

Evaluating Connecticut State Department's Student Teaching Rubric, Materials and Pilot Study Procedures

Jacqueline Kelleher, Evaluator

Fall 2003 Title II Pilot Study

Cooperating Teacher/University Supervisor Training

January 9, 2004

Background Synopsis

The Issue

The Connecticut State Department of Education is aware that Connecticut's fifteen teacher preparation institutions are using various instruments to evaluate teacher candidates. Varying instruments may lead to inconsistent measurement of candidate performance. Additionally, these instruments may or may not be aligned with the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching [CCCT] standards. Candidates are required to demonstrate competency in the CCCT pursuant to State **Standards and Procedures for the Approval of Connecticut Educator Preparation Programs** Section 10-145d-11. In the summer of 2003, a committee of higher education representatives from these institutions formed and generated a Student Teaching Rubric to accompany CCT standards and expectations. In the fall of 2003, four institutions agreed to pilot the student teaching rubric and additional evaluation tools. The objective of this evaluation is to collect data that will determine the merit and worth of the student teaching tools and related materials. Additionally, this evaluation will collect information on the pilot study process. The purpose of this evaluation, an investigation collecting data using mixed methodologies, is to make recommendations for how to improve the instruments and pilot study

experience for future participants.

Pilot Study Synopsis:

Use of Evaluation: 1. To improve product; evaluation will provide feedback to project personnel regarding the rubric and additional tools 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.

Audience: Connecticut State Department of Education; participating higher education institutions.

Evaluation/Project Objectives.

Initial Evaluator questions:

- Did the higher education committee develop a rubric that can appropriately measure a teacher candidate's competency on the CCCT? Is the instrument clear? Is the instrument reliable and valid?
- How do stakeholders perceive the student teaching rubric and piloting materials? Do they find the instruments effective? Is the rubric easy to use in evaluating student teachers? What feedback do stakeholders have regarding the instruments?
- Do different stakeholders have different perceptions about the instruments?
- Did the training for cooperating teachers and university supervisors provide the necessary support and information to run a reliable and valid pilot study? What were areas of strength and weakness?
- Did higher education institutions follow the procedures requested by CSDE in the pilot study?

- What are suggested revisions for both the student teaching rubric and materials and pilot study?

Principle Players/Stakeholders.

Key players in this evaluation are university supervisors, cooperating teachers, and teacher candidates associate with the University of Hartford, Western Connecticut State University, The University of New Haven, and Fairfield University. A total of 49 participants provided information and feedback on this project through feedback surveys and focus group meetings.

Description and Plan for Title 2 Pilot Project Evaluation:

For this project, the role of the evaluator is to collect information and determine the merit and worth of the tools and pilot process.

Methods – In order to evaluate the product and process, a mixed methodology was necessary to collect the right information needed to make recommendations and revisions.

- Quantitative: Based on other product and process evaluation plans and the nature of project goals and objectives, a survey was developed. Questions were specifically framed to gather data on the products
- Qualitative: Focus group questions geared toward the student teaching instruments and the pilot study process were created. Four focus groups, one at each institution, were conducted with the student teachers.
- Material culture: all materials and background information necessary for this evaluation was assessed and summarized

Quantitative Results: Survey

Demographic data

University Supervisors.

Thirteen respondents in the study were university supervisors. The mean number of years spent as an educator in a PK-12 setting was 22 with a 12.08 standard deviation, indicating significant experience in the field. In terms of supervision, the mean number of years engaged in student teacher supervision was 6.08 with a 5.05 standard deviation. Certification areas for the supervisors were varied, ranging from All Subjects K-12, English, math, biology, chemistry, reading, health, and history to Special Education. Several supervisors had certifications in Supervision & Administration.

Cooperating Teachers.

Sixteen respondents in the study were cooperating teachers. The mean number of years teaching in the field was 21 and, during that time, the cooperating teachers hosted on average six student teachers and mentored close to on average three beginning teachers through Beginning Educator Support and Training (BEST) Program. Only 18% of respondents had not worked with a BEST candidate as a mentor. There was a wide distribution of certification areas and grade levels currently being taught. The sample of educators represented nearly every area of certification and grade level, elementary, middle, secondary and K-12 areas.

Teacher Candidates.

Twenty respondents were teacher candidates. Eighty percent were female and twenty percent were male. A frequency distribution revealed an even spread in terms of certification area and grade placements. In terms of teacher preparation, seventy percent indicated they were enrolled in a graduate/MAT program, twenty-five percent were in an undergraduate program, and five

percent did not specify. The institutions they attended represented three private and one state university, at both the graduate and undergraduate levels.

Table of Mean Responses.

**Feedback Survey Evaluation
Results: Fall 2003**

Ratings: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Agree, 4=Strongly Agree
ST = Student Teacher
CT = Cooperating Teacher
SU = Supervisor

	Mean Rating(M)		
	ST	CT	SU
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.	3.15	3.19	3.27
2. The proficiency levels of the rubric statements (1, 2, 3) were clear and helpful in distinguishing at which level the student teacher (or I) was performing.	2.65	3.00	2.92
3. The student teacher (or I) had sufficient learning opportunities in my preparation program and clinical experiences, prior to student teaching, to demonstrate the <u>planning</u> competencies (#1-3) outlined in the ST rubric.	3.30	n/a	3.65
3. [CT only] This ST rubric required the teacher candidate to demonstrate skills that will be essential to his or her success as a teacher.	n/a	3.56	n/a
4. The student teacher (I) had sufficient learning opportunities in my preparation program and clinical experiences, prior to student teaching, to demonstrate the <u>teaching</u> competencies (#4-12) outlined in the ST rubric.	3.15	n/a	3.65
4. [CT only] The ST rubric contains appropriate competencies and proficiency levels that are appropriate to student teaching	n/a	3.25	n/a
5. The student teacher had sufficient learning opportunities in my preparation program and clinical experiences, prior to student teaching, to demonstrate the <u>assessing and adjusting</u> (#13-16) competencies outlined in the ST rubric.	3.05	n/a	3.27
5. [CT only] I believe that I was able to <u>consistently</u> measure the student teaching performance using the ST rubric.	n/a	3.06	n/a

