



# **Southern Connecticut State University**

---

**CCSAR – Center for Community  
and School Action Research**

<http://ccsar.southernct.edu> Tel: (203) 392-6439

Norris M. Haynes, Ph. D., Director

Maureen Gilbride-Redman, M.P.A., Research Associate, Assistant Director

James M. Granfield, Ph.D., Interim Dean, School of Education

**Prepared by:**

**Jamie O’Meara-Cartwright, B.S.**

**Susan R. Tiso, B.S.**

**Gregory A. Osenko, B.A.**

**Maureen Gilbride-Redman, M.P.A.**

**Norris M. Haynes, Ph.D.**

---

**Clinical Field Experience Study**  
*An Analysis of Student Responses*  
**Spring 2005**

**Clinical Field Experience Study**  
**SCSU School of Education**  
**Spring 2005**

Southern Connecticut State University's (SCSU) School of Education (SOE) distributed the *Clinical Field Experience Student Survey* (CFESS) in the spring of 2005 to candidates enrolled in education courses with a field placement component. The CFESS is a brief survey instrument designed to gather information about a candidate's field experience at each stage of their academic preparation. The opportunity to conduct fieldwork is provided to all candidates enrolled in an Educator Preparation Program, and is but one of the requirements for successful completion of a certification program. Candidates are exposed to a variety of field experiences as they progress through the various levels of their program.

The purpose of this study is to learn about the quality of the field placement experiences provided to SCSU candidates and to ensure that these field experiences are productive and meaningful. The specific goals of this study are:

- to determine candidates' overall perceptions regarding their field placement experience at each gate 1, 2, and 3;
- to determine if there is a difference in candidates' perceptions of their field experience at each gate according to the course they are enrolled in;
- to determine if there is a difference in candidates' perceptions of their field experience at each gate between PDS schools, Partner Schools, and other schools;
- to determine if SCSU candidates are conducting their field experience in diverse schools, e.g., rural, urban, etc. based on the ERG.

**DEFINITIONS:**

**PDS Schools:** Conte West Hills, Edgewood Magnet, Jepson, and Jerome Harrison

Note: The PDS Schools have a maximum of 30 placements for students from the SOE.

**Partner Schools:** Wintergreen, Katherine Brennan, Wilbur Cross High School, and Career High School.

**Method**

***Participants***

Four hundred and forty-three candidates completed the CFESS in the spring of 2005. Candidates were enrolled in a variety of courses and represented three different levels of progression: Gate 1, Gate 2 and Gate 3. Candidates at Gate 1 were enrolled in EDU 200, EDU 201, and EXS 291; candidates at Gate 2 were enrolled in EDU 309, EDU 312, EXS 394, and SED 365; candidates at Gate 3 were enrolled in EDU 311, EDU 491, EDU 493, EDU 497, EXS 483, and SED 435. Table 1 shows the exact distribution of candidates at each gate, and the number of candidates enrolled in each course.

**Table 1 - Distribution of Candidates at Each Gate and the Size of Each Sample**

<b>Gate 1</b>		<b>Gate 2</b>		<b>Gate 3</b>	
No. of Candidates		No. of Candidates		No. of Candidates	
EDU 200	122	EDU 309	15	EDU 311	30
EDU 201	90	EDU 312	35	EDU 491	5
EXS 291	20	EXS 394	22	EDU 493	23
		SED 365	15	EDU 497	21
				EXS 483	32
				SED 435	13
<b>Total</b>	<b>232</b>		<b>87</b>		<b>124</b>
	52.4%		19.6%		28.0%

***Apparatus***

Faculty members in the School of Education developed the Clinical Field Experience Student Survey. Section A of the survey requests information about the course, field site school name, certification program, gate, and number of hours spent at the field site. Section B of the survey asks candidates to respond to thirty-four statements about their field experience using a five point Likert scale: **1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Not Sure, 4=Agree, and 5=Strongly Agree.** Section C contains one question about how many students a candidate intends to work with at his/her field placement site. A copy of the survey is available in the appendix section.

***Procedure***

The CFESS was distributed to candidates during class time by professors teaching the above listed courses. The courses were identified for inclusion because each contained a field placement experience. Completed surveys were returned in spring 2005 to Professor Sharon Misasi. CCSAR staff entered the data into SPSS and conducted all statistical analyses. Survey items B2, B5, B11, B12, B13, B22, and B29 were reversed scored when comparing and ranking mean scores because agreement with these items reflected a negative opinion about the field placement experience.

