohort. This consistency is important, as it indicates that candidates are receiving similar messages about their strengths and weaknesses.
- While inter-rater reliability exists within cohorts, it does not exist across cohorts. The Fall 2009 cohort, supervised by Dr. Jennifer Cook, and the Spring 2010 cohort, supervised by Dr. Janet Johnson, indicate that Dr. Johnson and her cooperating teachers score candidates consistently lower. There are multiple factors that could be contributing to this gap, including the variation in size of the cohorts, but we believe that we need to work together to ensure that our interpretations of the instrument are in alignment.
- As we examined the disaggregated data, per teacher candidate, we did not notice any obvious outliers, which is a sign that our instrument is effective in capturing both supervisors' and teachers' assessments of our candidates.

#### **4. Interpretation of Data as Evidence of Standards Met**

As indicated in Section #2, the Observation and Progress Report addresses an array of NCTE standards, including:

- Section One: Lesson Indicators (NCTE 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8, 4.10)
- Section Three: Reflection (NCTE 2.3)

Because most indicators within these sections are aligned to specific NCTE standards, and our candidates score consistently in the Acceptable and Target ranges, it is clear that candidates meet these standards. However, the Teacher Candidate Work Sample and the Candidate Observation and Progress Report do not by themselves completely integrate these NCTE standards. We will enlist the help of the English Education Program Advisory Committee to develop a separate instrument that specifically assesses candidates' pedagogical content knowledge in English Language Arts during student teaching.