

Reference 3

Inter-rater Reliability for Student Teaching Performance Assessment

Purpose	To establish range of rater-reliability in assessing teacher candidate teaching performance for all program areas during Student Teaching.
Composition of Evaluating Teams	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Full-time and part-time university field supervisors,• Methods professors (one invited),• School-based faculty (one invited),• Unit leadership (one from Director, Coordinator, Department Chair, Dean).
Assessment Instrumentation	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Field Supervisor rubric/evaluation forms with standards for the particular SPA and area of concentration,2. Matrix to record individual responses,3. Matrix to record aggregate responses per standard,4. Matrix to record aggregate responses per standard.
Period Review Cycle	<p>The ongoing inter-rater reliabilities studies will occur over a 3 year span with the following areas of concentration as the foci for each year:</p> <p><i>Year One</i> – Early Childhood and Childhood</p> <p><i>Year Two</i> – Special Education and Middle Childhood</p> <p><i>Year Three</i> – Secondary (various disciplines)</p>
Timeline	<p>September: The Director of Field Experience requests Field Supervisors to select and invite candidates to have a lesson videotaped during student teaching for use by the NU Department of Education. Field supervisors request permission from classroom teacher and building principal, and ensure that permission has been given by parents to the school for child's inclusion in photos/ videos.</p> <p>October: The Director arranges for the taping of videos of NU teacher candidates in Student Teaching placements in accordance with the periodic review cycle.</p> <p>January (retreat): The Director schedules assessment sessions with the evaluation team. The members of the team independently review the videos and provide written assessments for each video based on rubrics/evaluation forms used in assessment of student teaching.</p> <p>The team compile response results on matrices and discusses the results.</p> <p>March: The Director prepares a report on the findings for submission to the Planning and Evaluation Committee. The videotapes will become available in the Teachers' Studio for candidate and faculty use.</p>

Individual:

**INTER-RATER RELIABILITY OF STUDENT TEACHING
PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT**

CANDIDATE'S AREA OF CONCENTRATION _____

EVALUATION FORM USED _____

DATE _____

EVALUATOR: __ Field Supervisor __ Full-time __ Part-time

__ School-based Faculty __ elementary __ secondary

__ Methods Professor __ elementary __ secondary

__ Other

Rating Scale:

(1)

- 1- Outstanding
- 2- Effective
- 3- Making Progress
- 4- Unsatisfactory
- 5- Not Observed

(2)

- 1 – Not Met/Unacceptable
- 2 – Met/Acceptable
- 3 – Met with Strength/Exemplary
- 4 – Not Observed

-----RATING-----

STANDARD	1	2	3	4	5
1 Content (see SPA)					
2 Child Development					
3 Diversity					
4 Multiple Strategies					
5 Mot & Management					
6 Com & Technology					
7 Planning					
8 Assess of Learning					
9 Prof. Dev.					
10 School/Com Invol					

Composite:

**INTER-RATER RELIABILITY OF STUDENT TEACHING
PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT**

CANDIDATE'S AREA OF CONCENTRATION _____

EVALUATION FORM USED _____

DATE _____

EVALUATORS: (# of) ___ Field Supervisor ___ Full-time ___ Part-time

___ School-based Faculty ___ elementary ___ secondary

___ Methods Professor ___ elementary ___ secondary

___ Other

Rating Scale:

(1)

- 1- Outstanding
- 2- Effective
- 3- Making Progress
- 4- Unsatisfactory
- 5- Not Observable

(2)

- 1 – Not Met/Unacceptable
- 2 – Met/Acceptable
- 3 – Met with Strength/Exemplary
- 4 – Not Observed

-----**COMPOSITE RATING**-----

STANDARD	1	2	3	4	5
1 Content (see SPA)					
2 Child Development					
3 Diversity					
4 Multiple Strategies					
5 Mot & Management					
6 Com & Technology					
7 Planning					
8 Assess of Learning					
9 Prof. Dev.					
10 School/Com Invol					

Inter-Rater Reliability Pilot

Notes from Retreat, September 11, 2009: P.M. Session

Procedure:

The full-time field supervisors from both the Ontario and Lewiston campuses viewed a 15 minute Teachertube video of a teacher candidate's performance in a secondary literacy class. The supervisors evaluated the candidate's performance on the 10 standards from the Field Supervision Observation Form for Adolescent Grades 7-12. The results were tallied and discussed for inter-rater reliability.

As Facilitator, I was unable to find a video of an Early Childhood and Childhood candidate or a video of a Special Education Candidate, therefore, resorting to Teachertube for a video of Student Teaching in a secondary English classroom.

Findings:

1. When the evaluations for each standard on the Observation Forms were tallied, it was found that the field supervisors were consistent throughout in evaluating the candidate's performance between 3 (Making Progress) and five (Unsatisfactory). The ratings were recorded as follows:
2. In follow-up discussion, the supervisors were consistently and strongly of the same thinking in providing rationales for their ratings. It was noted that there was no evidence of supervisor biases in the findings. Consistency and firmness of supervisors in assessing the candidate's performance was evident.
3. Consensus was uniform that this was not a strong teacher candidate.
4. Focus in evaluation the candidate was on instructional skills rather than content, although it was not clear to the field supervisors whether the candidate was comfortable with the content. All supervisors noted a lack of creativity and student motivation. Classroom management was weak as noted the continual chatter among the students.

5. Usefulness of the 10 standards for consistency in assessment was noted.
6. When given the task to assess the candidate's teaching in the video, the field supervisors initially voiced an uncomfortable feeling, not having reviewed the lesson plan prior to delivery; the unknown candidate, student body, and school environment; not having met with the candidate in a pre-conference; whether this was a first or second observation; and whether this was a first or second placement.
7. All of the field supervisors concluded that the task was worthwhile and a good experience. All recommended that the inter-rater reliability exercise would be a useful activity for Professional development of field supervisors.
8. It was recommended that, since there are few videos available of Student Teaching for this purpose, that a request be sent to present field supervisors to look for candidates presently who would agree to videoing a lesson from their Student Teaching experience. The email has been sent to field supervisors.

----- COMPOSITE RATING RESULTS -----

STANDARD	1	2	3	4	5
1.Content				I IIII I	
2.Development			I	IIII	I
3.Diversity				IIII	I
4.Multiple Strategies			I	IIII	
5. Mot & Man				IIIII	
6. Com & Tech			II	III I	
7. Planning				III	III
8. Ass. of Learning				II	IIII
9. Prof. Dev.				I	IIII
10. S/Com Involve	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Dr. Helen Snider, Ed.D.
Director of Teacher Education Field Experiences
Department of Education
Academic Complex # 222
P.O. Box 1905
Niagara University, NY 14109-1905
(716) 286-8739
hsnider@niagara.edu

*Never lose sight of the fact that the child as the learner
is not only the centre of the school system,
but the only reason for its existence
R.W.B. Jackson*