

Formative Evaluation of the Title II Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality Project

October 2003

Kimberly S. Cowley, Nicole L. Finch, Merrill L. Meehan

AEL, Charleston, WV

and David Holdzkom, AEL Consultant

Cowley, K., Finch, N., & Meehan, M. (with Holdzkom, D.). (2003). *Formative evaluation of the Title II Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality Project*. Charleston, WV: Appalachia Educational Laboratory (now Edvantia).

AEL is a not-for-profit corporation that applies the latest education research and technology to spark innovation and promote strategies for student success. AEL delivers products and services that integrate research and development, evaluation, professional development, technology, and diverse perspectives. AEL operates several contracts funded by the U.S. Department of Education: a Regional Educational Laboratory, the Region IV Comprehensive Center, an Eisenhower Regional Consortium for Mathematics and Science Education, and the ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools.

Information about AEL research, products, and services is available by
writing P.O. Box 1348, Charleston, WV 25325;
calling 304-347-0400 or 800-624-9120; or
visiting [wwwael.org](http://wwwaelorg)

Copyright © 2003 by AEL

Reproduction of this document is permitted provided credit is given to AEL as the source.

This publication is based on work sponsored wholly or in part by the Western Kentucky University for its Title II Renaissance Partnership Project for Improving Teacher Quality. Its contents do not necessarily reflect the views of Western Kentucky University.

AEL is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	iii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
Project Description.....	1
Purpose and Audience.....	3
Evaluation Plan	3
METHODS	5
Instruments.....	5
Data Collection	6
Data Analysis	7
FINDINGS	9
Document Review.....	9
Introduction.....	9
Inventory of Documents Submitted.....	10
Participating Institutions	14
Review of Specific Documents.....	14
Summary	18
Interviews.....	20
Accountability Systems	21
Teacher Work Samples	22
Mentoring.....	23
Program Improvement	24
Partnerships.....	25
Research.....	26
Networking	26
Interviewee Recommendations.....	27
Surveys.....	29
Assessment Coordinators.....	29
Mentoring Coordinators.....	30
Teacher Work Sample Coordinators.....	31
Institutional Coordinators	34
District/School Personnel.....	40
Faculty.....	44
Student Teachers	49
Key Survey Findings by Topic Area	54

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

CONCLUSIONS.....	57
Evaluation Question One	57
Evaluation Question Two	58
Evaluation Question Three	58
Evaluation Question Four	59
Evaluation Question Five.....	59
Evaluation Question Six	60
Congruence of Conclusions and Year 4 Progress Report.....	60
RECOMMENDATIONS	62
REFERENCES	69
APPENDIXES	
A: Completed Evaluation Standards Checklist	
B: Interview Protocol	
C: Document Review Rating Form	
D: Institutional Coordinator Survey	
E: Assessment Coordinator Survey	
F: Mentoring Coordinator Survey	
G: Teacher Work Sample Coordinator Survey	
H: Faculty Survey	
I: School/District Personnel Survey	
J: Student Teacher Survey	
K: Matrix of Survey Questions by Multiple Stakeholder Groups	

LIST OF TABLES

1:	Renaissance Partnership Project Institutions	1
2:	Evaluation Matrix	4
3:	Descriptive Statistics for Document Review Rating Forms	10
4:	Description of Project Updates Covered in Institutional Newsletters	18
5:	Ratings for 11 Skills by Teacher Work Sample Coordinators.....	33
6:	Ratings for 11 Skills by Institutional Coordinators	36
7:	Descriptions of Course Revisions as Described by Institutional Coordinators	40
8:	Ratings for 11 Skills by District/School Personnel.....	41
9:	Major Strengths of Teacher Work Sample Methodology as Described by District/School Personnel	43
10:	Major Weaknesses of Teacher Work Sample Methodology as Described by District/School Personnel.....	44
11:	Ratings for 11 Skills by Faculty Members	45
12:	Major Strengths of Teacher Work Sample Methodology as Described by Faculty Members	46
13:	Major Weaknesses of Teacher Work Sample Methodology as Described by Faculty Members	47
14:	Adequacy Ratings of Teaching Processes as Described by Student Teachers	50
15:	Major Strengths of Teacher Work Sample Methodology as Described by Student Teachers	51
16:	Major Weaknesses of Teacher Work Sample Methodology as Described by Student Teachers	52
17:	Other Frequency Distributions of Mentor Meetings by Student Teachers	54

