

Final Report and Supporting Documentation

Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant

Submitted on behalf of the:

Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument Development Workgroup



Written and prepared by:
Georgette Nemr, Title II Project Director
Connecticut State Department of Education

Date: January 26, 2004

Table of Contents

Section I:	Introduction	Page 3
Section II:	Task Development.....	Page 8
Section III:	Validity/Accuracy, Reliability/Consistency, and Fairness	Page 10
Section IV:	Connecting the Task to Unit Assessment.....	Page 16
Section V:	Appendices.....	Page 18
Appendix A	7/14/03 and 9/5/03 Student Teaching Rubrics	
Appendix B	Manual for Fall 2003 Pilot Training for Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors	
Appendix C	CCCT and Student Teaching Rubric Alignment Chart	
Appendix D	Evaluations from the Fall 2003 Pilot Training for Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors	
Appendix E	Pilot Study Focus Group Discussion Notes	
Appendix F	Executive Summary and Background Synopsis: Evaluating Connecticut State Department's Student Teaching Rubric, Materials and Pilot Study Procedures and	
Appendix G	Final Report and Recommendations on Fall 2003 Pilot Study of Student Teaching Rubric and Cooperating Teacher/University Supervisor Training	
Appendix H	Final Student Teaching Rubric 1/15/04	
Appendix I	Final Forms to facilitate the student teaching evaluation process 1/15/04	

Section I Introduction

Section Overview:

In May of 2003, all deans of Connecticut educator preparation institutions including the Alternate Route to Certification (ARC) Program were invited to be part of a workgroup to review state teaching standards and develop an instrument to be used state-wide for the purpose of assessing student teaching performance. Based on accreditation data from the last five years, the CSDE has been aware that the student teaching evaluation instruments being used by the 15 teacher preparation institutions and the Alternate Route to Certification (ARC) Program are not in aligned with state teacher standards articulated in the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching (CCCT). Therefore, an area of concern for the CSDE and for all teacher preparation programs is developing an instrument for assessing student teaching performance that would align with state teaching standards and be part of the unit assessment system as required under National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standards.

Connecticut Program Approval Regulations Section 10-145d-11(b)(2) stipulate that the professional education unit (i.e., school or college of education) shall:

- (A) Demonstrate that students are knowledgeable about the Common Core of Learning, the Common Core of Teaching, the Connecticut Mastery Tests, the Connecticut Academic Performance Test, the Code of Professional Responsibility for Teachers, and the Code of Professional Responsibility for School Administrators;
- (C) Ensure that students demonstrate current Connecticut licensure competencies as defined in Sections 10-145d-400 through 10-145d-619 inclusive, of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, the Common Core of Teaching, and the Connecticut Content Specific Standards;

In June of 2003, the Connecticut State Department of Education convened a student teaching evaluation workgroup. Of the 16 institutions including ARC, only 10 institutions were represented on the workgroup (see chart below). Six institutions were not represented: Saint Joseph College, Connecticut College, Quinnipiac University, SCSU, Yale, and the ARC Program.

The workgroup convened was facilitated by the Title II Project Director and comprised of higher education representatives and PK-12 educators:

Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument Development Workgroup			
	Institution	Workgroup Member	Title
1.	CCSU	Holly Hollander*	Director of Student Teaching
2.	CCSU	Mitch Sakofs	Associate Dean of Education
3.	ECSU	Catherine Tannahill*	Faculty
4.	Fairfield	Sandra Billings*	Director of Secondary Education
5.	Fairfield	Pat Calderwood*	Director of Elementary Education
6.	Mitchell	Carol Nogy*	Assoc. Professor of Early Childhood

7.	Sacred Heart	Lois Libby*	Faculty
8.	UCONN	Jean McGivney-Burelle	Faculty and Director of Teacher Education
9.	UCONN	Jacqui Kelleher	Faculty and Assessment Coordinator
10.	Univ of Bridgeport	Richard Harper*	Director of Student Teaching
11.	Univ of Hartford	Joan Pedro*	Faculty
12.	Univ of Hartford	Regina Miller	Director of Education
13.	Univ of New Haven	Phyllis Gwatin	Faculty and Certification Officer
14.	Univ of New Haven	John Ciochine*	Faculty
15.	WCSU	Leah Stambler*	Faculty

16.	CSDE	Jack Hasegawa	Educator Program Approval Coordinator
17.	CSDE	Georgette Nemr	Title II Project Director
18.	EASTCONN	Nancy Potter*	Workgroup Facilitator
19.	CCSU/Professional Developer	Erin McGurk*	Workgroup Facilitator, Training Developer and Faculty Member/Supervisor at CCSU

* Indicates that workgroup member also has PK-12 teaching experience.

