

**Unit Assessment Report: Assessment #9 Field Experiences Evaluation**

**Instrument: School Year: 2011-2012**

**Description and Use of the Assessment:**

**Description and Use of the Assessment:** Description: The chart below shows the results of the evaluations that are administered during the first field experience in each initial program. In the Initial Programs the instrument is built on a 4 point scale ranging from Unacceptable to Exceeds. This instrument assesses the candidate’s performance in the classroom in the following areas:

1) Attention to Diversity

2) Command of subject matter

3) Appropriate and Engaging Teaching Practices

4) Planning for Differentiation

5) Creating a positive learning environment

 6) Instructional Delivery

7) Literacy and Communication

8) Assessment

9) Collaborative Relationships

10) Leadership and Advocacy

11) Reflection

12) Professionalism

Criteria for ratings are as follows:

**1 - Unacceptable** - Unsatisfactory level of performance indicating that the teacher candidate has NOT met expectations for this level of experience, is unable to perform without direct supervision or assistance, and is NOT ready to move to the next stage of his/her development. Candidate will require significant coaching and practice before moving on to next level of experience

**2 - Acceptable** - Basic level of performance indicating the candidate has met expectations satisfactorily for this level of experience, is able to demonstrate competency indicators in most situations but at times needs assistance, and is ready to move to the next stage of his/her development. Candidate will require additional guided practice and support during next experience to gain fluency and ensure generalization and maintenance of newly acquired competency.
**3 - Target** - Proficient level of performance indicating the candidate has mastered expectations for this level of experience, is able to function independently of cooperating teacher or university supervisor prompts, and is ready to move to the next stage of their development.
**4 - Exceeds** - Exceptional level of performance indicating the candidate has gone beyond expectations for this level of experience

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Initial Programs**  | **Mean Score** |
| Elementary Education - Undergraduate | 2.61 |
| Elementary Education – Graduate Evening Masters | 2.72 |
| Early Childhood special Education- Undergraduate | NA |
| Early Childhood Special Education- Graduate | NA |
| Special Education Undergraduate | 2.40 |
| Special Education Graduate | 2.79 |
| Secondary Education – Mathematics undergraduate | 2.33 |
| Secondary Education – Mathematics graduate | 2.82 |
| Secondary Education – Science undergraduate | NA |
| Secondary Education – Science graduate | 2.99 |
| Secondary Education – Social Science History undergraduate | 2.45 |
| Secondary Education – Social Science History Graduate | 2.00 |
| Secondary Education – Social Science Psychology undergraduate | NA |
| Secondary Education - Social Science Psychology graduate | NA |
| Secondary Education – English Language Arts undergraduate | 2.50 |
| Secondary Education - English Language Arts Graduate | 2.81 |
| Secondary Education Average of all candidates | 2.56 |
| **Initial Candidates Average** | **2.58** |

**Discussion:**

Aggregated results from the 2011-2012 Field Experience Evaluation administered to initial licensure candidates across all undergraduate and graduate programs reveals performance at expected levels for the first field experience on this instrument. Particularly strong performance (>2.5) is noted among Secondary English Language Arts graduate candidates, Secondary Science graduate candidates, Special Education Graduate candidate, and Elementary undergraduate and graduate candidates.

It must be noted that the target level of performance would require a candidate to function independently of their mentor (cooperating) teacher which would not be a reasonable expectation for a candidate in their first field experience. It is more likely that candidates at this level would perform at the acceptable level with some assistance and guidance from both the mentor (cooperating) teacher and the university supervisor.

It should also be noted that program means indicate that most candidates function at an acceptable level with mean scores >2.0. This indicates that there are no significantly weak program means and reveals that most candidates are scoring at an acceptable level of performance.

Program data reports for Assessment #9 will disaggregate more deeply the area of the evaluation instrument that will trigger program discussion on how to better support candidates in their first field experience.
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