



The Teacher Candidate in the Clinical Experience

MEES Protocols and Forms

Academic Year 2019-2020



www.dese.mo.gov

The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, gender, national origin, age, or disability in its programs and activities. Inquiries related to Department programs and to the location of services, activities, and facilities that are accessible by persons with disabilities may be directed to the Jefferson State Office Building, Office of the General Counsel, Coordinator – Civil Rights Compliance (Title VI/Title IX/504/ADA/Age Act), 6-Floor, 205 Jefferson Street, P.O. Box 480, Jefferson City, MO 65102-0480; telephone number 573-526-4757 or TTY 800-735-2966; email civilrights@dese.mo.gov.

Contents

Introduction	3
Standards and Quality Indicators Webmap	4
MEES Teacher Candidate Assessment Tool	5
MEES Teacher Candidate Assessment Rubric	6
Scoring Scale and Protocol	7-11
Training of Evaluators and Inter-Rater Reliability	12
Contact Information	13

Using Missouri's Educator Evaluation System (MEES) to Assess the Performance of Teacher Candidates during the Clinical Experience

Introduction

Missouri's Educator Evaluation System (MEES) was developed and refined by hundreds of educators across the state. 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. These beliefs include that evaluation processes are formative in nature and lead to continuous improvement; are aligned to standards that reflect excellence; build a culture of informing practice and promoting learning; and use multiple, balanced measurements that are fair and ethical.


Beginning in fall 2018, the MEES for Teacher Candidates became the required performance assessment for student teachers across the state. The MEES underwent revision using a content validity process. Additionally, each Educator Preparation Program (EPP) will determine required artifacts for candidates. Artifacts may be required to provide essential evidence to determine if a candidate has met a standard to an acceptable level.

Teacher Candidates are an essential part of Missouri's Professional Continuum. Teacher Candidates are in the preparation process to enter the profession. In the Clinical Experience, Teacher Candidates are afforded the opportunity to put preparation into practice.

As prescribed in the Missouri Standards for the Preparation of Educators (MoSPE), Teacher Candidates in their Clinical Experience are to be assessed using the Missouri Educator Evaluation System (MEES). The following provides an introduction to the forms and a description of their use.

Standards and Quality Indicators Webmap

The Missouri Educator Evaluation System contains thirty-six Quality Indicators across nine standards. In the Clinical Experience, each of the nine standards will receive one score from the Cooperating Teacher and one score from the University Supervisor.



The Teacher Candidate is assessed on each of the nine standards by the University Supervisor and the Cooperating Teacher. The forms included in this process are explained to provide further detail on how this assessment occurs.

Teacher Candidate Assessment Tool

The *Teacher Candidate Assessment Tool* (TCAT) is a specifically designed evaluation tool used to assess Teacher Candidates, both formatively and summatively, throughout the culminating semester. The nine focus standards were selected from the *Missouri Teacher Standards* to evaluate Teacher Candidates similarly to the principal evaluations of first-year teachers. Formative evaluations using the TCAT provide opportunities for the Teacher Candidate to analyze their growth on a single standard over time. This promotes reflection, as well as conferencing and goal-setting with evaluators. Use of the Teacher Candidate Assessment Tool is optional, as EPPs may use their own electronic system to gather this data. When adjusting the format to meet each EPP's individual needs, it is essential that the language of the standards, quality indicators, and descriptors remain unchanged to ensure consistency across the state.

Missouri Educator Evaluation System (MEES) Teacher Candidate Assessment Tool 2019-2020

Standard 1: Content knowledge aligned with appropriate instruction.

The teacher candidate understands the central concepts, structures, and tools of inquiry of the discipline(s) and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful and engaging for students.

0-The teacher candidate does not possess the necessary knowledge, therefore, the standard is not evident or is incorrect in performance.
 1-Emerging Candidate: The teacher candidate is able to articulate the necessary knowledge, but does not demonstrate in performance.
 2-Developing Candidate: The teacher candidate is able to articulate the necessary knowledge and demonstrates in performance with some success.
3-Skilled Candidate: The teacher candidate is able to articulate the necessary knowledge and effectively demonstrates in performance.
 4- Exceeding Candidate: The teacher candidate adapts and develops the lesson according to the teaching environment/ student response.

The Skilled Candidate (3) Effectively:

- Provides students with multiple opportunities to process the content.
- Conveys accurate content knowledge, relevant examples, and content-specific resources to engage students and support learning.
- Conveys vocabulary and terminology necessary to understand content and uses evidence-based instructional strategies to engage students.
- Consistently engages the majority of students in the content.

