

Section IV - Assessment 4 Narrative

Pedagogical and Professional Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions (Clinical Practice)

1. Description of assessment and its use in the program

The KSC Clinical Assessment Form (**Attachment A**) is an observational instrument that focuses on the teacher candidates' performance in the clinical setting. It assesses the pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions found in Danielson's *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*. The teacher candidates are very familiar with these elements because they are inherent in the KSC conceptual framework, which is the foundation of all ESEC courses.

This assessment is first used at least once in the field placement experience in the Secondary Social Studies Methods course (ESEC 385-386). During student teaching the instrument is used a minimum of four times during the student teaching experience by both the cooperating teacher and the college supervisor.

Many of the elements contained in the instrument can be assessed while observing the teacher candidate while teaching. Some elements, however, must be assessed after conversation with the teacher candidate at the conference held after each observation. An example of this is IV. D., which assesses reflective practice. The teacher candidate is given the opportunity to reflect on the lesson taught during the observation and discuss that reflection with the observing professional educator.

It is expected that the teacher candidates will score within the 2 range (See **Attachment B**) of the assessment (Meets Expectations).

2. Description of how this assessment specifically aligns with the standards

The KSC Clinical Assessment Form utilizes Danielson's framework and includes the elements found in her pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions associated with successful teaching. By using this instrument in clinical observations of both Methods students and student teachers, both the teacher candidate and the professional educator who is the observer can reflect on the results of the observation and, thus, work on necessary modifications to the clinical experience to improve the pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions. The instrument seeks to assess the knowledge and skills (and to some degree, the dispositions) of the teacher candidate's classroom practice. Element I.B specifically addresses the content standards as a whole.

3. Analysis of data findings

The data was gathered in the spring of 2006 from 13 student teachers in Secondary Social Studies. The data is presented in two tables in **Attachment C**. The first table (Part A) is the data from the final observation made by the cooperating teacher during the student teaching semester. (Student Teacher #12's cooperating teacher failed to submit the KSC Clinical Assessment Form.) The second table (Part B) is the data resulting from the final observations of the college supervisor.

In terms of the Danielson elements, the range of the cooperating teachers' scores (Part A) for teacher candidates was 1.83-2.46 which is mostly within the 2 or Meets Expectations range. The score of 1.83 for Element I.B. reflects the often articulated feeling held by cooperating teachers that student teachers are definitely in the process of gaining content knowledge in great leaps during this period of clinical practice. In this case, a score of 1.83 for this element is to be expected. The three Danielson elements with the highest scores were I.A (Knowledge of Students & School Context), III.B (Flexibility and Responsiveness), and IV.C (Use of Technology). In terms of the teacher candidate scores assessed by cooperating teachers, the range of scores was 1.71-2.82 with the three highest scores being 2.82, 2.78, and 2.57 respectively. The three lowest scores were in the upper 1 or Needs Improvement range and were 1.71, 1.79, and 1.85 respectively. These scores indicate that students are falling within the Meets Expectations range.

Part B reflects the scores per Danielson element and scores per teacher candidates from the assessments done by college supervisors. The range for the Danielson framework was 2.46-2.77 with the three highest scores in Elements IV.A (Clear & Accurate Communication), II.B (Managing Routines & Procedures), and I.A (Knowledge of Students & School Context). Interestingly, one element that received a high score from cooperating teachers (IV.C – Use of Technology) was the lowest Danielson element score from college supervisors. The results from teacher candidate scores from college supervisors present a range of 2.0-2.93. Over half the teacher candidates scored in the upper 2 range of Meets Expectations. There were no teacher candidate scores below a 2.0.

4. Interpretation of how data provides evidence for meeting standards

Scores on the part of both cooperating teachers and college/site supervisors indicate that teacher candidates are meeting expectations for pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions. The average between the cooperating teachers and college supervisors scores shows that KSC Secondary Social Studies teacher candidates meet expectations on the knowledge, skills, and dispositions included in this assessment. Element I.B. average scores between cooperating teachers and college supervisors reflect the meeting of expectations on the broad content knowledge required by the standards. While the goal would be to have yet higher averages in content, it is not unexpected. Student teachers have only their own classroom learning to draw on for Social Studies content. Most professional educators agree that nothing cements content knowledge like teaching!

The assessment was created and piloted by the secondary Social Studies program and one elementary Methods instructor. The assessment was piloted during the fall of 2005, modified and put into full use in the Social Studies program in the spring of 2006. Final minor modifications have been made to this instrument/rubric and it has been adopted as a unit-wide clinical practice assessment.