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Renaissance Partnership Project for Improving Teacher Quality was funded in September 1999 by a U.S. Department of Education Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant. Now in its fourth year, the goal of this project is to become accountable for the impact of teacher graduates on student achievement by developing systems to measure and improve teacher candidates' ability to facilitate student learning. The project is a five-year initiative by 11 teacher preparation institutions in 10 states to improve the quality of their graduates and teachers in local partner schools by focusing attention on PK-12 student learning. All 11 institutions are members of the Renaissance Group, whose presidents, provosts, and deans have collaborated on issues of teacher preparation.

The purpose of this report is to provide a formative evaluation of the Title II Renaissance Partnership Project for Improving Teacher Quality. The evaluation took place during the end of the third year (started in August 2003) and over the course of the fourth year of the five-year grant. Findings from the evaluation can be used to further refine the direction and subsequent activities of the 11 partner institutions during the remainder of the fourth year and during the final year. The primary audience is staff of Western Kentucky University, i.e., the project director and originator of the request for a formative evaluation. Secondary audiences include U.S. Department of Education staff, staff from the 11 participating universities, and others interested in improving teacher quality and student learning.

Staff from AEL in Charleston, WV, contracted with staff at Western Kentucky University to evaluate the Title II Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality Project by addressing the following questions: (1) To what extent have the activities of the project achieved the project goals and objectives? (2) To what extent has the project achieved the goals and expectations of the Title II Partnership Program? (3) What factors, activities, and processes have contributed most to progress toward the changes desired to improve teacher quality? (4) What factors, activities, and processes have been barriers to progress or have contributed to lack of progress? (5) What are recommendations about the continued operation of the Renaissance Partnership that would likely result in greater effectiveness and productivity? (6) What can be learned from this project that will add to the knowledge base on improving teacher quality?

AEL conducted the evaluation over the course of one year (August 2002 through August 2003) using three major data collection strategies: surveys, interviews, and document review.

The first instrument used in this evaluation was an interview protocol developed by AEL staff for use at the October 2002 Title II Renaissance Partnership Project for Improving Teacher Quality meeting held in Washington, DC. This protocol was reviewed and approved by Renaissance staff prior to its implementation and included five broad questions pertaining to progress in meeting project objectives, supportive and inhibiting factors, recommendations for improvement, and lessons learned for improving teacher quality. A total of 35 Renaissance staff members were interviewed during the October meeting.

A total of 62 documents were submitted by Renaissance staff to AEL staff for inclusion in the document review. These documents included the project proposal, draft products such as the teacher work samples manual, downloads from the project Web site, and copies of presentation slides. A 10-item rating form was developed by AEL staff for use in rating a subset of 10 representative documents.

Seven surveys were developed by AEL staff and an experienced educational consultant for use with institutional coordinators, mentoring coordinators, assessment coordinators, teacher work sample coordinators, faculty members, school/district personnel, and student teachers. Given the limited

involvement of business partners noted from the interviews, it was decided not to survey this particular stakeholder group. Draft surveys were submitted to an AEL staff member previously involved with the Renaissance Project for issues concerning validity and clarity; the revised surveys were then reviewed and approved by Renaissance staff. The number of items varied by survey: assessment coordinator–10, mentoring coordinator–8, teacher work sample coordinator–12, faculty–20, school/district personnel–14, student teacher–18, and institutional coordinator–34. The institutional coordinator was the longest of the surveys and included items relevant to each of the seven topic areas of the project (assessment, teacher work samples, mentoring, program improvements, partnerships, networking, and research).

