Student Teacher Assessment Form (STAF) Evaluations All Programs

The Student Teacher Assessment Form (STAF) is used to document the program completer's performance at both the midpoint and at the end of the student teaching experience. This form is completed by the clinical faculty member (cooperating teacher) by using the indicators listed below for each item. A check mark is placed in the appropriate descriptor column using the following rating scale:

Student Teacher Assessment Form Rating Scale													
Below Basic (0)	Basic (1)	Proficient (2)	Distinguished (3)										
The teacher candidate does not appear to understand the requirements and makes little or no attempt to respond.	The teacher candidate appears to understand the requirements but the response is incomplete and or incorrect in some way	The teacher candidate clearly understands the concepts underlying the component and implements it well.	The teacher candidate at this level produces exemplary work.										

A sample from the STAF form for a physical education student teacher follows. The first four items (A-D in bold) reflect InTASC standards and the remaining items are reflective of specialized professional association (SPA) standards related to the major. This pattern is used throughout the document for all teaching majors.

Des	cript	ors: (0) Below Basic, (1) Basic, (2) Proficient, (3) Distinguished				
I. I	(NOV	VLEDGE (INTASC/COE STANDARDS: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8)	0	1	2	3
	Α.	Demonstrates knowledge of subject matter				
ASC	В.	Brings in relevant information/material beyond that in textbooks				
lnT,	C.	Able to answer student questions				
	D.	Seeks current information				
	E.	Demonstrates personal competence in motor skill performance for a variety of physical activities				
(PE)		and movement patterns (NASPE 1.1)				
A C	F.	Demonstrates personal competence in health-enhancing fitness (NASPE 1.2)				
SP	G.	Demonstrates performance concepts and tactics related to skillful movement and fitness in a				
		variety of physical activities (NASPE 1.3)				

If a teacher candidate receives low (Below Basic or Basic) scores on the midpoint evaluation, a Professional Development Plan is formulated by the collective effort of the Director of Field Services, the clinical faculty member, the university supervisor, and the teacher candidate.

The tables on the pages that follow contain summary data by academic year for all teacher education program completers.

Section I: Knowledge

I. Knowledge	Academic		0		1		2		3		Response	StDev	Mean
I. Knowledge	Year	N	Row %	N	Row %	N	Row %	N	Row %	N	Row %	Sibev	iviean
A. Demonstrates	2012-2013	0	0.00%	4	4.49%	39	43.82%	46	51.69%	0	0.00%	0.6	2.47
knowledge of subject	2013-2014	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	34	40.48%	50	59.52%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.6
matter	2014-2015	0	0.00%	3	5.00%	21	35.00%	36	60.00%	0	0.00%	0.6	2.55
B. Brings in relevant	2012-2013	0	0.00%	4	4.49%	29	32.58%	56	62.92%	0	0.00%	0.6	2.58
information/material beyond what is in	2013-2014	0	0.00%	1	1.19%	33	39.29%	50	59.52%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.5
textbook	2014-2015	0	0.00%	3	5.00%	19	31.67%	38	63.33%	0	0.00%	0.6	2.58
	2012-2013	0	0.00%	5	5.62%	34	38.20%	49	55.06%	1	1.12%	0.6	2.5
C. Able to answer student questions	2013-2014	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	34	40.48%	49	58.33%	1	1.19%	0.5	2.59
student questions	2014-2015	0	0.00%	2	3.33%	19	31.67%	39	65.00%	0	0.00%	0.6	2.62
D. Caralia Communit	2012-2013	0	0.00%	1	1.12%	31	34.83%	56	62.92%	1	1.12%	0.5	2.63
D. Seeks Current Information	2013-2014	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	30	35.71%	53	63.10%	1	1.19%	0.5	2.64
IIIIOIIIIatioii	2014-2015	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	22	36.67%	37	61.67%	1	1.67%	0.5	2.63
	Totals	0	0.00%	23	2.47%	345	37.02%	559	59.98%	5	0.54%	0.55	2.57

Discussion: This portion of the STAF form aligns to InTASC Standard 4, Content Knowledge, and INTASC Standard 5, Application of Content. Teachers must have a deep and flexible understanding of their content areas and be able to draw upon content knowledge as they work with learners to access information, apply knowledge in real world settings, and address meaningful issues to assure learner mastery of the content. At the end of the student teaching experience, 97% of teacher candidates have, and can apply, content knowledge to support student learning. These data align to CAEP standard 1.1 which requires that candidates demonstrate an understanding of the InTASC standards.