CSDE Student Teaching Rubric/Pilot Procedures

6. The student teacher had sufficient learning opportunities in my program and in clinical experiences, prior to student teaching, to demonstrate the <u>professional</u> competencies (#17-20) outlined in the ST rubric.	3.30	n/a	3.54
6. [CT only] In my opinion, the student teacher's performance was measured <u>consistently</u> by the <u>university supervisor</u> using the ST rubric.	n/a	3.33	n/a
7. This ST rubric required the teacher candidate to demonstrate skills that will be essential to his or her success as a teacher.	3.40	n/a	3.62
7. [CT only] 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.	n/a	3.13	n/a
8. The ST rubric contains appropriate competencies and proficiency levels that are <u>appropriate</u> to student teaching.	2.85	n/a	3.23
8. [CT only] 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.	n/a	3.07	n/a
9. [Supv] I believe that I was able to <u>consistently</u> measure the student teaching performance using the ST rubric.	n/a	n/a	3.12
9. [CT] The ST rubric is an important tool for my student teacher to use in improving his or her practice.	n/a	3.13	n/a
9. [ST] The ST rubric is an important tool for me to use in improving my teaching practice.	2.95	n/a	n/a
10. In my opinion, the student teacher's (or my) performance was measured <u>consistently</u> by the <u>cooperating teacher</u> using the ST rubric.	3.25	n/a	3.25
10. [CT] The ST rubric was useful in evaluating my student teacher's <u>pedagogical knowledge and skills</u> .	n/a	3.00	n/a
11. In my opinion, I (my supervisor) 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.	3.40	n/a	3.15
11. [CT] The ST rubric was useful in evaluating the student teacher during observations.	n/a	3.13	n/a
12. 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.	3.20	n/a	3.23
12. [CT] The ST rubric was useful in evaluating the student teacher during discussions of his or her work and analysis of student learning.	n/a	2.94	n/a
13. [Supv] The ST rubric is an important tool for my student teacher to use in improving his or her practice.	n/a	n/a	3.38
13. [ST] The <u>university supervisor</u> effectively used the CCCT ST rubric to provide formative (developmental) and summative (summary) <u>feedback</u> to help me improve my performance.	3.20	n/a	n/a
13. [CT] This ST rubric enabled the student teacher to evaluate and reflect upon his or her own pedagogical knowledge and skills.	n/a	3.00	n/a
14. [Supv] The ST rubric was useful in evaluating my student teacher's <u>pedagogical knowledge and skills</u> .	n/a	n/a	3.38
14. [CT] The ST rubric outlined realistic expectations of a <u>student teacher</u> .	n/a	2.87	n/a

CSDE Student Teaching Rubric/Pilot Procedures

14. [ST] The ST rubric was effectively used by my <u>cooperating teacher</u> to evaluate my teaching skills.	3.10	n/a	n/a
15. [Supv] The ST rubric was useful in evaluating the student teacher <u>during observations</u> .	n/a	n/a	2.85
15. [CT] The student teacher' teacher preparation program (courses and clinical/field experiences) prepared the student teacher well for student teaching.	n/a	3.38	n/a
15. [ST] The ST rubric was effectively used by my <u>university supervisor</u> to evaluate my teaching skills.	3.45	n/a	n/a
16. [Supv]The ST rubric was useful in evaluating the student teacher <u>during discussions</u> of his or her work and analysis of student learning.	n/a	n/a	3.19
16. [CT] The competencies in the ST rubric describe pedagogical skills that should be taught in teacher preparation programs.	n/a	3.33	n/a
16. [ST] The ST rubric was used to evaluate me <u>during observations</u> of my teaching	3.45	n/a	n/a
17. [Supv] This ST rubric enabled the student teacher to evaluate and reflect upon his or her own pedagogical knowledge and skills.	n/a	n/a	3.50
17. [CT] The competencies of the scoring rubric address the content necessary for effective teaching.	n/a	3.00	n/a
17. [ST] The ST rubric was used to evaluate me <u>during discussions</u> of my work and my analysis of student learning.	3.05	n/a	n/a
18. [Supv] The ST rubric outlined realistic expectations of a <u>student teacher</u> .	n/a	n/a	3.27
18. [CT] The three proficiency levels on the ST rubric are <u>fair</u> .	n/a	2.75	n/a
18. [ST] The ST rubric outlined <u>realistic expectations</u> of me as a student teacher.	2.75	n/a	n/a
19. [Supv] The student teacher' teacher preparation program (courses and clinical/field experiences) prepared the student teacher well for student teaching.	n/a	n/a	3.77
19. [CT] The three proficiency levels of the ST rubric were easy to <u>understand</u> .	n/a	2.93	n/a
19. [ST] The ST rubric addresses the skills necessary for effective teaching.	3.20	n/a	n/a
20. [Supv] The competencies in the ST rubric describe pedagogical skills that are taught in the teacher preparation program for which I supervise.	n/a	n/a	3.65
20.[CT] The three proficiency levels of the ST rubric were easy to <u>apply</u> .	n/a	3.13	n/a
20.[ST] My teacher preparation program (courses and clinical/field experiences) prepared me well for student teaching.	3.43	n/a	n/a
21.[Supv] The competencies of the scoring rubric address the content necessary for effective teaching.	n/a	n/a	3.42
21.[ST] The ST rubric competencies are aligned with the knowledge, skills and dispositions covered in my teacher preparation program.	3.33	n/a	n/a
22. The three proficiency levels on the ST rubric are <u>fair</u> .	2.65	n/a	3.08
22. [CT] The competencies and three proficiency levels are <u>clearly described</u> .	n/a	2.81	n/a
23. The three proficiency levels of the ST rubric were easy to <u>understand</u> .	2.50	n/a	2.92
23. [CT] I believe that more than one evaluator could come up with the	n/a	3.07	n/a