A frequency distribution was computed for each survey item at every gate. A mean score and standard deviation were also calculated for every survey item. A frequency distribution was calculated to determine the diversity of schools where candidates were completing their field experience (e.g., urban, suburban) at each gate. Next, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) and post hoc test (Scheffe) were run at each gate to determine if there were statistically significant differences between candidate responses by course or by type of school. All analyses were conducted utilizing a .01 level of significance. This rigorous level of significance was selected to address the issue of uneven sample size between (1) the various courses reviewed, and (2) the comparison between the 3 types of schools: PDS, Partner and all other schools. Because statisticians' recommend a minimum sample size of 30 to generalize statistically significant results, many comparisons could not be made.

## Results

### GATE 1 -FINDINGS

#### **I. – Candidates’ overall perception of their field experience at Gate 1**

Two hundred and thirty-two surveys were reviewed to determine candidates’ overall perceptions of their field experience at Gate 1. The calculated ‘overall’ survey mean score for this sample was 3.87 and the range of calculated ‘overall’ survey mean scores for these 232 respondents was 2.53 – 4.76.

The distribution of mean scores for individual survey items ranged from 3.01 – 4.64 with item **B3** receiving the highest mean score: *I feel that I am doing a good job at representing SCSU at my field site* (M=4.64), and item **B2** receiving the lowest mean score: *I do not have the opportunity to participate in school wide meetings/events outside of my regularly scheduled time at my field site* (M=3.01). Table 2 shows the distribution of mean scores for all 34-survey items.

These results suggest that candidates’ overall perceptions of their field experience at Gate 1 (M=3.87) were fairly positive, although seven items in total earned a mean score of less than 3.5 (3=Not Sure): items **B2, B12, B13, B16, B20, B25, and B34**: B2-*I do not have the opportunity to participate in school-wide meetings/events outside of my regularly scheduled time in my field site*; B12-*When I was given a responsibility in the classroom, I felt uncertain at times about how to deal with the responsibility*; B13-*Something in my environment of my field experience impeded my best efforts to demonstrate my competency*; B16- *SCSU faculty inspire me to imitate them*; B20-*People at my field site encourage me to attend school wide meetings/events outside of my regularly scheduled time there*; B25-*The school faculty at my field site and SCSU faculty regularly communicate about me and /or field placements in general*; and B34-*I used to have more trouble than I have now in managing a group of students or classroom*. These areas may need further exploration.

**Table 2 – A Comparison of Mean Scores for the Thirty-four Survey Items and the ‘Overall’ Mean Survey Score at Gate 1.**

Question	Mean Score	Question	Mean Score
<b>B1</b>	4.01	<b>B18</b>	3.99
<b>B2</b>	<b>3.01</b>	<b>B19</b>	4.08
<b>B3</b>	<b>4.64</b>	<b>B20</b>	3.03
<b>B4</b>	4.58	<b>B21</b>	4.09
<b>B5</b>	4.41	<b>B22</b>	3.67
<b>B6</b>	4.01	<b>B23</b>	4.00
<b>B7</b>	3.71	<b>B24</b>	3.68
<b>B8</b>	3.96	<b>B25</b>	3.32
<b>B9</b>	3.97	<b>B26</b>	4.16
<b>B10</b>	4.03	<b>B27</b>	4.07
<b>B11</b>	4.12	<b>B28</b>	4.12
<b>B12</b>	3.07	<b>B29</b>	3.66
<b>B13</b>	3.24	<b>B30</b>	3.93
<b>B14</b>	3.57	<b>B31</b>	3.60
<b>B15</b>	4.14	<b>B32</b>	3.96
<b>B16</b>	3.40	<b>B33</b>	4.38
<b>B17</b>	4.02	<b>B34</b>	3.43
<b>Overall Mean Score 3.87</b>			

**II. – Differences in candidates’ perceptions of their field experience based on course enrollment at Gate 1**

An overall survey mean score was determined for each course EDU 200 (M= 3.98), EDU 201 (M= 3.77), and EXS 291 (M=3.71) at Gate 1. Table 3 lists these mean scores by course, and provides information on the highest and lowest scoring survey items for each course.

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) statistical procedure showed differences in candidates’ overall perceptions of their field experience based on course enrollment. Candidates’ perceptions of their field experience in EDU 200 were more positive than candidates’ perceptions of their field experience in EDU 201 ( $F_{(2,229)} = 9.33$ ;  $p < .01$ ). EXS 291 was excluded in this analysis due to a small sample size.

