Background

Research suggests there are many variables related to student achievement; however, “there is no in-school intervention that has a greater impact on student learning than an effective teacher” (NCATE, 2010 p. 1). For decades, teacher education programs have implemented a traditional approach to preparing teachers that often consisted of on-campus coursework disconnected from instructional practice and a student-teaching model that led to student teachers who felt isolated with little or no support (Heck, 2014). “Learning to teach in isolation does not effectively prepare teacher candidates, nor does it benefit P-12 students” (p. 1). Perhaps this is why some have characterized teacher education as focused heavily on theory while making little connection to the practice of teaching and learning (Darling-Hammond, 2005). According to Strieker, Shaleen, Hubbard, Digiovanni and Lim (2014), “teacher education has the urgent responsibility of transforming its curriculum pedagogy, structure and delivery” (p. 40).

The National Council on Teacher Quality (NCQT) released the Teacher Prep Review (2013) in which they argued that four out of five teacher preparation programs could be categorized as either weak or failing. Despite criticism of the methodology employed by the NCQT, a national debate and media frenzy over the quality of teacher education preparation programs across the United States exploded with many asking the question, “How much work needs to be done to give teachers the training they need to be classroom-ready upon graduation?” (NCQT, 2014). In addition to the NCQT report, there has been the merger of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Teacher Education
Accreditation Council (TEAC) into the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) in the spring 2014. CAEP is demanding “urgent changes in educator preparation” and has unveiled a complex system evaluation and a call for a national model of teacher education (Bullough, 2014). Both CAEP and NCQT recognize the Nation Research Council (NRC) report, Preparing Teachers: Building Evidence for Sound Policy (2010) which identified the clinical preparation of future teachers as one of three "aspects of teacher preparation…likely to have the highest impact on outcomes for students," (p. 180) along with the quality of teacher candidates and their level of content knowledge. (NCATE, 2010).

As a result, the topic of teacher preparation has become an important focus for state school boards and legislatures, with 33 states (Missouri included) passing significant policy changes targeting improvements that include: (1) Addressing screening methods for entry into teacher preparation programs, (2) Increasing the amount of testing, with a focus on content knowledge, (3) Ensuring that pre-service teachers understand effective reading instruction, and (4) Making the student teaching experience matter (NCQT, 2014). These changes are designed to make teacher preparation more rigorous and accountable for the effectiveness of graduates as measured by the achievement of students they teach.

**Purpose**

The purpose of the Missouri Teacher Internship Program (MoTIP) is to address the need for improvements to the clinical / student teaching experience. The MoTIP approach is designed to provide pre-service teachers an authentic year-long field experience in a single school setting that replaces the traditional student teaching approach. Each “intern” will be assigned to a Master Teacher in one of three pilot school districts. Master Teachers will serve as both a mentor and coach throughout the academic year. The intern will be co-teaching with the Master Teacher
throughout the academic school year as opposed to observing for few weeks then teaching for a few week as has been the model in the traditional approach. In growing the novice pre-service teacher over the course of a school year, the MoTIP hopes to provide the interns with an authentic, real-world “teaching” experience. University coursework traditionally delivered on campus (e.g. instructional technology, curriculum development, assessment methods, etc.) will be embedded into the day-to-day work of the classroom so that the Master Teacher can assist the intern in making the connection between theory and practice. In addition, a Teacher in Residence identified by each school district will replace the traditional university supervisor serving as a per-course faculty and ensuring that each Intern meets the requirements of the preservice teacher standards. Connections with university faculty are still an important component of this approach, however, the university liaisons work directly with public school educators to see that coursework is embedded and that students are meeting standards set forth by the university and the state. The goal of this pilot project is to examine the benefits of replacing the traditional approach to practicum and student teaching with one that provides a year-long “on the job” experience for the pre-service teachers that “matters” (NCQT, 2014).

