

TEACHER INTERN ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT (TIAI)

TAG: CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.3, 3.4, 3.5, 5.3, 5.5; CC Theme Technology

Description

For the evaluation of the student teaching experience, the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) is a state proprietary instrument used to evaluate all teacher candidates completing a licensure program. The TIAI evaluation rubric is aligned with the Mississippi Statewide Teacher Growth Rubric (TGR), which is used by MDE to assess practicing teachers in the classroom, and the InTASC Standards.

Purpose

The purpose of the evaluation is to provide a comprehensive assessment (both formative and summative) of instructional practices of teacher candidates. Items rated at the “Meets Standard” level (a rubric score of *two*) or “Exceeds Standard” (a rubric score of *three*) represents successful planning and/or implementation of that TIAI item by the candidate. Rubric scores of *one* (“Needs Improvement”) or *zero* (“Unacceptable”) are viewed as areas in need of developmental strengthening, and the candidate will meet with the cooperating teacher and university supervisor for guidance and suggestions for greater success.

Administration

The TIAI instrument is administered by cooperating teachers and university supervisors during each field experience placement throughout the student teaching semester for a total of four times (two formative and two summative). Cooperating teachers and university supervisors are required to view a presentation on the evaluation instrument and to complete a statewide online training module prior to evaluating teacher candidates. Upon completion of the training, a certificate of completion is awarded. Training is to be completed once every three years. The data summarized are representative of the summative evaluations by the university supervisor.

Candidates review the instrument at the beginning of the student teaching semester during the Professional Development Seminar with their university supervisor. A copy of the evaluation is uploaded to their Field Experience Binders (one in first experience and the other in the second experience). After the evaluation has been completed by either the university supervisor or the cooperating teacher, the candidate has instant access to view the scores and the feedback provided. The university supervisor as well as the cooperating teacher also verbally review scores with the candidate.

Content of the Assessment

STANDARD	KEY ELEMENT	ELEMENT DESCRIPTION
CAEP	1.1	Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the 10 InTASC standards at the appropriate progression level(s) in the following categories: the learner and learning; content; instructional practice; and professional responsibility.

	1.2	Providers ensure that candidates use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession and use both to measure their P-12 students' progress and their own professional practice.
	1.3	Providers ensure that candidates apply content and pedagogical knowledge as reflected in outcome assessments in response to standards of Specialized Professional Associations (SPA), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), states, or other accrediting bodies (e.g., National Association of Schools of Music – NASM).
	1.4	Providers ensure that candidates demonstrate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college- and career-ready standards (e.g., Next Generation Science Standards, National Career Readiness Certificate, Common Core State Standards).
	1.5	Providers ensure that candidates model and apply technology standards as they design, implement and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning; and enrich professional practice.
InTASC	1 (The Learner and Learning)	Learner Development. The teacher understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.
	2 (The Learner and Learning)	Learning Differences. The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.
	3 (The Learner and Learning)	Learning Environments. The teacher works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.
	4 (Content)	Content Knowledge. The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.
	5 (Content)	Application of Content. The teacher understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.
	6 (Instructional Practice)	Assessment. The teacher understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own

		growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making.
	7 (Instructional Practice)	Planning for Instruction. The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and community context.
	8 (Instructional Practice)	Instructional Strategies. The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.
	10 (Professional Responsibility)	Leadership and Collaboration. The teacher seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth, and to advance the profession.
ISTE	5	Educators design authentic, learner-driven activities and environments that recognize and accommodate learner variability.
TGR	1	Lessons are aligned to standards and represent a coherent sequence of learning.
	2	Lessons have high levels of learning for all students.
	3	The teacher assists students in taking responsibility for learning and monitors student learning.
	4	The teacher provides multiple ways for students to make meaning of content.
	5	The teacher manages a learning-focused classroom community.
	6	The teacher manages classroom space, time, and resources (including technology when appropriate) effectively for student learning.
	7	The teacher creates and maintains a classroom of respect for all students.
	9	The teacher establishes and maintains effective communication with families/guardians.

Scoring

Candidate who are not successful in meeting the minimum level of proficiency on this assessment or struggling at any point during their student teaching experience, the process for remediation, change of placement or removal from the program will be initiated.