The four surveys intended for key coordinator groups (institutional, mentoring, teacher work sample, and assessment) were mailed in late January 2003. Each survey kit included a paper copy of the survey, a cover letter from the project director, and a self-addressed return envelope. Surveys were sent to the full population for each coordinator group. In April, e-mail reminders were sent to nonrespondents by the project director, asking that surveys be completed and returned to AEL as soon as possible. After several additional follow-ups, 100% response rates were achieved for each of these four groups (institutional, mentoring, assessment, and teacher work sample coordinators).

For the remaining three surveys (faculty, school/district personnel, and student teachers), the project director asked the institutional coordinator at each institution to select a convenience sample of 3 to 7 faculty members each from education and arts/sciences, to select a convenience sample of 3 to 7 school/district personnel, and to provide names for all of the student teachers who completed teacher work samples during the fall 2002 semester. The faculty and school/district personnel survey kits were mailed in early March 2003, and again included a paper survey, a cover letter from the project director, and a self-addressed return envelope. Because AEL staff did not have mailing addresses for the student teachers (some of whom had subsequently graduated), these survey kits were mailed in bulk to each institutional coordinator, along with a cover letter asking them to distribute the kits (either on campus or by mail). Follow-up packets were mailed in June, asking respondents to complete and return their surveys as soon as possible. However, because surveys were being returned anonymously, this meant that all survey recipients received a follow-up packet. The cover memo instructed recipients to disregard the follow-up kit if they had already returned their surveys. The deadline for accepting returned surveys was July 2003. By that time, 36 of the 77 school/district personnel surveys were received, for a 47% response rate; 83 of the 130 faculty member surveys were received, for a 64% response rate; and 83 of the 213 student teacher surveys were received, for a 40% response rate.

Conclusions

A number of conclusions can be drawn from the findings presented within this formative evaluation of the Title II Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality Project. These conclusions are organized by the six broad evaluation questions.

To what extent have the activities of the project achieved the project goals and objectives? There are differing levels of progress in achieving specific project goals and objectives. This progress also varies for each of the 11 participating institutions.

The teacher work sample objective is clearly the most advanced. All work sample and institutional coordinators report using the “Performance Prompt, Teaching Process Standards, and Scoring Rubrics for the Teacher Work Sample” product. Further, nearly all these coordinators believe the work sample methodology is more effective when compared to prior preparation methods for student teachers. This component of the project seems to have tremendous faculty support across institutions.

The mentoring objective also has been met to a high degree. About half of the assessment and institutional coordinators report that their institutions have mentors for more than 75% of their teacher candidates. About a third of the assessment coordinators and half of the institutional coordinators report that their institutions have mentors for more than 75% of their teacher candidates. However, only about half of student teachers report having some type of mentoring.

Progress has been made to some extent for the accountability and networking objectives, yet these areas show a marked difference in progress across institutions. About half of the assessment coordinators report that their institutions have a fully implemented data management system; however, only a fourth of the institutional coordinators share this viewpoint. Nearly all of the institutional coordinators report networking with faculty members within their institutions; more than half also network with faculty at other institutions, with teacher candidates, and with school practitioners. Some institutions have developed closer working relationships with schools and/or school districts than have others. The number of courses revised as a result of this project range across institutions from 3 to 30; most of these revisions are described as inclusion of the teacher work sample methodology or assessment practices.

The least progress toward project goals has been in the objectives of business partners and research. In fact, many of the project staff are unsure of the exact purpose and intent of the business partnerships. Only one institution has an operational business partner; eight either have not identified a business partner or have not moved beyond initial contact with a business. For research, most of the institutional coordinators report involvement in survey research; about two thirds are involved in studies of an ethnographic, descriptive, or observational nature. Less than a third of the coordinators are involved in correlational, quasi-experimental, or experimental studies.