Section II: Planning and Preparation

II. Planning and	Planning and Academic		0		1		2		3		Response	CADON	Maan
Preparation	Year	N	Row %	N	Row %	N	Row %	N	Row %	N	Row %	StDev	Mean
	2012-2013	0	0.00%	2	2.25%	37	41.57%	49	55.06%	1	1.12%	0.5	2.53
A. Develops appropriate	2013-2014	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	25	29.76%	59	70.24%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.7
lesson objectives	2014-2015	0	0.00%	2	3.33%	22	36.67%	36	60.00%	0	0.00%	0.6	2.57

II. Planning and	Academic	0			1		2		3		Response	CAD	D4
Preparation	Year	N	Row %	N	Row %	N	Row %	N	Row %	N	Row %	StDev	Mean
D. Compident learning	2012-2013	0	0.00%	2	2.25%	42	47.19%	45	50.56%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.48
B. Considers learning styles of students	2013-2014	0	0.00%	1	1.19%	32	38.10%	50	59.52%	1	1.19%	0.5	2.59
styles of students	2014-2015	0	0.00%	2	3.33%	25	41.67%	33	55.00%	0	0.00%	0.6	2.52
C. Incorporates a variety	2012-2013	0	0.00%	1	1.12%	37	41.57%	51	57.30%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.56
of instructional	2013-2014	0	0.00%	2	2.38%	30	35.71%	52	61.90%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.6
strategies	2014-2015	0	0.00%	4	6.67%	22	36.67%	34	56.67%	0	0.00%	0.6	2.5
	2012-2013	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	50	56.18%	38	42.70%	1	1.12%	0.5	2.43
D. Plans for a variety of assessment	2013-2014	0	0.00%	2	2.38%	42	50.00%	40	47.62%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.45
assessment	2014-2015	0	0.00%	4	6.67%	25	41.67%	31	51.67%	0	0.00%	0.6	2.45
	2012-2013	0	0.00%	2	2.25%	38	42.70%	49	55.06%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.53
E. Plans instruction to motivate learners	2013-2014	0	0.00%	1	1.19%	31	36.90%	52	61.90%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.61
motivate learners	2014-2015	0	0.00%	2	3.33%	22	36.67%	36	60.00%	0	0.00%	0.6	2.57
5 DI 11	2012-2013	0	0.00%	3	3.37%	42	47.19%	43	48.31%	1	1.12%	0.6	2.45
F. Plans time, space and materials	2013-2014	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	36	42.86%	46	54.76%	2	2.38%	0.5	22.6
materials	2014-2015	1	1.67%	5	8.33%	18	30.00%	35	58.33%	1	1.67%	0.7	2.47
G. Adapts and modifies	2012-2013	0	0.00%	3	3.37%	43	48.31%	41	46.07%	2	2.25%	0.6	2.44
lessons for students with special needs	2013-2014	0	0.00%	1	1.19%	41	48.81%	42	50.00%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.49
with special fleeds	2014-2015	1	1.67%	3	5.00%	25	41.67%	27	45.00%	4	6.67%	0.7	2.39
	Totals	0	0.00%	27	2.32%	480	41.20%	655	56.22%	3	0.26%	0.55	3.47

Discussion: These items on the STAF form are intended to measure InTASC standards 6, 7, 8 that relate to instructional practice. By the end of student teaching, 97.2% of program completers from DSU are proficient in using effective instructional practice strategies. This requires that completers understand and integrate assessment, planning, and instructional strategies in coordinated and engaging ways. This aligns to CAEP standard 1.1 that requires that candidates demonstrate an understanding of the InTASC standards. Item II. A addresses CAEP standard 1.3, which focuses on completers' ability to apply content and pedagogical knowledge.

