



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:

Karen Troiano, M.S.

Maureen Gilbride-Redman, M.P.A.

Norris M.Haynes, Ph.D.

Academic Year 2004-2005

A Report on SCSU Student Teaching Performance-

An Analysis of Student Teaching Evaluation

Responses Submitted by Cooperating Teachers

-Fall 2004-

A report on SCSU Student Teaching Performance-
An Analysis of Student Teaching Evaluation Responses Submitted
by Cooperating Teachers
Fall 2004

Southern Connecticut State University (SCSU) School of Education (SOE) distributes the *Evaluation of Student Teaching Performance (ESTP)* survey to Cooperating teachers who are working with Southern Connecticut State University student teachers. These surveys are completed and signed by the student and Cooperating teacher and mailed back to the Director of Student Teaching on the final day of the student teaching period.

The purpose of the *ESTP* survey is to determine how well the SOE has prepared educators to student teach and to meet the competency requirements stipulated by the accrediting agencies for SCSU's various programs. Cooperating teachers are also encouraged to use the *ESTP* survey as a basis for discussing students' competencies throughout his/her student teaching experience. The *ESTP* survey consists of 66 items that address students' behavior and performance relative to the Interstate New Teachers Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) standards, and the requirements listed in *Connecticut's Common Core of Teaching*.

The specific goals of collecting and analyzing the fall 2004 *Evaluation of Student Teaching Performance (ESTP)* surveys are:

- to determine Cooperating teachers' perceptions of SCSU student teachers and their level of competency;
- to obtain ideas and suggestions for improving the quality of the field experience that SCSU provides its student teachers; and
- to meet the needs of Connecticut schools for highly trained and well-prepared classroom teachers.

Method

Participants

One hundred and thirty-five *ESTP* surveys were collected and analyzed for this study. These surveys represent the evaluation of students who were student teaching during the fall 2004 from October 4, 2004 – December 17, 2004 in (1) a second eight-week student teaching placement or (2) a ten-week student teaching placement. These student teaching experiences were at a variety of schools in Connecticut, including both urban and rural schools, and elementary, middle and secondary schools.

Students evaluated represented a variety of majors and programs and were seeking certification in Elementary Education, Middle Grades, Secondary or K-12 (Art, Special

Education, Physical Education, and Library Science). The exact distribution of majors and programs can be viewed in Table (1) on the next page.

Table 1- Programs and Certification Areas

Program of Study ↓	Level of Certification →	Elementary Certification n=58	Middle Grades n=3	Secondary n=37	K-12 n=26
Elementary Education		58			
Middle Grades			3		
Art					13
Special Education					4
Physical Education					8
Library Science					1
Math				15	
History				5	
English				7	
Biology				7	
Earth Science				1	
General Science				2	

N=124

**** 11 surveys did not indicate a major or certification area**

Apparatus

The *Evaluation of Student Teaching Performance (ESTP)* survey is an evaluation instrument developed and used by the School of Education. Part one of the survey asks students to provide identifying information including their name, address, phone number, etc. It also asks students to indicate his/her major or area of certification, time period of student teaching, and the name of the school where they completed their student teaching experience. Part II of the survey instrument consists of 66 items, divided into ten competency areas:

I. Knowledge of Subject Matter, items 1.1-1.6; **II. Knowledge of Human Development and Learning**, 2.1-2.4; **III. Instruction is Adapted to Meet Diverse Learners**, 3.1-3.4; **IV. Use of Multiple Instructional Strategies and Resources**, 4.1-4.10; **V. An Effective Learning Environment is Created**, 5.1-5.11; **VI. Effective Communication to Foster Inquiry & Collaboration**, 6.1-6.6; **VII. Lesson Planning**, 7.1-7.11; **VIII. Assessment of Student Learning to Improve Teaching**, 8.1-8.4; **IX.**

Reflection and Professional Development, 9.1-9.5; and X. Partnerships with School and Community, 10.1-10.5.

These 10 competency areas align with the Interstate New Teachers Assessment and Support Consortium: *Model Standards for the Beginning Teacher Licensing and Development* (INTASC) and the standards set by the accrediting agencies for SCSU's various programs, e.g. CSDE, NCATE, etc.

Cooperating teachers are asked to evaluate student teachers' behavioral competencies using the following scale:

- Met+ = demonstrates exemplary achievement of objective
- Met = demonstrates consistent achievements
- Met- = demonstrates minimal progress toward objective
- N/A = no opportunity or not applicable.

Space is also provided after each competency area for any additional comments that a teacher might offer. In addition, space is provided on the last page of the survey for a 'Summary of Statements'. Each candidate is also assigned a final grade of 'pass' or 'fail'. A copy of the *Evaluation of Student Teaching Performance* survey is attached in the Appendix section of this report.