Possible Artifacts/Evidence:

- Pre and/or Post Conference
- Interest Inventory
- Journal
- Lesson/Unit Plan

The Exceeding Candidate (4) demonstrates all descriptors of a Skilled Candidate and one or more of the following:

- Identifies low engagement and responds with strategies to increase engagement.
- Uses a variety of skillful questioning strategies to promote active participation and depth of student response.
- Facilitates a lesson in which every student in the class appears engaged for the duration of the lesson.
- Promotes students authentically using vocabulary and terminology relevant to the content

Performance Assessment	Score	Feedback
Formative 1 Date		
Formative 2 Date		
Formative 3 Date		
Formative 4 Date		
Formative 5 Date		
Formative 6 Date		
Summative Date		

Teacher Candidate Assessment Rubric

A Teacher Candidate Assessment Rubric (TCAR) has been provided for each of the nine standards. The rubric specifically highlights the transition from “knowing to doing” that occurs during the Clinical Experience. The first row of the rubric articulates the particular performance represented in the given standard. This articulation occurs across a continuum that includes skills and knowledge Not Evident, Emerging, Developing, Skilled, and Exceeding. The Skilled Level of performance is highlighted, indicating it is the expected level of performance for the teacher candidate by the end of the Clinical Experience. Evaluators should use the language in the rubric to determine a score; the rubric is analytic, not holistic, meaning evaluators should select the descriptors that they observed in the classroom or through evidence such as artifacts.

MEES Teacher Candidate Assessment Rubric

Standard 1

Standard 1: Content knowledge aligned with appropriate instruction. The teacher candidate understands the central concepts, structures, and tools of inquiry of the discipline(s) and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful and engaging for students.				
0-The teacher candidate does not possess the necessary knowledge, therefore, the standard is not evident or is incorrect in performance.	1-Emerging Candidate: The teacher candidate is able to articulate the necessary knowledge, but does not demonstrate in performance.	2-Developing Candidate: The teacher candidate is able to articulate the necessary knowledge and demonstrates in performance with some success.	3-Skilled Candidate: The teacher candidate is able to articulate the necessary knowledge and effectively demonstrates in performance. <i>Expected level of performance by the end of the student teaching semester.</i>	4-Exceeding Candidate: The teacher candidate adapts and develops the lesson according to the teaching environment/ student response (all descriptors in the skilled candidate (3) column must be met as well as at least one descriptor below):
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides no opportunity for students to process content. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates an awareness of strategies to allow students to process content. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides students limited opportunities to process content. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides students with multiple opportunities to process the content. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifies low engagement and responds with strategies to increase engagement.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shares incorrect information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates an understanding of basic content. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conveys accurate information when teaching content. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conveys accurate content knowledge, relevant examples, and content-specific resources to engage students and support learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses a variety of skillful questioning strategies to promote active participation and depth of student response.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides no evidence of addressing needed vocabulary and/or terminology for student understanding of content. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plans to introduce vocabulary and terminology, but does not use strategies to enhance student engagement and responses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduces vocabulary and terminology necessary to understand content, but uses limited strategies to engage students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conveys vocabulary and terminology necessary to understand content and uses evidence-based instructional strategies to engage students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitates a lesson in which every student in the class appears engaged for the duration of the lesson.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides no evidence of planning for student engagement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plans for student engagement but no evidence of implementation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inconsistently engages students in the content. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistently engages the majority of students in the content. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promotes students authentically using vocabulary and terminology relevant to the content.

The Teacher Candidate Assessment Rubric is offered for informational purposes for the Teacher Candidate, University Supervisor, and Cooperating Teacher. The overall purpose of the rubric is to create common language articulating the expected performance of the Teacher Candidate in the Clinical Experience.

Scoring Scale

Teacher Candidates will be scored based on a 0-4 scale and assessed by both the Cooperating Teacher and University Supervisor assigned to the Teacher Candidate by the educator preparation program. The scores of the Cooperating Teacher and University Supervisor are equally weighted and reported during the certification recommendation process. Below are the scoring levels:

- **0-Not Evident** *The Teacher Candidate does not possess the necessary knowledge, therefore, the standard is not evident or is incorrect in performance.*
- **1-Emerging Candidate** *The Teacher Candidate is able to articulate the necessary knowledge, but does not demonstrate in performance.*
- **2-Developing Candidate** *The Teacher Candidate is able to articulate the necessary knowledge and demonstrates in performance with some success.*
- **3- Skilled Candidate** *The Teacher Candidate is able to articulate the necessary knowledge and effectively demonstrates in performance. This is the expected level of performance of the Teacher Candidate by the end of the student teaching semester.*
- **4- Exceeding Candidate** *The Teacher Candidate adapts and develops the lesson according to the teaching environment/student response (all descriptors in the skilled candidate (3) column must be met and at least one descriptor in the exceeding (4) column must be present during the evaluation).*