5. Attachments of assessment documentation

- A. Assessment tool
- B. Scoring guide for assessment
- C. Candidate data derived from assessment

**Section IV – Assessment 4 – Attachment A
KSC Clinical Assessment Form**

Candidate _____
Observer _____
Date: _____

School _____
Grade/Class _____

Comments

I. Planning and Preparing for Instruction

A. Knowledge of Students and School Context _____

B. Knowledge of Content and Associated Pedagogy _____

C. Instructional Goals/Activities/ Assessments/Learning Outcomes _____

II. Creating a Learning Environment

A. Respect/Rapport _____

B. Managing Routines and Procedures _____

C. Managing Student Behavior _____

III. Instruction

A. Activating and Maintaining Engagement _____

B. Flexibility/Responsiveness _____

C. Activities _____

D. Pacing and Timing _____

IV. Professional Responsibility

A. Clear and Accurate Communication with All Audiences _____

B. Professional Interactions and Pursuit of Professional Development _____

C. Use of Technology _____

D. Reflective Practice _____

Key: 1=Needs Improvement
2=Meets Expectations
3=Exceeds Expectations
N/O=Not Observed

Observer Signature (following conference)

Course Instructor Cooperating/Mentor Teacher

Methods/Practicum Instructor College Supervisor

Site Supervisor

Other Professional Educator (please describe)

Teacher Candidate Signature (following conference)

Field placement: Methods/Practicum

**Section IV – Assessment 4 – Attachment B
KSC Clinical Assessment Observation Rubric**

		Needs Improvement (1)	Meets Expectations (2)	Exceeds Expectations (3)
Planning and Preparing Instruction	<i>Knowledge of Students and School Context</i>	Minimal knowledge of school context; developmental character of age group; different approaches to learning based on individual needs; students' prior knowledge; and/or interests & cultural heritage	Accurate knowledge of school context; developmental character of age group; different approaches to learning based on individual needs; students' prior knowledge; and/or interests & cultural heritage	Thorough understanding of school context; developmental character of age group; different approaches to learning based on individual needs; students' prior knowledge; and/or interests & cultural heritage
	<i>Knowledge of Content & Associated Pedagogy</i>	Many content errors; does not clarify student errors or misconceptions	Basic content knowledge; basic associated pedagogical knowledge	Solid content knowledge; pedagogical practice reflects best practice
	<i>Instructional Goals/ Activities/ Assessments/ Learning Outcomes</i>	Goals unclear or not standards-based; irrelevant or unsuitable activities; assessment incongruent with goals; unclear learning outcomes	Goals clear & standards-based; suitable activities; assessment congruent w/ goals; appropriate learning outcomes met	Clear standards-based goals; wide variety of appropriate activities; assessment congruent with goals and clear criteria for students; multiple appropriate learning outcomes met
Creating a Learning Environment	<i>Respect/Rapport</i>	Allows for disrespectful environment: student-teacher or student-student interaction is negative, demeaning, or age inappropriate	Fosters environment of respect: appropriate student-teacher and student-student interactions evident	Creates pervasive environment of respect: exemplary student-teacher and student-student interactions evident
	<i>Managing Routines & Procedures</i>	Time lost due to inefficiency; unnecessary time spent on non-instructional activities	Efficient; minimal loss of time on non-instructional activities	Organized routines; systems in place for efficiently handling non-instructional activities
	<i>Managing Student Behavior</i>	Minimal standards of conduct; student behavior not monitored; response to misbehavior inconsistent; safety of students compromised	Standards of conduct established; aware of and responsive to misconduct; safety of all students assured	Standards of conduct established with student collaboration; alert and responsive to all student behaviors; safety of all students assured
Instruction	<i>Activating & Maintaining Engagement</i>	No agenda available or inconsistent use of agenda; little or no prior knowledge activated; minimal questioning techniques; few students involved/focused; lack of enthusiasm for content	Agenda visible and referenced; prior knowledge activated; enthusiasm for content; variety of questioning techniques; most students involved; maintains student focus	Consistent use of complete & clear agenda; prior knowledge of all students activated; enthusiasm for content; broad variety of questioning strategies; all students involved; commanding presence
	<i>Flexibility/Responsiveness</i>	Rigid or unresponsive to student questions and/or needs; inadequate feedback	Accommodation of student needs evident; appropriate feedback offered	Lesson adjusted as needed to meet all student needs; high quality, consistent feedback that fosters interaction
	<i>Activities</i>	Insufficient variety of learning activities; instructional materials/resources lacking and/or of poor quality; activities not relevant to content/standards	Variety of activities utilizing quality instructional materials/resources; activities relevant to content/standards	Wide variety of activities that challenge students to construct knowledge; relevant and authentic activities utilizing many resources; all activities relevant to content/standards
	<i>Pacing & Timing</i>	Untimely start of class; few transitions; minimal adjustment of lesson flow; closure not evident	Class begins on time; lesson flows and includes smooth transitions; closure evident	Class begins on time; effective transitions; seamless lesson flow; consistent lesson closures
Professional Responsibility	<i>Clear & Accurate Communication with All Audiences</i>	Unclear, inappropriate or inaccurate written or oral communication that is not clearly directed to an audience	Communication features audible, legible, appropriate language for targeted audience; clarifications/questions addressed	Communication features articulate and appropriate language for targeted audience; clarifications/questions welcomed
	<i>Professional Interactions & Pursuit of Professional Development</i>	Relationships w/colleagues are negative or self-serving; minimal involvement in school activities; little or no professional development activities; unprofessional appearance/demeanor	Maintains cordial relationships w/colleagues; participates in school activities; participates in convenient professional development activities; professional appearance/demeanor	Fosters supportive/cooperative relationships w/colleagues; volunteers for & contributes to school activities; seeks opportunities for professional development; consistent professional appearance/demeanor
	<i>Use of Technology</i>	Minimal use of technology in the classroom	Uses technology in instruction	Embraces technology as an instructional tool; teaches students how to use technology; designs activities employing technology
	<i>Reflective Practice</i>	Self-assessment of lesson effectiveness unclear or not articulated.	Accurate self-assessment of lesson effectiveness; makes appropriate suggestions for change	Accurately assesses lesson effectiveness and cites specific examples; makes specific suggestions for improvements for instruction and learning