**Evaluation Plan**

According to Oliva (1988) evaluation is defined as the “process of obtaining and providing useful information for judging decision alternatives” (p. 476). While there are many models that exist for the purpose of evaluation, the methodology and design for the proposed MoTIP evaluation plan will follow an objectives-based approach (Madau & Stufflebeam, 1988). Evaluators will collect and analyze data with two purposes in mind: 1) examination of the extent to which planned objectives are being met and 2) determination of MoTIP effectiveness and sustainability. In addition to these two primary evaluation goals, the evaluation MoTIP plans to
work collaboratively with the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (MODESE) to determine if the MoTIP pilot might serve as a state-wide model for teacher preparation. Following the Research Evaluation Model (REM) developed by the School Program Evaluation and Research (SPEaR) MoTIP at the University of Kansas (Lee, Lohmeier, Frey, & Tollefson, 2004), evaluators will utilize an approximation of Stufflebeam’s Context-Input-Process-Product (CIPP - Stufflebeam, 1971; Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 1985) incorporating scientifically valid evaluation procedures (Ginsberg & Rhett, 2003). According to Edwards and Newman (1982), social validity can be defined as a process for “eliciting value structures from the stakeholders” and thus is important to consider when evaluating social programs that have many objectives and participants. Through use of process and product evaluation framework, the goal of this proposed evaluation is to provide research designs and data collection methods that yield socially valid results providing information to stakeholders on “how” programs are being implemented, the potential barriers to implementation, as well as the degree to which desired outcomes are being met.
School districts participating in the MoTIP pilot were selected by the university because they support research and evaluation methods in their schools aimed at identifying factors associated with improved student outcomes, most notably but not limited to academic achievement. Based upon the Research Evaluation Model (REM) first introduced by Lee, S., Tollefson, N., Lohmeier, J., and Frey, B. (2003), the MoTIP districts recognize the unique differences between educators and educational researchers but also recognize the value-added advantages associated with collaborative efforts. Accountability systems and measures faced by school districts and the university have compelled many to seek opportunities to identify key factors in education reform targeting improved student outcomes. “Schools provide the context for educational change and reform…while universities provide the capacity to tap the extant research literature to guide reform and provide a high level of methodological and content expertise” (Lee, et al, 2003).

Design

Utilizing a matched-pairs quasi-experimental design, students participating in the MoTIP pilot will be compared to “like” students who follow the traditional “student teaching” approach. Matching will allow evaluators to control for descriptive and demographic variables such as gender, age, and academic status. The following data will be collected: (1) Missouri Educator Evaluation System (MEES) measures of student growth and observation of teacher performance; (2) surveys of teacher education candidates and school district personnel; (3) personal interview with master teachers and teachers in residence; (4) focus group interviews with MoTIP teacher candidates; (5) Missouri Educator Gateway Assessments, including the MoGEA, MEP, MoCA, and MoPTA; and (6) Teacher-Readiness Exam designed by university researchers to measure the students’ knowledge of content-related proficiencies / competencies.
**Missouri Educator Evaluation System:** The state of Missouri has a long history of implementing various processes designed to improve the practice of teachers and leaders. In 1983, the Missouri legislature adopted section 168.128, RSMo directing the board of education of each school district to cause a comprehensive performance-based evaluation for each teacher employed by the district and the Department to provide suggested procedures for such an evaluation. This led to the creation of performance-based evaluation models for educators at all levels and marked the beginning of an intentional effort to link together the evaluation and the development of an educator’s practice. The system is founded on general beliefs about the purpose of the evaluation process. Central to these beliefs is a theory of action which maintains that improving student performance is predicated on the improvement of educator practice.

**Missouri’s Theory of Action: Increase Student Performance**
The standards and quality indicators associated with the evaluation system draw evidence from three professional frames at each level of the *Professional Continuum*. This reflects the research based on educator development, as well as feedback from Missouri educators on how to make the standards meaningful to teachers and leaders. The three frames are (a) professional commitment, (b) professional practice and (c) professional impact. These frames, which together constitute a determination of educator effect, organize data sources to facilitate the improvement of effective practice of teachers and leaders.

*Professional Continuum of the Missouri Teacher*

- **Candidate**
  - This level describes the performance expected of a potential teacher preparing to enter the profession and is enrolled in an approved educator preparation program at a college, university, or state-approved alternate pathway. Content knowledge and teaching skills are being developed through a progression of planned classroom and supervised clinical experiences.

- **Emerging**
  - This level describes the performance expected of a new teacher as they enter the profession or a practicing teacher in a new assignment. The base knowledge and skills are applied as they begin to teach and advance student growth and achievement in their classroom.

- **Developing**
  - This level describes the performance expected of a teacher early in their assignment with the teaching, content, knowledge, and skills that he/she possesses continually developing as they encounter new experiences and expectations in the classroom, school, district, and community while they continue to advance student growth and achievement.