To what extent has the project achieved the goals and expectations of the Title II Partnership Program? The project is clearly aimed toward achieving the goals and expectations of the Title II Partnership Program. Some activities seem to have more widespread acceptance and support across the institutions, and so more time and effort are currently being spent in these areas.

While there is not yet any clear-cut evidence that this project is achieving its goal of improving student achievement, there are indications that such an outcome is certainly within reach. Survey data reveal that faculty and school personnel perceive student teachers are most skilled in the areas of specifying learning goals, mastering subject matter, and designing instruction. These teaching strengths bode well for actually impacting student learning in the classroom. However, respondents perceive student teachers as most weak in the area of planning for student differences, which also has direct repercussions in the classroom.

The impact of this project within the 11 participating institutions is spreading. Nearly all of the education and arts and science faculty members surveyed indicate they have received training in the teacher work sample methodology. Further, about two thirds have received training in mentoring.

What factors, activities, and processes have contributed most to progress toward the changes desired to improve teacher quality? There seem to be a number of factors common across the institutions that are contributing to the success of the project.

Across program objectives, there is a strong leadership component, faculty commitment and buy-in, and collaboration both within and across institutions. For teacher work samples, respondents note that it is of professional interest, it is not too expensive to implement, and it improves service delivery. As a result, faculty members are more interested and willing to complete activities pertaining to this objective.

Mentoring is also perceived to be of professional interest, although more so for education faculty than for arts and science faculty members, despite two thirds of arts science faculty having been trained.

A strength of the accountability or data management systems is the willingness of institutions making most progress in this area to share and model their systems with staff of other institutions. Success factors for partnering and networking included adequate travel budgets for fostering working relationships, sharing successes and problems, and opportunities for conference presentations. The ability to learn from one another, problem solve, and discuss how to adapt or adopt systems or methods was seen as one of the major strengths of this project.

What factors, activities, and processes have been barriers to progress or have contributed to lack of progress? There was a high level of consensus regarding those factors that are impeding the progress of the project.

Across the institutions and across program objectives, the major issues are time constraints and a feeling of being “overwhelmed.” Also high on the list of impediments are faculty resistance to change and high faculty turnover. Some institutions are experiencing financial difficulties in funding “big ticket” items such as computers and software for the data management system or additional staff to carry out project activities.

Barriers are also present for specific program objectives. For example, in addition to the need for additional funding to purchase hardware and peripherals, some respondents note a need for more knowledge about setting up and running large databases (i.e., the data management system). Others note the time-consuming and labor-intensive nature of the teacher work samples. For mentoring, staff identified problems in communication between faculty and students and the difficulties in scaling up to mentor large student populations. For the partner objective, project staff are struggling to understand and then express to businesses exactly what their roles might be in such a partnership. The contributions of businesses to the project and the value they might add is ambiguous at best.

What are recommendations about the continued operation of the Renaissance Partnership that would likely result in greater effectiveness and productivity? During the project staff interviews, a number of recommendations were made for improving effectiveness and productivity; these are described below. Specific recommendations emerging from the evaluation activities and analyses are provided in the next section.

Project staff see a need for their institutions to take on more responsibility for ensuring that project activities are undertaken and that objectives are met. They also feel that the dissemination and public relations aspects of the project should be expanded to make others more aware of the project and its successes to date.

Interviewees believe that more information sharing across institutions is needed for all of the institutions to develop and implement data management systems. They also note the need for allowing time to properly implement the teacher work samples before expecting desired outcomes. They note the need to expand the mentoring systems across all institutions and for all student teachers; the provision of stipends may help to increase faculty participation as mentors.

Other recommendations include the need to continue recognizing and making minor adjustments to program details and courses, sharing information across institutions about research endeavors, and clearly identifying the responsibilities of institutions and businesses in a partnership and the benefits such an arrangement provides for both entities.

What can be learned from this project that will add to the knowledge base on improving teacher quality? A number of learnings have been voiced and codified as a result of this formative evaluation.

