**Analysis of 2013 K-12 Student Teaching Evaluation Data** (February 2014)

One of the biggest concerns with the student teaching evaluation data is gaps that exist within the data. There seemed to be some ambiguity on how to mark particular items; many of the lines were left blank or labeled NA. The case of the lines being left blank was an error on the organization of the evaluation form. In some cases, the supervisor and/or mentor teacher filled in the blank lines and in other cases it was left blank. We have since corrected this error. On some forms, the supervisor and/or mentor teacher included a score of an N/A which was not a given choice. One secondary evaluation contained 5 N/A scores. Questions arose whether the candidates were unsuccessful in completing a particular task, unable to perform a particular task in their particular student teaching environment or with constraints placed by the mentor teacher, or the line item was simply overlooked. For data collection purposes, these were coded a “1”, but upon further analysis, these scores were broken down into the chart below. Eleven lines were left blank (with 4 scores circled in the question), and seven lines were labeled N/A with only 1 item marked level 1. There were some items that occurred frequently, such as “*has appropriate accommodations for ELL students*” and “*effective and timely parental contact*”. Mentors were unclear on how to mark these items if their classroom did not have an ELL student or if they retained sole responsibility for contacting parents. Many of the items with blank scores were on lines without preprinted choices-“*wait time”* and “*participates in professional development”* were two examples. One student had perfect marks throughout but had two blank line items with the two being items that were not pre-printed, so it seems likely it was an oversight by the supervisor and the mentor teacher, rather than being a reflection of the student teacher’s performance. As previously mentioned, these errors have been corrected on the evaluation form. There were some other inconsistencies. For instance, on the line marking level of student engagement, some forms submitted both a circled mark on the question (e.g., 25, 50, 75%) as well a score of 1-4. These two marks, however, were often inconsistent (e.g., 75% circled translated into scores of 3 or 4). In all such cases, the reliability of scores is questionable, and some scores may not be a fair indication of candidate performance.

Patterns emerged when looking at the scores marked a 2 or less. One elementary student had 3 level 2 scores as she struggled with classroom management, time management and classroom presence. This cluster represents validity and reliability with the evaluation form as these weaknesses clustered one central concept. This student had a Montessori background and is currently seeking Montessori training. The differences in pedagogical beliefs and classroom practice may have to these lower scores. This particular student has not applied for her Indiana teaching license. One elementary candidate retained a weakness documented at Decision Point 2 in generating advanced lesson plans and this weakness carried over to the final student teaching evaluation. The item *High quality of student work displayed* received 2 level 2 marks from elementary candidates.

The data set was discussed at a department meeting on February 19, 2014. Line item c under cultural responsiveness was discussed at great length. For student teachers that remain locally, the urban experience provides an opportunity to focus on adaptations for English Language Learners as most of the classroom rooms used in this experience were more culturally diverse than the local classrooms. An effort is made to place students in more diverse schools in the area and a high level of cultural diversity is required for urban placements. Other ideas included designing a student teaching seminar focused on teaching English Language Learners or having teacher candidates observe the ESL resource teacher during their student teaching if one is available in their school. In addition, the EPP is in the process of evaluating the ELL population and resources available in the local schools as well as the urban schools that are used for student teaching. The urban experience could fill this gap for all student teachers who are assigned to schools with less diverse student populations. This evaluation will help guide future student teaching placements to ensure that teacher candidates are placed in the most culturally diverse schools possible. It was decided that for item h under competence that the 25, 50, 75% choices be removed for greater clarity in how to mark those answers. The forms will be revised to ensure clear descriptions of each numerical value. Line w, *High quality work for all students is displayed* will also be removed. Clearer communication and expectations on how to mark the student teaching evaluation (given the various circumstances) with all student teacher mentors and supervisors is needed to create uniformity in the data set. Use of N/A is not a reliable option within the PassPort data system and because the notation could be interpreted in various ways. A score of “1” means that there is no evidence or that the candidate’s performance is not effective. If this is a key expectation, then the marks need to depict an unbiased portrayal of the student’s performance in student teaching. The data set along with potential recommendations will be shared with the Advisory Board in March 2014. Student teaching supervisors will review this data on March 3, 2014. Each student teaching orientation with supervisors, teacher mentors, and student teachers will carefully review scoring guidelines and ideas for experiences in the school corporation related to teaching k-12 students who are learning English.

Break down on scores on final student teaching evaluation:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Mark | Category | Number of students-level-initial |
| **Blank** | Adapts and Differentiates instruction for students’ abilities including IEPs- Competence-line j | 1- elementary- EH |
|  | Has appropriate accommodations for ELL students-Cultural responsiveness-line c | 1-elementary- EF2-secondary-JG, BN |
|  | Punctuality and dependability-commitment-line h | 1-elementary-TR |
|  | Wait time used effectively-competence-line u | 1-secondary-JG |
|  |  | 1-elementary-ND |
|  | Participates in Professional Development-commitment line j | 1-elementary-ND |
|  | Demonstrates relevance to students’ lives and to the community; competence line k | 1-secondary-JG |
|  | Wrote in 50% for high level of student engagement | 1-elementary- EH1-Secondary-DK |
|  | Wrote in 75% for high level of student engagement | 2-elementary-MG, EB |
| **NA** | Effective and timely parental contact-commitment –line o | 2-elementary- EB, EF1-secondary-DK |
|  | High quality work of all students displayed-competence-line w | 1-elementary-LM1-secondary- DK |
|  | Has appropriate accommodations for ELL students-culturally responsiveness-line c | 1-secondary-DK3-elementary-SB, AM, EH |
|  | School and community involvement to support student learning-commitment –line i | 1-secondary-DK |
|  | Participates in professional development-commitment line j | 1-secondary-DK |
| **Level 1** | Effective and timely parental contact-commitment-line o | 1-elementary-AM |