- **Proficient**
  - This level describes the performance expected of a career, professional teacher who continues to advance his/her knowledge and skills while consistently advancing student growth and achievement.

- **Distinguished**
  - This level describes the career, professional teacher whose performance exceeds proficiency and who contributes to the profession and larger community while consistently advancing student growth and achievement. The Distinguished Teacher serves as an educational leader in the school, district, and the profession.
The identification of indicators is essential to establishing a particular focus based on performances articulated in the indicators. Baseline data serve as a starting point by establishing a current level of performance. Strategies for improvement are identified and practiced. Meaningful feedback is provided regarding the extent to which the new strategies are addressing the area of focus. A follow-up rating provides indication of the amount of growth in performance that occurred. Reflection on the process and the amount of growth that occurred or did not occur informs whether this particular indicator remains an area of focus or whether there is a new area of focus. This sequence is an important component to the growth in educational practice that ultimately increases student performance. (see Appendix A for Missouri Educator Evaluation System - Teacher Standards and Indicators of Performance).

According to the American Psychological Association’s (APA) report Assessing and Evaluating Teacher Preparation Programs, “assessment of new teachers’ impact on student learning is arguably the most critically needed type of data to engage in a cycle of evaluation and continuous improvement for teacher preparation programs” (2014). To address this issue, all Missouri school districts must ensure that teacher ratings of performance include measures of student growth as well as classroom observational data beginning 2015-2016.

**Instrumentation:** Survey instruments will be developed by the evaluation team and administered to the teacher education candidates in both the pilot MoTIP and the comparison group. A survey instrument will also be developed and administered to school district personnel supervising teacher interns from Missouri State University. A survey questionnaire will also be administered to elementary students receiving instruction by MSU interns. This instrument will measure stakeholder perceptions of the quality of instruction provided by both interns and career
teachers as well as the impact they are having on students’ academic achievement and overall learning growth.

**Interviews:** Interview protocols will be developed by the evaluation team and administered to program participants including interns, master teachers, teachers-in-residence, building principals and university faculty / liaisons. The purpose of the interview questionnaires will be to measure perceptions of the level of effectiveness of the MoTIP.

**Missouri Educator Gateway Assessments (MEGA):** (1) Missouri General Education Assessment (MoGEA), (2) Missouri Educator Profile (MEP), (3) Missouri Content Assessments (MoCA), and (4) the Missouri Pre-service Teacher Assessment (MoPTA).

**Readiness Exam:** Using core competencies detailed in Missouri State University course syllabii, the evaluation team will develop a Teacher-Readiness Assessment (TRA) to measure the degree to which interns and the comparison group of student teachers have mastered competencies related to course topics such as instructional technology, curriculum development, assessment methods, classroom management, et cetera.

**Participants**

**Interns:** Formerly known as Student Teachers and commonly called Teacher Candidates and/or pre-service teachers. The intern is the student who is selected to participate in the MoTIP pilot and must fulfill the requirements of both coursework and clinical experience during a full academic year within the same classroom while co-teaching with a practicing classroom teacher. The intern will be a full participating member of the school community, will fulfill responsibilities of both the school and university, and co-teach with a master classroom teacher, while completing all DESE requirements and maintaining dispositional requirements including but not limited to being punctual and present each school day, conducting oneself in a
professional manner, attending school and district meetings, working with parents and other stakeholders, honoring requests made by participating partners for tutoring, completing paperwork, and managing the classroom in the absence of the classroom teacher.

**Master Teacher:** Formerly known as the *Cooperating Teacher*, this person is the classroom teacher who has been selected by the school district based on effective instruction and ability to mentor colleagues and future educators. The Master Teacher will “co-teach” in collaboration with the Intern and assist the Intern in implementing university coursework into authentic classroom experiences with students. The master teacher has responsibility for the students in the classroom, mentors the Intern in the classroom for an entire academic year, and has expressed willingness and openness to the MoTIP goals and objectives. Master teachers have expressed support for the MoTIP pilot project and are willing to be flexible if needed and provide feedback on a regular basis to the Intern, teacher in residence, principal, and director. Master teachers assist with determining course grades for the clinical experience and keep teachers in residence and the building principal informed of intern and MoTIP progress and communicates with all stakeholders on a regular basis. Master teachers receive an annual stipend of $750 for their participation in MoTIP.

