

To: Georgette Nemr, Title II Project Director
Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant

From: Erin K. McGurk
Technical Advisor/Professional Developer

Date: December 31, 2003

**Final Report and Recommendations on
Fall 2003 Pilot Study of Student Teaching Rubric and
Cooperating Teacher/University Supervisor Training**

Purpose:

The purpose of this report is to summarize feedback on the design of training for cooperating teachers and university supervisors and the implementation of instruments associated with the student teacher evaluation project and to provide recommendations for changes to the instruments, training design and materials.

Method:

This report is based on information obtained through several sources, including:

- 1) evaluation forms from and observation of Cooperating Teacher /University Supervisor training on October 24 and 25, 2003;
- 2) documentation submitted by the four teacher preparation institutions participating in the pilot study;
- 3) feedback on the instruments obtained through notes from focus groups with student teachers; and
- 4) suggestions and feedback from the cooperating teachers, student teacher evaluation committee members, and university supervisors gathered at a pilot study debriefing meeting on December 18, 2003. See Attachment A at for a listing of meeting attendees.

In addition, regular meetings were held for the purpose of general advisement to and feedback from the Title II Project Director on the implementation of the pilot study.

Forms/instruments:

Data sources: notes from student teacher focus groups, feedback from cooperating teachers and university supervisors, and documentation from teacher preparation institutions

Strengths:

- Some student teachers reported that the rubric helped them plan more effectively and that they had a clearer idea of the expectations for effective teaching
- Lesson plan format worked well for many student teachers, although some student teachers reported a higher level of comfort with the forms they had previously used
- In general, lesson plans submitted were detailed and contained all relevant information as prompted by questions on form.
- All lesson plans submitted indicated connection to either local district curriculum guidelines or state or national content standards. Many student teachers made reference to standards at all three levels.
- Focus on individual student needs in lesson plan seen as useful, helped student teachers focus on being proactive
- Some student teachers reported that they felt better prepared for assessment in the BEST program as a result of participating in the pilot and having the opportunity to utilize a rubric based on the Common Core of Teaching

Weaknesses:

- Many student teachers found rubric “wordy”; some felt there were terms that were unclear or vague.
- On lesson plan form, term “specially identified learners” was not clear.
- While student teachers identified learners with special instructional needs, it was not clear how these needs were determined or identified.
- Student teachers noted confusion about which forms they were to fill out, which were to be filled out by supervisor/cooperating teacher.
- Pre-conference questions were seen to be redundant with information required in lesson plan.
- Post-observation conferences were not conducted, or not conducted consistently, for some student teachers.
- Some student teachers identified as many as 24 standards related to an individual lesson.
- Some student teachers reported difficulty accessing electronic versions of required forms.
- Lesson plans submitted often did not have measurable learning objectives (example: “students will compare and contrast in story”).
- Data collection forms submitted often had rubric ratings in margins or users created an additional column.
- Some data collection forms submitted included judgmental comments (example: superb!) rather than evidence from the lesson observed.
- Rating forms submitted showed some confusion about what ratings to use, with some using U, A, P instead of a numerical rating and others using scores such as 2/3, 2.5 or 3+.
- Documentation submitted showed a pattern of limited data collection to support ratings of student teacher performance. In particular, very few cooperating teachers and university supervisors collected specific data related to competencies 1-3 and for 15-20.

Forms/instruments (continued):

Data sources: notes from student teacher focus groups, feedback from cooperating teachers and university supervisors, and documentation from teacher preparation institutions

Recommendations:

- Simplify and clarify rubric language.
- Label each form with clear information about who (student teacher, cooperating teacher, university supervisor) is responsible for completing the form.
- Eliminate structured pre-observation conference questions.
- Include space on lesson plan form to record notes from pre-conference.
- Revise lesson plan form to include specific prompt to record initiation, lesson development, and closure.
- Revise lesson plan form to prompt for specific, measurable objectives.
- Replace term “specially identified learners” with “individuals needing differentiated instruction”.
- Limit number of related standards to 1-2 priority standards.
- Separate post-observation conference form from lesson plan form.
- Include space on post-observation conference form for overall comments and goals for student teacher.
- Revise data collection form to include column for rubric ratings.
- Add terms to glossary, including concept-based teaching, reflection, differentiated instruction and attach to rubric.
- Make provisions to have all required forms available for download from the Internet.
- Clarify process for rating forms, including using whole number ratings and not totaling or averaging scores.
- Request submission of student work samples with lesson plans from student teachers.

Cooperating Teacher/ University Supervisor Training:

Data sources: observation of and evaluations from training and feedback from cooperating teachers and university supervisors

Strengths:

- Sample notes to correspond with videotapes were seen as a helpful tool
- Participants found notebook/binder of materials organized and user-friendly
- Small group discussions regarding video segments were well-received
- Pilot study guidelines were clarified for participants serving in each role (cooperating teacher/university supervisor)
- Overall evaluation ratings indicated that participants felt that the training had been helpful in learning to apply the student teacher rubric effectively and to distinguish between levels of proficiency

Weaknesses:

- Participants in October training often rated student teacher performances without using specific evidence to make determination of proficiency level.
- Using the Ms. Muffin Mining tape following the Ms. Millie Bean tape seemed to lead to inflated ratings due to the substantive differences in classroom management skills, rather than in actual performance.
- Additional practice in application of rubric and additional time to discuss ratings with peer/table groups was requested.

Recommendations:

- Increase focus in initial training on reviewing each rubric competency and the related proficiency levels.
- More options for training dates and locations should be offered to make it easier for cooperating teachers and university supervisors to attend.
- Expand pool of trainers; consider recruiting trainers from teacher preparation institutions as well as from the existing pool of BEST trainers.
- Identify student teacher and cooperating teacher and/or university supervisor teams that are willing to be videotaped in order to provide models of pre- and post-conferences for future training.

Attachment A

CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Bureau of Educator Preparation and Certification

**December 18, 2003, Student Teaching Evaluation Pilot Study Debrief Meeting
ITBD, New Britain
9:00-12:30**

**Meeting Facilitator: Erin McGurk
Project Director: Georgette Nembr**

	Institution	Lname	Fname	Role
1.	CCSU	Hollander	Holly	Dev Comm Member
2.	Fairfield University	Calderwood	Pat	Dev Comm Member/Supervisor
3.	Fairfield University	Basmadjian	Kevin	Supervisor
4.	Mitchell College	Nogy	Carol	Dev Comm Member
5.	Sacred Heart	Libby	Lois	Dev Comm Member
6.	Univ of Hartford	Wassal	Marth	Coop Teacher
7.	Univ. of Bridgeport	Harper	Richard	Dev Comm Member
8.	Univ. of Hartford	Pedro	Joan	Dev Comm Member/Supervisor
9.	Univ. of Hartford	Hershey	Jay	Supervisor
10.	Univ. of Hartford	Steckler	Barbara	Supervisor
11.	Univ. of New Haven	Ciochine	John	Dev Comm Member/Supervisor
12.	Univ. of New Haven	Gwatkin	Phyllis	Dev Comm Member/Supervisor
13.	Univ. of New Haven	Randi	Judy	Supervisor
14.	WCSU	Stambler	Leah	Dev Comm Member/Supervisor
15.	WCSU	King	Virginia	Supervisor
16.	WCSU	Moore	Ned	Supervisor
17.	WCSU	Tedesco	Jeanette	Supervisor