Procedure

Copies of the *Evaluation of Student Teaching Performance* surveys for students who student taught during the fall 2004 were provided to CCSAR by the Student Teaching Office, SOE.

CCSAR first reviewed each survey to ensure that it was for the appropriate time period (fall 2004, 10/4/04 – 12/17/04) and completed on the appropriate student teaching evaluation sheet. Surveys that did not meet both of these requirements were discarded. A coding frame was then developed and each survey assigned a unique identification number. All completed forms were sent to Saztec International for data entry. Once the data was entered, CCSAR was sent an electronic copy in ASCII file format.

CCSAR then converted all data into SPSS and conducted frequency analyses. For each item, a mean score, standard deviation and frequency distribution were calculated using the following scale: met+=3, met=2, met-=1, and N/A. Responses of N/A were recoded as 'system missing' in the calculation of mean and standard deviation scores for individual survey items and for the ten INTASC/competency areas. An 'overall' mean score was also calculated for each INTASC competency area by summing together the individual item mean scores within each section, and then calculating an 'overall' mean standard score. Bar charts were then developed to provide a visual representation of item responses.

Results

The mean score for individual survey items ranged from **2.48** *‘Engages students in selecting their own learning objectives and activities’* (item 4.4) to **2.91** *‘Demonstrates ethical behavior’* (item 5.8). A frequency distribution, mean and standard deviation score for each survey item can be found in the Appendix section of this report. The range of mean scores for the 10 INTASC standards/competency areas was **2.58** *‘Partnerships with school and community’* to **2.81** *‘Knowledge of subject matter’*. The ten INTASC/Competency scores can be viewed in Table 2 below.

The high range of mean scores on both the individual survey items and on the 10 INTASC standards suggests that the SCSU educator preparation programs have successfully prepared students for their student teaching experience.

Table 2 - Mean Scores for each INTASC standard/competency area

Scale Range: Met+= 3, Met= 2, Met-= 1

INTASC STANDARDS	MEAN SCORES
1. Knowledge of subject matter, 1.1-1.6	2.81
2. Knowledge of human development and learning, 2.1-2.4	2.67
3. Instruction is adapted to meet diverse learners, 3.1-3.4	2.70
4. Use of multiple instructional strategies and resources, 4.1-4.10	2.71
5. An effective learning environment is created, 5.1-5.11	2.75
6. Effective communication to foster inquiry and collaboration, 6.1-6.6	2.74
7. Lesson planning, 7.1-7.11	2.78
8. Assessment of student learning to improve teaching, 8.1-8.4	2.70
9. Reflection and professional development, 9.1-9.5	2.71
10. Partnerships with school and community, 10.1-10.5	2.58

** (N/A responses recoded as ‘system missing’ in the calculation of mean scores)

Qualitative Findings

Qualitative comments listed in the comments and summary statement sections of the *Evaluation of Student Teaching Performance* surveys were also reviewed and are summarized below as programmatic strengths and areas in need of improvement.

I. Strengths

Positive comments regarding the preparation and quality of SCSU student teachers involved areas directly related to:

- **Knowledge of subject matter**
- **Lesson Planning**
- **Adapting Instructional Practices for Diverse Learners**
- **Using Multiple Instructional Strategies**
- **Assessment of Student Learning to Improve Teaching**
- **Personal Attributes / Professional Attitudes**
- **Student Rapport and Respect**

Supporting Quotes

Knowledge of Subject Matter

“... has proved to be strong in her content areas, using correct notation and vocabulary throughout her student teaching experience.”

“... has a wonderful knowledge of the subject matter.”

“ ...has shown through her lessons that she possesses knowledge of the subject matter being presented. She used a variety of ideas she obtained from resource materials available to her as well as internet sources.”

“ ...demonstrates academic competencies, major principles and concepts are very strong, constantly researches for additional sources of information.”

Lesson Planning

“...plans are superb. His organization is high above the norm for a student teacher.”

“ Her lessons were extremely well planned, thought provoking and original while keeping within the guidelines of curriculum.”

“Lesson plans have been very well written.”

“He is able to revise the lesson plan whenever necessary based on student feedback.”

“ ... lesson plans identified the goals and objectives of her lessons. Her lessons showed sequence, and she revised instruction to meet the needs of the students.”

Adapting Instructional Practices for Diverse learners

“...has shown understanding of the many modes of learning. She has planned lessons that include information for the visual, auditory and tactile learners.”

“ A good understanding of appropriate teaching styles that adapt to different learning styles of students.”