**Table 3 - A Comparison of Overall Survey Mean Scores and the Range of Individual Survey Mean Scores by Course at Gate 1**

<b>Course</b>	<b>Number of Surveys</b>	<b>Overall Survey Mean Score</b>	<b>High Mean Score</b>	<b>Low Mean Score</b>
EDU 200	n = 122	3.98	4.84(#4)	3.02(#20)
EDU 201	n = 90	3.77	4.58(#3)	2.86(#2)
EXS 291	n = 20	3.71	4.40(#3)	2.75(#13,29)

EDU= Education                      EXS= Exercise Science

A secondary analysis was conducted to explore differences in candidate perceptions by course, on individual survey items. Again, EXS 291 candidate responses were excluded in this analysis because the sample size did not meet statistician’s minimum requirement (n=30). An ANOVA indicated that there were statistically significant differences found between candidate responses on the following eight survey items:

- B1-If you knew me before this semester and know me now, you’d probably think that my competence as a teacher has greatly improved.*
- B4-I feel that I am “connecting” with at least some of the students at my field site.*
- B7- My field experience contributed to my ability to competently teach students who are not typical students (e.g., special education).*
- B14- As a result of my field experience, I am familiar with the laws and regulations that impact teaching.*
- B17- My field experience contributed to my ability to make sure that male and female students equally benefit from my teaching.*
- B26- I engage in ongoing reflection of my experience at my field placement in at least one SCSU course.*
- B32- I have noticed that the theory I learn in my university courses connects to instructional practice at my fieldwork site.*

*B33- As a result of interacting with the students at my field site, I am developing the knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to becoming a good teacher.*

In each instance the mean response for candidates in EDU 200 was statistically significantly higher than the mean response for candidates enrolled in EDU 201.

*Summary of item responses that were statistically different:*

The analysis on item B1 revealed a statistical difference between EDU 200 and EDU 201 (M=4.15 vs. M=3.80). The mean difference on this item was significantly higher for EDU 200 at the  $p < .01$  level.

The analysis for item B4 revealed a statistical difference between EDU 200 and EDU 201 (M=4.84 vs. M=4.32); the mean difference for this item was significantly higher for EDU 200 at the  $p < .01$  level.

The analysis for item B7 revealed a statistical difference between EDU 200 and EDU 201 (M=3.91 vs. M=3.47). The mean difference for this item was significantly higher for EDU 200 at the  $p < .01$  level.

The analysis for item B14 revealed a statistical difference between EDU 200 and EDU 201 (M=3.74 vs. M=3.35). The mean difference for this item was significantly higher for EDU 200 at the  $p < .01$  level.

The analysis for item B17 revealed a statistical difference between EDU 200 and EDU 201 (M=4.21 vs. M=3.83). The mean difference for this item was significantly higher for EDU 200 at the  $p < .01$  level.

The analysis for item B26 revealed a statistical difference between EDU 200 and EDU 201 (M=4.39 vs. M=3.90). The mean difference for this item was significantly higher for EDU 200 at the  $p < .01$  level.

The analysis for item B32 revealed a statistical difference between EDU 200 and EDU 201 (M=4.17 vs. M=3.69). The mean difference for this item was significantly higher for EDU 200 at the  $p < .01$  level.

### ***III. – Differences between Professional Development, Partner, and all other schools at Gate 1***

The three types of schools in our sample were Professional Development Schools (PDS), Partner Schools and all other schools. An overall survey mean score was determined for each type of school. Table 4 lists these mean scores by school, and provides information on the highest and lowest scoring survey items within each course. Analysis to determine a statistically significant difference between school ‘types’ was not calculated because the number of completed surveys in PDS (n=11) and Partner (n=9) schools did not meet statistician’s minimum requirement for a sample size (n=30).

**Table 4 - A Comparison of Overall Survey Mean Score by Type of School at Gate 1**

Type of School	Number of Surveys	Overall Mean Score	High Mean Score	Low Mean Score
Professional Development School	n= 11	3.99	4.91(B3)	2.64(B2)
Partner School	n= 9	3.88	4.78(B3)	2.56(B31)
All Other School	n=205	3.88	4.62(B3)	3.00(B20)

**IV – Distribution of candidates based on Economic Reference Group at Gate 1**

Schools where candidates conducted their field placement experiences were grouped together to determine the diversity of candidates’ field placement experiences as measured by the school’s ERG. The majority of candidates at gate 1 conducted their field placements at schools located in ERG’s D (20%) and I (32%). The following table shows the distribution of candidates’ field placement experiences as measured by the school’s Economic Reference Group.

