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Evidence and Analysis of Candidate Assessments of Cooperating Teachers, Field Supervisors, Self-Assessments, and the EPP for Continuous Improvement:

An important facet of our EPP’s approach to continuous improvement and ongoing analysis of the efficacy of candidate field and clinical experiences are candidate assessments. Candidates formally evaluate their cooperating teachers in the schools where they are assigned, their university field supervisors who serve as liaisons between the schools and the university, a self-assessment of their field and clinical experiences, and of the EPP.

In the concluding seminar of fall 2015, the Director of Teacher Preparation and Advising asked teacher candidates to complete an exit evaluation. Question 6 of the instrument asks candidates to evaluate the strengths or concerns about their preparation throughout the progression of the EPP. Their evaluation or assessment of the EPP serves as the culminating activity to allow teacher candidates the opportunity to anonymously report any strengths and/or any concerns of their clinical experiences that they now have as a result of their teaching experiences. As concerns, teacher candidates listed areas where they would like to have more professional development or training. A summary of what was reported for Question 6 follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Strengths:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Concerns:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Classroom Management</td>
<td>1. Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hands-on-learning</td>
<td>2. Special Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Content knowledge</td>
<td>3. ESL Classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Help available</td>
<td>4. History Classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Friendliness</td>
<td>5. Guided Reading Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Personnel very helpful</td>
<td>7. Communication with Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lesson planning</td>
<td>8. Separating PACE and Traditional Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Supervisors</td>
<td>10. ESL Testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Professionalism</td>
<td>11. ESL Content Too Heavy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Support for Student Teachers</td>
<td>13. IEP/ARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Informative Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Job Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Organization of observations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Clear instructions for certification process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Program is well explained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Reading courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Being prepared to teach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Mandatory testing before student/clinical teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Methods courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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24. Great cooperating teachers  
25. T2O  
26. Task Analysis

Implications of these data assist the EPP in driving our efforts of continuous improvement in accomplishing our mission to prepare educators who are *confident, skilled, and reflective professionals*. The EPP recognizes that some of the responses from teacher candidates indicated Classroom Management as an area of strength, while others indicated Classroom Management was an area where additional help was needed. Reading courses were identified as an area of strength, while Guided Reading Instruction as an area where additional training is needed. One teacher candidate indicated help was needed for ESL Testing; yet another indicated the ESL Content was “Too Heavy.”

Candidates’ evaluatory comments regarding our EPP reinforce our understanding that all of our candidates are individuals with their own strengths and areas of need, just as their own P-12 students have. As a teacher preparation program, we will continue to strive in meeting their needs and preparing them to be the most effective teachers possible in the future.

Candidates identified the strengths of our program as a *General Education Program* that is *Well-Explained* with *Support for Student Teachers* that feel *Prepared to Teach*; where candidates have gained *Content Knowledge* and *Lesson Planning* from *Knowledgeable Professors* with *Hands-on-Learning and Professionalism*; *Classroom Management*; *Teaching Strategies* and *Task Analysis*; *Organization of Observations and Methods courses*; and even indicated our *Mandatory testing before student/clinical teaching* as a strength!

Candidate assessments of their cooperating teachers and university field supervisors provide additional data to drive our efforts of continuous improvement. Exemplary questions from these assessments include the following:

**Candidate Assessments of Cooperating Teachers.**

The questionnaire assessment of their cooperating teachers that candidates complete indicates their agreement on a scale from 1 *Strongly Agree*, 2 *Disagree*, 3 *Neither Agree Nor Disagree*, 4 *Agree*, to 5 *Strongly Agree* for Questions 1-15. Candidates may give a first or second placement rating for each of the questions. The questions on the questionnaire include the following:

My cooperating teacher/mentor:

1. Helped me with lesson planning.  
2. Gave me regular feedback about my planning.  
3. Watched me teach several lessons before giving me responsibility for the subject.  
4. Gave me regular feedback about my teaching.  
5. Explained his/her classroom management/discipline plan.  
6. Provided regular feedback about my classroom management/discipline.  
7. Set reasonable expectations for my performance as a Student Teacher/intern (did not
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compare me to veteran teachers).
8. Provided adequate support while allowing me the opportunity to function independently.
9. Did not make unreasonable demands on my time.
10. Was helpful, understanding, enthusiastic, friendly, interested in me, and supportive.
11. Provided adequate observation time.
12. Made me feel welcome in his/her classroom.
13. Provided experiences beyond the classroom (i.e., parent conferences, PTA/PTO, field trips, faculty meetings, staff development, curriculum workshops, class parties, etc.).
14. Treated me as if I were a professional colleague.
15. Shared ideas and materials.

