

**ITEMS IN STUDENT TEACHING EVALUATION INSTRUMENT THAT RESULTED IN LESS THAN 80%
OF THE SUCCESS INDEX ESTABLISHED BY THE TEACHING FACULTY COMMITTEE**

I. Student teachers in the academic semester from January-May 2016

Lesson Plan items: All items scored at 80% or more.

Teaching Performance items: All items scored at 80% or more.

II. Student teachers in the academic semester from August - December 2016

Lesson Plan Items:

Item #7 – Writes high expectations be communicated to all students

Item #8 – Exposes clear and precise directions

Item #10 – Plans in the Set Induction, appropriate open ended questions that focuses students' attention on the critical elements and cues written in the Table of Critical Elements.

Item #37 – Plans a summary of the last class that actively involves 80% or more of the students with adequate open-ended and follow-up questions and/or interactive strategies like *Correct is Correct* or *Stretch It*.

Item #38 – Plans a Set Induction that actively involves 80% or more of the students by using adequate open-ended and follow-up questions and/or interactive strategies like *Correct is Correct* or *Stretch It*.

Item #39 – Plans at least three (3) open ended questions in the Development Activity that challenges students to critically think about the skill/s being practiced. These questions are adequate for the game phase in which they are practicing.

Item 48 – Plans the use of an assessment technique that will involve 100% of the students in the corroboration of the objective being met with open ended and follow-up questions that can be quantified and utilized in planning the next class.

Teaching Performance Items:

Item #11 – Clearly communicates high expectations that will motivate students 'participation in class.

Item #37 – Quantitatively corroborates meeting the class objective.

Item #46 – Asks adequate open ended questions or exposes a hypothetical example of the day's topic in order to corroborate student understanding.

Item #69 – Clearly communicates high expectations that will motivate student participation in class.

III. Student teachers in the academic semester from January - May 2017

Lesson Plan Items:

Item #16 – Plans a demonstration for each task or drill before sending students to their positions or spaces in the activity area.

Item #17 – Plans an appropriate modification for less skilled and more skilled students.

Item #18 – Provides an appropriate explanation for each modification planned.

Item#39 – Plans at least three (3) open ended questions in the Development Activity that challenges students to critically think about the skill/s being practiced. These questions are adequate for the game phase in which they are practicing.

Teaching Performance Items:

Item #25 – Effectively detects and corrects elements of the fundamental movement utilizing correct cues.

Item #37 – Quantitatively corroborates meeting the class objective.

Item #51 – Uses precise examples and non-examples that facilitate student understanding of the task.

Item #59 – Provides effective demonstrations throughout his/her teaching.

Item #70 – Provides appropriate specific and corrective feedback about the critical elements of the skill/s taught.

Item #71 – Effectively detects and corrects elements of the skill by utilizing correct cues.

Analysis of Results and Recommended Changes

Introduction:

Throughout the past fifteen years, the Teaching faculty in the Teaching Physical Education Program has made revisions and changes in the Student Teaching Practicum course, in the Methodology of Teaching courses and, in its curriculum. The information gathered in the student teaching experience throughout the years has especially helped improve our evaluation process of student teaching.

Before 2007, each supervisor visited and evaluated his or her student teachers and would eventually meet with each one to provide feedback for improvement throughout the semester. If there were three supervisors in a given semester, each would meet with their student teachers individually on a weekly basis. In 2007, the supervisors decided to meet in a two and a half hour weekly seminar where each student teacher was given the opportunity to share his/her experience in the school setting. This seminar provided our student teachers not only with the opportunity to express themselves about their experience as teachers but also, to expose the difficulties that they were experiencing and to listen to others who had gone through the same problems and had found out how to solve them.

Thanks to the weekly seminar the supervisors were able to better understand the problems that plagued our student teachers in the public schools and how these situations affected their ability to teach. This information also became very valuable to the professors that were teaching the Methodology courses where changes such as adding, eliminating or revising information were and are still made at the end of the student teaching practicum.

The information that resulted from the seminar facilitated the improvement of our evaluation instruments. This informal process produced valuable improvements. Not only did the information offered by our student teachers help to constantly modify our evaluation instrument but also, their observational skills improved as the instrument became more and more specific to the teaching behaviors that we as a faculty wanted to see in our future teachers.