CSDE Student Teaching Rubric/Pilot Procedures

same score for a student teacher candidate using this rubric to measure performance.			
24. The 3 proficiency levels of the ST rubric were easy to apply.	2.60	n/a	2.62
24. [CT] This rubric is appropriate for evaluating all student teacher candidates, regardless of demographic and cultural variables (i.e. age, gender, race/ethnicity).	n/a	3.20	n/a
25. The three proficiency levels of the ST rubric reflect competencies that would suggest <u>future success or performance</u> as an educator.	2.88	2.80	3.27
25. [CT] The student teacher had sufficient opportunity during the placement to demonstrate each competency in the ST rubric.	n/a	3.13	n/a
26. The competencies and three proficiency levels are <u>clearly described</u> .	2.47	n/a	2.58
26. [CT] I feel that the rubric scores I gave the student teacher accurately reflect his or her abilities as an educator.	n/a	3.50	n/a
27. 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.	2.80	n/a	3.04
27. [CT] The student teacher was able to demonstrate all competencies included on the instrument during his or her student placement.	n/a	3.07	n/a
28. This rubric is appropriate for evaluating all student teacher candidates, regardless of demographic and cultural variables (i.e. age, gender, race/ethnicity).	3.15	n/a	3.27
28. [CT] The rubric requires a student teacher to analyze his or her performance based on PK-12 student learning.	n/a	3.13	n/a
29. The student teacher had sufficient opportunity during the placement to demonstrate each competency in the ST rubric.	2.95	n/a	3.21
29. [CT] The rubric requires a student teacher to collect and analyze evidence of PK-12 student learning in order to determine instructional effectiveness.	n/a	3.27	n/a
30. [Supv] I feel that the rubric scores I gave the student teacher accurately reflect his or her abilities as an educator.	n/a	n/a	3.33
30. [ST] The major pedagogical knowledge and skills that are taught in my teacher preparation program are reflected in this ST rubric.	3.21	n/a	n/a
30. [CT] 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	n/a	3.00	n/a
31. [Supv]The student teacher was able to demonstrate all competencies included on the instrument during his or her student placement.	n/a	n/a	3.19
31. [ST] I feel that my scores on the ST rubric accurately reflect my abilities as an educator.	3.00	n/a	n/a
32. The rubric requires a student teacher to analyze his or her performance based on PK-12 student learning	2.75	n/a	3.62
32. [ST] I used the ST rubric to evaluate and reflect upon my own pedagogical knowledge and skills.	3.05	n/a	n/a
33. The rubric requires a student teacher to collect and analyze evidence of PK-12 student learning in order to determine instructional effectiveness.	2.89	n/a	3.38

34. 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.	2.89	n/a	3.31
--	------	-----	------

Results

Survey instruments listed between 30-35 questions regarding the student teaching rubric and materials. Most mean responses were above the 3.00 range, indicating most participants agreed with the items. The rubric was useful in helping all participants understand the competencies they needed to demonstrate over the course of the student teaching experience. University supervisors felt the rubric listed the essential skills teacher candidates need to demonstrate to be a successful teacher in the future ($M = 3.27$); teacher candidates ($M = 2.88$) and cooperating teachers ($M = 2.80$), although approaching agreement, did not agree that the tool had this predictive capabilities.. Teacher candidates and observers felt they had a strong enough background to demonstrate behaviors listed in the rubric. Overall, as indicated in the table, participants were in agreement that the CCCT rubric and materials are reliable, valid, and appropriate. However, there were a few areas of importance that should be addressed as part of this evaluation. Participants did not agree or only moderately agreed with the following:

- proficiency levels of the rubric statements were clear and easy to apply
- student teaching instrument was useful during discussions with teacher candidate about performance and during observations
- student teaching rubric identified realistic expectations
- three proficiency levels of the rubric reflected competencies indicative of future success as an educator

Qualitative Results

Teacher Candidate Participants

Demographic data. Data were collected from four focus groups held at four volunteer institutions. Eight participants, mostly nontraditional, and five females and three males, were graduate students from Fairfield University; two participants, traditional and female, were

bachelor's seeking students from the University of Hartford; four participants from Western Connecticut State were two females/two males and all were bachelor's seeking students; and, six participants came from University of New Haven, all of whom were female and there was a mix between traditional and nontraditional students seeking a Master's in Teaching. There was a diverse spread of age, area of certification, and clinic placements.

Format. Focus group sessions were facilitated in a similar fashion. Students were welcomed and provided with an overview of the pilot study as well as a format for questions and answers. Students were thanked in advance for their participation. The focus group met for forty-five to sixty minutes, ending with students having the opportunity to ask questions of the facilitators. Before leaving the session, students verified their contact information and were informed they would receive a certificate of participation from the CSDE.

Focus group common themes

Inconsistent use of rubric and accompanying tools.

The first half of the pilot semester was confusing for most participants. Teacher candidates commented that supervisors and cooperating teachers did not seem to know how to use the instrument. Most participants said that this feeling of ambiguity dissipated after the October 24 and 25 Training for Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors and that they began using the tools after that training and midterm in the placement. Several participants used the CCT rubric in various ways during the pilot study, including using the rubric to score a videotaped lesson, build a lesson plan to incorporate competencies, and engage in self-assessment after a lesson. The most common use seemed to be going through the instrument with a cooperating teacher and supervisor in conference formats. There were, however, a sample of participants who reported looking at the rubric for the first time during the focus group; they did not use the instrument during the student teaching part of the pilot study. ...

