

INTEGRATED BACHELOR'S/MASTER'S PROGRAM
STUDENT TEACHING EVALUATION MIDTERM RESULTS: JUNIOR CLINIC EVALUATION
FALL 2015

Context

This survey is part of the set of surveys administered at key transitions points during their junior year in the IB/M program. This survey was administered to the university supervisors of the 129 members of the Fall 2015 IB/M junior cohort.

Survey Content

- Information about the clinic placement
- Professional characteristics
- General comments/feedback on the student's performance

Methodology

The survey was administered using Qualtrics, an online survey tool. An email invitation was distributed to the clinic teachers of all of the students participating in internships. The data collection period was November 18th to December 4th, 2015. A total of 129 surveys were completed (response rate = 129/129 = 100%). All references to individuals/placement sites have been omitted to maintain anonymity.

The data are used for two types of reports.

- **Individual-level report.** This report was distributed to the individual student, the clinic teacher, the seminar leader, and the faculty advisor.
- **Program-level report.** This report, which contains aggregate data, was delivered to the academic program.
 - Disaggregated results are not reported across campuses, due to no or too few students enrolled in this focus area at the campus.

Key Findings

- The most common target certification area was elementary education (36%), followed by mathematics (14%) and special education (12%).
- On five general performance standards, the student teachers averaged 3.45 out of 4 points, with 3 defined as "meets expectations" and 4 defined as "exceeds expectations."
- The average overall score for the students was 17.24 out of 20, indicating that on average, the student teachers either met or exceeded expectations for their performance in the clinic.
- Qualitative feedback indicated that the student teachers were helpful, got along well with students and staff, and were motivated to improve their teaching practice.
- Supervisors made several suggestions for the student teachers to further develop their skills, such as being more proactive about seeking new strategies, and feeling more confident standing in front of the classroom.

District Placement

Program	Count	Program	Count
East Hartford	18 (13.95%)	Regional School District #19	13 (10.08%)
Glastonbury	15 (11.63%)	Tolland	3 (2.33%)
Hartford	10 (7.75%)	Willington	14 (10.85%)
Manchester	11 (8.53%)	Windham	14 (10.85%)
Mansfield	18 (13.95%)	Windsor	9 (6.98%)
Plainfield	4 (3.10%)	Total	129 (100%)

Grade Placement (check all that apply)

Grade	Count
K – 2	25
3 – 5	38
6 – 8	44
9 – 12	50
Ungraded	2

Candidate's Target Certification Area

Grade	Count
Agriculture	0 (0.00%)
Elementary	46 (35.66%)
English/Language Arts	12 (9.30%)
History/Social Studies	14 (10.85%)
Mathematics	18 (13.95%)
Music	13 (10.08%)
Science	6 (4.65%)
Special Education	16 (12.40%)
World Language	4 (3.10%)

Performance Areas

For each of the students, the following scale will be used to evaluate the teaching candidate:

4 = Exceeds Expectations

3 = Meets Expectations

2 = Needs Work

N/A = For use only in the mid-term: means "not applicable" because this standard is yet to be covered.

Item	2	3	4	Mean
1. Demonstrates responsibility & professionalism	0 (0%)	3 (5.26%)	54 (94.74%)	3.53
2. Transitioning from student to professional	0 (0%)	2 (2.99%)	65 (97.01%)	3.46
3. Exhibits a growing awareness of students' needs & instructional strategies	0 (0%)	5 (6.33%)	74 (93.67%)	3.34
4. Utilizes observation & reflection activities	0 (0%)	2 (2.78%)	70 (97.22%)	3.42
5. Attends clinic placement/ school-related events as scheduled	0 (0%)	3 (4.76%)	60 (95.24%)	3.48

Total Score (out of 20)	Count
10	0 (0.00%)
11	2 (1.56%)
12	0 (0.00%)
13	1 (0.78%)
14	3 (2.34%)
15	21 (16.41%)
16	22 (17.19%)
17	18 (14.06%)
18	23 (17.97%)
19	17 (13.28%)
20	21 (16.41%)
Average	17.24