**Table 5- Diversity of Field Placement Experiences at Gate 1 as Measured by ERG**

Economic Reference Group	Number of Surveys Completed by Candidates
<b>A</b>	6
<b>B</b>	17
<b>C</b>	4
<b>D</b>	42
<b>E</b>	* 3
<b>F</b>	38
<b>G</b>	5
<b>H</b>	28
<b>I</b>	*68

\*Highest and lowest distributions at Gate 1

*Please note: Education Reference Groups –ERGs- were developed by the Connecticut State Department of Education to compare groups of districts with similar characteristics such as median family income, level of parents’ education and primary language other than English spoken in the home. In general, ERG A may be considered to include the state’s wealthiest communities, while ERG I includes its poorest (including Connecticut’s largest cities).*

Dr. Betty J. Sternberg, Commissioner of Education; from: [http://www.state.ct.us/sde/Final\\_CMT\\_Newsrelease.pdf](http://www.state.ct.us/sde/Final_CMT_Newsrelease.pdf)

**V – Summary Findings for Gate 1**

Findings suggest that candidates’ overall perceptions of their field experience at Gate 1 (M=3.87) were positive, although some items received a mean score of less than 3.5. Additionally, EDU 200 candidates’ overall perceptions of their field experience were more positive than candidates enrolled in EDU 201(M=3.98 vs. M=3.77). Statistical differences in favor of EDU 200 were also seen on eight survey items.

The one survey item with a consistently high mean score was item **B3** - *I feel that I am doing a good job at representing SCSU at my field site*. This item received the highest mean score at gate 1; the highest mean score for candidates in EDU 201 and EXS 291; and the highest mean score when comparing overall mean scores by ‘type’: PDS, Partner, and all other schools. Survey item **B2**- *I do not have the opportunity to participate in school wide meetings/events outside of my regularly scheduled time at my field site* received the lowest mean score at Gate 1; the lowest mean score for candidates in EDU 201; and the lowest overall mean score when comparing ‘type’ of school for Professional Development Schools. The item with the lowest mean score for EDU 200 candidates at gate one was survey item **B20**- *People at my field site encourage me to attend school wide meetings/events outside of my regularly scheduled time there* and the item with the lowest mean score for EXS 291 candidates was tied: **B13 and B29**: *Something in my environment at my field experience impeded my best efforts to demonstrate my competency* and *My field site does not lend itself to using information and/or instructional technology*.

The lowest scoring item when comparing mean scores by ‘type’ of schools as for Partner Schools, item **B 31**- *I am able to explain why a task I was given to do at my field site did not go as planned* and for all other schools, it was item **B20**- *People at my field site encourage me to attend school wide meetings/events outside of my regularly scheduled time there*. The highest number of candidates working in a single ERG was 68/211 (32%) for candidates working in schools identified as ERG I. The second highest number was for candidates working at ERG D: 42/211 or 20%.

## **GATE 2-FINDINGS**

### ***I. – Candidates’ overall perception of their field experience at Gate 2***

Eighty-seven candidate surveys were reviewed to determine candidates’ overall perceptions of their field experience at Gate 2. The calculated overall mean survey score was 3.88 for this sample of 87 candidates and the range of calculated ‘overall’ mean survey scores for these respondents were 2.39– 4.74.

The distribution of mean scores for individual survey items ranged from 2.65– 4.64 with item **B4** receiving the highest mean score: *I feel that I am “connecting” with at least some of the students at my field site* (M=4.64) and item **B2** receiving the lowest mean score: *I do not have the opportunity to participate in school wide meetings/events outside of my regularly scheduled time at my field site* (M=2.65). Table 6 shows the distribution of mean scores earned for each survey item.

These results suggest that candidates’ overall perceptions of their field experience at Gate 2 were fairly positive, although five items in total earned a mean score of less than 3.5 (3=Not Sure): items **B2, B13, B14, B20, and B25**: **B2**-*I do not have the opportunity to participate in school wide meetings/events outside of my regularly scheduled time at my field site*; **B23**-*Something in my environment at my field experience impeded by best efforts to demonstrate my competency*; **B14**- *As a result of my field experience, I am familiar with the laws and regulations that impact teaching*; **B20**- *People at my field site encourage me to attend school wide meetings/events outside of my regularly scheduled*

time there and **B25-** *The school faculty at my field site and SCSU faculty regularly communicate about me and/or field placements in general.* These areas may need further exploration.