Following CAEP's recommendation for establishing a formal assessment instrument, the items in both the evaluation instrument pertaining to the Lesson Plan and to the Teaching Performance, were calculated and analyzed. The evaluation instrument pertaining to the Lesson Plan consists of 49 items while the Teaching Performance Instrument consists of 71 items.

The following information exposes and discusses the items in the Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument that resulted below our established success index which is 80% or more. However, it is important that the readers of this document understand that all except one of our student teachers in the three cycles of evaluation, passed the Student Teaching Practicum and, every student teacher that took the Teacher Certification Test also passed and are presently certified teachers.

The possible changes that came about by identifying the teaching behaviors that scored below 80% were made three different ways:

1. Adding to the Methodology of Teaching Manual information that needs to be revised according to the results of the assessment in the previous semester.
2. Adding to or stressing upon the teaching behaviors in demonstrative classes performed in the Methodology of Teaching PE course.
3. Revising the wording of the item/s resulting in less than 80% during the previous semester in order to clarify what is asked of students.
4. Changes in the curricular sequence of courses.

I. Academic Semester January – May 2016

Results showed that all student teachers during this semester scored 80% or more in the Class Plan Instrument and in the Teaching Performance Instrument pertaining to teaching strategies and/or behaviors (Tables 1 and 2).

Lesson Plan Instrument:

All 49 items in the Lesson Plan Instrument resulted in 80% and above (see Table 1)

Teaching Performance Instrument:

All 71 items in the Teaching Performance Instrument resulted in 80% or more (see Table 2)

Changes to be made in the Methodology of Teaching Manual, in demonstrative classes or revision of item:

Even though all 49 items in the Lesson Plan Instrument and all of the 71 items of the Teaching Performance Instrument resulted at 80% or more, we wanted to see the items that resulted in exactly 80%. These were the following:

1. Item #11 – Plans appropriate practice conditions that provide for individual differences.
2. Item #39 – Plans at least three open ended questions in the Development Activity that challenge students to critically think about the skill/s being practiced. These questions were adequate for the game phase in which students were learning.
3. Item #48 – Plans for the use of an assessment technique that will involve 100% of students in the corroboration of the class objective with open ended and follow-up questions that can be quantified and used in planning the next class.

II. Academic Semester August – May 2016

Results demonstrated that student teachers scored below 80% in the following teaching strategies and/or behaviors (Tables 1 and 2).

Lesson Plan Instrument:

1. Planning high expectation/s
2. Planning clear directions

3. Planning appropriate open ended questions in in Set Induction to involve 80% or more of students
4. Planning a demonstration for each activity or drill
5. Planning a summary of the last class to involve 80% or more students.
6. Planning open ended questions for Development Activity
7. Planning the use of assessment technique that involves 100% of students

Teaching Performance Instrument:

1. Doesn't communicate high expectations
2. Doesn't quantitatively corroborate class objective
3. Asks adequate open ended questions to corroborate student understanding

Changes to be made in the Methodology of Teaching Manual, in demonstrative classes and/or revision of item/s:

A total of seven of the 49 items in the Class Plan Instrument resulted in less than 80%. Two of these in a low 60%. These were *planning for the communication of high expectations and planning for clear and precise directions*, which are basic parts of the Initial Activity. Most of the time student teachers write a sentence or two that basically expresses what they will say to students in the form of high expectations but, in most of these were written more like learning objectives than high expectations.

The other items below 80% in the Lesson Plan were related to *planning appropriate open ended questions in different parts of the class in order to stimulate student participation, planning demonstrations for each activity and, planning the use of an assessment technique*.

In relation to three of the 71 items in the Teacher Performance Instrument that resulted below 80%, student teachers have typically preferred to corroborate class objectives by using open ended questions instead of a formal assessment. In order to stimulate the use of formal assessment techniques, which they have learned to use and create their own in different courses, a section dedicated to quantitative assessments used during student teaching will be incorporated in the portfolio rubric.

This specific semester was very difficult for these student teachers because the Cooperating Teacher in his role as a coach, traveled many times during the semester with different school teams to compete in other schools. On these days the student teachers weren't able to offer their class session. These competitions turned into major interruptions that made it difficult for our student teachers to provide the effective progression of the content needed for student learning to occur. There is no excuse however, for not planning for nor providing high expectations in class.

