Measure 2 – Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness (Component 4.2)

Source of Data
LiveText data base

Trend Analysis
Data from 2016-2017 shows that 100% of initial licensure candidates scored “At Expectations” or “Above Expectations” when rated by their University Supervisors and their Preservice Instructive Mentor (Cooperating Teacher). This follows data from AY 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 where at least 95% of candidates scored “At Expectations” or “Above Expectations” when rated independently by the two individuals.

Summary Evaluation Data
Data show that our undergraduate candidates are evaluated several times during their final semester by their Preservice Instructive Mentor (Cooperating Teacher), and by their University Supervisor. Candidates are evaluated several times during the last semester and have a final or summative evaluation at the end. These final or summative evaluation results are noted below. All assessors use the same instrument. The criteria are below. These criteria, apart from “r” and “s”, mirror the criteria of the state-approved evaluation instruments for in-service teachers with levels of performance appropriate for pre-service teachers.

Summary Evaluations of Candidates by Preservice Instructive Mentor (PIM) and University Supervisor (US) during final semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring 2017</th>
<th>BSED Candidates</th>
<th>MAT Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation by PIM</td>
<td>Evaluation by US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N= 74</td>
<td>100% scored “At Expectations” or “Above Expectations” for all criteria.</td>
<td>N= 10*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring 2017</th>
<th>Evaluation by PIM</th>
<th>Evaluation by US</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N= 74</td>
<td>100% scored “At Expectations” or “Above Expectations” for all criteria.</td>
<td>N= 10*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Most MAT candidates are Job Embedded Practitioners who are evaluated by their respective administrators using one of several state-approved teacher evaluation instruments. The evaluation criteria are similar. These candidates must score 3 (out of 5) overall to remain employed.
Criteria Headings used by both PIM and US are noted below. These criteria, apart from “r” and “s”, mirror the criteria of the state-approved evaluation instruments for in-service teachers with levels of performance appropriate for pre-service teachers.

a. Instructional planning
b. Student work products
c. Quality of assessments utilized
d. Knowledge of standards & objectives
e. Skill at motivating students
f. Competence in presenting instructional content
g. Competence in Lesson Structure and Pacing
h. Qualities of activities and materials
i. Use of a variety of questioning types
j. Use and quality of academic feedback
k. Using and managing the grouping of students
l. Teacher candidate knowledge of content
m. Teacher candidate knowledge of students
n. Promoting Thinking Skills
o. Promoting problem solving
p. Setting clear and high expectations
q. Managing student behavior
r. Collaboration with PIM and US
s. Collaboration with Professionals, Parents and Others
t. Promoting a respectful culture