**Table 6 – A Comparison off Mean Scores for the Survey Items and the Calculated ‘Overall’ Survey Mean Score**

Question	Mean Score	Question	Mean Score
<b>B1</b>	4.13	<b>B18</b>	4.30
<b>B2</b>	<b>2.65</b>	<b>B19</b>	4.00
<b>B3</b>	4.55	<b>B20</b>	3.09
<b>B4</b>	<b>4.64</b>	<b>B21</b>	4.06
<b>B5</b>	4.35	<b>B22</b>	3.55
<b>B6</b>	3.64	<b>B23</b>	4.00
<b>B7</b>	3.56	<b>B24</b>	3.81
<b>B8</b>	4.07	<b>B25</b>	3.39
<b>B9</b>	3.74	<b>B26</b>	4.17
<b>B10</b>	4.21	<b>B27</b>	3.72
<b>B11</b>	4.40	<b>B28</b>	4.30
<b>B12</b>	3.79	<b>B29</b>	3.55
<b>B13</b>	3.08	<b>B30</b>	3.85
<b>B14</b>	3.41	<b>B31</b>	4.13
<b>B15</b>	4.09	<b>B32</b>	4.00
<b>B16</b>	3.80	<b>B33</b>	4.36
<b>B17</b>	3.92	<b>B34</b>	3.67
<b>Overall Mean Score -3.88</b>			

**II. – Differences in candidates’ perceptions of their field experience based on course enrollment at Gate 2**

An overall survey mean score was determined for each course at Gate 2: EDU 309(M=3.83), EDU 312(M=3.90), SED 365(M=3.90), and EXS 394(M=3.85). Table 7 below lists the overall mean survey score for each course, and the highest and lowest scoring survey items within each course. Additional analyses to determine differences between groups were not calculated because the number of candidates taking each course did not meet statisticians’ minimum requirement for sample size (n=30). However, the overall survey mean scores are moderately high, indicating that candidates felt positive about their field placements at gate 2.

**Table 7 - A Comparison of Overall Survey Mean Scores and the Range of Individual Survey Mean Scores by Course**

Class	Number of Surveys	Overall Survey Mean Score	High Mean Score	Low Mean Score
EDU 309	n=15	3.83	4.80(B4)	2.33(B2)
EDU 312	n=35	3.90	4.74(B4)	2.66(B2)
SED 365	n=15	3.90	4.73(B11)	2.87(B14)
EXS 394	n=22	3.85	4.38(B3)	2.67(B2)

EDU= Education

SED= Special Education

EXS=Exercise Science

### III. – Differences between Professional Development, Partner, and all other schools at Gate 2

The three types of schools in our sample were Professional Development Schools (PDS), Partner Schools and all other schools. Table 8 below lists and compares the overall survey mean scores between PDS, Partner and all other schools. Additional analyses to determine differences between groups were not calculated because the number of candidates taking each course did not meet statisticians’ requirement for minimum sample size (n=30).

The overall high survey mean scores earned by PDS, Partner and ‘all other schools’ suggests that candidates have positive perceptions regarding their field placement experiences at Gate 2 when comparing the mean survey score between type of school.

**Table 8 - A Comparison of Overall Survey Mean Score by Type of School**

Type of School	Number of Surveys	Overall Survey Mean Score	High Mean Score	Low Mean Score
Professional Development School	n = 10	3.77	4.60(B4)	2.30(B2)
Partner School	n = 2	3.87	5.00 (B4, B5, B29, B33)	2.00(B6)
Other Schools	n = 75	3.88	4.63(B4)	2.70(B2)

### IV. – Distribution of candidates based on Economic Reference Group at Gate 2

Schools where candidates were conducting their field placement experiences were grouped together to determine the diversity of candidates’ field placement experiences as measured by the school’s ERG. The majority of candidates at Gate 2 conducted their field placement experiences at ERG I (67%). ERG I includes the state’s poorest communities. Table 5 shows the distribution of candidates’ field placement experiences as measured by the school’s Economic Reference Group.

**Table 9- Diversity of Field Placement Experiences at Gate 2 as Measured by ERG**

Economic Reference Group	Number of Surveys Completed by Candidates
<b>B</b>	3
<b>D</b>	15
<b>F</b>	*1
<b>G</b>	*1
<b>H</b>	7
<b>I</b>	* 55

\* Highest and lowest distributions at Gate 2

*Please note: Education Reference Groups –ERGs- were developed by the Connecticut State Department of Education to compare groups of districts with similar characteristics such as median family income, level of parents’ education and primary language other than English spoken in the home. In general, ERG A may be considered to include the state’s wealthiest communities, while ERG I includes its poorest (including Connecticut’s largest cities).*

Dr. Betty J. Sternberg, Commissioner of Education; from: [http://www.state.ct.us/sde/Final\\_CMT\\_Newsrelease.pdf](http://www.state.ct.us/sde/Final_CMT_Newsrelease.pdf)

