

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

**Instrument: Rubric used to Assess Candidates’ Performance**

**School Year: 2014-2015**

**Description and Use of the Assessment:** All the programs leading to initial licensure and some of the programs leading to advanced certification require candidates to conduct field experiences. 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 | 3.35 |
| Elementary Education – Graduate Evening Masters | 3.66 |
| Early Childhood special Education- Undergraduate | 3.44 |
| Early Childhood Special Education- Graduate | 3.54 |
| Special Education Undergraduate | N/A |
| Special Education Graduate | 3.51 |
| Secondary Education – Mathematics undergraduate | N/A |
| Secondary Education – Mathematics graduate | 3.69 |
| Secondary Education – Science undergraduate | 2.10 |
| Secondary Education – Science graduate | 2.45 |
| Secondary Education – Social Science History undergraduate | 2.19 |
| Secondary Education – Social Science History Graduate | 3.08 |
| Secondary Education – Social Science Psychology undergraduate | N/A |
| Secondary Education - Social Science Psychology graduate | N/A |
| Secondary Education – English Language Arts undergraduate | 2.11 |
| Secondary Education - English Language Arts Graduate | 3.26 |
| Secondary Education Average of all candidates | 2.70 |
| **Initial Candidates Average** | **3.03** |

**Discussion:** Review of data indicating assessment of candidates’ field experiences in different programs leading to licensure in elementary, secondary, early childhood, and special education indicates that in general candidates score very well and at above the target level. The patterns of performance continued from previous years’ indicate that candidates pursuing certification at the graduate level perform better than undergraduate candidates. This may be due to candidates’ experience in practicing at different capacities in relation to their area of specialization.

Remediation plans have been implemented in rare cases where a candidate has performed below target with the goal that candidates are adequately prepared and ready before entering clinical practice. The trends also show that graduate candidates have in general performed strongly at the graduate level.
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