“Instruction was adapted to meet the needs of hyperactive classes and students.”

“ ... was very vigilant in the planning of her lessons, matching the level of the lesson difficulty with the level of learning styles and abilities within the classroom.”

“...demonstrates a keen understanding of special-needs students, modified plans and is able to fit individual modifications into her teaching.”

Multiple Instructional Strategies

“He was not afraid to “try’ new things with all of the classes.”

“ Manipulatives were used to tap into the kinesthetic learning styles, as well as use of an overhead, chalkboard, or chart paper for more visual learners. Books were chosen for instruction that met the needs of our diverse group of learners.”

“... poses questions that are stimulating and appropriate. She has encouraged problem solving skills, as well as critical thinking.”

“ ... has used whole group instruction, group work and individual assessment to foster critical thinking.”

“ The balance of group sizes in instruction was excellent.”

Assessment of Student Learning to Improve Teaching

“...She used her students’ strengths as teaching tools and planned her instruction accordingly.”

“...has developed skills in monitoring student progress to increase effectiveness of instruction. In many lessons she has adjusted instruction based on student’s strengths and weaknesses.”

“She has used student class work and homework to assess their understanding.”

“... has used a variety of assessment tools to monitor student learning. He has assigned homework on a daily basis, used projects to explore topics and aligned his quizzes to the curriculum.”

“Daily assessment is done through teacher observation and student participation. ...quickly learned and became very efficient at assessing the children on this basis.”

Personal Characteristics and Attributes

“...attended parent teacher conferences and maintained a professional demeanor with parents

“She is enthusiastic and committed to put forth her best effort.”

“She is highly motivated, caring, and conscientious, has a positive attitude, and loves children. All of these qualities are displayed on a daily basis.”

“ She is dedicated to the profession.”

“... growth during her student teaching term was phenomenal. She watched, learned techniques and strategies, and then created her own unique style.”

“She set high standards for herself, spent a great deal of time reflecting on teaching and learning, and always conducted herself in a professional manner.”

“ Also, he went beyond the call of duty many times in offering extra help.”

Rapport and Respect for Children

“...tone and temperament in the classroom earned him the respect of the students who came in contact with him.”

“Her enjoyment in working with children is genuine.”

He has treated all students with respect and given them the freedom to express their views.”

“Students feel comfortable, respected and are eager to participate and share their ideas.”

“She developed good rapport with the children in the class. They felt at ease and comfortable with her.”

“She established positive relationships with her students and an open environment in which they felt comfortable asking questions and asking for help”

II. Areas in Need of Improvement

Comments in this area were relatively few. Additionally, areas identified initially as a shortcoming usually improved over the course of the student teaching experience, as noted by the Cooperating teacher.

Areas noted for improvement included:

- **More Time in Self-reflection**
- **Classroom Management**
- **Instructional Techniques**

Supporting Quotes

“... needs to be more reflective of his teaching, and use suggestions or support offered by his colleagues (particularly if co-teaching).”

“ I would encourage ... to reflect on every lesson and find at least one thing about each lesson that he would improve upon. I only add this because I know that the BEST portfolio requires intense self reflection about how one can improve a lesson the next time they teach it.”

“Also needs to reinforce and adhere to strict classroom management procedures to allow for a better discipline policy.”

“ ... needs to develop her own style of discipline- this will come with experience!”

“... classroom management skills strengthened as her time went on.”

“I have witnessed her improvement in management and organizational skills.”

“ ... has shown much improvement in his discipline techniques and classroom management.”

“ The time span of her lessons tends to be somewhat of a problem, but with practice it is easily correctable. ”

“He has very good ideas but sometimes they are not implemented to their potential. Overtime, I think this is an area he can do exceptionally well in with practice. ...has also been working on his questioning skills. In the beginning, he tended to ask factual, single answer questions.”

“In the beginning, in the planning of instruction, he tended to overestimate the intellectual level of students in terms of presenting material such as vocabulary in a way that they could understand. Also, in the organization of instructional activities, his delivery of information and directions to students would tend to be rushed and in chunks too large for them to grasp rather than in a slow, small chunk, step-by-step fashion.”

Summary and Conclusion

The strong, positive range in mean scores on individual survey items (2.48 – 2.91) and in the 10 INTASC/competency areas (2.58-2.81) suggest that SCSU is preparing its students to successfully complete and pass their student teaching experience. Additionally, these high scores indicate that Cooperating teachers’ perceptions of SCSU students and their competency levels are also quite favorable. The large number of positive comments further supports this position. It is recommended, however, that comments noted in ‘areas in need of improvement’ be reviewed to augment the student teaching experience and enhance the overall quality of the SCSU educator preparation programs.