Critique of rubric

Most respondents felt the rubric was a complete, thorough, effective tool because there was a clear outline of behaviors participants could follow as guidelines. Teacher candidates commented that the tool is a good reminder of characteristics that need to be demonstrated and users are secure in the fact the rubric is fashioned after the CCT. Some teacher candidates used the rubric while planning their lessons so they could be sure to incorporate the necessary expectations. However, a majority of participants felt the tool needed to be adjusted to accommodate a fourth or emerging category with respect to evaluating performance. Additionally, there were several comments that centered on the language used to define unacceptable, acceptable, and proficient; teacher candidates found little difference in the language that separated the different categories and recommended more discerning categories. There was also some confusion among some of the teacher candidates about whether cooperating teachers and supervisors were using this tool with the mindset that what it was specifically designed for student teachers and not for experienced teachers. They were not sure their supervisors were keeping in mind that there is a different set of expectations for student teachers than a professional educator. To some participants, the rubric was as formal and layered as a BEST portfolio rubrics instrument and this proved to be a concern to the cooperating teachers. There is a lot of information contained in the rubric and some teacher candidates felt they could not meet all of the expectations given their placement and the relationship with their cooperating teachers.

Several respondents felt the tool was too wordy and overwhelming. One teacher candidate shared that the format was not user friendly and another shared, “[the tool] makes you want to run and hide.”

Degree of helpfulness in learning process

The general consensus was that the rubric was helpful in presenting state expectations. The idea of the rubric was well-received and participants agreed that the current model is headed in the right direction. Many participants used the tool to guide planning and to engage in dialogue with their cooperating teachers and supervisors. Student teachers felt pressured to touch on every behavior in every lesson. Student teachers commented that the emphasis should be made on meeting competencies over time rather than all in one lesson. This directive was not clearly expressed by supervisors.

Also, comments indicated that some of the classroom/clinical experiences did not lend themselves to fitting particular competencies on the rubric, so some student teachers felt unfairly penalized as a result. At least one participant shared that the way the rubric is designed and the materials are designed, the whole experience felt unnatural and unrealistic; she admitted to planning and executing artificial lessons for observation purposes that in no way reflected the lessons she was giving while not being observed.

A couple of participants were working with cooperating teachers and supervisors who were not sharing the rubric or ratings, so they found the materials unhelpful in their professional development. Students indicated that the rubric is a helpful and useful tool, but it needs to be incorporated over time and cooperating teachers/supervisors need to show them how to use it in a realistic format.

Effective tool: Format and Communication

Students liked the way the rubric was a tool that kept “everyone on the same page”. There were many comments that supported the idea that a common rubric seemed to standardize the experience and allowed for better dialogue. Students were aware that this format was similar to BEST portfolio expectations and agreed that working with a similar tool earlier on is likely to ensure success later. Students appreciated the data source list and encouraged CSDE to develop

that area with more examples. Students felt the categories (i.e. fostering collaboration, responsibility, moral conduct) were effective and challenging. Nearly everyone agreed that the rating sheet was helpful because everyone used it the same way.

A few cooperating teachers and supervisors reported to their student teachers that the rubric was awkwardly worded or too wordy and requested a parsing down of the language. With respect to the design of the instruments, participants were split. Nearly half of the participants found the format acceptable. The other half provided some information that will lead to improving the instrument. Some of these suggestions included:

- Breaking down categories and descriptors into more simple, bulleted items; the wording of items is overwhelming
- More clarity in defining unacceptable, acceptable and proficient; it was suggested a glossary might accompany the tool with references to items in the descriptors as well as the categories. In some cases, cooperating teachers had different ideas and definitions for terms in the CSDE materials.
- Changing “unacceptable – 1” to “novice” or something in between acceptable and proficient; one student commented not to use an odd numbered rubric or everyone will fall into the middle.
- A fourth category; emerging could come after unacceptable to indicate growth
- Remove the numbers and have the categories only

Rubric alignment with teacher preparation program

This was another area where participants were split. Nearly half of the students shared this was the first time they were being exposed to CCT expectations and were required to align lessons with state/national standards. They said that they had not been exposed to CCT concepts in education classes nor had the chance to implement activities and lessons that would allow them

to see in advance how they meet state expectations. Students found items on the rubric that they were not prepared in (i.e. differentiation).

Other students felt the CCT has been embedded in their teacher preparation program and they were familiar and comfortable with the categories and expectations. Some of the wording might be a little different from what they have worked with in class, but it was relatively straightforward because of prior exposure.

Lesson plan format and use

- Where many people thought the rubric was mostly aligned with what they have been learning in their teacher prep classes, most people felt the lesson plan format and pre/post conference expectations were dissimilar from what they had been previously exposed to. This was an area of great criticism. The lesson plans were not like the 3-4 page lessons required of them by core classes. Other suggestions included formatting the lesson plan and conference forms to allow more room, eliminating phrases such as “why did you choose”, and to eliminate the redundancy between the pre and post conference forms. Students used their university format/materials and cut and paste into state instruments since the CSDE lesson plan format differed from what they have been working with at their home institutions. Although there were a few who appreciated the lesson plan format and commented on ease of use, a majority of participants felt it was too difficult to use the state format after being conditioned to use the institutional format.

Some comments from the focus groups specific to enhancing the CSDE supporting materials included:

- Would have been helpful to have a model
- Too vague
- Not Bloom friendly; does not accommodate for multiple objectives

- Categories are not juxtaposed in a way that is manageable (i.e. material and resources, content summary)
- Didn't understand unit goal, local state or national all on there. We had to do a unit for our class and seemed kind of redundant.
- For assessment, the directions not clear on what to write. If it's what I'm thinking, it doesn't say that it is to be written a certain way. I didn't cut and paste the lesson objective and reword as assessment (which is what I usually do).
- Lesson plan form, first couple of times, wrote it the way I used to, to make it work in my own head, easier to write it and figure out how to reword it. Didn't know the exact standard [curricular—national/state] I am aligning it to. Supervisor wanted to know the exact standard to align it to.
- It's an easier form to use but not easy to use for implementing instruction [on a daily basis]. Not bulleted, harder to pick up what student teacher is doing when teaching. This is a more general lesson plan form.
- I was cutting and pasting information into the state form; I did not use the state form in my planning and implementation—I just cut and pasted to contribute to the pilot. I was more comfortable with my institutional lesson plan and resorted to that.