Scoring Protocol

- For levels 0 – 3, a score earned on a majority of the strands will be the score assigned to that standard.
- For standards with an even number of strands, if the scores are split evenly between two adjacent levels, the lower score will be given.
- If neither of the first two rules applies, the mean of all strand scores should be calculated and used as the standard score. This score should be rounded down if the mean is *.5 or lower and rounded up if it is greater than *.5.
- Teacher candidates must demonstrate all of the skilled level (3) plus at least one of the exceeding descriptors to earn a 4.
- If a particular strand within a standard is not observable, score the standard based on the evidence available.
- All standards must be scored on the Summative Evaluation.
- If a Teacher Candidate has two cooperating teachers with time equally split between them, the scores for the standard will be averaged by the EPP. For other lengths of placements, please consult your EPP.
- Scores are reported as whole numbers only.
- Each EPP may require artifacts to support scoring.

Scoring Scenarios

The tables below reflect the results of applying the protocol rules to every possible combination of strand scores.

		5-strand scenarios					
		Score-1	Score-2	Score-3	Score-4	Score-5	Score for the Standard
At least one (0)		0	0	0	0	0	0
		0	0	0	0	1	0
		0	0	0	0	2	0
		0	0	0	0	3	0
		0	0	0	1	1	0
		0	0	0	1	2	0
		0	0	0	1	3	0
		0	0	0	2	2	0
		0	0	0	2	3	0
		0	0	0	3	3	0
		0	0	1	1	1	1
		0	0	1	1	2	1
		0	0	1	1	3	1
		0	0	1	2	2	1
		0	0	1	2	3	1
		0	0	1	3	3	1
		0	0	2	2	2	2
		0	0	2	2	3	1
		0	0	2	3	3	2
		0	0	3	3	3	3
		0	1	1	1	1	1
		0	1	1	1	2	1
		0	1	1	1	3	1
		0	1	1	2	2	1
		0	1	1	2	3	1
		0	1	1	3	3	2
		0	1	2	2	2	2
		0	1	2	2	3	2
		0	1	2	3	3	2
		0	1	3	3	3	3
		0	2	2	2	2	2
		0	2	2	2	3	2
		0	2	2	3	3	2
		0	2	3	3	3	3
		0	3	3	3	3	3
At least one (1)		1	1	1	1	1	1
		1	1	1	1	2	1
		1	1	1	1	3	1

and no (0)	1	1	1	2	2	1
	1	1	1	2	3	1
	1	1	1	3	3	1
	1	1	2	2	2	2
	1	1	2	2	3	2
	1	1	2	3	3	2
	1	1	3	3	3	3
	1	2	2	2	2	2
	1	2	2	2	3	2
	1	2	2	3	3	2
	1	2	3	3	3	3
	1	3	3	3	3	3
	At least one (2) and no (0) and no (1)	2	2	2	2	2
2		2	2	2	3	2
2		2	2	3	3	2
2		2	3	3	3	3
2		3	3	3	3	3
All (3)	3	3	3	3	3	3

4-strand scenarios					
	Score-1	Score-2	Score-3	Score-4	Score for the Standard
At least one (0)	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	1	0
	0	0	0	2	0
	0	0	0	3	0
	0	0	1	1	0
	0	0	1	2	1
	0	0	1	3	1
	0	0	2	2	1
	0	0	2	3	1
	0	0	3	3	1
	0	1	1	1	1
	0	1	1	2	1
	0	1	1	3	1
	0	1	2	2	1
	0	1	2	3	1
	0	1	3	3	2
	0	2	2	2	2
	0	2	2	3	2
	0	2	3	3	2
	0	3	3	3	3
	1	1	1	1	1

At least one (1) and no (0)	1	1	1	2	1
	1	1	1	3	1
	1	1	2	2	1
	1	1	2	3	2
	1	1	3	3	2
	1	2	2	2	2
	1	2	2	3	2
	1	2	3	3	2
	1	3	3	3	3
	At least one (2) and no (0) and no (1)	2	2	2	2
2		2	2	3	2
2		2	3	3	2
2		3	3	3	3
All (3)	3	3	3	3	3

