**Description of evaluation:** The COEPS designed the InTASC evaluation of teacher candidates (TC) to determine their preparedness on the model core teaching standards and learning progressions created by the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC). The model core standards “outline what teachers should know and be able to do to ensure every PK-12 student reaches the goal of being ready to enter college or the workforce in today’s world. This ‘common core’ outlines the principles and foundations of teaching practice that cut across all subject areas and grade levels and that all teachers share (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2013).” The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction requires teacher preparation programs to use the InTASC standards to guide their programs.

**Rating Scale:**

Numerical values for responses: (1) Beginning, (2) Developing, (3) Effective, and (4) Highly Effective

* Not Observed: did not observe the candidate to perform identified skill, will be counted but not rated on the numerical scale provided
* Beginning: basic knowledge of concepts, requires constant supervision
* Developing: attempts to implement strategies, requires regular supervision
* Effective: implements appropriate strategies consistently, requires some supervision
* Highly Effective: consistent and skillful use of appropriate strategies, does not require supervision

Table 1. Fall 2019 pre-student teaching InTASC evaluation results (pilot involving 55 candidates from secondary programs)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **InTASC standard** | **Mean** |
| 1. Learner Development | 2.30 |
| 2. Learning Differences | 2.16 |
| 3. Learning Environments | 2.53 |
| 4. Content Knowledge | 2.40 |
| 5. Application of Content | 2.35 |
| 6. Assessment | 2.25 |
| 7. Planning for Instruction | 2.36 |
| 8. Instructional Strategies | 2.35 |
| 9. Professional Learning and Ethical Practice | 2.68 |
| 10. Leadership and Collaboration | 2.57 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Domain** | **Mean** |
| Dispositions | 2.52 |
| Communication | 2.41 |

**Summary.** The mean scores across all domains indicate candidates’ knowledge and skills at the developing level, as would be expected in a pre-student teaching experience. Across the InTASC domains, there were consistent areas in which the candidates’ were “not observed” including, working with families, using technology, participating in professional development activities, and supporting English Language Learners. While this result could indicate a lack of opportunity, it may also be lack of knowledge and/or skill development in these areas.

Table 2. Fall 2019 student teaching InTASC evaluation results (N= 148)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **InTASC standard** | **Mean** |
| 1. Learner Development | 2.76 |
| 2. Learning Differences | 2.76 |
| 3. Learning Environments | 3.00 |
| 4. Content Knowledge | 2.88 |
| 5. Application of Content | 2.82 |
| 6. Assessment | 2.91 |
| 7. Planning for Instruction | 2.92 |
| 8. Instructional Strategies | 2.83 |
| 9. Professional Learning and Ethical Practice | 3.18 |
| 10. Leadership and Collaboration | 3.06 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Domain** | **Mean** |
| Dispositions | 3.03 |
| Communication | 3.01 |

**Summary.** Please note this is a different sample than in Table 1. The mean scores reflect candidates knowledge and skills in student teaching nearing the effective level. The areas candidates show relative strength include professional learning and ethical practice, leadership, and managing the learning environment. The increase in mean scores from pre-student teaching to student teaching is not reflective of growth as this is a different and larger sample. In addition, the student teaching sample includes candidates from a variety of programs.