

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

**Instrument: School Year: 2012-2013**

**Description and Use of the Assessment:** Description: The chart below shows the results of the evaluations that are administered during the firstfield 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 is 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 | 3.63 |
| Elementary Education – Graduate Evening Masters | 2.88 |
| Early Childhood special Education- Undergraduate | - |
| Early Childhood Special Education- Graduate | - |
| Special Education Undergraduate | 2.52 |
| Special Education Graduate | 3.74 |
| Secondary Education – Mathematics undergraduate | 3.50 |
| Secondary Education – Mathematics graduate | 2.6 |
| Secondary Education – Science undergraduate | 2.42 |
| Secondary Education – Science graduate | 3.50 |
| Secondary Education – Social Science History undergraduate | 3.92 |
| Secondary Education – Social Science History Graduate | 3.10 |
| Secondary Education – Social Science Psychology undergraduate | - |
| Secondary Education - Social Science Psychology graduate | - |
| Secondary Education – English Language Arts undergraduate | 3.10 |
| Secondary Education - English Language Arts Graduate | 3.30 |
| Secondary Education Average of all candidates | 3.17 |
| **Initial Candidates Average** | **3.18** |

**Discussion**: A review of the data obtainedduring the2012-2013 school year indicates that candidates across the initial programs score in the acceptable to target ranges on the items for this new instruments designed to measure proficiency on the above 12 competencies. The wide range of scores from 2.42 to 3.74 for candidates in their field experience may be indicative of the need to engage in inter rater reliability study with follow up training, discussion and practice scoring for university clinical faculty and mentor teachers who complete the evaluation for the candidates. Even scores of 3.0 + are suspect for no one would expect a candidate in their first field experience to demonstrate such a high level of proficiency.

Some individuals included in the sample who might be expected to score higher on the instrument are those graduate students who may have had experience working as teacher assistants in the schools of which includes several candidates in the Special Education master’s program. High scores are also noted for several of the secondary graduate programs and these scores may be indicative of significantly small numbers of candidates in these samples.

The Initial and Assessment committees will be charged to review the results and engage in conversation about insuring the inter rater reliability and avoiding over evaluation of candidates in their first field experience.
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