## V – Summary Findings for Gate 2

These findings suggest that candidates' overall perceptions of their field experience at Gate 2 were positive. In particular, candidates in SED 365 felt most positive about item **B11** (reversed scored)- *As a result of my field experience, I am rethinking whether I am suited for this profession*; candidates in EDU 309, EDU 312 felt most positive about item **B4**- *I feel that I am “connecting” with at least some of the students at my field site*; and candidates in EXS 394 felt most positive about item **B3**- *I feel that I am doing a good job at representing SCSU at my field site*. Item **B4** had the highest mean score for PDS and 'all other' schools when comparing the survey mean score by 'type' of school.

Item **B2** (reversed scored) - *I do not have the opportunity to participate in school wide meetings/events outside of my regularly scheduled time at my field site* was the item with the lowest mean score for all respondents at Gate 2; the lowest mean score for candidates in EDU 309, EDU 312 and EXS 394; and the lowest mean score when comparing overall survey mean scores by 'type' of school for both PDS and other schools. Item **B14**- *As a result of my field experience, I am familiar with the laws and regulations that impact teaching* was the lowest item mean score awarded by SED 365 candidates (n=15). The highest number of candidates working in a single ERG was 55/82 or 67% at schools located in ERG I. The second highest number of candidates conducting field placements at schools located in ERG D was 15/82 or 18%.

## GATE 3-FINDINGS

### I. – Candidates' overall perception of their field experience at Gate 3

One hundred and twenty-four candidate surveys were reviewed to determine candidates' overall perceptions of their field experience at Gate 3. The calculated 'overall' survey mean score was 3.88 and the range of calculated 'overall' survey mean scores for these respondents was 3.03 – 4.82.

The distribution of mean scores for individual survey items ranged from 2.89 – 4.63 (see Table 10), with item **B3** receiving the highest mean score: *I feel that I am doing a good job at representing SCSU at my field site*, and item **B2** (reversed) receiving the lowest survey mean score: *I do not have the opportunity to participate in school wide meetings/events outside of my regularly scheduled time at my field site*. These results suggest that candidates' overall perceptions of field experience are fairly positive at Gate 3, although four items in total received a mean score of less than 3.5 (3=Not sure): **B2**- *I do not have the opportunity to participate in school wide meetings/events outside of my regularly scheduled time at my field site*; **B14**- *As a result of my field experience, I am familiar with the laws and regulations that impact teaching*; **B20**- *People at my field site encourage me to attend school wide meetings/events outside of my regularly scheduled time there*; and **B25**- *The school faculty at my field site and SCSU faculty regularly communicate about me and/or field placements in general*. These areas may need further exploration.

**Table 10- A Comparison of Mean Scores for Survey Items and the Calculated ‘Overall’ Survey Mean Score**

Question	Mean Score	Question	Mean Score
<b>B1</b>	4.04	<b>B18</b>	4.41
<b>B2</b>	<b>2.89</b>	<b>B19</b>	4.02
<b>B3</b>	<b>4.63</b>	<b>B20</b>	3.01
<b>B4</b>	4.42	<b>B21</b>	4.03
<b>B5</b>	4.14	<b>B22</b>	3.63
<b>B6</b>	3.78	<b>B23</b>	4.17
<b>B7</b>	3.70	<b>B24</b>	3.84
<b>B8</b>	3.85	<b>B25</b>	3.31
<b>B9</b>	3.67	<b>B26</b>	4.17
<b>B10</b>	4.15	<b>B27</b>	3.81
<b>B11</b>	4.36	<b>B28</b>	4.34
<b>B12</b>	3.82	<b>B29</b>	3.62
<b>B13</b>	3.52	<b>B30</b>	3.91
<b>B14</b>	3.26	<b>B31</b>	3.96
<b>B15</b>	4.03	<b>B32</b>	4.01
<b>B16</b>	3.74	<b>B33</b>	4.29
<b>B17</b>	3.82	<b>B34</b>	3.60
<b>Overall Mean Score 3.88</b>			

## **II. – Differences in candidates’ perceptions based on course enrollment at Gate 3**

An ‘overall’ survey mean score was determined for each course represented at Gate 3: EDU 311 (M= 3.97), EDU 491 (M=3.90), EDU 493 (M=3.65), EDU 497 (M=3.92), EXS 483 (M=3.91), and SED 435 (M=4.00) Table 11 lists the ‘overall’ mean survey score for each course and the highest and lowest scoring survey item in each course. An ANOVA was conducted to determine if there were differences in responses between EDU 311 and EXS 483. Results of the ANOVA showed no differences in overall mean score between these courses. A difference did exist on item **B7- My field experience contributed to my ability to competently teach students who are not typical students (e.g., special needs)**. Candidates enrolled in EDU 311 felt more positively about their ability to teach students with special needs than candidates enrolled in EXS 483 ( $F_{(5,117)} = 8.80$ ;  $p < .01$ ). No additional analyses could be conducted because of the small number of students in the other courses ( $n < 30$ ).

