

CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
FALL 2004 Student Teaching Evaluation Pilot Study

UNIVERSITY SUPERVISOR FEEDBACK SURVEY

Please complete and mail this survey upon completion of the final student teaching evaluation and no later than **December 10, 2004**, to:

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

Supervisor's Name: _____

Supervisor's Institution: (check box below):

Fairfield Conn Col Sacred Heart Saint Joseph UNH UB

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

Number of years served as a PK-12 educator	Certification Area and Grade/Subject	Total number of years as a student teacher supervisor

2. On average, how many hours did you spend conducting a single observation and follow-up conference with a student teacher in the pilot study?	# hours
3. On average, how many hours did you spend writing up the typical evaluation of the student teacher performance per single observation (including time you spent reviewing your notes/script, reviewing the ST's lesson plan form, reviewing the ST's responses to the Post-Observation Questions and completing the data collection form)?	# hours per evaluation
4. On average, how many hours did you spend writing up the mid-term or final evaluation of the student teacher's performance (including time you spent on reviewing your notes/script, reviewing the ST's lesson plan form, reviewing the ST's responses to the Post-Observation Questions and completing the data collection form)?	# hours per mid-term or final evaluation

For each statement below, please indicate your level of agreement by circling one rating:	RATINGS			
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5. 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
6. 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
7. The student teacher had sufficient learning opportunities in my preparation program and clinical experiences, prior to student teaching, to demonstrate the planning competencies (#1-3) outlined in the ST rubric.	4	3	2	1
8. The student teacher had sufficient learning opportunities in my preparation program and clinical experiences, prior to student teaching, to demonstrate the teaching competencies (#4-12) outlined in the ST rubric.	4	3	2	1

CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
FALL 2004 Student Teaching Evaluation Pilot Study

UNIVERSITY SUPERVISOR FEEDBACK SURVEY

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>
9. The student teacher had sufficient learning opportunities in my preparation program and clinical experiences, prior to student teaching, to demonstrate the assessing and adjusting (#13-16) competencies outlined in the ST rubric.	4	3	2	1
10. The student teacher had sufficient learning opportunities in my program and in clinical experiences, prior to student teaching, to demonstrate the professional competencies (#17-20) outlined in the ST rubric.	4	3	2	1
11. This ST rubric required the student teacher to demonstrate skills that will be essential to his or her success as a teacher.	4	3	2	1
12. The ST rubric contains appropriate competencies and proficiency levels that are appropriate to student teaching.	4	3	2	1
13. I believe that I was able to <u>consistently</u> measure the student teaching performance using the ST rubric.	4	3	2	1
14. In my opinion, the student teacher's performance was measured <u>consistently</u> by the <u>cooperating teacher</u> using the ST rubric.	4	3	2	1
15. 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
16. The <u>cooperating teacher</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
17. The ST rubric is an important tool for my student teacher to use in improving his or her practice.	4	3	2	1
18. The ST rubric was useful in evaluating my student teacher's <u>pedagogical knowledge and skills</u> .	4	3	2	1
19. The ST rubric was useful in evaluating the student teacher <u>during observations</u> .	4	3	2	1
20. 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
21. This ST rubric enabled the student teacher to evaluate and reflect upon his or her own pedagogical knowledge and skills.	4	3	2	1
22. The ST rubric outlined realistic expectations of a <u>student teacher</u> .	4	3	2	1
23. The student teacher' teacher preparation program (courses and clinical/field experiences) prepared the student teacher well for student teaching.	4	3	2	1

CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
FALL 2004 Student Teaching Evaluation Pilot Study

UNIVERSITY SUPERVISOR FEEDBACK SURVEY

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>
24. The competencies in the ST rubric describe pedagogical skills that are taught in the teacher preparation program for which I supervise.	4	3	2	1
25. The competencies of the scoring rubric address the content necessary for effective teaching.	4	3	2	1
26. The three proficiency levels on the ST rubric are <u>fair</u> .	4	3	2	1
27. The three proficiency levels of the ST rubric were easy to <u>understand</u> .	4	3	2	1
28. The three proficiency levels of the ST rubric were easy to <u>apply</u> .	4	3	2	1
29. 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
30. The competencies and three proficiency levels are <u>clearly described</u> .	4	3	2	1
31. 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
32. 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
33. The student teacher had sufficient opportunity during the placement to demonstrate each competency in the ST rubric.	4	3	2	1
34. I feel that the rubric scores I gave the student teacher accurately reflect his or her abilities as an educator.	4	3	2	1
35. The student teacher was able to demonstrate all competencies included on the instrument during his or her student placement.	4	3	2	1
36. The rubric requires a student teacher to analyze his or her performance based on PK-12 student learning.	4	3	2	1
37. 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
38. 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.

CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
FALL 2004 Student Teaching Evaluation Pilot Study

UNIVERSITY SUPERVISOR FEEDBACK SURVEY
--

39. Are there any other comments or suggestions you would like to make that might improve the student teaching rubric for future candidates?
40. 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.
41. 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.
42. How easy was it to use this instrument to compare performance to a standard set of criteria? Please explain.