Section III: Instruction and Assessment

III. Instruction and	Academic		0		1		2		3	No	Response	StDev	Magn
Assessment	Year	N	Row %	N	Row %	N	Row %	N	Row %	N	Row %	StDev	Mean
A. Employs	2012-2013	0	0.00%	1	1.12%	45	50.56%	43	48.31%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.47
instructional strategies based	2013-2014	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	36	42.86%	48	57.14%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.57
on objectives	2014-2015	0	0.00%	2	3.33%	23	38.33%	35	58.33%	0	0.00%	0.6	2.55
B. Focuses learners'	2012-2013	0	0.00%	3	3.37%	38	42.70%	48	53.93%	0	0.00%	0.6	2.51
attention at onset	2013-2014	0	0.00%	4	4.76%	26	30.95%	54	64.29%	0	0.00%	0.6	2.6
of lesson	2014-2015	0	0.00%	2	3.33%	24	40.00%	34	56.67%	0	0.00%	0.6	2.53
C. Limbo imptumention	2012-2013	0	0.00%	1	1.12%	46	51.69%	42	47.19%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.46
C. Links instruction to prior learning	2013-2014	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	31	36.90%	53	63.10%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.63
to prior rearring	2014-2015	0	0.00%	2	3.33%	23	38.33%	35	58.33%	0	0.00%	0.6	2.55
D. Links instruction	2012-2013	0	0.00%	3	3.37%	41	46.07%	45	50.56%	0	0.00%	0.6	2.47
to learners' life	2013-2014	0	0.00%	1	1.19%	53	63.10%	27	32.14%	3	3.57%	0.5	2.32
experiences	2014-2015	0	0.00%	3	5.00%	20	33.33%	36	60.00%	1	1.67%	0.6	2.56
E. Modifies/adapts	2012-2013	0	0.00%	4	4.49%	52	58.43%	32	35.96%	1	1.12%	0.6	2.32
instruction based on learners'	2013-2014	0	0.00%	1	1.19%	53	63.10%	27	32.14%	3	3.57%	0.5	2.32
responses	2014-2015	0	0.00%	5	8.33%	31	51.67%	22	36.67%	2	3.33%	0.6	2.29
F. Orients learners	2012-2013	0	0.00%	3	3.37%	47	52.81%	39	43.82%	0	0.00%	0.6	2.4
to examine global ideas and	2013-2014	0	0.00%	1	1.19%	36	42.86%	47	55.95%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.55
perspectives	2014-2015	1	1.67%	4	6.67%	23	38.33%	31	51.67%	1	1.67%	0.7	2.42
6.5.1.1	2012-2013	0	0.00%	1	1.12%	37	41.57%	51	57.30%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.56
G. Provides lesson closure	2013-2014	0	0.00%	1	1.20%	27	32.53%	55	66.27%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.65
ciosure	2014-2015	0	0.00%	2	3.39%	22	37.29%	35	59.32%	0	0.00%	0.7	2.52
H. Provides	2012-2013	0	0.00%	1	1.12%	38	42.70%	49	55.06%	1	1.12%	0.5	2.55
appropriate feedback to	2013-2014	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	38	45.24%	46	54.76%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.55
students	2014-2015	0	0.00%	2	3.33%	21	35.00%	37	61.67%	0	0.00%	0.6	2.58
	Totals	1	0.05%	47	2.52%	831	44.63%	971	52.15%	12	0.64%	0.56	2.50

Discussion: Items in Section III also align to InTASC standards 6, 7, and 8 which center on linking instruction and assessment. DSU program completers are consistently successful in this category, as approximately 97% are rated as Proficient or Distinguished.

Section IV: Managing the Environment

IV.	Managing the	Academic		0	1		2		3		No Response		StDev	Mean
	Environment	Year	N	Row %	N	Row %	N	Row %	N	Row %	N	Row %	Sibev	iviean
A.	Provides a safe and	2012-2013	1	1.12%	1	1.12%	27	30.34%	59	66.29%	1	1.12%	0.6	2.64
	positive learning	2013-2014	1	1.18%	1	1.18%	26	30.59%	57	67.06%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.67
	environment	2014-2015	0	0.00%	2	3.33%	17	28.33%	41	68.33%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.65
_	Diamlas a amaitis its sta	2012-2013	1	1.12%	0	0.00%	28	31.46%	60	67.42%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.65
В.	Displays sensitivity to and respects learners	2013-2014	1	1.18%	0	0.00%	24	28.24%	60	70.59%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.71
	and respects learners	2014-2015	0	0.00%	2	3.33%	14	23.33%	43	71.67%	1	1.67%	0.5	2.69
C.	Uses managerial routines that create	2012-2013	1	1.12%	5	5.62%	43	48.31%	40	44.94%	0	0.00%	0.6	2.37
	smoothly functioning	2013-2014	1	1.18%	3	3.53%	40	47.06%	41	48.24%	0	0.00%	0.6	2.45
	learning experiences and environments	2014-2015	0	0.00%	5	8.33%	21	35.00%	34	56.67%	0	0.00%	0.7	2.48
D.	Encourages	2012-2013	0	0.00%	2	2.25%	29	32.58%	58	65.17%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.63
	appropriate	2013-2014	0	0.00%	1	1.19%	29	34.52%	54	64.29%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.63
	behaviors	2014-2015	2	3.33%	0	0.00%	18	30.00%	40	66.67%	0	0.00%	0.7	2.6
E.	Keeps students	2012-2013	1	1.12%	6	6.74%	42	47.19%	39	43.82%	1	1.12%	0.7	2.35
	academically	2013-2014	1	1.18%	3	3.53%	41	48.24%	40	47.06%	0	0.00%	0.6	2.44
	engaged	2014-2015	2	3.33%	3	5.00%	19	31.67%	36	60.00%	0	0.00%	0.7	2.48
F.	Handles student	2012-2013	0	0.00%	3	3.37%	37	41.57%	47	52.81%	2	2.25%	0.6	2.51
	conflicts	2013-2014	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	39	46.43%	43	51.19%	2	2.38%	0.5	2.52
	appropriately	2014-2015	0	0.00%	2	3.33%	23	38.33%	35	58.33%	0	0.00%	0.6	2.55
G.	Helps students	2012-2013	0	0.00%	1	1.12%	40	44.94%	47	52.81%	1	1.12%	0.5	2.52
	accept responsibility	2013-2014	0	0.00%	1	1.19%	40	47.62%	43	51.19%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.5
	for their actions	2014-2015	2	3.33%	0	0.00%	20	33.33%	37	61.67%	1	1.67%	0.7	2.56
		Totals	14	0.86%	41	2.51%	617	37.62%	954	58.46%	9	0.55%	0.59	2.52

