

Eastern Connecticut State University

Three Cycles of Disposition Assessment in the CARE, Clinical I, Clinical II, Pre-Student Teaching Student Teaching, and Exit Survey

(Spring 2019 to Spring 2020)

Disposition Data Collection in CARE Interview

All the candidates' disposition was assessed in the CARE, clinical experience I, clinical experience II, pre-student teaching, student teaching, and Exit Survey from spring 2019 to spring 2020.

All undergraduate CARE applicants are interviewed in spring and fall semester. All graduate CARE applicants are interviewed monthly. The CARE interviews are conducted by two faculty members. One is a CARE member and the other is a non-CARE faculty member. During the interview, each interviewer individually scores each candidate on each of the 4 rubric items. A score of 1 on any item in the consensus rubric does not allow the candidate to be admitted by CARE.

The CARE data were collected in spring 2019 by using the old CARE interview instrument. The CARE data were collected in fall 2019 and spring 2020 by using the updated CARE interview instrument. A total of 49, 57, and 55 CARE candidates were interviewed and scored in the three semesters, respectively.

Data Analysis and the Results of the Disposition Items in CARE (3 Cycles of Data)

Descriptive statistics were conducted for the three disposition items. The results show that on average the teacher candidates were rated above acceptable on all the disposition items. The mean of each item was provided in the table as follows.

The CARE rubric items are scored on a three-point scale, ranging from “Unacceptable” to

“Target.”

Unacceptable (1) Acceptable (2) Target (3)

Table 1. Results of the Descriptive Statistics

Table 1. Results of the Descriptive Statistics

Categories	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020
	Mean	Mean	Mean
Professional Dispositions	2.15	2.14	2.09
Candidate Dispositions	2.12	2.12	2.22
Communication	2.17	2.07	2.15

Disposition Data Collection in the Clinical Experience I (3 Cycles of Data)

Spring 2019: The clinical experience I data were collected using the new instrument in spring 2019. The faculty evaluated all the candidates who completed the clinical via TK-20. All the 26 teacher candidates were evaluated and the response rate was 100%. Descriptive statistics were conducted for each of the 2 disposition items of the clinical experience data with the new instrument. The results show that on average the teacher candidates were rated close to proficient on the two disposition items. The mean of each item was provided in the table as follows

Fall 2019:

The clinical experience I data were collected using the new instrument in fall 2019. The faculty evaluated all the candidates who completed the clinical via TK-20. All the 32 teacher candidates were evaluated, and the response rate was 100%. Descriptive statistics were conducted for each of the 2 disposition items of the clinical experience data with the new instrument. The results show that on average the teacher candidates were rated close to proficient on the two disposition items. The mean of each item was provided in the table as follows

Spring 2020:

The clinical experience I data were collected using the new instrument in spring 2020. The faculty evaluated all the candidates who completed the clinical via TK-20. All the 19 teacher candidates were evaluated, and the response rate was 100%. Descriptive statistics were conducted for each of the 2 disposition items of the clinical experience data with the new instrument. The results show that on average the teacher candidates were rated close to proficient on the two disposition items. The mean of each item was provided in the table as follows
The mean of each item was provided in the table as follows.

All the competencies are scored on a three-point scale, ranging from “not proficient” to “proficient.”

Not Proficient (1) Developing Proficiency (2) Proficient (3)

Table 2. Results of the Descriptive Statistics

Categories	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020
	Mean	Mean	Mean
Create a class climate that is responsive to and respectful of the learning and social needs of students with diverse backgrounds, interests and ability levels.	2.81	2.81	2.67
Conduct themselves as professionals in accordance with the Connecticut's Code of Responsibility for Teachers.	2.88	2.97	2.89

Disposition Data Collection in the Clinical Experience II (3 Cycles of Data)

Spring 2019: The clinical experience II data were collected using the new instrument in spring 2019. The faculty evaluated all the candidates who completed the clinical via TK-20. All the 52 teacher candidates were evaluated and the response rate was 100%. Descriptive statistics were conducted for each of the 2 disposition items of the clinical experience data with the new instrument. The results show that on average the teacher candidates were rated close to proficient on the two disposition items. The mean of each item was provided in the table as follows

Fall 2019:

The clinical experience II data were collected using the new instrument in fall 2019. The faculty evaluated all the candidates who completed the clinical via TK-20. All the 7 teacher candidates were evaluated and the response rate was 100%. Descriptive statistics were conducted for each of the 2 disposition items of the clinical experience data with the new instrument. The results show that on average the teacher candidates were rated close to proficient on the two disposition items. The mean of each item was provided in the table as follows

Spring 2020:

The clinical experience II data were collected using the new instrument in spring 2020. The faculty evaluated all the candidates who completed the clinical via TK-20. All the 13 teacher candidates were evaluated and the response rate was 100%. Descriptive statistics were conducted for each of the 2 disposition items of the clinical experience data with the new instrument. The results show that on average the teacher candidates were rated close to proficient on the two disposition items. The mean of each item was provided in the table as follows
The mean of each item was provided in the table as follows.