**Table 11- A comparison of Overall Survey Mean Scores and the Range of Individual Survey Mean Scores by Course**

Class	Number of Surveys	Overall Survey Mean Score	High Mean Score	Low Mean Score
EDU 311	n=30	3.97	4.63(B3, B4)	2.43(B2)
EDU 491	n=5	3.90	4.80(B3, B18)	3.00(B9,B14,B27,B29)
EDU 493	n=23	3.65	4.48(B3)	2.89(B20)

EDU 497	n=21	3.92	4.67(B3)	3.10(B7, B25)
EXS 483	n=32	3.91	4.69(B3)	2.72(B2)
SED 435	n=13	4.00	4.69(B11)	2.50(B20)

EDU= Education                      EXS= Exercise Science                      SED= Special Education

**III. – Differences between Professional Development, Partner, and all other schools at Gate 3**

The three types of schools in our sample were Professional Development Schools (PDS), Partner Schools and all other schools. Analysis to determine a statistically significant difference between school ‘types’ was not calculated because the number of completed surveys in PDS (n=5) and Partner (n=6) schools did not meet statistician’s minimum requirement for a sample size (n=30). The strong overall mean survey scores earned by PDS, Partner and other schools suggest that students at these types of schools perceive their field experience in a positive venue.

**Table 12- A Comparison of Overall Survey Mean Score by Types of Schools**

Type of School	Number of Surveys	Overall Survey Mean Score	High Mean Score	Low Mean Score
Professional Development School	n = 5	3.92	4.80(B28)	2.60(B2)
Partner School	n = 6	3.87	4.83(B3)	2.83(B9)
Other Schools	n = 105	3.89	4.64(B3)	2.88(B2)

**IV – Distribution of students based on Economic Reference Group at Gate 3**

Schools where candidates conducted their field experiences were grouped together to determine the diversity of field experiences as measured by a school’s ERG. The majority of field placement experiences at Gate 3 were held at schools in ERGs D (20%) and I (44%). Table 13 shows the distribution of candidates’ field placement experiences as measured by the school’s Economic Reference Group

**Table 13-Diversity of Field Placement Experiences at Gate 3 as Measured by ERG**

Economic Reference Group	Number of Surveys Completed by Candidates
A	5
B	5
C	*1
D	21
E	*1
F	9
G	2
H	14
I	*46

\* Highest and lowest distributions at Gate 3

*Please note: Education Reference Groups –ERGs- were developed by the Connecticut State Department of Education to compare groups of districts with similar characteristics such as median family income, level of parents’ education and primary language other than English spoken in the home. In general, ERG A may be considered to include the state’s wealthiest communities, while ERG I includes its poorest (including Connecticut’s largest cities).*  
Dr. Betty J. Sternberg, Commissioner of Education; from: [http://www.state.ct.us/sde/Final\\_CMT\\_Newsrelease.pdf](http://www.state.ct.us/sde/Final_CMT_Newsrelease.pdf)

## **V – Summary Findings for Gate 3**

These findings suggest that candidates’ overall perceptions of their field experience at Gate 3 were high (M=3.88), although some items received a mean score of less than 3.50. Additionally, there were no differences between courses when comparing the overall mean survey score. There was a difference, however on item **B7- My field experience contributed to my ability to competently teach students who are not typical student (e.g., special needs)** between candidates enrolled in EDU 311 and EXS 483 at Gate 3. Candidates in EDU 311 felt more positive about item **B7** than students in EXS 483.

The one survey item that consistently received a high mean score at Gate 3 was item **B3- I feel that I am doing a good job at representing SCSU at my field site**, (M=4.63). This item had the highest mean score (from all respondents) at Gate 3, the highest mean score for candidates enrolled in these courses: EDU 493, EDU 497, EDU 483, tied for first for candidates enrolled in EDU 311 and EDU 491; and had the highest mean score when comparing the mean survey score by ‘type’ of school for Partner and ‘all other’ Schools. Other items that received a high mean score included item **B4** for candidates in EDU 311, **B18** for candidates in EDU 491, and **B11** for candidates in SED 435.