Discussion: Section IV of the STAF form aligns to InTASC standard 3. It is essential that teachers work to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation. By the completion of student teaching, 96.04 % of DSU program completers are effective at managing the classroom environment. This provides further evidence of meeting CAEP standard 1.1.





V. Technology	Academic	0		1		2		3		No Response		StDev	Mean
v. recimology	Year	N	Row %	N	Row %	N	Row %	N	Row %	N	Row %	Sidev	iviean
A. Implements	2012-2013	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	29	32.58%	59	66.29%	1	1.12%	0.5	2.67
technology to	2013-2014	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	35	41.67%	49	58.33%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.58
enhance instruction	2014-2015	0	0.00%	1	1.67%	15	25.00%	44	73.33%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.72
B. Applies technology to	2012-2013	0	0.00%	1	1.12%	26	29.21%	61	68.54%	1	1.12%	0.5	2.68
increase teacher	2013-2014	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	27	32.14%	57	67.86%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.37
productivity	2014-2015	0	0.00%	3	5.00%	17	28.33%	40	66.67%	0	0.00%	0.6	2.62
C. Uses technology to	2012-2013	0	0.00%	1	1.12%	38	42.70%	47	52.81%	3	3.37%	0.5	2.53
explore global	2013-2014	0	0.00%	1	1.20%	36	43.37%	42	50.60%	4	4.82%	0.5	2.52
settings	2014-2015	0	0.00%	3	5.00%	23	38.33%	31	51.67%	3	5.00%	0.6	2.49
D. Uses technology to communicate,	2012-2013	0	0.00%	2	2.25%	37	41.57%	47	52.81%	3	3.37%	0.5	2.52
collaborate with	2013-2014	0	0.00%	1	1.20%	36	43.37%	42	50.60%	4	4.82%	0.5	2.52
peers, parents and community	2014-2015	0	0.00%	3	5.00%	23	38.33%	27	45.00%	7	11.67%	0.6	2.45
	Totals	0	0.00%	16	1.72%	342	36.77%	546	58.71%	26	2.80%	0.53	2.56

Discussion: Technology is a cross-cutting theme in the InTASC standards and is highlighted in items 3(g), 3(h), 3(j), 3(m), 4(g), 5(c), 5(k), 5(l), 6(i), 7(k), 8(g), 8(n), 8(o), 8(q), 8(r) 9(d), 9(f), 10(e), 10(g) and 10(n). It is also a cross-cutting theme throughout the CAEP standards. DSU takes pride in its efforts to ensure that DSU teacher candidates are leaders in the area of integrating technology into the teaching and learning process. CAEP standard 1.5 emphasizes technology use, by stating the completers must model and apply technology standards as they design, implement and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning; and enrich professional practice. These data support meeting CAEP standards 1.1 and 1.5