Pre- and post-conference/rating forms and experience

Students felt the pre and post conference items helped to keep them on track and guided reflective thinking. They felt some of the items were redundant or not appropriate for every meeting (i.e. use of instructional groups when working one on one, writing about the same child in every lesson). Different institutions and supervisors used the forms and conferencing in different way. Some supervisors meet before and after and some supervisors had students mail them the conference forms and gathered data that way. Some students who met with supervisors

before their lesson felt the experience was too long and too intense before going through the observation session; it was recommended that the session be shortened and/or to have an abbreviated pre-conference format to follow. Additionally, people shared it was very hard to schedule regular meeting times for observations when trying to teach class every block and/or the supervisor needing to go see other teacher candidates. Student teachers who did meet directly with their supervisors with the post conference form felt they needed more time to reflect; they felt that if they had the opportunity to consider their lessons at night, they would have shared more reflective information with their supervisors.

Student teachers commented that they liked the portion on the lesson plan that had them indicate state and national standards. One student noted “writing the standards helps one make connections to goals and objectives.”

Most people liked the rating form that was used at the mid-term and final. They felt that this added standardized form was helpful and allowed for consistency. However, it was clear that many participants were getting caught up in the numbers game and focusing on the degree to which they were earning 3s rather than whether they were rated as unacceptable or acceptable.

Consistency of ratings

There was another split in affective comments specific to consistency. Student teachers either felt the rating tool enabled complete consistency with standardization or student teachers had been kept in the dark with respect to how their cooperating teachers or supervisors scored their performance. Some of the comments focused on dissension between supervisor and cooperating teacher scores, where other issues beyond the scope of this evaluation seemed to be festering. Several issues that emerged had to do with tensions between supervisors and cooperating

teachers that were evident to the teacher candidate. Some comments included:

- The form's definition and my cooperating teacher's definition of what 1,2,3 was not clear, there is a lot of "some", "most" hard to tell- did they do enough?
- my university supervisor said "I wouldn't give most of the teachers I know 3s", but some others [other student teachers] were getting 3s
- cooperating teacher added all the numbers up, calculated score, I got 81, which is a B- and almost considered as failing at my school.

Despite some of these concerns, by and large, students shared that using the tool led to ratings that were closely aligned between observers and student teachers' perception. There was a higher degree of confidence with respect to the alignment of the final ratings compared to the mid-term ratings when everyone was confused with how to use the instruments. One thing that excited some of our participants is that the state is moving toward mandating a consistency that will control for "an A at Central is the same as an A at UNH and that Sara's A means the same thing as Simon's A". Students feel that there is so much subjectivity in evaluation at this point that different grades mean different things depending on the supervisor or teacher you are working with. These CSDE tools will work toward controlling for grade inconsistencies.

The final comments were directed toward inconsistency among supervisors and cooperating teachers. Although the ratings might have looked similar, the experience each student teacher had with his or her supervisor/cooperating teacher was different.

Improvement of practice after working with tools and after seminar

Over half of the participants indicated that the rubric and the pre-post conference materials led to the improvement of reflective practice. They were able to see growth using the rating sheets.

Student teachers who used the CCT rubric felt they gained a deeper understanding of the CCT since they "went through the motions" and applied it.

Initially the experience was difficult and the participants felt confused, but after the seminar, all people involved were in a better spot.

There were some student teachers who felt their cooperating teachers were not open to sharing the CSDE binder, materials, and opinions with their student teacher; they felt that it was not a collaborative effort and that this should be addressed in future pilots.

Realistic expectations of student teachers

Nearly all participants agreed that the expectations outlined in the rubric were “do-able” and realistic if broken down and observed over time rather than in one session. The tools as they are now seemed overwhelming and complicated, but the basic proficiencies did not come as a surprise to any participants.

Useful experience for future teachers

Most participants felt that having a rubric that everyone follows will facilitate consistency across evaluations for all student teachers. Therefore, the general consensus across participants was that this pilot was a valuable experience personally and will be a valuable experience for future preservice educators.

Reflections on pilot experience

Student teachers by and large felt there was a tremendous amount of confusion centered on the pilot study. There was also some resentment among student teachers that they were never asked to volunteer; they noted that it was an imposition to be singled out for the pilot and that there was extra work without any incentives. Student teachers felt out of the loop, except on occasions where materials were “thrown at them”. For the first part of the pilot, it was a frustrating experience and student teachers felt “backed into a corner”.

Student participants shared their perceptions that cooperating teachers voiced confusion and frustration about feeling ambiguous toward the paperwork; supervisors were not clear on how to work with the pre and post conference forms.

Some cooperating teachers reported to their student teachers that it was a lot of work to complete

all of the forms and university forms on top of CSDE forms.

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 second half of the semester.

Student teachers wanted more involvement; in the future, the students would like a more formalized session for using the rubric and accompanying materials. Several participants made the suggestion that materials should be disseminated well in advance so there is not an additional stressor at the beginning of student teaching.

The October 24 and 25 training sessions seemed to shed a lot of light on the pilot for cooperating teachers, so there was a great turnaround near the second half of the semester.

Some students feel more prepared for the BEST Program and feel a stronger relationship with the state department as a result of participating in 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.

Open-ended Responses on Survey Instrument.

Although the pilot study evaluation survey was primarily used to collect quantitative data, there were a few questions that yielded qualitative data. The following items are open-ended items on the instrument with bulleted themes that emerged from respondents.

Student Teacher Participants

Open-ended Responses on Survey Instrument

1. Are there any overall comments or suggestions you would like to make that might improve the student teaching rubric for future candidates?