Section IV - Assessment 4 – Attachment C

Part A - Final Observations from Cooperating Teachers

Danielson Domain		(13 STUDENT TEACHERS)													AVERAGE PER DANIELSON FRAMEWORK STANDARD
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
I. Planning & Preparing for Instruction	A. Knowledge of Students & School Context	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	2.5	1.5	3	3	N/A	2	2.5
	B. Knowledge of Content & Associated Pedagogy	2	3	2	2	1	2	1.5	2	2	2.5	2.5	N/A	2	1.83
	C. Instructional Goals/Activities/ Assessments/Learning Outcomes	3	2	2	2	1	2	2	3	2.5	2.5	2.5	N/A	2	2.25
II. Creating a Learning Environment	A. Respect/Rapport	2	2	3	3	1.5	3	2	2.5	2	3	3	N/A	2	2.42
	B. Managing Routines & Procedures	2	2	3	2	1	3	1.5	2.5	2	3	3	N/A	1.5	2.21
	C. Managing Student Behavior	2	2	2.5	3	2	2	1	2.5	2	3	3	N/A	1.5	2.21
III. Instruction	A. Activating & Maintaining Engagement	2	2	3	2	2	2	1	3	2	2	3	N/A	1.5	2.08
	B. Flexibility/Responsiveness	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	2.5	1.5	2	3	N/A	2	2.46
	C. Activities	3	2	3	2	1	2	2	2.5	2.5	2	3	N/A	2	2.25
	D. Pacing & Timing	2	3	3	2	2	2	1.5	2	2	2	2.5	N/A	2	2.21
IV. Professional Responsibility	A. Clear & Accurate Communication with All Audiences	2	2	3	2	2	2/5	2	2.5	2.5	2	2	N/A	1.5	2.29
	B. Professional Interactions & Pursuit of Professional Development	3	3	3	2	1.5	2	2	3	3	3	3	N/A	2	2.4
	C. Use of Technology	2	2	3	N/A	3	2	1.5	3	3	3	3	N/A	N/A	2.45
	D. Reflective Practice	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2.5	2.5	3	3	N/A	2	2.21
	Teacher Candidate Average Scores	2.21	2.43	2.78	2.23	1.71	2.32	1.79	2.43	2.21	2.57	2.82	--	1.85	

Teacher Candidate Scores

N = 12
 Range: 1.71 – 2.82
 Mean: 2.25
 Median: 2.28

Danielson Framework Scores

N = 12
 Range: 1.83 – 2.5
 Mean: 2.27
 Median: 2.33

Part B - Final Observations from College Supervisors

Danielson Domain		(13 STUDENT TEACHERS)													AVERAGE PER DANIELSON FRAMEWORK STANDARD
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
I. Planning & Preparing for Instruction	A. Knowledge of Students & School Context	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	2.5	3	2.5	2.69
	B. Knowledge of Content & Associated Pedagogy	2.5	3	2.5	3	3	3	2	2	3	2.5	2	3	2	2.58
	C. Instructional Goals/Activities/ Assessments/Learning Outcomes	3	2	2.5	3	3	3	2	2.5	3	2.5	2	3	2	2.58
II. Creating a Learning Environment	A. Respect/Rapport	2	2	2.5	3	2.5	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	2.54
	B. Managing Routines & Procedures	3	2	3	3	2.5	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2.73
	C. Managing Student Behavior	2	2	3	3	2.5	3	2.5	2	3	3	3	3	2	2.62
III. Instruction	A. Activating & Maintaining Engagement	3	2	2.5	3	2.5	3	2	3	3	2	2.5	2.5	2	2.54
	B. Flexibility/Responsiveness	2	3	2.5	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	2	2.65
	C. Activities	3	2	3	3	3	2.5	2	2.5	3	2	3	3	1.5	2.58
	D. Pacing & Timing	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2.5	2	2.5
IV. Professional Responsibility	A. Clear & Accurate Communication with All Audiences	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	2.77
	B. Professional Interactions & Pursuit of Professional Development	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	2.62
	C. Use of Technology	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	2.46
	D. Reflective Practice	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2.54
	AVERAGE PER TEACHER CANDIDATE	2.46	2.36	2.68	2.79	2.79	2.89	2.25	2.07	2.93	2.57	2.57	2.93	2.0	

Teacher Candidate Scores

N = 13
 Range: 2.0 – 2.93
 Mean: 2.71
 Median: 2.57

Danielson Framework Scores

N = 13
 Range: 2.46 - 2.77
 Mean: 2.6
 Median: 2.5