Trend Analysis
Data from 2019-2020 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 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 where at least 96% 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 Mentor 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 are noted on the next page and, 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>Year</th>
<th>BSED Candidates</th>
<th>MAT Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation by PIM</td>
<td>Evaluation by PIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2020</td>
<td>N= 61 100% scored “At Expectations” or “Above Expectations” for all criteria.</td>
<td>N= 5* 100% scored “At Expectations” or “Above Expectations” for all criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2020</td>
<td>Evaluation by US</td>
<td>Evaluation by US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=61</td>
<td>100% scored “At Expectations” or “Above Expectations” for all criteria.</td>
<td>N= 5* 100% scored “At Expectations” or “Above Expectations” for all criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These are conventional MAT students who are not teaching in a classroom while working on their Master of Arts in Teaching degree. Most of our 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.

- Instructional planning
- Student work products
- Quality of assessments utilized
- Knowledge of standards & objectives
- Skill at motivating students
- Competence in presenting instructional content
- Competence in Lesson Structure and Pacing
- Qualities of activities and materials
- Use of a variety of questioning types
- Use and quality of academic feedback
- Using and managing the grouping of students
- Teacher candidate knowledge of content
- Teacher candidate knowledge of students
- Promoting Thinking Skills
- Promoting problem solving
- Setting clear and high expectations
- Managing student behavior
- Collaboration with PIM and US*
- Collaboration with Professionals, Parents and Others*
- Promoting a respectful culture

*Criteria that is not noted on the state-approved evaluation instruments for in-service teachers