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Question

Does a comparison of the field experience evaluation data from year one (2011-2012) with data from year two (2012 – 2013) reflect growth in skills and dispositions of Inclusive Elementary Educator Program candidates?
2012 Assessment Fair

Question: Are we preparing teacher candidates to be successful in their field placements?

Measure:
GTEP Initial Field Experience Evaluation

Data Collection:
Means were calculated for each of the 20 items on the evaluation form across all teacher candidates (N = 15). Frequency counts were calculated for each response type.

Scale:
0 = No evidence
1 = Unsatisfactory
2 = Emerging
3 = Proficient
4 = Exemplary

Results / Findings: Range of item means = 3.13 – 3.53
(Candidates are prepared as evidenced by ratings of proficient to midway between proficient and exemplary)
Comparison Data

Winter 2012
• **Measurement:** Initial Field Experience Evaluation
• **Results / Findings:** Range of item means = 3.13 – 3.53
Candidates are prepared as evidenced by ratings of proficient to midway between proficient and exemplary

Fall 2013
• **Measurement:** GTEP Field Experience Evaluation
• **Results / Findings:** Range of item means = 3.10 – 3.7
Overall mean score of 3.37
Candidates continue to demonstrate preparedness as evidenced by ratings of proficient to midway between proficient and exemplary
## 2011 - 2013 Comparison Data Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Year / Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPED Academic Field Experience Eval</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTEP Initial Field Experience Eval</td>
<td>Winter 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTEP Student Teaching Eval</td>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTEP Student Teaching Eval</td>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED Academic Field Experience Eval</td>
<td>Winter 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A – Coursework embedded field Experience</td>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data:

Analysis/Conclusions:

There are three separate evaluation forms used in an alternating sequence across the six terms of the two year program. The initial field experience evaluation is used only once and is distinctly different from the other evaluation measures. Therefore comparison data lacks validity.
Take Action:

Developed a single inclusive educator field experience evaluation, from merged GTEP and SPED evaluation forms to be field tested 2013 -2015.

Action steps:

1. Develop an evaluation instrument that is aligned to GTEP and SPED assessments in order to:
   a) Assess program needs
   b) Measure growth of IE2P teacher candidates over the six terms of the program.
Revisiting 2011-12 action items:

1. Continue to analyze data from subsequent field placements.
   • Determined the current forms are not a valid measure for comparison data.

2. Train field supervisors to ensure that ratings are an accurate reflection of the behavior they are observing and evaluating.
   • Supervisors participated in training during Fall 2012 & Winter 2013 and a field experience evaluation form & supervisor evaluation form have been developed in conjunction with the field placement office.

3. Develop observation/evaluation forms
   • Developed a field experience evaluation form to “field test” with the 2013 – 2015 Cohort
IE²P Field Experience Evaluation

Portland State University
Graduate School of Education
Inclusive Elementary Educator Program (IE²P)
Evaluation of Field Experience

Student Name: ___________________________ PSU ID: _____________

Term: □ Fall □ Winter □ Spring Year: 20________

Year 1 Field Experiences: □ SPED Initial □ EC / ELEM Initial □ EC/ELEM Student Teaching
Year 2 Field Experiences: □ SPED Academic Student Teaching □ EC / ELEM Student Teaching

Site: ___________________________ District: ___________________________ Authorization: □ EC □ ELEM

Cooperating Teacher: ___________________________

University Supervisor: ___________________________

This is the: □ Midterm evaluation □ Final evaluation Date of evaluation: ___________

You are completing this evaluation in your role as:

□ Site Supervisor/Cooperating Teacher □ University Supervisor □ Student

Items I. through V. below follow Objectives for Initial Teacher License (OAR 584-017-0100).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Planning instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Establishing a classroom climate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Engaging students in learning activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Evaluating, acting upon, reporting progress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Exhibiting professional behaviors/ethics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Exhibiting professional commitment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Score:

To pass the following field experiences, teacher candidate must earn:

SPED Initial Practicum: average score of 2.5 on items V & VI (related to dispositions)
Year 1 EC/ELEM Practicum & Student Teaching: (a) a minimum score of emerging on each item and (b) an overall average score of 2.5 on items I-VI
Year 2 Student Teaching (EC/ELEM and SPED): an overall average score 3.0 on items I-VI

Using technology | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
Supporting diverse learners | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

Evaluation:

The student □ has □ has not made satisfactory progress toward meeting all objectives of the field experience.
The results of this evaluation □ have □ have not been shared in an evaluation conference with the student.

Supervisor: ___________________________ Cooperating teacher: ___________________________

Candidate: ___________________________ Conference date: ___________________________

04/2013
IE²P Field Experience Evaluation
Recruitment Strategies:
- Quarterly Open House (averaged 6 – 10 participants)
- Drop in Advising (averaged 2 students per week)
- Karen Devol (referred 11 students)
- PSU Open House (12 contacts)
- Perspective student wiki (61 students)
- Connections Portland Teacher Program (3)

34 Applicants to the program
- 16 Sent Acceptance letters
- 10 Acceptance pending (test scores)
- 4 did not submit
- 4 declined applicants

Diversity of Applicants
- 29 Females (86%) & 5 Males (14%)
- 2 (5%) Asian / Pacific Islander
- 19 (58%) Caucasian
- 8 (23%) Hispanic
- 5 (14%) Undeclared
2013 Action Steps:

1. Pilot the IE2P field evaluation form
2. Train field supervisors to evaluate students using the IE2P field experience evaluation (pilot form) in order to ensure that ratings are an accurate reflection of the behavior they are observing and evaluating.
3. Analyze data and evaluate the progression of skills and dispositions across two consecutive field experiences with the 2013 – 2015 IE2P cohort
4. Expand and Refine recruitment strategies