Section VI: Professionalism

VI Duefeesieneliene	Academic		0	1		2		3		No Response		CAD	D.d. a. a. a.
VI. Professionalism	Year	N	Row %	N	Row %	N	Row %	N	Row %	N	Row %	StDev	Mean
	2012-2013	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	20	22.47%	69	77.53%	0	0.00%	0.4	2.78
A. Maintains confidentiality	2013-2014	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	20	23.81%	64	76.19%	0	0.00%	0.4	2.76
confidentiality	2014-2015	1	1.67%	1	1.67%	16	26.67%	42	70.00%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.7
B. Acts in accordance	2012-2013	0	0.00%	1	1.12%	25	28.09%	63	70.79%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.7
with school policy and	2013-2014	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	22	26.19%	62	73.81%	0	0.00%	0.4	2.74
practices	2014-2015	0	0.00%	1	1.67%	16	26.67%	43	71.67%	0	0.00%	0.6	2.65
C. Maintains a	2012-2013	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	24	26.97%	65	73.03%	0	0.00%	0.4	2.73
professional appearance and	2013-2014	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	18	21.43%	66	78.57%	0	0.00%	0.4	2.79
demeanor	2014-2015	0	0.00%	1	1.67%	14	23.33%	45	75.00%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.73
D. Interacts in a	2012-2013	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	20	22.47%	67	75.28%	2	2.25%	0.4	2.77
respectful manner	2013-2014	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	18	21.43%	66	78.57%	0	0.00%	0.4	2.79
with school personnel	2014-2015	0	0.00%	1	1.67%	17	28.33%	42	70.00%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.68
- A4 1 11 11 11 1	2012-2013	0	0.00%	3	3.37%	25	28.09%	61	68.54%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.65
E. Meets obligations in a timely manner	2013-2014	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	25	29.76%	59	70.24%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.7
timely manner	2014-2015	1	1.67%	4	6.67%	13	21.67%	41	68.33%	1	1.67%	0.7	2.59
F. A	2012-2013	0	0.00%	1	1.12%	26	29.21%	62	69.66%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.69
F. Accepts constructive feedback	2013-2014	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	21	25.00%	63	75.00%	0	0.00%	0.4	2.75
Tecuback	2014-2015	0	0.00%	2	3.33%	15	25.00%	43	71.67%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.68
C. Danie attil at automal	2012-2013	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	30	33.71%	59	66.29%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.37
G. Respectful of cultural diversity	2013-2014	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	29	34.52%	54	64.29%	1	1.19%	0.5	2.65
ulversity	2014-2015	0	0.00%	2	3.33%	17	28.33%	41	68.33%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.65
II. Damanahashas	2012-2013	0	0.00%	2	2.25%	26	29.21%	61	68.54%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.66
H. Demonstrates initiative	2013-2014	0	0.00%	3	3.57%	23	27.38%	58	69.05%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.65
miliative	2014-2015	0	0.00%	3	5.00%	15	25.00%	41	68.33%	1	1.67%	0.6	2.64

Section VI: Professionalism (continued)

VI. Professionalism	Academic		0	1		2		3		No Response		CADON	Mass
VI. Professionalism	Year	N	Row %	N	Row %	N	Row %	N	Row %	N	Row %	StDev	Mean
I. Uses appropriate written	2012-2013	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	32	35.96%	56	62.92%	1	1.12%	0.5	2.64
communication skills with students,	2013-2014	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	39	46.43%	44	52.38%	1	1.19%	0.5	2.53
colleagues, and parents	2014-2015	0	0.00%	3	5.00%	18	30.00%	37	61.67%	2	3.33%	0.6	2.59
J. Uses appropriate verbal language (age	2012-2013	0	0.00%	1	1.12%	30	33.71%	58	65.17%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.64
appropriate	2013-2014	0	0.00%	1	1.18%	34	40.00%	50	58.82%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.6
vocabulary and proper grammar)	2014-2015	0	0.00%	2	3.33%	19	31.67%	39	65.00%	0	0.00%	0.6	2.63
K. Performs all duties and responsibilities in	2012-2013	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	24	26.97%	65	73.03%	0	0.00%	0.4	2.73
accordance with the	2013-2014	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	26	30.95%	58	69.05%	0	0.00%	0.5	2.69
Code of Professional Ethics	2014-2015	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	19	31.67%	40	66.67%	1	1.67%	0.5	2.68
	Totals	2	0.08%	32	1.25%	736	28.71%	1784	69.58%	10	0.39%	0.49	2.67

Discussion: Section VI aligns to InTASC standards 9 and 10 that fall in the category of professional responsibility. Teachers must engage in meaningful and intensive professional learning and self-renewal by regularly examining practice through ongoing study, self-reflection, and collaboration to create an effective learning environment for their students. Upon completion of student teaching 98% of DSU program completers have the professional skills and dispositions to be successful in their own classroom, providing solid evidence of achieving CAEP standard 1.1.

This section on the STAF form also provides evidence of meeting CAEP standard 3.3, by providing a final evaluation to monitor program completers' attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability.