

INTEGRATED BACHELOR'S/MASTER'S PROGRAM
STUDENT TEACHING EVALUATION Midterm RESULTS: WORLD LANGUAGE
Spring 2017

Context

This survey is part of the set of surveys administered at key transitions points in the IB/M program. This survey was administered to the university supervisors of the 4 members of the Spring 2017 IB/M World Language education cohort.

Survey Content

- Information about the student teaching 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 placement supervisors of all of the students participating in internships. The data collection period was in the first week of March 2017. A total of 4 surveys were completed (response rate = 4/4 = 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 supervisor, the cooperating teacher, and the 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 student teachers were rated and average of 2.08 out of a possible 3 points across 19 performance standards, which is the performance level expected of student teachers at this stage in the semester, and their careers.
- Qualitative feedback indicated that the student teachers were knowledgeable, highly professional, and successfully developed rapport with their students.
- University supervisors recommended that the students work to refine their assessment strategies, and continue to seek out professional development opportunities

For more information, please contact Jamison Judd, Interim Director of Assessment (jamison.judd@uconn.edu). This report is available online - <http://assessment.education.uconn.edu/>

Please indicate the district placement of the student.

District	Count
East Hartford	1 (25.00%)
Coventry	3 (75.00%)

Grade Level Placement (Check all that apply)

Grade	Count	Grade	Count
7	1	10	3
8	1	11	3
9	2	12	2

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

3 = Student is making outstanding progress by effectively planning/implementing instruction to address this standard.

2 = Student is making satisfactory progress by making deliberate attempts to address this standard.

1 = Student is not making satisfactory progress and still remains weak in addressing this standard.

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

Because satisfactory progress is the target for this learning experience, teacher candidates need to aim for a minimum rating of "2" as they seek to meet each standard. On the final, if the teacher candidate has mostly "2's" and five or more "3's," s/he will receive a letter grade of A. If the candidate has predominantly "2's," a grade of A is awarded. If the candidate has mostly "2's" and three "1's", s/he will receive a B+. If the candidate has four "1's," s/he will receive a grade of B. If there are five or more "1's," the teacher candidate will receive a grade of B or below.

Item	1	2	3	Mean
1) Language Acquisition Theories: (ACTFL Standard 3)	0 (0%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	2.5
2) Target language input: (ACTFL Standard 3, World Language Teacher Core Practice 1, InTASC Standard 4)	0 (0%)	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	2
3) Negotiation of meaning: (ACTFL Standard 3, InTASC Standard 1, Teacher Core Practice 4)	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	1.75
4) Meaningful Classroom Interaction: (ACTFL Standard 3, Teacher Core Practice 5, InTASC Standard 3)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	2.75

5) Adapting instruction to address students' language levels, language backgrounds, learning styles: (ACTFL Standard 3, InTASC Standard 2, Teacher Core Practice 2)	0 (0%)	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	2
6) Adapting instruction to meet students' special needs: (ACTFL Standard 3, Teacher Core Practice 2)	0 (0%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	2.5
7) Critical thinking and problem solving: (ACTFL Standard 3, Teacher Core Practices 4 and 6)	0 (0%)	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	2
8) Grouping: (ACTFL Standard 3; Teacher Core Practice 15; InTASC Standard 3)	0 (0%)	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	2.25
9) Use of questioning and tasks: (ACTFL Standard 3)	0 (0%)	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	2.25
10) Integration of Standards into instruction: (ACTFL Standard 4)	0 (0%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	2.5
11) Use of three modes of communication (interpretive, interpersonal, presentational): (ACTFL Standard 4; World Language Core Practices 2 and 5).	0 (0%)	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	2
12) Use of standards-based cultural products, practices, and perspectives: (ACTFL Standard 4).	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)	1.5
13) Connections to other subject areas and connections to target language communities: (ACTFL Standard 4).	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)	1.5
14) Selection, adaptation, and integration of authentic materials and technology: (ACTFL Standard 4; InTASC Standards 4 and 8)	0 (0%)	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	2
15) Plan for assessment: (ACTFL Standard 5)	0 (0%)	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	2.25
16) Assessment of Cultural perspectives: (ACTFL Standard 5)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)	1.5
17) Assessment variety, reflection and adjustment: (ACTFL Standard 5, InTASC Standard 6; Teacher Core Practice 10)	0 (0%)	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	2.25
18) Interpret and report progress to students: (ACTFL Standard 5)	0 (0%)	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	2
19) Communicate with stakeholders: (ACTFL Standard 5)	0 (0%)	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	2