3-strand scenarios				
	Score-1	Score-2	Score-3	Score for the Standard
Atleast one (0)	0	0	0	0
	0	0	1	0
	0	0	2	0
	0	0	3	0
	0	1	1	1
	0	1	2	1
	0	1	3	1
	0	2	2	2
	0	2	3	2
	0	3	3	3
Atleast one (1) and no (0)	1	1	1	1
	1	1	2	1
	1	1	3	1
	1	2	2	2
	1	2	3	2
	1	3	3	3
Atleast one (2) and no (0) and no (1)	2	2	2	2
	2	2	3	2
	2	3	3	3
All (3)	3	3	3	3

2-strand scenarios			
	Score-1	Score-2	Score for the Standard
Atleast one (0)	0	0	0
	0	1	0
	0	2	1
	0	3	1
Atleast one (1) and no (0)	1	1	1
	1	2	1
	1	3	2
Atleast one (2) and no (0) and no (1)	2	2	2
	2	3	2
All (3)	3	3	3

Formative Implementation University supervisors are required to complete a formative assessment at least once every three weeks for each Teacher Candidate, but each EPP may require more than the minimum number of visits and some Teacher Candidates may benefit from more than the minimum number of formative observations. Each EPP will provide Cooperating Teachers with information about the frequency and instrument used for formative feedback to the Teacher Candidate.

Summative Implementation To provide summative scores used for certification recommendation, the Cooperating Teacher(s), Teacher Candidate, and University Supervisor will conference and consider the formative data points provided throughout the observations during the culminating semester. The Cooperating Teacher and University Supervisor will independently submit a score for each of the nine standards. Each score will be a reflection of the degree to which the Teacher Candidate met the expectations detailed in the MEES Teacher Candidate Assessment Rubric.

Passing Score

The performance assessments will be scored at the educator preparation level. Below is the phase-in schedule for the minimum combined summative score (US + CT) required for certification.

Academic Year	MEES for Teacher Candidates – Combined Summative Score (US + CT)*
2018-2019	24 points
2019-2020	42 points
2020-2021 and beyond	To be determined

Candidates must meet or exceed the minimum passing score in order to be recommended for certification.

Artifacts As some standards are non-observable or do not provide the opportunity to be consistently observed during a formative, “snapshot” lesson evaluation, artifacts may be required for scoring. Required artifacts will be determined by each EPP. It is the responsibility of the Teacher Candidate to provide artifact(s) identified by their Educator Preparation Program to support the scoring process.

Training of Evaluators and Inter-Rater Reliability

Mandatory Cooperating Teacher and University Supervisor Training

Because the MEES requires subjective scoring, inter-rater reliability is important; all evaluators (Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors) need to learn to consistently identify the same kinds of behaviors (or lack thereof) at each rating level.

All evaluators must complete annual calibration training. The Educator Preparation Program may provide additional institution-specific materials to Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors. Teacher Candidates may be invited to attend institution-specific training.

- Every Cooperating Teacher who is hosting a Teacher Candidate for the upcoming semester or year, as well as any University Supervisor assigned to supervise a Teacher Candidate, must complete a training either face-to-face or online.
- Every EPP must utilize the training materials provided by DESE including the same videos for purposes of consistency. All evaluators must look for the same behavioral evidence and consider the criteria provided on the Teacher Candidate Assessment Rubric when assessing performance.
- An online training is available for Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors who may be out of area or unable to attend a face-to-face training.
- Each EPP should provide additional institution-specific training related to their processes and timelines.

Inter-Rater Reliability involves statistically determining the similarity of data collected by different raters. The extent of agreement among data collectors is called, “*interrater reliability*” and can vary due to the variability among observers - different people interpret observations in different ways. It is important for the different raters to rate teaching behaviors and evidence similarly and thus provide as close to the same scores as possible. Providing the same training for all Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors helps to ensure acceptable inter-rater reliability.

During training, the evaluators view videos of different classrooms, use the Teacher Candidate Assessment Rubric (TCAR) to determine scores on different specified standards; then participants in face-to-face trainings discuss the evidence from their observations to increase reliability of ratings.

Contact Information

Please direct questions to:

Paul Katnik
Assistant Commissioner
Office of Educator Quality
Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Paul.Katnik@dese.mo.gov
573-751-2990

Buddy Alberson
Assistant Director - Educator Preparation
Office of Educator Quality
buddy.elberson@dese.mo.gov
573-751-1191

Suzanne Hull
Director Field & Clinical
Missouri Southern State University
hull-s@mssu.edu
417-625-9623

Daryl E. Fridley
Associate Dean
Southeast Missouri State University
dfridley@semo.edu
573-651-2556

Beth Kania-Gosche
Chair, Teacher Education and Certification
Missouri University of Science and Technology
bkaniagosche@mst.edu
573-341-4120

Kimberley Nuetzmann
Director of Field Experiences
University of Missouri, Columbia
nuetzmannk@missouri.edu
573-882-4364