Appendix to the July, 2010  
Report of Assessments in the Majors: School of Education

Explanation: When our department completed our D.A.R.E. in May, 2010, we did not have the student teaching evaluation material. We put this piece of assessment analysis off until the August retreat day on August 19th, 2010.

Data: student teaching evaluation forms for student teachers from Spring, 2010 semester.  
Programs Included: English, Math, Elementary, History, Science, Art and Music Education.  
Note: We did not review Physical Education or Early Childhood education at this time.

Process: pairs of faculty reviewed a given program and tallied the numbers of students who received ‘proficient’, ‘evolving’, ‘marginal’, and ‘not applicable’ on each of the scoring criteria. There was also an examination of narrative evaluation sections on these student teachers. These are brief notes from the overall discussion and tallied results.

Results of our analysis:

Art: proficient in everything!

Elementary Education: positives were: candidates are respectful, technology knowledge is helpful, knowledge of assessments is proficient, and they have good follow through; weaknesses were classroom discipline, lots of n/a on working with parents and general communication with family; only 3 ‘evolving’ marks on grammar usage!

Music: positives were time management, candidates are respectful, and collaboration is strong; weaknesses were record keeping and monitoring of student progress; communication with families; and piano playing skills.

English Language Arts: mostly all proficient markings; consistently higher marks than other secondary majors; we wonder if this is because of their knowledge, appreciation and awareness of literacy??

Math: there was only one candidate last spring; 20 ‘evolving’ ratings on the final student teaching evaluation form. This seemed like a lot of evaluation criteria still in the evolving stages.

Social Science: the two teacher candidates that were measured using the Social Science evaluation rubric were actually Elementary Education majors seeking a middle school endorsement in Social Studies. Their evaluation showed largely proficient ratings, although this was the wrong instrument to be measured by.

Science: there was only one candidate last spring: 15 evolving ratings but the written comments were very strong.
Having examined the student teaching final evaluation forms and discussed the outcomes of the various content areas, we devised more questions that need to be addressed, either at CTEP meetings and/or at department meetings.

**Discussion Questions Raised:**
1. What does this scale mean?
2. What is evolving?
3. What is proficient?
4. Should we offer a profile for each rating to help cooperating teachers understand what our scale means?
5. Do we need different definitions of ‘progress’?
6. We notice that the alignment between ratings and comments is “off”.
7. Should we offer a profile for each rating to help cooperating teachers understand what our scale means?
8. Do we need different definitions of ‘progress’?
9. We notice that the alignment between ratings and comments is “off”.

**Data:** Internship Evaluation Forms for all traditional and PACE students in all programs

**Process:** reports were generated by Livetext database. Faculty members looked at ratings as well as narrative comments from internship evaluation forms and concluded any patterns or trends.

**Results of our analysis:**

**Level III Internship Evaluations (from final semester before student teaching):**

1. Most all of the items were marked proficient in both traditional and PACE. For MTS 3B and 7I, scores were varied. The item concerns ‘language differences’. Is this a lack of understanding in the evaluation item? Does this item need clarification or clearer defining for us and our constituents? Do we mean children learning a 2nd language or language development delays?

2. The lowest areas on the evaluations, with lots of ‘evolving’ ratings marked, was our candidate’s ability to monitor learning and their ability to understand and use formative assessments.

3. The highest areas on the evaluations were items related to the dispositions. Many comments related to our candidates’ confidence.
Level II Internship Evaluations (from sophomore or junior year or second semester of the PACE sequence):

1. Many ‘non applicable’ ratings marked with relation to a candidate’s classroom performance. This may be more of an issue with PACE students who are not being monitored in their 2nd semester internship. Descriptors on the evaluation forms with the word ‘collaboration’ have been marked ‘n/a’. We questioned the use of n/a.

2. In this internship semester, proficient ratings predominated. However, under the ‘language differences’ descriptors, many are marked at the ‘evolving’ level.

Level I Internship Evaluations (from freshmen year or first semester of the PACE sequence):

1. There are inconsistencies with ratings between how candidates are being rated in regards to their early candidate assessments (CAs) and internship evaluations.

2. There appeared to be many ‘proficient’ ratings on evaluative items.

3. ‘n/a’ was marked for odd items.

4. For the item “Candidate is able to identify teaching strategies” (MTS 1.G, K), many have been marked as evolving and n/a. This would be expected at the Level I internship.

5. For the item “Candidate is able to use a variety of teaching strategies” (MTS 3.I or H), many have been marked as evolving. This would be expected at the Level I internship.

6. We are questioning: Did comments and ratings remain consistent?

**Solution we want to focus on:** Look at ways to connect Level 2 PACE internship to the courses in the 2nd semester of PACE.
**Data:** Feedback Surveys for Cooperating Teachers, University Supervisors and Teacher Candidates

**Process:** reports were generated by Livetext database. Faculty members looked at ratings as well as narrative comments from feedback forms and concluded any patterns or trends.

**Results of our analysis:**

1. Cooperating Teacher feedback of University Supervisor: all ratings and comments were very positive. We have a strong group of university supervisors.

2. Teacher Candidate feedback of Cooperating Teacher: no negative trends were apparent. We had two individual teacher candidates who were unhappy with their cooperating teachers. We have left this to the field director to manage.

3. Teacher Candidate feedback of University Supervisor: ratings were marked ‘strongly agree’ or ‘agree’ as the norm for all items; very few stand out as ‘disagree’; one teacher candidate marked ‘disagree’ with having to attend outside functions and activities!

4. University supervisor of Millikin’s Teacher Education Program: these ratings were positive; very few ‘disagrees’; one comment was that our teacher candidates were able to create assessment tools and this aspect was appreciated.

5. Cooperating Teacher feedback of Millikin’s Teacher Education Program: in general, cooperating teachers have very positive comments about co-teaching; from cooperating teachers of music education candidates, comments were made about the fact that music majors should know how to play the piano; overall, cooperating teachers remarked that there needs to be more knowledge of technology.

6. University Feedback of Cooperating Teacher: all ratings of items were in the ‘strongly agrees’ category. However one item was consistently marked as ‘mostly agrees’. This item was ‘knowledge about the TWS’.
Preliminary Conclusions/Questions that can be made from this D.A.R.E.:

1. Why are the same items marked as ‘non-applicable’ for all programs?
2. Is this a situation where supervisors do not understand what a particular item is?
3. Do supervisors need better instruction/training?
4. Should any items ever be ‘non-applicable’? Should we have this option?
5. What is a reviewer going to say about the same item marked ‘non-applicable’, especially a sensitive one such as ‘works with parents from diverse situations’?

We need to look at this as a group in CTEP. Each program representative should receive their own student teaching evaluations, internship evaluation forms, and feedback surveys and analyze their own results, instead of just reading what the education department has concluded.