Maximum Points Possible: 75 points

TEACHER INTERN ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT RUBRIC

DOMAIN I. PLANNING AND PREPARATION

Items 1 - 6 should be assessed from written lesson and unit plans classroom observations, and from other artifacts (pretests, inventories, surveys, etc.).

**Notes for Domain I*

Indicator 2: Examples include developing learning experiences (remediation, enrichment, accommodations) planned for students with disabilities or exceptionalities, students who are gifted, and students who represent diversity based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, language, religion, sexual identification, and/or geographic origin.

Indicator 3: To Exceed Standard, the instructional plans include integrating content connections across disciplines throughout the internship experience.

Indicator 4: Examples include but are not limited to the following: cooperative learning, discovery learning, demonstration, discussion, inquiry, simulation, etc.

Indicator 5: Examples include assessments aligned with standards and objectives such as pre/post assessments, quizzes, unit tests, rubrics, and/or checklists.*

	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
1. The teacher candidate develops measurable and observable grade and subject level objectives that are aligned with appropriate state curricula frameworks. CAEP 1.2; InTASC 7; TGR 1)	0 The teacher candidate's objectives are not measurable, observable, or aligned with appropriate state curricula frameworks.	1 The teacher candidate's objectives are aligned with appropriate state curricula frameworks, but they are not measurable or observable.	2 The teacher candidate's objectives are measurable, observable, and aligned with appropriate state curricula frameworks.	3 In addition to meets standard, the teacher candidate's objectives are stated at different instructional levels based on individual needs of students (DOK Levels and/or Bloom's Taxonomy).
2. The teacher candidate develops meaningful and authentic learning experiences that accommodate developmental and individual needs of each learner in the group. (CAEP 1.1; InTASC 2; TGR 2)	0 The teacher candidate does not develop meaningful nor authentic learning experiences that accommodate developmental and individual needs of each learner in the group.	1 The teacher candidate develops meaningful and authentic learning experiences, but accommodations are not made to meet individual needs of each learner in the group.	2 The teacher candidate develops meaningful and authentic learning experiences that accommodate developmental and individual needs of each learner in the group.	3 In addition to meets standard, the teacher candidate provides evidence of research-based strategies that accommodate developmental and individual needs of each learner in the group.

	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
3. The teacher candidate integrates core content knowledge across and within subject areas in lessons when appropriate. (CAEP 1.1; InTASC 7; TGR 4)	0 The teacher candidate's instructional plans never integrate core content knowledge across and within subject areas.	1 The teacher candidate's instructional plans integrate irrelevant core content knowledge across and within subject areas (does not make connections).	2 The teacher candidate's instructional plans integrate core content knowledge across and within subject areas in lessons when appropriate.	3 In addition to meets standard, the teacher candidate's instructional plans include connections of content across disciplines.
4. The teacher candidate plans appropriate and sequential teaching procedures that include innovative introductions and closures. Teaching procedures incorporate different teaching strategies that positively impact student learning and development. (CAEP 1.5; InTASC 8; ISTE 5; TGR 2)	0 The teacher candidate does not plan appropriate or sequential teaching procedures that include innovative introductions and closures. Different teaching strategies are not utilized.	1 The teacher candidate's plans lack logical sequence and different teaching strategies.	2 The teacher candidate plans appropriate and sequential teaching procedures that include innovative introductions and closures. Teaching procedures incorporate different teaching strategies that positively impact student learning and development.	3 In addition to meets standard, the teacher candidate's multiple lesson plans cite research-based evidence.
5. The teacher candidate's plans indicate use of appropriate assessments that effectively evaluate student learning and development. (CAEP 1.3; InTASC 6; TGR 3)	0 The teacher candidate's plans do not indicate use of assessments that effectively evaluate student learning and development.	1 The teacher candidate's plans indicate use of assessments but not all are appropriate.	2 The teacher candidate's plans indicate use of appropriate assessments that effectively evaluate student learning and development.	3 In addition to meets standard, the teacher candidate's assessments are performance-based to enhance

	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
				critical thinking and problem solving.
6. The teacher candidate's plans include technology that will engage students in analysis, creativity, and deeper learning experiences to improve student growth, development, and understanding. (CAEP 1.5; InTASC 7; ISTE 5; TGR 6)	0 The teacher candidate's plans do not include technology that will engage students.	1 The teacher candidate's plans lack logical use of technology.	2 The teacher candidate's plans include technology that will engage students in analysis, creativity, and deeper learning experiences to improve student growth, development, and understanding.	3 In addition to meets standard, the teacher candidate's multiple lesson plans utilize technology to enhance learning opportunities.