The project deliverables included the following:

1. A student teaching evaluation rubric
2. A design for training Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors
3. Pilot testing of instrument with evaluation data from forms developed to facilitate the evaluation process
4. Survey data from Student Teachers, Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors to validate the rubric and the evaluation process
5. Data from focus group meetings with student teachers from the pilot institutions
6. Data from meeting to debrief with university supervisors and workgroup members on the rubric, forms and processes used to implement the student teaching evaluation process

Milestones of the project included:

Date	Description of Milestone
June 29, 2003	First meeting of the development workgroup. Discussed short and long-term goal of the project, reviewed the CCCT and set timelines for development of the rubric.
September 5, 2003	Last meeting of the development workgroup. Reviewed latest version of the rubric and forms to be used in the Fall 2003 pilot study. Discussed overview of the training to be designed and delivered. Pilot formally initiated with dissemination of forms and rubric.
October 24 and 25, 2003	Fall 2003 Pilot Training for Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors conducted. 8 participants attended on October 24, and 31 attended on October 25. Training evaluations were collected.

November 12, 13, 18 and December 4	<p>Student Teachers Focus Group Meetings were conducted at the 4 pilot institutions. Focus group data was compiled and summarized. Questions included but were not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>How have you used the student teaching rubric?</i> • <i>Was rubric clear?</i> • <i>Was it helpful in assisting you in demonstrating proficiency?</i> • <i>Was it a realistic tool...expectations?</i>
December 11,	<p>Pilot Study documentation due to project director including following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Midterm evaluation data from cooperating teachers, and supervisors. • Final evaluation data from cooperating teachers, and supervisors. • Feedback Surveys from cooperating teachers, supervisors and student teachers.
December 18, 2003	<p>Debrief meeting with supervisors and development workgroup members. Meeting agenda included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Summary of Oct 24 & 25 Training Evaluations 2. Summary of Student Teacher Focus Group Data 3. Usability of Rubric for Formative and Summative Discussions with Student Teachers and revisions to the student teaching rubric, forms and process.
December 2003 – January 2004	<p>Evaluation results examined and revisions made to the Student Teaching Rubric, Forms and Cooperating Teacher Training</p>

Data from the fall 2003 pilot study were then used in making revisions to the rubric, forms, evaluation the procedures and the training for Cooperating Teachers and Supervisors in order to plan and implement a Spring 2004 pilot study.

The following documents were shared with the development workgroup at the June 29, 2003, meeting to provide a context and charge for the project:

CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Bureau of Certification and Professional Development

Connecticut Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument Development Workgroup
June 30, 2003
ITBD, New Britain, CT

Purpose: To develop a common, statewide student teaching evaluation instrument based on the Common Core of Teaching and INTASC Standards.

Rationale: Based on national and state expectations for accountability and consistency of assessment of prospective teacher candidates, the CSDE is facilitating the development, piloting and implementation of a statewide student teaching evaluation instrument. National and state expectations and standards include:

NCATE Standards stipulate that:

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practices

Element 3: Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions To Help All Students Learn

Target Standard: Candidates demonstrate mastery of content areas and pedagogical and professional knowledge before admission to and during clinical practice. Assessments used in clinical practice indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards and have a positive effect on student learning. Multiple assessments are used by candidates and clinical faculty to determine areas that need improvement and to develop a plan for improvement. Candidates work collaboratively with other candidates and clinical faculty to critique and reflect on each others' practice and their effects on student learning with the goal of improving practice.

Field experiences and clinical practice facilitate candidates' exploration of their knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to all students. Candidates develop and demonstrate proficiencies that support learning by all students as shown in their work with students with exceptionalities and those from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups in classrooms and schools.