A comments section is provided at the end of this section of the assessment.

Results from these exit assessments each semester are maintained in the Office of the Director of Teacher Preparation and Advising. The Director provides feedback to the Department Head who shares the analysis with program faculty. Changes in course offerings and improvements in instruction have resulted.

Candidate Assessments of Field Supervisors.

Using the same scale (1-5) from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree to assess their field supervisor, candidates are encouraged to answer Questions 16-24.

My University Field Supervisor:

16. Was helpful and supportive to me as a teacher.
17. Kept me informed as to my progress.
18. Was helpful and supportive to me as a person.
19. Was available when I needed help.
20. Possessed knowledge and skills that were helpful in my teaching situation.
21. Gave me sufficient assistance with planning and teaching.
22. Helped identify weaknesses in my technique or preparation.
23. Provided adequate supervision.
24. Acted as a professional in all manners.

A comments section is provided in this section of the questionnaire.

As in the cooperating teachers’ assessments, results from these exit assessments are maintained in the Office of the Director of Teacher Preparation and Advising each semester. The Director provides feedback to the Department Head who shares the analysis with program faculty. Changes in course offerings and improvements in instruction have resulted.

(Continued).
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Director of Field Experiences.

Using the same (1-5) scale, candidates assess the director of field experience by responding to Questions 25-27 of the questionnaire that is followed by a comments section at the end of this section.

The Director of Field Experience:

25. Was available for help.
26. Was able to answer questions adequately.
27. Was able to resolve problems effectively and efficiently.

All results from these exit assessments each semester are maintained in the Office of the Director of Teacher Preparation and Advising. The Director provides feedback to the Department Head who shares the analysis with program faculty. Changes in course offerings and improvements in instruction have resulted.

Candidate Self-Assessments and Assessment of the EPP.

Upon completion of their clinical experiences, our teacher candidates are encouraged to complete the Student/Clinical Teacher Exit Survey to assess their preparedness to teach by answering Questions 1-7.

Demographic Data

1. How many years did you attend West Texas A&M University?
2. What type of certification program are you completing?
   - Traditional Undergraduate Program
   - PACE/Post Bac

Student/Clinical Teaching Assignment

3. In which grade(s) did you student/clinical teacher? Circle all that apply.

   PreK  K  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10  11  12

4. What subject(s) did you teach?
5. In which school district did you student teach?

Specific Strengths and Weaknesses of the Teacher Education Program

6. Please describe what you believe to be the three greatest strengths and the three greatest areas of concern in the Teacher Education Program at West Texas A&M University.

7. How prepared were you to be a student/clinical teacher?
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Go through the statements below and circle according to your level of preparedness.

(Teacher candidates use a scale from 1 Very Prepared, 2 Not Prepared, 3 No Opinion, 4 Prepared, to 5 Very Prepared).

A. Teach the state’s curriculum content (i.e., TEKS).
B. Teach advanced content that exceeds the demands of the state’s core curriculum.
C. Methodologies of Teaching.
D. Keep the classroom on timely schedule.
E. Maintain order in the classroom.
F. Control misbehaviors that occur.
G. Implement teaching methods that meet academic objectives.
H. Establish a classroom atmosphere that promotes learning.
I. Use student performance assessment techniques.
J. Provide positive, constructive feedback to students.
K. Integrate educational technology into teaching.
L. Implement new methods of teaching (Ex.: cooperative learning).
M. Address the needs of special education students.
N. Address the needs of students with Limited English Proficiency (LEP).
O. Address the needs of students for diverse cultural backgrounds.
P. Overall, how prepared did you feel in your role as a student teacher?
Q. How prepared were you to impact student learning and development in your teaching?

Results from these Student/Clinical Exit Surveys have been previously reported in 1.1.8e. and 1.1.11. These assessments have yielded critical information for the EPP to make continual improvements and to strengthen the preparation of our candidates. In our comprehensive analysis of these data, the EPP has determined additional data from our completers or graduates who are currently in-service will provide an important feedback loop to assist the EPP to continually enhance and improve our program. The survey of WTAMU graduates administered by our Alumni Office has only seen a return of 19%
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respondents. The EPP has developed a Candidate Follow-Up Survey [See 2.2.6] and will partner with the WTAMU Alumni Office to administer the survey to our graduates beginning in the Fall 2016 semester.

Multiple Evidence Sources:

- [See 1.1.8e. Student/Clinical Teacher Evaluation-All Levels/Secondary, Fall 2014, Spring 2015].
- [See 1.1.11. Candidate Field and Clinical Teaching Assessments (Fall 2014, Spring 2015, and Fall 2015)].
- [See 2.2.6. Candidate Follow-Up Survey].