

CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
 Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant
 Spring 2004 Student Teaching Evaluation Pilot Study

COOPERATING TEACHER FEEDBACK SURVEY

Please complete and mail this survey upon completion of the final student teaching evaluation and no later than May 15, 2004, to:

Georgette Nemr
 Connecticut State Department of Education
 P.O. Box 150471 - Room 243
 Hartford, Connecticut 06115-0471

Cooperating Teacher's Name: _____

University (check one box): Fairfield Sacred Heart UNH UCONN WCSU

1. Demographic Information: Please indicate your responses in the boxes below.

Number of years teaching	Certification Area and Grade/Subject	Total Number of student teachers supported	Total Number of beginning teachers supported

For each statement below, please indicate your level of agreement by circling one rating:

	<i>RATINGS</i>			
	<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
1. Using the new Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric (hereafter referred to as "ST rubric") was helpful to me in understanding the skills the student teacher needed to demonstrate.	4	3	2	1
2. The proficiency levels of the rubric statements (1, 2, 3) were clear and helpful in distinguishing at which level the student teacher was performing.	4	3	2	1
3. This ST rubric required the teacher candidate to demonstrate skills that will be essential to his or her success as a teacher.	4	3	2	1
4. The ST rubric contains appropriate competencies and proficiency levels that are appropriate to student teaching.	4	3	2	1
5. I believe that I was able to <u>consistently</u> measure the student teaching performance using the ST rubric.	4	3	2	1
6. In my opinion, the student teacher's performance was measured <u>consistently</u> by the <u>university supervisor</u> using the ST rubric.	4	3	2	1
7. In my opinion, I was able to effectively use the rubric to provide formative (developmental) and summative (summary) <u>feedback</u> to help the student teacher improve his or her performance.	4	3	2	1
8. The <u>university supervisor</u> effectively used the ST rubric to provide formative (developmental) and summative (summary) <u>feedback</u> to help the student teacher improve performance.	4	3	2	1

CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
 Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant
 Spring 2004 Student Teaching Evaluation Pilot Study

COOPERATING TEACHER FEEDBACK SURVEY

	<i>RATINGS</i>			
	<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
9. The ST rubric is an important tool for my student teacher to use in improving his or her practice.	4	3	2	1
10. The ST rubric was useful in evaluating my student teacher's <u>pedagogical knowledge and skills</u> .	4	3	2	1
11. The ST rubric was useful in evaluating the student teacher <u>during observations</u> .	4	3	2	1
12. The ST rubric was useful in evaluating the student teacher <u>during discussions</u> of his or her work and analysis of student learning.	4	3	2	1
13. This ST rubric enabled the student teacher to evaluate and reflect upon his or her own pedagogical knowledge and skills.	4	3	2	1
14. The ST rubric outlined realistic expectations of a <u>student teacher</u> .	4	3	2	1
15. The student teacher' teacher preparation program (courses and clinical/field experiences) prepared the student teacher well for student teaching.	4	3	2	1
16. The competencies in the ST rubric describe pedagogical skills that should be taught in teacher preparation programs.	4	3	2	1
17. The competencies of the scoring rubric address the content necessary for effective teaching.	4	3	2	1
18. The three proficiency levels on the ST rubric are <u>fair</u> .	4	3	2	1
19. The three proficiency levels of the ST rubric were easy to <u>understand</u> .	4	3	2	1
20. The three proficiency levels of the ST rubric were easy to <u>apply</u> .	4	3	2	1
21. The three proficiency levels of the ST rubric reflect competencies that would suggest <u>future success or performance</u> as an educator.	4	3	2	1
22. The competencies and three proficiency levels are <u>clearly described</u> .	4	3	2	1
23. I believe that more than one evaluator could come up with the same score for a student teacher candidate using this rubric to measure performance.	4	3	2	1
24. This rubric is appropriate for evaluating all student teacher candidates, regardless of demographic and cultural variables (i.e. age, gender, race/ethnicity).	4	3	2	1
25. The student teacher had sufficient opportunity during the placement to demonstrate each competency in the ST rubric.	4	3	2	1
26. I feel that the rubric scores I gave the student teacher accurately reflect his or her abilities as an educator.	4	3	2	1

CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
 Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant
 Spring 2004 Student Teaching Evaluation Pilot Study

COOPERATING TEACHER FEEDBACK SURVEY

	<i>RATINGS</i>			
	<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
27. The student teacher was able to demonstrate all competencies included on the instrument during his or her student placement.	4	3	2	1
28. The rubric requires a student teacher to analyze his or her performance based on PK-12 student learning.	4	3	2	1
29. The rubric requires a student teacher to collect and analyze evidence of PK-12 student learning in order to determine instructional effectiveness.	4	3	2	1
30. The rubric and the proficiency levels indicate that PK-12 student learning is an important factor in measuring the degree to which a student teacher is demonstrating teaching competence.	4	3	2	1

Open-ended items. Please answer the following questions by writing your response in the space provided. If you need additional space, please write on the back side of the page.

31. Are there any overall comments or suggestions you would like to make that might improve the student teaching rubric for future candidates and cooperating teachers?
32. Are there competencies in the student teaching rubric that need clarification for you? Please identify the competencies that are confusing or unclear and explain why.
33. Are there proficiency statements (1, 2, or 3 level) in the student teaching rubric that need clarification for you? Please identify the proficiency statements that are confusing or unclear and explain why.
34. How easy was it to use the ST rubric to describe the student teacher's performance against the proficiency levels? Please explain