Connecticut Program Approval Regulations stipulate that:

The professional education unit shall:

- (A) demonstrate that students are knowledgeable about the Common Core of Learning, the Common Core of Teaching, the Connecticut Mastery Tests, the Connecticut Academic Performance Test, the Code of Professional Responsibility for Teachers, and the Code of Professional Responsibility for School Administrators;
- (C) ensure that students demonstrate current Connecticut licensure competencies as defined in Sections 10-145d-400 through 10-145d-619 inclusive, of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, the Common Core of Teaching, and the Connecticut Content Specific Standards;

Title II Federal Reporting Data:

Based on 2001-02 data, there were 2524 student teaching placements across all teacher preparation institutions (see attached report).

Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act –Title II:

Proposed language of this federal law includes more stringent state accountability measures for teacher education institutions in regard to demonstrating program and candidate quality based on state student and teacher standards.

**CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
 2001-2002 TITLE II INSTITUTIONAL DATA**

Institution	Candidates Enrolled	Candidates in ST	FT Supervisors	PT/FT Supv	PT Supv	Total Supv	ST/Supv %	#Hours/wk ST	Weeks Reqd	Total # Hours
ARC	380	380	0	0	51	51	7.45	40	4	160
CCSU	827	363	16	15	29	60	6.05	35	13-16	455-560
CONN	34	23	2	0	2	4	5.75	40	10	400
ECSU	340	119	23	0	20	43	2.77	40	15	600
FAIRFIELD	184	46	4	0	5	9	5.11	35	12-20	420-700
QUIN	200	43	1	0	6	7	6.14	35	10	350
Sacred Heart	459	228	5	0	32	37	6.16	30	10-12	300-360
SCSU	1275	549	18	8	32	58	9.47	30	10-16	300
SJC	399	137	2	0	32	34	4.03	32.5	13.5	422.5
UB	237	195	13	4	57	74	2.64	35	12	420
UConn	347	115	5	0	15	20	5.75	40	12	480
UHART	373	123	3	0	32	35	3.51	27.5	12	330
UNH	237	103	2	0	22	24	4.29	30	12	360
WCSU	94	89	9	0	8	17	5.24	35	15	525
YALE	13	11	3	0	2	5	2.20	25	10	250
Total	5399	2524					Avg = 5:1		Avg = 14 wks	Avg = 476.25

Section 2 Task Development

Section Overview:

First, the “task” being assessed is candidate performance during the student teaching placement. The student teaching evaluation rubric and forms to facilitate the evaluation process were developed between June 30, 2003, and September 5, 2003, by the workgroup members listed in the previous section. The workgroup met five times on the following dates: 6/30/03, 7/14/03, 7/29/03, 8/19/03, and 9/5/03.

Appendix A contains two iterations of the **student teaching rubric** that illustrate its development from its earliest stage in the summer to the Fall 2003 pilot version.

- **7/14/03 rubric -- earliest version of rubric**
- **9/5/03 Fall 2003 pilot version of rubric**

Second, once the draft rubric was developed, a small group of professional developers and technical advisors (Nancy Potter and Erin McGurk) who were integrally involved in the summer workgroup meetings met with the project director to design a one-day training for cooperating teachers and university supervisors to support their piloting of the student teaching rubric and associated data collection forms. It was decided that this one-day training would be made available to cooperating teachers who had already been trained as Mentors to beginning teachers participating in the Beginning Educator Support and Training (BEST) Program and therefore, would not be a “stand-alone” training module. Instead, the Cooperating Teacher/University Supervisor Training would ***build on*** the knowledge and skills gained from the 3-day BEST Mentor Training including understanding of the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching.

Appendix B contains the **manual** developed and used for the Fall 2003 Pilot Training for Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors. This manual contains all the version of the rubric and forms used by the pilot study participants including:

- Fall 2003 Lesson Plan Format/Lesson Contextual Information/Post Observation Conference questions
- Data Collection Form
- Mid-term and Final Rating Form

Third, pilot testing was conducted during the fall 2003 semester between September 5 and December 11 with four volunteer institutions:

- Fairfield University
- University of New Haven
- University of Hartford
- Western Connecticut State University

The pilot study at these four institutions involved 55 participants total serving in the following roles and working in a variety of settings and classrooms:

- 13 University supervisors [6 of whom were also development workgroup members]
- 21 Student Teachers [4 males, 17 females; placements included 10 elementary, 1 middle school (8th grade math), and 10 high school placements (across content areas including science, math, social studies, health and French)]
- 21 Cooperating Teachers [teaching in a range of school districts including rural (East Granby), urban (Norwalk, Danbury) and suburban (Fairfield, Bethel, Redding)]