Item **B2-I do not have the opportunity to participate in school wide meeting/events outside of my regularly scheduled time at my field site** had the lowest item mean score for all respondents at Gate 3 and for candidates enrolled in EDU 311 and EXS 495. For candidates enrolled in EDU 493 and SED 435, item **B20** had the lowest mean score, and for candidates enrolled in EDU 497, items **B7** and **B25** were the lowest scoring items for this group of respondents at Gate 3. The highest number of candidates working in one single ERG was 46/104 or 44% at schools located in ERG I. The second highest number was 21/104 or 20% of candidates working at schools located in ERG D.

## Summary and Conclusion

A review of the calculated ‘overall’ survey mean scores earned at Gate 1 (M=3.87), Gate 2 (M=3.88), and Gate 3 (M=3.88) suggests that candidates in the various SCSU educator preparation programs had positive perceptions of their field experiences. In particular, candidates identified the following areas as most favorable: item **B3**-*I feel that I am doing a good job at representing SCSU at my field site*, and item **B4**-*I feel that I am “connecting” with at least some of the students at my field site*. Another item that scored well for a specific course was item **B11** (recoded)- *As a result of my field experience, I am rethinking whether I am suited for this profession* (SED 365, Gate 2, M=4.73 and SED 435, Gate 3, M=4.69).

An area where candidate perceptions were not as favorable involved responses related to activities ‘outside’ the typical classroom, e.g., back-to school nights, teacher in-services, school wide meetings, parent-teacher conferences, etc. This perception was found to be true at each of the gates. Item **B2** (recoded)-*I do not have the opportunity to participate in school wide meetings/events outside of my regularly scheduled time at my field site* received the lowest ‘overall’ survey mean score at each gate and item **B20** - *People at my field site encourage me to attend school wide meetings/events outside of my regularly scheduled time* scored the lowest for candidates in EDU 200 (M=3.02) at Gate 1, and when comparing mean scores by ‘type’ of schools for ‘all other schools’ at Gate 1, and at Gate 3 for candidates enrolled in EDU 493 (M=2.89) and SED 435 (M=2.50). At Gate 2, item **B14**- *As a result of my field experience, I am familiar with the laws and regulations that impact teaching* was the item with the lowest mean score for candidates in SED 365 (M=2.87). Candidates in EXS 291 (n=20) at Gate 2 selected items B13 and B29 as the lowest items: (M=2.75) on item **B13** (recoded)- *Something in my environment of my field experience impeded my best efforts to demonstrate my competency* and on item **B29** (recoded)- *My field site does not lend itself to using information and/or instructional technology*. To view individual item scores for groups of less than 10, please see the charts included at each gate.

The calculation of statistical differences between types of schools, e.g., PDS, Partner, etc. at each gate was not plausible because of inadequate sample sizes. The PDS Schools have a maximum of 30 placements for candidates from the entire School of Education, across all gates. Observed differences between candidate perceptions of their field experience at Gate 3 by type of school (PDS, Partner, Others) was negligible.

A frequency distribution calculating the diversity of candidates’ field placement experiences by ERG identified ERG I as the place where 169/397 or 43% of SCSU candidates conducted their field experiences across all three gates. This strong number suggests that candidates are working with students from diverse backgrounds during their field placement experiences. ERG D had the second highest number of candidates working at schools within this ERG, 78/397 or 20%. The important issue is to ensure that candidates are placed at schools located in different ERG’s throughout their field experience. An ANOVA showed that candidates in ERG D (less diverse community) scored significantly lower on survey item **B24**-*My field experience contributed to my ability to competently teach students from low socioeconomic backgrounds*, indicating

that their field experience did not give them the teaching competencies needed to teach students from low socioeconomic backgrounds ( $F_{(8, 382)} = 8.11; p < .01$ ).

## **Recommendations**

It is suggested that SCSU review the importance of candidate participation and/or involvement with school wide events and activities during their field placement experience at each gate (e.g., teacher in-services, back to school nights, etc) and also examine individual items that earned a mean score of  $< 3.5$  to determine if change is warranted. The addition of a few open-ended questions on future surveys could also be used to explore these areas and inform the revision/addition of future survey items.

The significant differences in responses between EDU 200 and EDU 201 are interesting and require additional probing and reflection. For example, is this intentional or does this suggest a problem? Are we supposed to see differences between courses at each gate? Differences between gates? And what about between PDS, Partner and 'other schools? It is suggested that further exploration be conducted to (1) clearly define the goals and objectives at each gate, (2) and determine if these goals and objectives are to be different by course, by gate, by program and/or by type of school.