**Teachers in Residence:** This is a new role for a classroom teacher within the district who will work with the principal to manage all master teachers in the school building(s), university instructors, and other stakeholders. The Teacher in Residence will assist Master Teachers and help Interns implement course content contained in the “block” of coursework into the classroom teaching experience. The Teacher in Residence is the primary contact for the Academy Director. The Teacher in Residence will teach various portions of the content in collaboration with university instructors depending upon expertise, conduct evaluations of Interns using the
Missouri Educator Evaluation System (MEES), and keep university instructors informed of Interns’ progress. The Teacher in Residence is selected by the school district based on effective instruction and leadership potential. The university employs the Teacher in Residence as an adjunct faculty member and receives compensation at the same rate of adjunct or per course faculty.

**Academy Directors:** University faculty members who are responsible for the delivery of the content as stipulated in course syllabi are also charged with overseeing the clinical portion of the MoTIP for the university. Directors collaborate with the Teacher in Residence to conduct class at MoTIP school sites and oversee co-teaching. Acting as university liaisons between the districts and the university, the directors work with partners to keep pilot running smoothly. Responsibilities may include conducting any orientations / trainings needed; meeting with Teacher in Residence and Principal per school to be sure district/school policy is followed. The liaison(s) identifies what is needed for University assessment pieces, and assists school partners in observations if needed, would keep Superintendent’s informed, would organize common materials, would troubleshoot, would be the “go to” person for any of participants as questions arise, would make sure all participants are in compliance with any DESE mandates, etc.

Utilization of the Missouri Educator Evaluation System (MEES) will ensure all content requirements are met within the contexts of the academic year experience of the Interns.
Teacher Education “Internship” Model (MOTIP)
Transforming Pre-Service Teachers’ Field Experience
LOGIC MODEL

**GOAL 1**
*Develop and implement a year-long embedded clinical experience that is based on best practices in teacher education in order to prepare future teachers to meet the challenges of the new Missouri Model Teacher Standards.*

- Objective #1a: Increase pre-service teachers’ understanding of: a) content knowledge and appropriate instructional strategies, b) student learning, c) curriculum implementation and differentiation, d) assessment and data-analysis, and e) student behavior in order to create a positive school climate.
- Objective #1b: Increase pre-service teachers’ ability to: a) think critically, b) collaborate with others, c) communicate effectively, and d) demonstrate professionalism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INPUTS</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>OUTPUTS</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
<th>OUTCOME INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master Teachers</td>
<td>Co-teaching experience</td>
<td>Observations:</td>
<td>Increased level of understanding and ability to meet the Missouri</td>
<td>Missouri Educator Gateway Assessments (MEGA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers in Residence</td>
<td>- Shared responsibilities</td>
<td># of walk-thru evaluations completed by the Teacher in Residence</td>
<td>Model Teacher Standards</td>
<td>- Content Assessment(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Faculty</td>
<td>- Collaboration</td>
<td>- Student–teacher interactions</td>
<td>- Content Knowledge</td>
<td>- Pre-Service Teacher Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Principals</td>
<td>- Communication</td>
<td>- Classroom environment / management</td>
<td>- Student Learning</td>
<td>Surveys of Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Professionalism</td>
<td>- Student engagement</td>
<td>- Curriculum Implementation</td>
<td>Focus Group Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Embedded coursework</td>
<td>Artifacts:</td>
<td>- Critical Thinking</td>
<td>Teacher-Readiness Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Curriculum planning</td>
<td>- Curriculum documents and lesson plans (small /whole group)</td>
<td>- Classroom Environment</td>
<td>Missouri Educator Evaluation System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Technology</td>
<td>- Analysis of student assessment data</td>
<td>- Effective Communication</td>
<td>- Classroom observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Assessment</td>
<td>- Instruction based on analysis of data: use of differentiation</td>
<td>- Student Assessment</td>
<td>- Student Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>- Instruction embeds use of technology</td>
<td>- Professionalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walk-thru evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**GOAL 2**

*Establish university-school partnerships that share in the responsibility, authority and accountability for the development and implementation of the year-long embedded clinical experience approach to teacher preparation.*

- Objective #2: Increase the level of collaboration among pilot school districts and the university through the program planning, implementation and evaluation.
- Objective #3: Increase the level of awareness among university faculty regarding the needs of school districts; specifically the qualities associated with effective teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INPUTS</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>OUTPUTS</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
<th>OUTCOME INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Planning MoTIP Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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