Fourth, pilot testing of rubric, forms and evaluation process entailed the following activities:

- Student teachers were to be oriented to the rubric at the start of the placement.
- Cooperating teachers and university supervisors would use the rubric for formative discussion and observational purposes.
- Cooperating teachers and university supervisors would use the rubric and forms for formal observation purposes.
- Student teachers, cooperating teachers and university supervisors would be required to complete a feedback survey which included questions about the rubric, the support and evaluation process, alignment of the rubric with the teacher preparation program, and suggestions for revising rubric.
- One-hour focus group meetings were conducted with student teachers from the pilot institutions. During these focus group meetings, questions similar to those in the feedback survey were posed.
- A meeting was held on December 18, 2003, with university supervisors who participated in the pilot and workgroup members to discuss the training evaluation, feedback from the focus groups and revisions to the rubric and forms used in the evaluation process. Due to the difficulty of obtaining released-time for cooperating teachers, they were not required to be at this meeting. However, one did attend.

See **Pilot Study Guidelines** contained in **Tab 1 of Appendix B**, manual for Fall 2003 Pilot Training for Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors.

Section 3 Validity/Accuracy, Reliability/Consistency, and Fairness

Steps taken to ensure validity and accuracy of assessment:

The rubric and forms were developed by the workgroup identified in Section 1. All members of the workgroup had content expertise. They brought to the process vast experience in preparing and evaluating student teachers. The workgroup members represented bachelor's and graduate level teacher educators from state and private institutions.

Training was provided by the professional developers and state representatives throughout the rubric development process to ensure workgroup understanding of the state teaching standards articulated in the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching. Workgroup members were trained on the CCCT as part of the development of the rubric and through substantive discussions about the history of particular competencies and terminology that have been part of Connecticut's standards lexicon since the 1980's. It was also discussed and demonstrated how Connecticut teacher standards have shifted from behavior based-standards (1980s and early 1990s) to performance-based competencies (mid-1990s to present). In addition, discussions included ongoing opportunities to explain connections and expectations of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standards.

Throughout the summer development, the workgroup was asked to review and confirm alignment of the Student Teaching Rubric to the CCCT. See **Appendix C** for a detailed **alignment chart** of the applicable **CCCT competencies to the Student teaching rubric**. Throughout these discussions with teacher preparation representatives, it was reinforced with them that candidates must use and be assessed in the rubric competencies not only in student but must be provided opportunity to learn and demonstrate the competencies at various stages from admission to the program through student teaching. Workgroup members agreed that it would be critical to parse out the competencies in developmental chunks and use them for development and evaluation of candidate performance in field experiences and course work building up to student teaching.

On 9/5/03, the workgroup reviewed the rubric and forms developed and agreed to pilot the process in the Fall 2003, acknowledging that while the instrument and forms were not "perfect", they were ready for piloting in order to glean data for future revisions. A short training activity was facilitated with the workgroup to ensure their understanding and ability to apply the Student Teaching Rubric and Forms to an instructional vignette. For training purposes, a simulation activity was facilitated using a videotaped instructional segment which the workgroup had to view and apply the rubric and the forms to the best extent possible. While it was acknowledged that this was not the "ideal" application of the rubric and forms which were intended to be applied over time, throughout an entire 4-5 month semester, it was an opportunity for the workgroup to validate the applicability of the observable competencies articulated in the Student Teaching Rubric.

On October 24 and 25, 2003, further training was provided and required for all cooperating teachers and university supervisors piloting the Student Teaching Evaluation Process. See **Appendix B** for the **manual for the October 24 and 25 Pilot Training for Cooperating Teachers and University**

Supervisors. Evaluations of the training were collected at the end of each training day. See **Appendix D** for a **summary of the training evaluations** from October 24 and 25.

To collect further data on the validity/accuracy of the rubric and evaluation process, focus group meetings were scheduled with the student teachers at the four pilot study institutions as follows:

<p>November 12, Fairfield University</p> <p>November 13, WCSU</p> <p>November 18, Univ. of Hartford</p> <p>December 4, Univ. of New Haven</p>	<p>Student Teachers Focus Group Meetings were conducted at the 4 pilot institutions. Questions posed to the student teachers focused on but were not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>How have you used the student teaching rubric?</i> • <i>Was rubric clear?</i> • <i>Was it helpful in assisting you in demonstrating proficiency?</i> • <i>Was it a realistic tool...expectations?</i>
---	--

See **Appendix E** for a summary of the **Pilot Study Focus Group Discussion Notes**.

