**Edu 221**

**Field work Feedback**

**Connection to Conceptual Framework: Commitment and Critical Reflection**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Experience |  | Field placement site | | | Concerns/Interventions |
|  |  | ele | Jr. High | Both | Alt. |  |
| Fall 2011 | Tutoring 2 hours per week with inquiry project | 8 | N/A | N/A | N/A | No interventions required |
| W-2012 | Class observation with inquiry project | 3 |  |  |  | No interventions |
| S 2012 | All day observation at local elementary school; observations at New Tech and traditional high school; teaching field trip; leading science outreach at local elementary school | 17 |  |  |  | Alena Reese-failure to participate in planning and work well in group while teaching; questionable attendance |
| Fall 2012 | Tutoring 1 hr per week class observation 1 hr per week or GIRLS INc  Field trip teaching (at least 2 required) | 6 | 1 | 4 | 2 | Madison Filar-poor attendance  Jerrica Kersey-trouble connecting initially/some absences  Alex Lantz-irregular attendance towards end of semester/goog feedback overall (overwhelmed)  Dakota Lawson-not sure if like working with children (feedback from teacher) |
| W 2013 | Tutoring 1 hr per week  Class observation 1 hr per week |  |  |  |  | Lisa Radl-no reflection over experience  1 concern with ability to function in classroom |
| Fall 2013 | Tutoring 1 hr per week  Class observation 1 hr per week | 12 | 5 | 2 | NA | 1-poor attendance –Nora Stacy |

Field Experience (20 hours required)

In Fall 2010, tried to make course more engaging for students and collaborated with campus initiative to reach out to the local schools. Campus responded with a three-pronged approach: tutoring at the elementary school, mentors for junior high students and weekend Panther Packs with food. This fieldwork experience has been a positive experience for students exploring education and has continued with some modifications. An alumni of the education program contacted the education program about using GIRLS INC for a tutoring/fieldwork site. Some students shared they had not been in a real classroom as a teacher before and the tutoring and experience at GIRLS INC was too different for them as they questioned becoming a teacher, so additional time was added in actual classrooms. In response to their concerns. Tutoring was also added at the junior high to allow those interested in secondary education to have junior high experience. Actual teaching experiences were added by leading stations for Rivers Institute field trips and preparing and teaching health-based lessons for 4th and 5th graders at a local elementary school.

Feedback on students’ performance was provided by the mentor teacher or program supervisor (jr high and GIRLS INC sites). Form used for the tutoring program was adopted and is listed as follows:

Tutoring Feedback: Scale of 1-5 pts (with 5 highest)

Criteria:

1. prompt and happy to be there

2. always present,

3. visible improvements in students or learning

4. student look forward to seeing their tutors

Although teachers were given this form, most cooperating teachers sent qualitative information back on the candidates’ performance. If the form was submitted, red flags were raised if a candidate scored below a three in any category. Lowest marks occurred with always present and visible improvements in students categories. Attendance and dependability issues were discussed with students as it questioned their commitment to teaching and moving forward in the teacher education program.

In addition, students were asked to reflect on various aspects of their fieldwork experience; these include question prompts related to class discussions, self-evaluations of performance, and reflection over entire experience. Students were given feedback on their reflection with suggestions and questions to further their thinking.

These combined forms of evaluation criteria reflect the commitment and critical reflection of the conceptual framework.

Students not exhibiting appropriate dispositions are listed under the intervention category in the chart.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort | Number of students (n) | % interventions | % candidates | % interventions becoming candidates |
| Fall 2011 | 8 | 0 | 75 | 0 |
| Winter 2012 | 3 | 0 | 66 | 0 |
| Fall 2012 | 13 | 31 \* | 61.5 | 25 |
| Spring 2012 | 17 | 6 | 64.7 | 0 |
| Fall 2013 \*\*\* | 19 | 5 | 53 | Unk \*\* |

\*interventions for this cohort were for three first year students. 3 interventions were for attendance/dependability issues: One was early in the semester and improved throughout the experience; one was throughout the semester; and one became overwhelmed with other coursework and stopped going to field. Interesting this student still received rave reviews from cooperating teacher based on work with students when present. For this reason, student was allowed to become a candidate.