- The rubric was very useful for planning my lessons and assessing my teaching. It helped me make adjustments to my lessons. A suggestion would be to explain the rubric to a future student before they use it.
- Some student teachers were having a hard time understanding what "proficient" meant (a more clear definition is appropriate).
- It would be helpful if the three proficiency levels could be altered. For example, it was sometimes difficult to decide between the levels. At times I would have liked to be in between the levels (2+). I also felt that the rubric contained too many words
- Make 4 categories for grading rather than the 3 (Unacceptable, Acceptable, Proficient). Make wording clearer. Examples were vague. Change name of each category (unacceptable - beginner).
- The total number of items on which a student teacher is judged was too much! I was never able to demonstrate all those items in one lesson. Often I felt pressured to include them because of fear.
- I would like to suggest that #1 be referred to as something other than "unacceptable". And if you're a student teacher it's kind of difficult to strive toward "proficient." Perhaps that can be renamed as well and the expectations lowered a little.
- I feel that the rubric shows the student teacher what he/she needs to do in depth to become an effective teacher.
- I think the lesson plan format should be more succinct. I am repeating myself in it and I also feel like the old format I used laid everything out in an easier manner.
- Offer a glossary of terms.*
- Give student teachers forms that don't have the same questions on them.

*It is important to note that a full scale glossary was created and distributed to pilot participants at the beginning of the pilot, but the materials may not have reached all stakeholders.

2. Are there competencies in the student teaching ST rubric that need clarification for you?

Please identify the competencies that are confusing or unclear and explain why.

- no
- They were very clear and easily understood.
- All! I never had the patience to sit and analyze all the competencies. They are extremely wordy and unclear.
- Text clarification too wordy. Condense the competencies to one sentence - too many competencies to be included in one lesson plan. It wasn't that competencies were confusing - they are all important, it's the language that is difficult to understand.
- I feel that the competencies are well explained but a bit wordy. Perhaps a more terse description would help.
- The competency #7 in which I promote shared responsibility for learning needs more clarification so I have a better idea of what it means to communicate and reinforce high expectations for learning...opportunities for self-monitoring. It's difficult to apply
- Competency 7 - proficient category is very subjective, Competency 8 - how would a University Supervisor know prior learning segments?, Competency 12 - difference between acceptable and proficient is expression? Very subjective.
- Most of the rubric is unclear to me. I feel that the difference between 1-2 or 2-3 is very different competencies.

3. Are there proficiency statements (1, 2, or 3 level) in the student teaching ST rubric that need clarification for you? Please identify the proficiency statements that are confusing or unclear and explain why.
- no
 - They were very clear and easily understood.
 - The wording throughout the rubric was too vague and unclear
 - There needs to be a 4th level. There are big differences between a 2nd & 3rd level for instance. There aren't always suitable resources for all students to support all the needs. It's hard to see a student teacher in 3 categories
 - The proficiency statements are fine, but there are too few. There should be another category and they should be re-labeled. The term "proficient" was a bit misleading.
 - Several of the proficiency statements need clarification because it is difficult to distinguish between "acceptable" and "proficient". For example, competency #5 - in the first bullet: 2) Establishes rapport by demonstrating fairness and acceptance
 - I would like clarification on the proficiency statement in #4 that reads, "consequences are generally consistent and developmentally appropriate to the students". I understand the consistency aspect but I'm not clear on how consequences can be development.
 - 2/3 are too similar in terms of the descriptors. It was hard for my cooperating teacher/supervisor to choose between these numbers.
4. How easy was it to use the ST rubric to describe your performance against the proficiency levels? Please explain.
- It was easy to use the rubric but also very time consuming

- Each section of the rubric was clearly defined. It stated exactly what should be expected for proficient teaching and gave examples, which helped me to plan effective lessons. The source of data was very useful in helping me know where to look when assessing my own performance.
- Very easy! I feel the rubric correlated with our past assessment proficiency and was very clear!
- As I stated earlier, I felt that there should be more than three levels to go by.
- Due to the difficulty understanding the competencies, I had a hard time using the rubric to evaluate my performance.
- I felt that most of the time I was a 2+ or 3- there needs to be a fourth column/level.
- The rubric became a little cumbersome at times. Therefore I used the rating sheet as more of a guide and the rubric as a reference to go back to when I needed more information or clarification.
- I found it difficult to rate myself 2 or 3. At times I felt that a 2 was too low, but a 3 was too high. Also, since the proficiency statements were not always clear, it was hard to choose, and I found myself choosing one based on how I felt I did.
- I tried to work backwards. First review the competency, then review what I needed to do to be proficient, then work to arrange my lessons based on the proficiency level.
- It was not too difficult. But the student teacher had to "demonstrate" most of it. (Overall; the rubric provided me with standards that I should be looking for. It was not possible to demonstrate some of them.)
- I feel as if it was easy to describe my performance against the proficiency levels. I know what I needed to work on to become an effective student teacher from the beginning to the end.

- It was rather difficult because of the size. Flipping through the entire document took a very long time.
- It would have been helpful if the rubric allowed halves [scores] as well as just whole numbers.

As these data indicate, there were mixed reactions to the instrument. Student teachers were in favor of the content for the most part, but had specific issues with formats and definitions.

Cooperating Teacher Participants

Open-ended Responses on Survey Instrument. The cooperating teacher had the same questions as their student teachers.

1. Are there any overall comments or suggestions you would like to make that might improve the student teaching ST rubric for future candidates?

- # 5 was a little too vague i.e. fostering a learning community
- I believe that there should be more time set aside for pre & post conferences and an introduction for student teachers about this would help.
- NO
- Some sections contain competencies that could have been graded/marked separately within the 3 proficiency levels / 1 competency i.e.: - a ST could: communicate the behavior clearly yet not apply consequences consistently.
- The rubric is very difficult to use. It needs 4-5 categories. 3 is insufficient and renders the rubric essentially useless.
- I want my colleagues to be the best, and I want someone to screen out unsuitable candidates early in the process - BUT I also fear we are asking too much too soon of our new colleagues, judging from the fact that so many (over half) leave within 5 years -

- I feel that the cooperating teachers and the supervisors are reading the rubric in different ways. Supervisors are marking down because they are only there for 40 mins.
Cooperating teachers are grading on an overview of the student teacher.
- #12 in "acceptable" column - The sentence doesn't make sense. Needs to be rewritten.
- Provide coop. Teachers w/ a disk for recording observation notes. I finally received one in late Nov. but the competencies did not align with the Data Collection Form. (For example #6 on one is actually #7 on the rubric.)
- In answering #14 - realistic expectations of a student teacher. I feel that most student teachers would probably fall into the 2 or acceptable category. Very few (even experienced teachers) would meet the criteria for 3 or proficient
- The rubric should allow for halves to be given instead of just the three levels of proficiency.

