

Description of evaluation: The COEPS designed the InTASC evaluation of teacher candidates (TC) to determine their preparedness on the model core teaching standards and learning progressions created by the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC). The model core standards “outline what teachers should know and be able to do to ensure every PK-12 student reaches the goal of being ready to enter college or the workforce in today’s world. This ‘common core’ outlines the principles and foundations of teaching practice that cut across all subject areas and grade levels and that all teachers share (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2013).” The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction requires teacher preparation programs to use the InTASC standards to guide their programs.

Distribution: Cooperating Teachers complete the InTASC Evaluation two times during a candidates’ placement. First, at the mid-point in the student teaching semester and then again at the end of the semester. The Office of Field Experiences distributed the evaluation directly to Cooperating Teachers using Qualtrics. The Assistant Dean reviews results and prepares reports annually during winter (fall) and summer (spring).

Rating Scale:

Numerical values for responses: (1) Beginning, (2) Developing, (3) Effective, and (4) Highly Effective

- Not Observed: did not observe the candidate to perform identified skill, will be counted but not rated on the numerical scale provided
- Beginning: basic knowledge of concepts, requires constant supervision
- Developing: attempts to implement strategies, requires regular supervision
- Effective: implements appropriate strategies consistently, requires some supervision
- Highly Effective: consistent and skillful use of appropriate strategies, does not require supervision

Table 1. Spring 2020 mid-term student teachers InTASC evaluation results (n=173, 93% of candidates)

| InTASC standard | Mean |
|---|------|
| 1. Learner Development | 2.70 |
| 2. Learning Differences | 2.56 |
| 3. Learning Environments | 2.82 |
| 4. Content Knowledge | 2.75 |
| 5. Application of Content | 2.69 |
| 6. Assessment | 2.72 |
| 7. Planning for Instruction | 2.77 |
| 8. Instructional Strategies | 2.73 |
| 9. Professional Learning and Ethical Practice | 3.05 |
| 10. Leadership and Collaboration | 2.93 |

| Domain | Mean |
|---------------|------|
| Dispositions | 2.90 |
| Communication | 2.88 |

Summary. Cooperating Teachers completed this evaluation of teacher candidates after roughly 8-weeks into the student teaching placement. The mean scores across all domains indicate candidates’ knowledge and skills were at the developing level. This level indicates candidates’ performance requires regular supervision. Across the InTASC domains, there were consistent areas in which the candidates’

were “not observed” including, working with families, using technology, participating in professional development activities, and supporting English Language Learners. While this result could indicate a lack of opportunity, it may also be lack of knowledge and/or skill development in these areas. One notable area of strength was in Professional Learning and Ethical Practice, which includes working with a mentor to improve practice, and complying with laws and policies. In the areas of professional dispositions and communication, Cooperating Teaching rated candidates in the developing range.

Table 2. Spring 2020 final student teachers InTASC evaluation results (n= 173, 93%)

| InTASC standard | Mean |
|---|------|
| 1. Learner Development | 3.02 |
| 2. Learning Differences | 2.97 |
| 3. Learning Environments | 3.16 |
| 4. Content Knowledge | 3.04 |
| 5. Application of Content | 3.02 |
| 6. Assessment | 3.02 |
| 7. Planning for Instruction | 3.12 |
| 8. Instructional Strategies | 3.29 |
| 9. Professional Learning and Ethical Practice | 3.29 |
| 10. Leadership and Collaboration | 3.20 |

| Domain | Mean |
|---------------|------|
| Dispositions | 3.15 |
| Communication | 3.13 |

Summary. Cooperating Teachers completed this evaluation in spring 2020 after schools closed due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The candidates in this sample were the same as in Table 1. However, the Cooperating Teachers may not have been the same¹. The mean scores reflect candidates knowledge and skills in their student teaching placements near or at the effective level. This level indicates that candidates require some supervision. When compared to the mid-term evaluation (see Table 1), Cooperating Teachers rated candidates higher across all domains. The areas candidates show relative strength include instructional strategies, professional learning and ethical practice, and leadership. While the majority of scores were consistent, Cooperating Teachers evaluated candidates in the Learning Differences domain slightly lower. This domain includes making instruction accessible to linguistically diverse learners, seeks opportunities to deepen understanding to exceptional learner needs, and documents learner progress.

¹Some teacher candidates completed student teaching at two different placements. In these cases, two different cooperating teachers complete the final evaluation.