Survey respondents view the teacher work sample methodology as a “total” package for instruction. They see it as a comprehensive model for effective teaching. This is a very important learning from this evaluation of the Renaissance Teacher Quality Project.

Survey respondents note that having a specific goal pertaining to research has resulted in faculty and students working together on common objectives. And, such collaboration has led to an increase in the quantity and quality of such endeavors.

Interviewees report that networking and bi-annual meetings help their institutions stay on the “cutting edge” of teacher preparation. And, such collaboration benefits smaller institutions by allowing them to be part of a larger entity with more visibility. Networking also results in a richer learning experience for teacher educators, which eventually translates into a richer learning environment for their students.

Recommendations

Based on all the data collected during this evaluation, we offer 11 recommendations for the Renaissance Partnership Project to consider.

Implement fully the teacher work samples. Just as developing the accountability system may be the greatest opportunity for institutional improvement, the development of teacher work samples has, without doubt, the greatest potential to make a contribution to the practice of teacher education. Most of the data collected in this formative evaluation indicate that the people who have worked to develop and implement teacher work samples have experienced great satisfaction from the work and recognize the potential for improving the teaching skills of those enrolled in their institutions. The public relations value alone of this activity cannot be over-estimated. Therefore, it is important for the Renaissance Partnership Project to ensure that the three institutions that are not implementing the teacher work samples be brought on board very soon. Much of the difficult development work has been done, so it is hard to understand the lag in these institutions, especially given that the teacher work samples were a centerpiece of the initial proposal. Perhaps these institutions could be brought into a cooperative relationship with one other institution that has been successful in developing and using the teacher work samples. Through this mini-partnership, the “assisted” institution could be brought up to speed, while the “assisting” institution would benefit from the opportunity to review its own work and think about “what I’d do differently, if I had it to do over.”

It might be necessary and possible for the Renaissance Partnership Project to develop a set of work standards that must be met to remain in the project. Thus, if all institutions were aware of these benchmark standards and one institution, for whatever reason, was unprepared or unable to meet these standards, then that institution would no longer be a cooperating member. Even though the Renaissance Partnership Project as an entity has little power to coerce its members to do anything, the project will be judged by the efforts of all members. Therefore, they may need to discuss ways to ensure that all institutions are able to pass muster on each of the stipulated objectives.

Continue mentoring programs for all students across all institutions. The mentoring component of the Renaissance Partnership Project program has been highly successful in some institutions, less so in others. Mentoring is time/emotion-intensive work, but the potential pay-offs are great. Some institutions have made slow progress on this objective and should be assisted in overcoming whatever difficulties they are facing. There exists a real opportunity for the Renaissance Partnership Project, as well as each

individual institution to motivate mentoring teams to continue and expand their efforts. It would be possible, for example, for the Renaissance Partnership Program to sponsor an annual Mentor Team of the Year. This could also be done at each institution. In addition, students who have been mentored could be invited to write up their experiences and these writings could be posted on the Web site. This would not only be a welcome reward to the mentors, but it could provide a way for persons not in the Renaissance Partnership Project who are interested in mentoring programs to connect with experts in the field. Similarly, when the mentoring manual is prepared, it can be publicized on the Web site. Staff should assume that this manual will be in great demand and be prepared to distribute it in fairly large numbers, because many universities are interested in mentoring but are not sure how to set up such programs.

Encourage more research studies. While the faculty and staff of teacher-training institutions have historically been more engaged with the use of research-based knowledge than with its creation, the Renaissance Partnership Project offers an opportunity to make important contributions to the development of research-based knowledge. It seems clear that many faculty and staff of the partner institutions are interested in participating in research activities. Several steps can be taken to elevate the status of the research activities: (1) Greater visibility and credibility should be given to those studies sponsored by the partnership institutions that have been completed or are underway. (2) Compile a sourcebook or data file listing all the research work that is being sponsored by Renaissance Partnership Project institutions. This could be posted on the Renaissance Web site and updated periodically. (3) Similarly, the Web site could be used to highlight or feature specific studies that are being undertaken. (4) Encourage and advocate cross-institutional cooperative research studies.