Further validation of the rubric, forms and evaluation process was conducted through the use of feedback surveys, one for each of the participants in the triad: student teachers, cooperating teachers and university supervisors. These were distributed at the October 24 and 25 training and participants were directed to complete the surveys at the end of the student teaching placement. These surveys were to be returned to the pilot coordinator at the university. The surveys were to be submitted anonymously (i.e., without names), however, due to the fact that several cooperating teachers and student teachers did not return their surveys, the project director and the university pilot coordinators had a difficult time trying to figure out who had not submitted documentation. Consequently there were a few student teacher and cooperating teacher surveys not submitted. In the next iteration of the surveys, names will be required in order to ensure proper receipt of all surveys from participants.

Survey and focus group data was compiled and analyzed by project evaluator Jacqueline Kelleher. **Appendix F** contains an **evaluation report** on the focus group and feedback survey data. The most significant concern arising from the focus groups was that, at some institutions, candidates identified that they had not had sufficient opportunity to learn and demonstrate competency in the ways described in the rubric and in some cases were not familiar with the CCCT until seeing the rubric during the pilot study. Furthermore, some candidates identified that they were not sufficiently prepared in certain competencies within the rubric such as differentiated instruction or inquiry-based/student centered learning. However, overall the feedback surveys indicated that the participants supported using the rubric, forms and evaluation process developed but recommended further clarification, simplification and elimination of redundancy.

Data collected from the cooperating teacher training, pilot study documentation (i.e., actual student teacher evaluations using lesson plan forms, data collection forms, and post observation conference and mid-term and final rating form), and feedback from supervisors and cooperating teachers at the December 18, 2003, debrief meeting was analyzed by project evaluator Erin McGurk. **Appendix G** contains an **evaluation** of these data sources.

Based on recommendations received from the various evaluation reports and project data, the following are some of the **highlights** of changes and revisions implemented in the rubric, forms and cooperating teacher training for the next iteration of these products:

Rubric Revisions:

1. Simplify and clarify the language including the competencies 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 19.
2. Differentiate and align particular competencies that are related across the categories of planning and instructing:
 - Competencies 3 and 10;
 - Competencies 1, 8, 9 and 11.
3. Provide an introductory page to rubric explaining purpose and focus of competencies on student teachers (not all teachers) and intent that it be used over time, not only on a single lesson, for purposes of both formative and summative evaluation.
4. Include glossary as part of the rubric (as opposed to a separate document) eliminating chance that anyone using the rubric would not access the definitions to the rubric terminology. Based on feedback from pilot participants, the following terms and definitions were also added to the glossary: concept-based learning (conceptual understanding), differentiated instruction, engagement, reflection, and scaffolding.

Forms Revisions:

1. An instruction on purpose of forms and who must complete form was added to the top of each form. Also, all forms now require name of student teacher, cooperating teacher and/or university supervisor.
2. Questions/prompts on the Lesson Plan/Lesson Contextual Information/Post-Observation Conference Form were simplified and redundancy eliminated. Section on documenting 1-3 students needing differentiated instruction was revised and clarified and prompting questions added to ensure that student teachers substantiate the differentiation needed with evidence of instructional need.
3. Lesson Plan Form was revised as a stand alone form and a section added for supervisors or cooperating teachers to record specific notes during the pre-observation conference with the student teacher. Contextual information about lesson or class embedded in the lesson plan questions.
4. Post-observation questions were separated onto their own form to be used by the supervisors and/or cooperating teachers. Based on comments from supervisors, the post-observation question form was also revised to include an area for "overall comments" and "goals for the student teacher". This form can then be photocopied at the end of the lesson observation and conference and left with the student teacher.

5. Data collection from was revised from only collecting data on competencies 4-14, which are observable in a lesson, to collection and notation of data for all competencies 1-20. Due to the lack of comprehensiveness of data on the actual pilot data collection forms, it appeared that the evidence collected by supervisors and cooperating teachers was not comprehensive enough to justify ratings. Therefore, further revision was made on the form to promote use of this form for collection of cumulative data, in two stages, from beginning of placement to mid-term and from mid-term to final evaluation.
6. All forms will be uploaded to an internet website to allow all future users to download and use the forms as needed, when needed. We learned from the student teacher focus groups and feedback from some cooperating teachers and supervisors that the institutions did not forward the electronic versions of the forms to facilitate use. Some participants either wrote on pre-printed forms directly or actually cut and paste sections to fit into the pre-designated space provided. With electronic access to the forms, participants can type lesson plans or notes directly into the forms and the space will expand as needed.

