

**2018-2019 Employer Survey: Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness**

**Distribution**

Data was collected by cooperating teacher, teacher candidate, and college supervisor using the Valid and Reliable Instruments for Educator Preparation Programs (VARI-EPP) Candidate Preserve Assessment of Student Teaching (CPAST). This provides triangulation between the observations of the cooperating teacher and the college supervisor with a self-assessment from the intern. CPAST is a formative and summative assessment during the student teaching practicum.

**Rating Scale**

Candidates were rated by their cooperating teacher, college supervisor and by self-evaluation. The CPAST Form is intended to accurately reflect the student teacher's performance at the middle and end of the student teaching experience and to provide formative feedback to the student teacher.

A three-way conference is held twice a semester midterm (formative) and final (summative) with the cooperating teacher, college supervisor and student teacher. The meeting ensures that the perspective of each member is taken into consideration when evaluating the student teacher. The first three-way conference provides an opportunity for self and formative assessment and helps the student teacher identify areas of strengths and opportunities for growth in the remaining time in the placement. The second three-way conference serves as the summative assessment for the student teaching experience and takes place during the final week of the student teaching experience. This conference identifies areas of strength and opportunities for growth in his/her future teaching career. At each conference each participant (CT, CS, ST) shares their ratings and evidence he or she wrote on their CPAST form. A consensus score of "0" or "1" alerts the team that the student teacher needs to focus on that specific area and needs additional support from the cooperating teacher and college supervisor.

CPAST averages were calculated from: CPAST averages were calculated from: Exceeds Expectations = 3 points; Meets Expectations = 2 points; Emerging 1 point; Does Not Meet Expectations (0 points).

		CPAST		Midterm	Final
				Mean	Mean
<b>2020-21 Completers</b>	<b>Pedagogy: Planning for Instruction and Assessment</b>				
	A	Focus for Learning: Standards and Objectives/Targets	2.75	2.75	
	B	Materials and Resources	3	3	
	C	Assessment of P-12 Learning	2.25	3	
	D	Differentiated Methods	2.75	3	
	<b>Pedagogy: Instructional Delivery</b>				
	E	Learning Target and Directions	3	3	
	F	Critical Thinking	2	2.5	
	G	Checking for Understanding and Adjusting Instruction through Formative Assessment	2.5	3	
	H	Digital Tools and Resources	3	2.75	
	I	Safe and Respectful Learning Environment	1.75	3	
	<b>Pedagogy: Assessment</b>				
	J	Data-Guided Instruction	1.75	2.5	
	K	Feedback to Learners	2.5	2.75	
	L	Assessment Techniques	2.25	3	
	<b>Pedagogy: Analysis of Teaching</b>				
	M	Connections to Research and Theory	2	2.75	
	<b>Disposition: Professional Commitment and Behaviors</b>				
	N	Participates in Professional Development	2.5	3	
	O	Demonstrates Effective Communication with Parents or Legal Guardians	3	3	
	P	Demonstrates Punctuality	3	3	
	Q	Meets Deadlines and Obligations	2.75	3	
	<b>Disposition: Professional Relationships</b>				
	R	Preparation	3	3	
S	Collaboration	3	3		
T	Advocacy to Meet the Needs of Learners or for the Teaching Profession	2.5	3		
<b>Disposition: Critical Thinking and Reflective Practice</b>					
U	Responds Positively to Constructive Criticism	3	3		

ELED K-6 N=4	Midterm Mean	Final Mean
<b>Pedagogy</b>	2.46	2.84
<b>Dispositions</b>	2.60	2.9

## **Summary**

Overall, completers scored at “meets expectations” or “exceed expectations” in almost category for each Pedagogical area: Planning for Instruction and assessment; Instructional Delivery; Assessment; and Analysis of Teaching. The only area completers had at midterm as “meets expectations” was making connections to Research and Theory (1.75). However, by the final evaluation completers “meets expectations” when making connections to Research and Theory (2.31). Three areas had lower scores at the final evaluations than at the midterm evaluations, those areas were Digital Tools and Resources (2.87; 2.81), Demonstrates Punctuality (2.93; 2.88), and Collaboration (2.87; 2.81).

## **Reflection**

In reviewing the data completers showed growth in pedagogy and dispositions from midterm to final. Any area a student teacher received a consensus score of “0” or “1” additional support was provided from the cooperating teacher and college supervisor. Support was provided in the area by providing the student teacher additional readings, best practice articles, post conference discussions and suggestions on the area for improvement and more opportunities for the student teacher to demonstrate competence. In some cases, a co-teaching model was implemented to support the student teacher. Two areas of Pedagogy that scored lower than other areas were assessment and analysis of teaching.

In the next academic year, the EPP will review the curriculum and clinical experiences with the goal of addressing assessment practices and analysis of teaching. Additionally, the design and rotation of courses will be analysed to support scaffolding and critical assessment skills within the classroom. The required methods courses will be reviewed to address connections to research and theory.