DOMAIN II. ASSESSMENT

Items 7 - 8 should reflect the teacher intern's ability to effectively communicate assessment information to the students, provide feedback, and incorporate informal and formal assessments. Items should be assessed from written lesson and unit plans, classroom observations, and from other artifacts (pretests, inventories, surveys, etc.)

**Notes for Domain II*

Indicator 7: To meet the Exceeds Standard, intern must complete both stated requirements.

Indicator 8: Examples of assessments include pretests, quizzes, unit tests, checklists, rating scales, rubrics, and remediation and enrichment activities.*

	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
7. The teacher candidate communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to the students and provides feedback to students about academic performance.	0 The teacher candidate does not communicate assessment criteria or performance standards to the students or	1 The teacher candidate communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to the students. Fails	2 The teacher candidate communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to the students and	3 Student input is sought in developing assessment criteria. The teacher candidate provides

	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
(CAEP 1.2; InTASC 6; TGR 3)	provide feedback to students about academic performance.	to provide students with feedback.	provides feedback to students about their academic performance.	clear and actionable feedback that helps the student understand what s/he did well and provides guidance for improvement.
8. The teacher candidate uses formative and summative assessments to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate the learning and development of each learner in the group. (CAEP 1.2; InTASC 6; TGR 3)	0 The teacher candidate does not use formative and summative assessments to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate the learning and development of each learner in the group.	1 The teacher candidate uses formative and summative assessments but fails to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate differences in learning and development of each learner in the group.	2 The teacher candidate uses formative and summative assessments to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate the learning and development of each learner in the group.	3 In addition to meets standard , the teacher candidate conferences with individual students to assist with monitoring progress.

DOMAIN III. INSTRUCTION

Items 9 - 19 should reflect the teacher intern's overall ability to effectively communicate with students and implement innovative lessons using a variety of teaching strategies that meet the needs of all students. Items should be assessed from written lesson and unit plans and classroom observations.

***Notes for Domain III:**

Indicator 15: Examples include use of teaching strategies such as cooperative learning, discovery learning, demonstration, discussion, inquiry, simulation, etc.

Indicator 16: Examples include students with disabilities or exceptionalities, students who are gifted, and students who represent diversity based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, language, religion, sexual identification, and/or geographic origin).

Indicator 17: Guiding questions need to be listed in lesson plans.

Indicator 19: Examples include special guests, materials, extracurricular activities, etc.*

	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
9. The teacher candidate uses standard written, oral, and nonverbal communication in instruction. (CAEP 1.1; InTASC 5; TGR 4)	0 The teacher candidate does not use standard written, oral, and nonverbal communication in instruction.	1 The teacher candidate's standard written, oral, and nonverbal communication is difficult to follow for students.	2 The teacher candidate uses standard written, oral, and nonverbal communication in instruction to engage students.	3 In addition to meets standard, the teacher candidate enriches conversation with expressive language and vocabulary to engage students.
10. The teacher candidate provides explicit written and oral directions for instructional activities. (CAEP 1.1; InTASC 5; TGR 4)	0 The teacher candidate does not provide explicit written and oral directions for instructional activities.	1 The teacher candidate provides written and oral directions for instructional activities that are not explicit.	2 The teacher candidate provides explicit written and oral directions for instructional activities.	3 In addition to meets standard, the teacher candidate uses concrete examples to model and to clarify tasks and concepts.
11. The teacher candidate communicates positive expectations for learning for all students. (CAEP 1.1; InTASC 2; TGR 2)	0 The teacher candidate does not communicate positive expectations for learning for all students.	1 The teacher candidate has difficulty communicating positive expectations for learning for all students.	2 The teacher candidate communicates positive expectations for learning for all students.	3 In addition to meets standard, the teacher candidate encourages all students to set positive expectations for themselves and peers.
12. The teacher candidate conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning for all students. (CAEP 1.1; InTASC 3; TGR 7)	0 The teacher candidate does not convey enthusiasm for teaching and learning for all students.	1 The teacher candidate has difficulty conveying enthusiasm for teaching and learning for all students.	2 The teacher candidate conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning for all students.	3 In addition to meets standard, the teacher candidate elicits enthusiasm from students.