All the competencies are scored on a three-point scale, ranging from “not proficient” to “proficient.”

Not Proficient (1) Developing Proficiency (2) Proficient (3)

Table 2. Results of the Descriptive Statistics

Categories	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020
	Mean	Mean	Mean
Create a class climate that is responsive to and respectful of the learning and social needs of students with diverse backgrounds, interests and ability levels.	2.82	2.67	3.00
Conduct themselves as professionals in accordance with the Connecticut's Code of Responsibility for Teachers.	2.96	2.86	3.00

Disposition Data Collection in the Pre-Student Teaching (3 Cycles of Data)

Spring 2019: The pre-student teaching evaluation data were collected using the new instrument in spring 2019. The University Supervisors and the Cooperating Teachers evaluated all the candidates who completed the pre-student teaching via TK-20. All the 19 teacher candidates were evaluated and the response rate was 100%. Descriptive statistics were conducted for each of the 5 disposition items in of the pre-student teaching evaluation data with the new instrument. The results show that on average the teacher candidates were rated close to proficient on all the disposition items except the Disposition 2.

Fall 2019:

The pre-student teaching evaluation data were collected using the new instrument in fall 2019. The University Supervisors and the Cooperating Teachers evaluated all the candidates who completed the pre-student teaching via TK-20. All the 49 teacher candidates were evaluated and the response rate was 100%. Descriptive statistics were conducted for each of the 5 disposition items in of the pre-student teaching evaluation data with the new instrument. The results show that on average the teacher candidates were rated close to proficient on all the disposition items except Disposition 1. The mean of each item was provided in the table as follows.

Spring 2020:

The pre-student teaching evaluation data were collected using the new instrument in spring 2020. The University Supervisors and the Cooperating Teachers evaluated all the candidates who completed the pre-student teaching via TK-20. All the 14 teacher candidates were evaluated, and the response rate was 100%. Descriptive statistics were conducted for each of the 5 disposition items in of the pre-student teaching evaluation data with the new instrument. The results show that on average the teacher candidates were rated close to proficient on all the disposition items. The mean of each item was provided in the table as follows.

All the competencies are scored on a three-point scale, ranging from “not proficient” to “proficient.”

Not Proficient (1) Developing Proficiency (2) Proficient (3)

Table 2. Results of the Descriptive Statistics

Categories	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020
	Mean	Mean	Mean
Plan for and implement differentiated instruction for students of varying levels of competence, those with disabilities, and those with particular gifts and talents.	2.53	2.43	2.64
Interact with students with disabilities and communicate with their families in ways that support goals for intervention and adhere to legal rights and ethical principles.	2.39	2.70	2.58
Assess learning in ways that reflect the diverse cultural, linguistic, and learning needs of individual students.	2.56	2.52	2.57
Use visual cues, concrete objects, gestures, and/or other strategies to support the social interactions and learning of children with limited language proficiency.	2.68	2.86	2.62
Conduct themselves as professionals in accordance with the Connecticut’s Code of Responsibility for Teachers	2.84	3.00	2.86

Disposition Data Collection in the Student Teaching (3 Cycles of Data)

Spring 2019: The student teaching evaluation data were collected using the new instrument in spring 2019. The University Supervisors and the Cooperating Teachers evaluated all the candidates who completed the student teaching via TK-20. All 102 teacher candidates were evaluated, so the response rate was 100%. Descriptive statistics were conducted for each of 8 disposition items in the student teaching evaluation data with a total of 102 student teachers. The results show that on average the teacher candidates were rated proficient to or above proficient on all the disposition items. The mean of each item was provided in the table as follows.

Fall 2019:

The student teaching evaluation data were collected using the new instrument in spring 2019. The University Supervisors and the Cooperating Teachers evaluated all the candidates who completed the student teaching via TK-20. All 36 teacher candidates were evaluated, so the response rate was 100%. Descriptive statistics were conducted for each of 8 disposition items in the student teaching evaluation data with a total of 36 student teachers. The results show that on average the teacher candidates were rated proficient to or above proficient on all the disposition items. The mean of each item was provided in the table as follows.

Spring 2020:

The student teaching evaluation data were collected using the new instrument in spring 2020. The University Supervisors and the Cooperating Teachers evaluated all the candidates who completed the student teaching via TK-20. All 73 teacher candidates were evaluated, so the response rate was 100%. Descriptive statistics were conducted for each of the 8 disposition items in the student teaching evaluation data with a total of 73 student teachers. The results show that on average the teacher candidates were rated proficient to or above proficient on all the disposition items. The mean of each item was provided in the table as follows.

The student teaching evaluation data were collected using the new instrument in spring 2020. The University Supervisors and the Cooperating Teachers evaluated all the candidates who completed the student teaching via TK-20. All 73 teacher candidates were evaluated, so the response rate was 100%.