Even though they scored below 80% in *planning open ended and follow-up questions to corroborate student understanding*, they did stimulate student participation in each part of the class session with open ended and follow-up questions. In relation to the item related to *planning class demonstrations*, although they did not expose in the plan when demonstrations would be provided, student teachers for the most part, did provide a demonstration of the task or drill before sending students to their positions or spaces in the activity area.

Finally, student teachers scored just below 80% (79%) in *planning an assessment technique that would involve 100% of students* and, *in quantitatively corroborating the class objective during their teaching performance*. Student teachers typically use the class closure to corroborate student understanding when observed by the University Supervisor. However, in too many instances, when they did not use a formal assessment technique, few open ended questions were asked that did not involve the majority of the students. The Cooperating Teacher's feedback also confirmed this situation.

There is a need to focus on the basic strategies that make teaching effective. Using open ended and follow-up questions are a must to stimulate student participation. Using demonstrations to help students observe what is expected of them and also to corroborate their understanding are also a must. Using formal or informal assessment needs to be done to make sure that students do not lag behind. In the Methodology Manual in page 100, open ended questions at the different levels of Bloom's Taxonomy is another resource that will be thoroughly discussed and practiced throughout the course.

III. Academic Semester January – May 2017

Results show that student teachers scored below 80% in the following teaching strategies and/or behaviors (Tables 1 and 2).

Lesson Plan Instrument:

1. Plans appropriate modification for lower skilled and skilled students.
2. Plans adequate explanation for the modification made.
3. Plans at least three open ended questions for the Development Activity.

Teaching Performance Instrument:

1. Detects and corrects elements of the skill
2. Quantitative corroboration of class objective
3. Use of examples and non-examples
4. Use of effective demonstrations
5. Use of appropriate specific and corrective feedback
6. Detects and corrects.

Changes to be made in the Methodology of Teaching Manual, in demonstrative classes or revision of items:

When teachers plan their class session the probability that they will do in class what they have planned is very high. The general percentage scored by the seven student teachers in Items #17 and 18 in the Class Plan Instrument resulted in 67%. These were related the following: *Plan a modification of the task or drill for less skilled and for skilled students* and also, *in providing the appropriate explanation for each modification*. Students typically fill out this information at the beginning of the semester with effective modifications and explanations but as time goes by, they tend to simply repeat the modifications with little thought involved. This situation has become the norm.

In order to attack this negative tendency, Items #17 and #18 will be changed and become one item that expresses the following:

Plans a modification for the less skilled and skilled students in his/her class accompanied by a clear and detailed explanation that evidences how this modification will help these students eventually reach the level of performance planned for the class.

This suggested change will need to be discussed with the faculty committee of the Teaching Program and approved by the majority.

In relation to *planning open ended questions specifically in the Development Activity* which has kept coming up every semester, we believe that student teachers are very capable of elaborating open ended questions related to the task or drill being taught but were left out of their plan. Due to the amount of planning required in the Development Activity, a written reminder of the open ended question will be incorporated in the class plan.

In their teaching performance, these student teachers scored 68% in item #25 which states that *the candidate detects and corrects elements of the fundamental skill by using correct cues*. This was the lowest scored item in the Teaching Performance Instrument. Student teachers frequently detected incorrect movement and mentioned it out loud to students but did very little to stop the task or drill in order to provide correction.

Other teaching behaviors that resulted below 80%, specifically at 75% to 77%, were the *use of examples and non-examples, the use of demonstrations, use of specific and corrective feedback and, quantitative corroboration of class objective*. The use of non-examples, demonstrations and feedback are strategies that teachers needed to provide to students so that they can make the necessary adjustments in the execution of the skill/s. These will be emphasized in the demonstrative classes in the Methodology of Teaching courses.

Conclusion

We would like to make clear to all who read this document that although its focus was on the analysis of the items in the Class Plan and Teaching Performance Instruments that scored below 80% in order to eventually detect and correct these weaknesses, we reiterate that all of our student teachers in the three cycles of evaluation passed the Student Teaching Practicum. Also, all but one of the student teachers that took the Teacher Certification Test passed it and currently are certified teachers in physical education.

We are very pleased to have experienced how the information that surfaced provided such valuable insight on the changes that need to be made in order to continue improving our Program. A good example of this is the amount of redundancy found between and within the items in both instruments.

Our goal now is to update our instruments according to the 2017 results. This will be done by the Teaching Faculty Committee.

Elaborated by:

Dr. Diana Rodríguez Vega Ed.D

Dr. Iris A. Figueroa Robles Ph.D