	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
13. The teacher candidate provides opportunities for all students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning. (CAEP 1.1; InTASC 3; TGR 5)	0 The teacher candidate does not provide opportunities for all students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning.	1 The teacher candidate provides opportunities for all students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other but does not enhance learning.	2 The teacher candidate provides opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning.	3 In addition to meets standard, the teacher candidate enhances the development of student leadership and provides opportunities for students to work cooperatively on projects/activities of their choice.
14. The teacher candidate demonstrates content knowledge and an understanding of how to teach the content. (CAEP 1.3; InTASC 4; TGR 4)	0 The teacher candidate does not demonstrate content knowledge and how to teach the content.	1 The teacher candidate has difficulty demonstrating content and content pedagogical knowledge.	2 The teacher candidate demonstrates content knowledge and an understanding of how to teach the content.	3 In addition to meets standard, the teacher candidate uses a variety of instructional methods to ensure an understanding of the content.
15. The teacher candidate uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies, including technology, to impact student learning and development. (CAEP 1.3; InTASC 8; TGR 4)	0 The teacher candidate does not use a variety of appropriate teaching strategies, including technology, to impact student learning.	1 The teacher candidate has difficulty using a variety of appropriate teaching strategies, including technology, to impact student learning and development.	2 The teacher candidate uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies, including technology, to impact student learning and development.	3 In addition to meets standard, the teacher candidate uses a variety of appropriate student-centered teaching strategies to impact student learning and development.

	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
16. The teacher candidate planned learning experiences are implemented that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of each learner in the group. (CAEP 1.4; InTASC 1; TGR 2)	0 The teacher candidate does not implement planned learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of each learner in the group.	1 The teacher candidate implements learning experiences, but fails to accommodate the differences in developmental needs of each learner in the group.	2 The teacher candidate implements planned learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of each learner in the group.	3 In addition to meets standard, the teacher candidate cites research to support the planned learning experiences.
17. The teacher candidate engages all students in critical thinking through higher-order questioning. (CAEP 1.4; InTASC 5; TGR 4)	0 The teacher candidate does not engage all students in critical thinking through higher-order questioning.	1 The teacher candidate relies on lower level questioning.	2 The teacher candidate engages all students in critical thinking through higher-order questioning.	3 In addition to meets standard, the teacher candidate provides opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem-solving and critical thinking.
18. The teacher candidate adjusts instruction as needed based on student input, cues, and individual/group responses. (CAEP 1.4; InTASC 8; TGR 4)	0 The teacher candidate does not adjust instruction as needed based on student input, cues, and individual/group responses.	1 The teacher candidate elicits student input during instruction and attempts are made to adjust instruction based on student responses.	2 The teacher candidate elicits student input and adjusts instruction as needed based on student input, cues, and individual/group responses.	3 In addition to meets standard, the teacher candidate constructs appropriate prompts to encourage student responses that expand and justify their reasoning. Revises instruction based on student responses.
19. The teacher candidate uses family and/or	0	1	2	3

	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
community resources in instruction to impact student learning and development. (CAEP 1.1; InTASC 10; TGR 9)	The teacher candidate does not use family and/or community resources in instruction to impact student learning and development.	The teacher candidate attempts to use family and/or community resources to impact instruction but meaningful connections are not made.	The teacher candidate uses family and/or community resources in instruction to impact student learning and development.	In addition to meets standard, the teacher candidate designs and organizes instruction to foster ongoing communication and high expectations for learners.