Cooperating Teacher Training Revisions:

1. Based on student teaching evaluation data (i.e., the actual data collection on student teaching performance) and focus group data, there seemed to lack of understanding of the rubric competencies and proficiency level descriptors. Therefore, it was decided that the training would be revised to include more time for cooperating teachers and supervisors to “walk through” the rubric, competency by competency and across the three level rubric descriptors, to ensure understanding of the terms and the differences across the rubric. In this expanded rubric activity, participants would also be referred directly to the glossary when a rubric term was defined in the glossary.
2. The training was revised to use only one videotaped instructional vignette instead of two to allow more time to focus on applying the data collection skills, analyzing the performance and applying the rubric and the various forms. In the revised training design, more focus was also placed on having participants plan a post-observation conference with the student teacher to focus on performance areas needing improvement.
3. Information to clarify pilot study roles and responsibilities was also enhanced.

Steps taken to ensure reliability/consistency:

To begin establishing reliability, the workgroup developed forms to facilitate the process of assessing student teacher competency as outlined in the rubric. The forms were intended to ensure that sufficient data was collected for each competency, particularly competencies 1-16 which relate to the planning, instructing, assessing and reflecting categories. It was determined that the forms as well as other contextual documentation would be necessary to document evidence that would lead to determining the level of competency the student teacher demonstrated as described in one of three rubric proficiency levels. Data for competencies 17-20 must be collected in and outside instructional/student teaching settings as they apply to professional and ethical practice, professional responsibility and leadership and collaboration.

Furthermore, the one-day training around the rubric and the data collection process using related forms was intended also to support development of reliability, or at least consistency of use of the rubric and forms. Although reliability was a goal for the fall 2003 pilot study, it was also unrealistic that reliability would be achieved at this early stage of using the new rubric and forms. In addition, due to the fact that the training was not provided until mid-semester, it was understood by the developers that the late timing of the training would decrease the reliability and consistency of using the rubric, forms and the evaluation process.

Student teaching focus group data further revealed that not conducting the training mid-semester had a negative impact on the student teacher access to and use of the rubric, as well as on the cooperating teacher and supervisor use and understanding of the rubric and forms. Future training of cooperating teachers and university supervisors, as well as orientation of student teachers, must be conducted at the start of the placement to ensure understanding of the student teaching competencies and the use forms for facilitating data collection for applying the rubric. Due to the tight development timelines of the Fall 2003 semester, it was, unfortunately, unavoidable that there was a delay in providing the training.

From examination and evaluation of the pilot study evaluation data completed by cooperating teachers and university supervisors, it was clear that there is still much work to be done to increase the consistency and reliability of documenting student performance data. To increase consistency and reliability, the data collection forms used and the training of cooperating teachers and university supervisors must stress the collection of comprehensive and legally defensible data needed to make a final evaluative decision using the rubric. Additional resources will be utilized to create videotape and exemplar documents (lesson plans, data collection forms, etc.) that will provide student teachers, cooperating teachers and university supervisors with models that they can refer to in order to improve and facilitate a consistent and reliable student teaching evaluation process.

Fairness

Focus group data and feedback survey data showed overall that student teachers, cooperating teachers and supervisors felt that the rubric and the evaluation process were fair. There were some concerns about bias of the rubric in that it was not clear to student teachers or that student teachers felt that the cooperating teachers or supervisors were not clear that the rubric was for all teachers, not just student teachers. Therefore, an introduction was added (see Appendix XX for 1/15/04 version of Final Rubric) to communicate that purpose and focus of the student teaching rubric on pre-service teachers only.

The data did not bear out any other significant concerns about the fairness of the rubric but such data will be examined in more depth during the spring 2004 pilot study using the revised rubric and forms.

