

Evaluation Executive Summary

Jacqueline Kelleher, Evaluator

Fall 2003 Title II Pilot Study--January 9, 2004

Respondent Recommendations and Evaluation Findings

Use of Evaluation: 1. To improve product [CCT Student Teaching Rubric and materials]; evaluation will provide feedback to project personnel regarding the instrument with the intent of improving existing tool. 2. To improve pilot study process; evaluation will provide feedback on the pilot study to project personnel with the intent of improving the next round of piloting.

Data were collected from four higher education institutions and analyzed. The formal investigation can be found in the full evaluation report entitled “Evaluating Connecticut State Department’s Student Teaching Rubric, Materials and Pilot Study Procedures”. Respondent suggestions for improvement and keeping specific components in place as institutions continue with the pilot process, both as participants in the interview process, on the survey instrument, or on the open-ended portion of the survey, are grouped together below in a formal summary of findings.

- The student teaching rubric and rating system would be improved by including a fourth proficiency level.
- The higher education committee developed a student teaching rubric that appropriately measures teacher candidate proficiencies on the CCCT. With proper modifications, this is a tool that participating institutions feel confident about using in terms of evaluating teacher candidates. Some of the modifications include eliminating wordiness, defining terms, and designing the tool in way that student teachers must show proficiency in the competencies over time rather than all in one

lesson. With respect to the proficiency levels, the different levels outlined in the rubric need to be more discerning and easier to apply. There was some concern that was voiced in the focus groups and among survey results garnered from teacher candidates and cooperating teachers that the proficiency levels as they are do not reflect future success as an educator; however, survey results yielded from university supervisors indicated agreement that the proficiencies reflecting competencies that could predict success as an educator..

- However, for the most part, there were very positive perceptions regarding the student teaching rubric and materials.
- The student teaching rubric and accompanying materials possess language that is difficult to understand and is often vague or unclear. Specific suggestions have been offered in the qualitative portion of this report. If such suggestions were followed, participants felt confident these tools would be effective and easier to use. Many participants commented that the student teaching instruments were not completely useful during discussions and observations with and of teacher candidates.
- Nearly all stakeholders deemed the student teaching rubric reliable and valid.
- Cooperating teachers and university supervisors had stronger, more positive feelings about the usefulness and effectiveness of both the student teaching evaluation tools and pilot process.
- Cooperating teachers and teacher candidates tended to feel that the student teacher rubric was overwhelming and did not provide realistic expectations for student teachers, but university supervisors found the tools to be reflective of what a student teacher should be able to do within a semester. It is not clear whether or not this is an issue with the rubric or if it was an issue with the pilot study training. This perception may exist because student teachers and cooperating teachers were not familiar with the terminology used in the instrument and may not have had the opportunity to

apply the tool to the video in the training experience.

- Cooperating teachers were dissatisfied with the meeting on the pilot study in September, ongoing technical support from the state and/or supervisors, and dissemination of information throughout the pilot. The second pilot study needs to make sure that everyone is clear on his or her responsibilities, use of the pilot tools, and there should be follow up support.
- Not all institutions followed the guidelines and procedures in a standard format, thereby threatening the reliability of some of these evaluation results.
- Model lesson plans, pre/post conference forms, and perhaps examples of what makes a teacher candidate one of the three levels should be incorporated with future materials.
- Pre and post conference forms were helpful in guiding dialogue between student teachers and supervisors.
- All participants found the rating forms effective, useful, and helpful in standardizing ratings.
- Most participants did not care for the CSDE lesson plan format and preferred using the home institution forms since it is what they had been using for months prior to the pilot study.
- Teacher candidates felt that they were not invited to participate. They had no choice with respect to participation and some harbored resentment throughout the pilot. Some students felt that their student teaching experience was drastically different compared to peers who were not involved in the pilot; on one hand they feel more informed with respect to the CCT, but on the other hand they felt like they put in at least double the work of their peers.
- Materials were not disseminated appropriately; many students reported not getting the lesson plans or the conference forms. There were quite a few students who did

not get the rubric until near the end of the semester.

Respondent suggestions generated from data yielded from focus groups and survey responses for pilot and instrument improvement and overall feedback have been grouped together to reflect impressions of the pilot study and instruments. Although the suggestions and feedback are insightful and will help shape the instruments and future training sessions, the overarching suggestion is to not incorporate too many changes to the instruments and materials until the pilot has been run again. At this time, it is not clear whether the same feedback will be collected after the training program has been modified. Suggestions and feedback specific to the pilot training session and overall communication should be analyzed first. If similar findings in support of modifying the instruments are apparent after the pilot training session [with modifications] has been run, it is highly recommended the CSDE modify the instruments. Comments targeted toward the instruments may have been made due to a lack of understanding of how the instruments should be used in the students teaching context. It would be appropriate to pilot the instruments again before making further modifications.