DOMAIN IV. LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

Items 20 - 24 should reflect the teacher intern's ability to manage the classroom environment in a way that is conducive to learning. Items should be assessed from classroom observations.*

	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
20. The teacher candidate adjusts the classroom environment to enhance positive peer relationships, motivation, and learning. (CAEP 1.1; InTASC 3; TGR 5)	0 The teacher candidate does not adjust the classroom environment to enhance positive peer relationships, motivation, and learning.	1 The teacher candidate has difficulty adjusting the classroom environment to enhance positive peer relationships, motivation, and learning.	2 The teacher candidate adjusts the classroom environment and delivers instruction to enhance positive peer relationships, motivation, and learning.	3 In addition to meets standard, the teacher candidate encourages students to develop self-monitoring skills.
21. The teacher candidate attends to and delegates routine tasks. (CAEP 1.1; InTASC 3; TGR 6)	0 The teacher candidate does not attend to and delegate routine tasks.	1 The teacher candidate attempts to attend to and delegate routine tasks but there is no	2 The teacher candidate attends to and delegates routine tasks.	3 In addition to meets standards, the teacher candidate has a systematic

	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
		consistency or established routine.		routine for attending to and delegating tasks.
22. The teacher candidate uses multiple strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs. (CAEP 1.1; InTASC 3; TGR 5)	0 The teacher candidate does not manage student behavior.	1 The teacher candidate has difficulty applying appropriate strategies in managing student behavior.	2 The teacher candidate uses multiple strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs.	3 In addition to meeting the standard, the P-12 students self-monitor their behavior.
23. The teacher candidate creates a culturally inclusive environment that promotes fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students. (CAEP 1.1; InTASC 3; TGR 7)	0 The teacher candidate does not create a culturally inclusive environment.	1 The teacher candidate has difficulty maintaining a culturally inclusive environment.	2 The teacher candidate creates and maintains a culturally inclusive environment that promotes fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.	3 In addition to meets standard, the teacher candidate's cultural inclusivity is evident in student interactions.
24. The teacher candidate maximizes instructional time. (CAEP 1.1; InTASC 7; TGR 6)	0 The teacher candidate does not maximize instructional time.	1 The teacher candidate has difficulty maximizing instructional time.	2 The teacher candidate maximizes instructional time.	3 In addition to meets standard, the teacher candidate's transitions, routines, and procedures are executed in an efficient manner with minimal teacher direction.

DOMAIN V. PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Item 25 should reflect the teacher intern's ability to involve parents and/or guardians in the child's learning. Items should be assessed from written lesson and unit plans, classroom observations, and from other artifacts (inventories, surveys, and other documentation).

***Notes for Domain V**

Indicator 25: Examples include documented evidence such as PLCs, data meetings, newsletters, positive notes, extracurricular activities, professional development opportunities, conferences, etc.*

	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
25. The teacher candidate collaborates with professional colleagues (classroom cooperating teacher and/or university supervisor) to communicate with families about student learning and development. (CAEP 1.1; InTASC 10; TGR 9)	0 The teacher candidate does not collaborate with professional colleagues to communicate with families about student learning and development.	1 The teacher candidate has difficulty collaborating with professional colleagues to communicate with families about student learning and development.	2 The teacher candidate collaborates with professional colleagues to communicate with families about student learning and development.	3 In addition to meets standard, the teacher candidate engages in ongoing professional learning opportunities with professional colleagues, and seeks advice/information from experienced educators.

Data Validity

The TIAI was written based on the formerly used candidate measurement tool: the MTAI In-Class Evaluation (Mississippi Teacher Assessment Instrument). In 2012, the Field Directors in the state of Mississippi gathered and collaboratively authored the TIAI. This new assessment instrument was piloted in fall 2012. After piloting, revisions were made and the instrument was reduced to 25 indicators and aligned to the MSTAR and InTASC Standards. As a result of the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments, the statewide EPP Collaboration Committee consisting of field directors, chairs/directors, and assessment coordinators began meeting in 2017 to revise the 2012 instrument. The committee worked to removed subjectivity in the indicators and content validity is assured through the close alignment of the indicators with the CAEP, InTASC, and the state Teacher Growth Rubric (TGR - Mississippi State Evaluation for evaluation of teachers in the Classroom). The updated instrument was piloted in fall 2017 and spring 2018. Minor revisions were made in spring 2018 and all institutions (public and private) in the state of Mississippi adopted the instrument for evaluation starting fall 2018. Summative data is reported to the Mississippi Department of Education as part of the Annual Report. The Lawshe CVR is 0.778 agreement.