Final Revisions and Iterations of Forms Following the Fall 2003 Pilot Study:

Final versions of the rubric, forms and feedback surveys are contained in the following appendices. These forms and other documents can be found on the following website:

http://www.title2ct.org/student_teaching/index.shtml

Appendix H contains the **final version of the rubric dated 1/15/04**

Appendix I contains the **final version of forms** to be used to facilitate the student teaching evaluation process including:

- Lesson Plan Form
- Post Observation Questions
- Notetaking Form
- Rubric Rating Form
- Feedback Surveys: Student Teacher, Cooperating Teacher and University Supervisor

Section 4 Connecting the Task to Unit Assessment

Section Overview:

To assist institutions in connecting the student teaching assessment to the unit assessment plan, the CSDE facilitated the development of an instrument that would meet the NCATE standards and align directly to the state's teaching standards, the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching. This was part of a four year effort funded under the Title II State Grant of the Higher Education Act to help all institutions in Connecticut transition to NCATE accreditation standards. While other projects funded by the Title II Grant focused on other transition points within the pre-service preparation continuum (e.g., admission, pre-student teaching), this project focused its efforts on developing an instrument that would focus on performance-based standards for student teaching.

NCATE Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other professional school personnel know and demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

- The student teaching assessment instrument (the rubric and forms) assesses a student teacher's performance related to:
 - content knowledge as demonstrated in when delivering content based instruction and in developing materials for use in the instructional setting;
 - professional knowledge to justify instructional planning for students needs as demonstrated in pre- and post-conference opportunities with cooperating teachers and supervisors;
 - professional skills when delivering instruction to students; and
 - dispositions necessary to help all students learn as demonstrated throughout the student teaching experience and within the teacher preparation course work through professional interaction with
 - school based individuals (including students, cooperating teachers, principals, maintenance and support staff, parents, etc.)
 - program faculty and supervisors, and
 - personal conduct beyond school and professional settings that may reflect on the candidates fitness to serve as a teacher.

- In collaboration from Connecticut teacher preparation institutions, the CSDE plans to facilitate ongoing development, refinement and piloting of the student teaching evaluation instrument until the product has sufficient data to support its viability for full-scale implementation statewide. Furthermore, the CSDE will continue to study and build documentation to support the validity and reliability of the instrument across different institutional settings and placement settings.

- Once sufficient documentation has been developed, it will be proposed in regulations that the CSDE instrument or comparable instrument be implemented at each of the Connecticut teacher preparation institutions to ensure alignment with the CCCT and the best practices for teaching evaluation.
- The CSDE plans to continue piloting the instrument and training through Spring 2005, at which point, it will be determined whether full-scale implementation can be achieved.

NCATE Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on the application qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs.

- Institutions piloting (and eventually implementing) the student teaching evaluation instrument will be able to compile and glean data that will determine areas of student teaching performance strength and weakness. Further, if the competencies are embedded and built upon throughout the program from time of admission, through clinical experiences to student teaching, candidates will have opportunities to learn and demonstrate the competencies as be prepared to master them during the student teaching experience.
- Cumulative and longitudinal data from the student teaching evaluation instrument would provide an institution data on candidate performance in 5 domains or categories:
 - Planning instruction
 - Instructing
 - Assessing student learning
 - Reflecting on instruction based on student learning data
 - Professional Responsibility (or dispositions)

This data would inform faculty and administration of the unit about the programmatic success or need for improvement relative to the above categories of candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions and would identify for the unit curricular and faculty instructional areas that need to be reviewed and improved. Together with other performance assessment data that the unit implements as part of its assessment plan, the student teaching evaluation data would provide targeted data on lack of alignment of curriculum, clinical experience or inconsistency of instruction that may impact candidates' ability to teaching effectively and lead students to learn.

Section 5 Appendices

- Appendix A 7/14/03 and 9/5/03 Student Teaching Rubrics
- Appendix B Manual for Fall 2003 Pilot Training for Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors
- Appendix C CCCT and Student Teaching Rubric Alignment Chart
- Appendix D Evaluations from the Fall 2003 Pilot Training for Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors
- Appendix E Pilot Study Focus Group Discussion Notes
- Appendix F Executive Summary and Background Synopsis: Evaluating Connecticut State Department's Student Teaching Rubric, Materials and Pilot Study Procedures and
- Appendix G Final Report and Recommendations on Fall 2003 Pilot Study of Student Teaching Rubric and Cooperating Teacher/University Supervisor Training
- Appendix H Final Student Teaching Rubric 1/15/04
- Appendix I Final Forms to facilitate the student teaching evaluation process 1/15/04