All disposition items are scored on a four-point scale, ranging from “not proficient” to “highly proficient.”

Not Proficient (1) Limited Proficiency (2) Proficient (3) Highly Proficient (4)

Table 2. Results of the Descriptive Statistics

Categories	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020
	Mean	Mean	Mean
Plan for and implement differentiated instruction for students of varying levels of competence, those with disabilities, and those with particular gifts and talents.	3.21	3.03	3.16
Interact with students with disabilities and communicate with their families in ways that support goals for intervention and adhere to legal rights and ethical principles.	3.17	3.27	3.28
Assess learning in ways that reflect the diverse cultural, linguistic, and learning needs of individual students.	3.07	3.12	3.12

Create a class climate that is responsive to and respectful of the learning and social needs of students with diverse backgrounds, interests and ability levels.	3.53	3.47	3.59
Participate in establishing a school-wide climate that promotes positive affect and social and emotional health of students.	3.32	3.26	3.30
Use visual cues, concrete objects, gestures, and/or other strategies to support the social interactions and learning of children with limited language proficiency.	3.36	3.21	3.34
Conduct themselves as professionals in accordance with the Connecticut's Code of Responsibility for Teachers	3.86	3.86	3.73
Participate in professional development activities within and outside of the school and apply ideas that are learned.	3.55	3.68	3.60

Disposition Data Collection in Exit Survey (3 Cycles of Data)

Spring 2019:

Data Collection

The End-of-Program/Exit Survey data were collected at the end of spring 2019. The online survey was created via the SelectSurvey and the link was sent to the candidates. Faculty of the following courses, EDU 425/525, EDU 465/565, ECE 405/506, and HPE 476, assisted with the survey administration. A total of 88 teacher candidates ($n = 88$) responded to the survey with the response rate of 95%.

Data Analysis and the Results

Descriptive statistics were conducted for each item in the End-of-Program data with a total of 21 teacher candidates. The results showed that on overage the students agreed or strongly agreed that the teacher education program coursework prepared them on the disposition items on cultural diversity, collaboration, and professionalism. In addition, they rated good or excellent when they were asked if the program helped them with their oral and written communication skills. The mean and standard deviation of each item were provided in the table as follows.

Fall 2019:

Data Collection

The End-of-Program/Exit Survey data were collected at the end of fall 2019. The online survey

was created via the SelectSurvey and the link was sent to the candidates. Faculty of the following courses, EDU 425/525, EDU 465/565, ECE 405/506, and HPE 476, assisted with the survey administration. A total of 27 teacher candidates ($n = 27$) responded to the survey with the response rate of 90%.

Data Analysis and the Results

Descriptive statistics were conducted for each item in the End-of-Program data with a total of 27 teacher candidates. The results showed that on overage the students agreed or strongly agreed that the teacher education program coursework prepared them on the disposition items on cultural diversity, collaboration, and professionalism. In addition, they rated good or excellent when they were asked if the program helped them with their oral and written communication skills. The mean and standard deviation of each item were provided in the table as follows.

Spring 2020:

Data Collection

The End-of-Program/Exit Survey data were collected at the end of spring 2020. The online survey was created via the SelectSurvey and the link was sent to the candidates. Faculty of the following courses, EDU 425/525, EDU 465/565, ECE 405/506, and HPE 476, assisted with the survey administration. A total of 73 teacher candidates ($n = 73$) responded to the survey with the response rate of 90%.

Data Analysis and the Results

Descriptive statistics were conducted for each item in the End-of-Program data with a total of 73 teacher candidates. The results showed that on overage the students agreed or strongly agreed that the teacher education program coursework prepared them on the disposition items on cultural diversity, collaboration, and professionalism. In addition, they rated good or excellent when they were asked if the program helped them with their oral and written communication skills. The mean and standard deviation of each item were provided in the table as follows. The disposition assessment items in the Exit Survey are scored on a 5-point scale, ranging from

“Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree.”

Table 3. Results of the Descriptive Statistics

Items	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020
	Mean	Mean	Mean
Monitor and address my cultural biases and recognize and articulate the influences of their own families and cultures on their beliefs and professional practices	4.00	3.60	4.17
Honor all family languages and understand the importance of preserving language as a fundamental part of culture	4.00	3.80	4.08

Collaborate effectively with colleagues to support student learning and growth	3.75	4.20	4.40
Collaborate effectively with families to support student learning and growth	3.50	4.20	3.93
Understand and uphold professional ethics (Code of Professional Responsibility), policies, and legal codes of conduct and understand the professional boundaries for interaction with students	4.50	4.60	4.58
Engage in relevant professional learning opportunities	4.13	4.60	4.27

Items	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020
	Mean	Mean	Mean
Develop written communication skills.	4.28	4.19	4.40
Develop oral communication skills.	4.35	4.63	4.37