2. Are there competencies in the student teaching ST rubric that need clarification for you?

Please identify the competencies that are confusing or unclear and explain why.

- Everything was clear and understood
- NO
- Some competencies are redundant especially for elementary grades. I believe much more evidence needs to be shown in classroom management and varied models of teaching (i.e. small groups, tutorial, large group, "stations")
- The term "standards of behavior" can be interpreted many ways...academic, social, etc.
- Wow, I wish every adult in every interaction could be held to such awesome standards!
- #7 - Supervisors and cooperating are reading them differently.

- I found a few of the competencies to be cumbersome and overwhelming, but mostly #11: #11 - there is too much here. It was hard to keep in mind the main objective of this competency, as it dealt with communication styles, student-centered vs. teacher centered.
- #3 and #10 overlap in terms of differentiation, which makes it confusing.
- Now that I have used the ST rubric several times and have read and reread the proficiency statements numerous times, I feel I am finally beginning to feel less confused and unclear as I was initially. What I like most is the lime green Mid-term & Final rating sheet!
- They were difficult to understand until I attended the workshop. The first time was very difficult for me and took several hours. After attending the workshop, I was more confident about using this as an assessment piece but not as the only assessment.

3. Are there proficiency statements (1, 2, or 3 level) in the student teaching ST rubric that need clarification for you? Please identify the proficiency statements that are confusing or unclear and explain why.

- Everything was clear and understood
- NO
- I am clear on all the statements although I would like to see more explanation of assessing.
- Although the terminology should seem clear, my idea of "proficient" is based on the ST as a student teacher not yet expected to be 100% "proficient" as an experienced teacher. Maybe the rubric could include a definition of proficient
- 3 are insufficient. Rubric needs at least 4 columns to be effective.
- #12 in the "proficient" column - could better define "expressively". #10 not enough difference between "acceptable" and "proficient" on this one.

- I found the distinction between level 2 and level 3 to very often be vague, esp. in the following competencies: #4 - "generally consistent" vs. "applied consistently" #5 - "occasionally models sensitivity" vs. "frequently models sensitivity"
 - #1 - under proficiency level 2 - define "uneven progression" it's not clear. #12 under proficiency level 2 - correct the language after the second bullet.
 - Some of the statements like "Generally Support", "Some Diversity", "General Connections" are so subjective and unclear. I'm sure that two people rating the same ST could come up with entirely different scores after reading these nebulous, vague statements
4. How easy was it to use the ST rubric to describe your student teacher's performance against the proficiency levels? Please explain.
- The ST rubric made it easy to describe the student teachers performance. I feel, however, that this is too wordy and I like the CCI assessment.
 - Was able to script and the implement specifics in the notes from observation of the lesson. However, it was very time consuming.
 - This was easy because I had a fine student teacher and superb supervisor
 - It was very clear and concise.
 - Overall, easy once I attended the all day workshop in October, although the University supervisor explained it early on as well.
 - Very difficult . The rubric needs more levels. 3 is neither appropriate nor effective.
 - It was hard to determine the difference between a 2 and a 3 for some of the numbers. The rubric needs to explain a 2 and a 3 better.

- Given the vagueness between the proficiency levels, and also the length of some of them (#5 and #11), it wasn't always so straightforward in determining "acceptable" versus "proficient" performance.
- It takes a bit of practice. After scripting, I would place observational notes in the appropriate spaces on the Data Collection Form & then consult the rubric to determine a rating.
- As I said earlier, it took a lot of going back and forth from one to the other to get it done. I imagine the more I use it, the easier it would become.
- The ST rubric was very easy to use.

University Supervisors

Open-ended Responses on Survey Instrument. University supervisors had the same open-ended questions on their survey instruments. Themes that emerged are reported below.

1. Are there any overall comments or suggestions you would like to make that might improve the student teaching ST rubric for future candidates?

- Preference for a 4pt. likert scale - such as the one you are using for this feedback survey e.g. marginally acceptable moving close to proficiency
- Provide a T sheet that shows how CCI effective teaching skills (10 indicators / 22 attributes) are embedded in the CCCT. Helpful for student teachers to take a first step w/ effective teaching skills - then progress to full CCCT rubric
- I was trained in the use of the CCI and am experienced in using it. In my view, the significant changes between it and the student teaching rubric are items 10, diversity/differentiation and 11, higher order thinking / student-student instruction. I like the STR
- The student teachers had a difficult time with the 3 categories and wanted something

between 2 & 3. Some of the wording was difficult to understand.

- #8 - Should there be a "basic skills" checklist for the first few weeks of ST?

Developmentally, they are not ready for this rubric until they master more basic.

- Very difficult to use early in practicum. Can it be simplified to take this into account? It is too long. We don't have that much time in a post-conference. Can't see my non-faculty supervisors doing this well at all.
- I think that the rubric did indeed measure the degree to which the student teacher demonstrated the competencies. In some instances though, we were compelled to give 2.5, which may indicate that we are not comfortable in all areas to give proficiency.

2. Are there competencies in the student teaching ST rubric that need clarification for you?

Please identify the competencies that are confusing or unclear and explain why.

- # 15 - analyzing multiple sources of data limited during student teaching.
- Engagement / reengagement are clear to me because I was a BEST assessor. I believe that periodic sweeps of the class - documented in a script - is a powerful
- I don't think they need additional clarification
- #7 Effectively is difficult to assess & be objective. #10 Diversity of learning need has to be more defined.
- Fostering ethical & responsible behavior - I know what it means but supervisors don't see this at a particular lesson. Promoting sensitivity is another one that is not always seen. What are we looking for here? - touchy/feeling teachers?
- #7, 8 & 9
- 3 & 10 - repetitive overlapping. 7 & 11 repetitive overlapping.
- As part of the development committee, I know the pains we took to clarify the language and I feel that we achieved that objective.

