

**Unit Assessment Report: Assessment #4 – Clinical Practice Evaluation**

**School Year: 2012-2013**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Initial Programs**  | **Mean Score** |
| Elementary Education - Undergraduate | 3.85 |
| Elementary Education – Graduate Evening Masters | 3.77 |
| Special Education Undergraduate | 3.15 |
| Special Education Graduate | 3.60 |
| Secondary Education – Mathematics undergraduate | 3.63 |
| Secondary Education – Mathematics graduate | 3.50 |
| Secondary Education – Science undergraduate | 3.23 |
| Secondary Education – Science graduate | N/A |
| Secondary Education – Social Science History undergraduate | 3.15 |
| Secondary Education – Social Science History Graduate | 3.00 |
| Secondary Education – Social Science Psychology undergraduate | N/A |
| Secondary Education - Social Science Psychology graduate | N/A |
| Secondary Education – English Language Arts undergraduate | 3.68 |
| Secondary Education - English Language Arts Graduate | 3.87 |
| Secondary Education Average of all candidates | 3.44 |
| **Initial Candidates Average** | **3.49** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Advanced programs** | **Mean Score** |
| Educational leadership: Principal Preparation  | 2.71 |
| English as a Second Language | 2.00\* |
| Instructional Technology | N/A |
| Reading and Literacy | 2.82 |
| School Counseling |  |
| **Advanced Programs Average** | **NA** |

* ESL utilizes a 2 point scale

Discussion:

A review of results from the 2012-2013 school year indicate that candidates in the college of education at Lewis University meet performance expectations in the assessment of the knowledge and skills they demonstrate in clinical practice. A change in the instrument for initial candidates was implemented this year as the competencies are now measured on a 4 point scale rather than a 3 point scale. The new clinical practice evaluation form was developed by a task force of university faculty who serve as supervisors in the field along with mentor teachers and administrators from our P-12 partner schools. The goal of the task force was to create an evaluation form that provided both quantitative and qualitative feedback to the candidate and to more closely measure ability to meet the learning needs of all P-12 students, demonstrate cultural competence, assess learning of P-12 students, and integrate into the school community. As the results show, the initial candidates performed well within expectations. Some concern is noted on the unusually high average score of the elementary education undergraduate candidates and both the department and the unit will investigate the understanding of the competency ratings and how consistently they were applied. As with any new assessment instrument there is a need to measure the reliability and validity of the instrument by both the university supervisor and the mentor teacher.

In addition to a new instrument, the unit has engaged mentor teachers in a seminar to improve their clinical supervision skills including but not limited to use of the evaluation instrument. These forums have provided practice and dialogue on how to effectively set goals for the teacher candidates and give specific and constructive feedback to improve their skills in the classroom. In this seminar, stages of teacher development are introduced so that mentors will have an understanding of what is “average” performance by a novice so as not to over or under evaluate the candidate’s performance,

In the advanced program the methodology for measuring performance varies by program and it is therefore difficult to compare performance from one program to another. Advanced candidates are generally in service teachers looking for additional licensure and an advanced degree. Advanced candidates earn high ratings from their onsite mentors and university supervisors.
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