\*\*Intervention with student was over attendance; conference yielded possible miscommunication error-student sent written apology to cooperating teacher. First year student that cannot apply to program until next year so unknown as this time.

\*\*\* This cohort contained the largest percentage of first year students (32%). Students do not become a candidate until second semester sophomore year.

Conclusions

Overall the purpose of Edu 221 is an introductory course to explore teaching as a profession. The higher percentage of students committed to teaching as a profession, the fewer interventions required. Interventions were usually required for students who chose to pursue other majors. Students explored education at various times as 3 students were already junior/seniors when taking this introductory course.

**Tracking students**

***Fall 2011 Fall 2012 winter 2013***

No interventions 4 interventions 2 interventions (no candidate)

6/8 became candidates 1 with intervention became candidate

1/8 gpa issue 1/13 senior exploring edu 3/9 exploring edu (jr/sen/inter)

1/8 HMS major 1/13 withdrew from college 1/9-withdrew college

8/13 candidates 2/9-candidates

1/9-new major

**Winter 2013 Spring 2012**

No interventions 1 intervention (continued major but not candidate)

2 candidates 11/17 became candidates

1 not admitted-Praxis 5/17 explored EDU

**Fall 2013**

1 intervention

10/19 candidates

2/19-continue in program-poor gpa preventing admission

1/19-undecided

6/19-first year students

**Spring term Edu 221**

EDU 221S offered in the spring term mirrors Edu 221 when taught during the regular fall and spring terms. The textbooks are the same and the major assignments are very comparable. Key content is covered in both courses: academic and cultural diversity in the classroom, Gardner, history of American education, Dewey, philosophies of education, current trends in education. The major difference in the spring term is centered around the field work experience. During the spring term, students are still asked to observe in classrooms, except during this term, the goal is to observe for an entire day at the elementary school and visit a high school and New Tech school. Students are asked to participate in outreach activities in the local schools. Although it is at the elementary level, the goal for this experience is to expose students to planning, preparing and leading a lesson. Working with diverse age groups is stressed along with fifth graders as this is a cross-over age group for both elementary and secondary education students.

**Comments from field experience:**

* Excellent job. Prompt, professional, have seen visual student improvement (Fall, 2013-2 students)
* All 5’s in performance, 4 in student visual improvements. This group of tutors cam with great attitudes and ready to help. Please come back. (Fall 2013—3 students)
* All 5’s. I cannot tell you how grateful I am for these ladies help in my classroom! They have all been such as asset to kids who began the year struggling. The ladies were always willing to step right in and help where needed and the kids looked forward to them being there. They all displayed patience, dependability, and friendliness while visiting the classroom and helped so much! (Fall, 2013-3 students)
* Did a great job. The students were glad to go with them. They were on time and pleasant to deal with. They both reinforced math skills (Fall, 2013-2 students)
* 5/5 in all categories (with 5 being the highest)-tutor prompt and happy to be there, always present, visible improvements in students, student look forward to seeing their tutors
* Comments: Caroline was wonderful! (Fall, 2012)
* I loved working with Avery James! She was very efficient and effective. I had her working one to one with students reviewing their tests or correcting errors on work they had completed. She also did timed readings. She is conscientious and sweet! (Fall, 2012)
* Alex had a very positive attitude towards working with my students. He was very helpful when working with William on work he was behind on completing and whatever task I gave him after William was withdrawn. Responsible and professional in his interactions in my classroom and with my students while he came. For the past couple of weeks, when the others still came, he didn’t. I didn’t know if his class was finished or why he wasn’t present, as I had plans for students to work with him. Other than that frustration, he was a great addition to my Wednesday language class. (Fall 2012-intervention)
* From the middle school: Jacob Bedel showed up most Fridays and had a positive attitude. He, unfortunately, had a student at first who was not motivated to work with him and so I made a change and gave him someone who was much more motivated (Fall, 2012)
* Jr. High: Lauren and Jeffrey certainly stand out. They came every week and worked hard with their students. They had positive attitudes and their students seemed to enjoy working with them. As a matter of fact, Lauren asked if she could return next semester and so we have scheduled another time for her to meet with the same student.(Fall, 2012)
* Punctual and does whatever is asked. Not sure that he enjoys working with children, but he was very helpful when working with William on work he was behind on completing and whatever task I gave him after William was withdrawn. (Fall 2012,concern noted)