3. Are there proficiency statements (1, 2, or 3 level) in the student teaching ST rubric that need clarification for you? Please identify the proficiency statements that are confusing or unclear and explain why.

- Very Time consuming - Scheduling pre & post conferences challenging esp. if student has sequential classes, duties, etc.
- All Okay
- No. I think they're adequately clear
- #10 2,3, the terms some & various
- At my institution students would score more "3s" for a variety of reasons - older, experienced, poised, program is taught by practitioners.
- I feel that most of them do not flow into each other smoothly. (Indicators)
- Need one more proficiency level 1 - - 3

4. How easy was it to use the ST rubric to describe your performance against the proficiency levels? Please explain.

- Need one more step. Rubric data is like the old T sheets from assessor days. Need opportunity to give narrative feedback.
- No Problems. After having served as a cooperating teacher/mentor, State CCI assessor, and now a portfolio scorer, this Rubric is a logical outgrowth of the CCCT and its embedded CCI. Note: Extensive paper work is time consuming
- I think it was generally easy. Having a fairly good understanding of almost all of the competencies due to my familiarity with the CCI provided the background I think I need to adapt to the STR. I think this feedback survey is well developed

- I'm growing to like using detailed evaluation rubrics - I find good ones to be flexible enough to be suitable for my students. The students are learning to view the rubrics as roadmaps to help judge their own work. I also have experienced an easing of my
- Not as easy as I had thought. There is a lot of room for judgments especially if the student teacher is a good student as well.
- The instrument well serves its purpose. As in any pilot, the instrument needs to be refined. Using the standards demonstrated that, when expectations are clear, Student teachers can & do rise to the challenge. I saw great growth in both my student teachers
- With practice it was easier. Sometimes difficult to use w/ a single lesson. Easier after several lessons b/c there was more data & more growth. It is hard for students to be consistent, just as it is for us. Who can be up 180 days on a consistent basis?
- I found it somewhat difficult completing this instrument on a single lesson.
- The instrument became easier to work with as I practiced.
- I believe the rubric made it very easy to compare the performance of the student teacher to a set criterion. I saw the student teacher a number of times and the suggestions he got based on the rubric he improved on in the future lessons.

Joint Committee Standards

In conducting the evaluation of the student teaching instrument and pilot procedures, what Joint Committee Program Evaluation Standards are most important to address? How are each met?

Utility Standards: standards used to ensure the evaluation will serve the information needs of intended users

- Audience and stakeholders were identified after discussions with Georgette Nemr and after exploring information gathered from the CSDE Title 2 training manual--

U1

- Evaluation professional has been prepared as a professional evaluator by Western Michigan University MTS Summer Institute 2000 and MTS Internship 2000 participation. –U2
- The perspectives, procedures, and rationale for the evaluation are carefully described and the findings are clearly interpreted. –U4
- Evaluation reports contain essential information with recommendations to allow for maximum impact; all reports are organized and follow a timeline agreed upon by all parties. –U5, 6, 7

Feasibility Standards: standards intended to ensure that an evaluation will be realistic, prudent, diplomatic, and frugal

- Evaluation makes use of focus group information, and participants are contacted in advance to ensure procedures are not disruptive or interrupt the flow of pilot procedures. –F1
- The project director and evaluator discussed possible political tensions and ways to deal with such tensions should they arise. --F2
- The evaluation is cost effective and practical. All parties engaged in email, fax, and telephone to conduct evaluation cost effectively. Interviews were in line with midpoint meeting; the evaluator did not evaluate the entire project, but rather identified a smaller component. Most money fronted for the evaluation was a part of a Title 2 grant. –F3

Propriety Standards: standards used to ensure that an evaluation will be conducted legally, ethically, and with due regard of the welfare of those involved

- Evaluation questions, goals, objectives, and collection procedures were derived with the sole purpose of assisting the organization in serving the needs of targeted

participants; evaluation tables and work plans were designed and agreed upon by Georgette Nemr and Jacqui Kelleher. –P1 & P2

- Use of informed consent form—P3
- Complete and fair assessment of the student teaching tools and participants involved in design and procedures identified both strengths and weaknesses; participants did not feel threatened or harmed. –P4 & P5
- All evaluation reports and findings will be disclosed to Georgette Nemr and CSDE; all expenditures are accounted for and are appropriate for the evaluation. – P 7 & 8

Accuracy Standards: standards used to ensure that an evaluation will convey technically adequate information about the features that determine worth or merit of the evaluated project.

- Program, project, and pilot process are clearly identified –A1
- Project, context, purposes and procedures are described in detail so information can be assessed –A2 & A3
- Sources of information are adequately described –A4
- Evaluation questions answered systematically and adequately through qualitative and quantitative measures—A 8 & 9
- Conclusion justified so stakeholders can assess them –A10

Respondent Recommendations and Evaluation Findings

Respondent suggestions generated from data yielded from focus groups and survey responses for pilot and instrument improvement and overall feedback are grouped together below.

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.

- The student teaching rubric and rating system must include a fourth category.
- 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 evaluation teacher candidates. Some of the modifications include eliminating wordiness, defining terms, and designing the tool in way that student teachers must show proficiencies over time rather than all in one lesson. With respect to the proficiencies, the different levels outlined in the rubric need to be more discerning and easier to apply. There was some concern that the proficiencies as they are do not reflect future 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.
 - Proficiency levels in the rubric were not clearly defined or easy to apply. This may have been due to the participants' lack of training and understanding in the rubric development. It is strongly recommended that all stakeholders leave pilot training sessions with a clear understanding of the language used to define terms.
 - Participants were dissatisfied with the training session in September, technical support, 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.