Data Reliability

As stated earlier, cooperating teachers and university supervisors are required to view a presentation on the evaluation instrument and to complete a statewide online training module prior to evaluating teacher candidates. Upon completion of the training, a certificate of completion is awarded.

University supervisors are sent a student work sample to review at the beginning of the semester during the supervisors' meeting to establish inter-rater reliability. Supervisors bring their completed evaluations to discuss how the sample was scored. Results are recorded for the practice session.

Data Results Showing Agreement

Completed Spring 2019

N=9

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>-2</i>	<i>-1</i>	<i>Agreement</i>	<i>+1</i>	<i>+2</i>
1		4	5		
2		2	4	3	
3		3	6		
4	1		5	3	
5	3	1	5		
6		2	5	2	
7			5	2	2
8	1	3	5		
9		1	8		
10		3	5	1	
11			9		
12			8	1	

13		4	4	1	
14		3	5	1	
15			6	1	1
16			8	1	
17		2	4	3	
18			5	4	
19		1	7	1	
20		4	4	1	
21			5	4	
22		4	5		
23			5	2	2
24		1	7	1	
25		1	6	2	

Analysis of Data Findings

Candidates are evaluated twice during their 14-week placement: formative and summative. Because most of the candidates have two, seven-week student teaching placements, there are two summative data points per candidate. The data reported are based only on the candidates' TIAI's summative scores from the last placement as completed by the university supervisor.

Descriptive statistics of candidates' summative scores are shown in evidence 1.1 Initial Assmt Data. Statistics are provided for each TIAI indicator (items 1 – 25), for three semesters (spring 2018, fall 2018, and spring 2019), and by type/location of each teacher candidate licensure program (Aggregated, Hattiesburg, Gulf Coast, Online, and Elementary Education/SPED Dual).

Reviewing indicators 1 through 25 in the aggregated section shows that during the three recorded semesters for all programs, spring 2018, fall 2018, and spring 2010, as a whole, the mean averages were above 2.0. Since a rubric score of “2” is “Meets Standard,” this shows that candidates show average scores at the “Meets Standard” level of proficiency.

The weakest indicator of all three semesters was #19 Uses family and/or community resources in instruction to impact student learning and development (fall 2018, M=2.14). Low scores were also reported in indicator #7 Communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to the students and provides feedback to students about academic performance (spring 2018, M=2.23; spring 2019, M=2.29) and in indicator #17 Engages all students in critical thinking through higher-order questioning (spring 2019, M=2.29).

Strengths were shown in indicator #15 Uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies, including technology, to impact student learning and development (spring 2018, M=2.90), #24 Maximizes instructional time (fall 2018, M=2.78), and #14 Demonstrates content and content pedagogical knowledge (spring 2019, M=2.91).

Discussion of Interpretation of Data

In comparing scores across the three semesters, the scores were pretty tight. Fall 2018 semester continues to score low on this evaluation as well as the other evaluations administered during this semester.

It is interesting to note that indicator #7 was the lowest for both spring semesters. Looking across all programs, History, Elementary GC, and Physical Education were the contributing influence on the low scores. Since the results for these programs are above the mean of “2” Meets Standard, there is not much cause for alarm. However, feedback for Physical Education is paramount for motivation of physical performance. Feedback is more than just grading a paper. Feedback should enhance learning and improve assessment performance. Learning how to give good constructive feedback to students in your classroom is important and cannot be learned overnight. As a result, we have had discussions about where in our program should this weakness be addressed. Oftentimes, we feel that the topic should be pigeonholed to one class, but instead this needs to be addressed in all courses that we teach. From courses that teach lesson planning to courses that teach assessment, candidates should have lots of opportunities to give constructive to their peers as well as receive timely feedback from their instructors.

The lowest indicator across all three semesters was #19 in fall 2018 semester. Before the TIAI was revised, #19 had been one of those indicators that continually was lower than the others. Through the years, we have sought to rectify this by having the candidates document the number of times they come in contact with a parent at a school event or even in the carpool line. The lowest scores came from Elementary Education which is surprising given that parents are more involved in the lower grades than with the upper grades. There was, however, a slight increase the following semester.