In addition to these efforts, the Renaissance Partnership Project can provide support for research at the collaborative level. This can be done by encouraging faculty and researchers at individual organizations to publish their results in peer-reviewed journals and make presentations at conferences, including the American Educational Research Association (AERA) and similar organizations. By creating a peer-review network within the Renaissance Partnership Project, researchers can receive valuable feedback from sympathetic reviewers before offering the work to a larger national audience. In addition to creating important relationships across institutions, such a network could stimulate multi-institution studies, because much of the work being done in individual universities is similar to that being done in other parts of the Renaissance Partnership Project. Further, research results could be posted to the Web site to further expand their visibility and to reach other audiences. Finally, institutions should aggressively find ways to reward research activities. This could range from bearing the costs of travel to national conferences for presentations to publicizing the researcher at his/her home institution to finding ways to support research efforts on behalf of the Renaissance Partnership Project.

Reconsider the business partner objective. The notion of partnerships for organizational change is based on the idea of synergy: two heads are better than one. However, synergy only works when the partners are clear about the goals of the partnership and believe that all parties will benefit in some way from the partnership. The institutions cooperating in the Renaissance Partnership Project have presented a very mixed record in terms of creating and using partnerships with businesses. Two fundamental questions might be addressed by the institutions: What do we think the business partners can bring to this initiative that we need? What can we provide to the business partners that would serve as an incentive for them to participate? If the answers to these questions are not positive, then staff should consider dropping this activity as an objective. Clearly, those institutions that have created and are using partnerships with business should be free to continue these. However, as a project-supported effort, this requirement could be dropped. This would have the effect of freeing up energy and resources to support other activities and obviating the need to "make work" for the business partners and for the participating institutions.

If the answers to the questions are positive, then perhaps the efforts that have been taken should be examined to see which strategies have worked and which have not. The institutions that have created

partnerships could be instrumental in educating other institutions about how they created the relationship, what they expect from the partnership, and how they have been able to sustain the relationship. It may be that a higher level of institutional involvement (perhaps at the provost/president) level will be necessary.

Finally, if the business partnership requirement cannot be eliminated, and if reasonable efforts to jump-start these relationships cannot be undertaken, then it may be enough to restructure the requirement such that its current status can be considered adequate to meet the contractual obligations of the Renaissance Partnership Project.

Accelerate progress on data management systems. In the long term, the development of data management systems for institutional accountability may be the greatest contribution to the practice of higher education that the Renaissance Partnership Project will make. Some member institutions have made excellent progress on this objective; others have been slower. The Renaissance Partnership Project should bring its professional and moral suasion to bear in an effort to motivate and assist those institutions that are making slower progress. The interviews with the university presidents and provosts indicate that this activity is a priority among all the institutions. Therefore, the “leader” universities may be able to play a more active role in assisting other institutions to make progress. By sharing evaluation targets, software, strategies, and so on, these leader institutions may be able to share successes, offer technical assistance (both formal and informal), and exchange information with other universities. It may be that a working group conference could help get this effort going. At such a conference, the persons responsible for implementing this objective along with the institutional leadership could come together to present progress reports, while smaller, more specialized working groups could help solve problems that are being encountered by others. It is certainly true that this objective entails large investments of time, talent, and money. It is anticipated, however, that the outcomes are well worth pursuing, even in a time of fiscal restraint in most states and, consequently, in state-supported universities.

Continue making course revisions. Because knowledge about teaching and learning is always expanding and changing, it is important that faculty of the various universities continue to revise courses currently offered and consider developing of new courses as appropriate. Member institutions of the Renaissance Partnership Project report that such course revision/creation activities have been an ongoing part of their work. However, some institutions report far more revised courses than others. Why should this be so? What motivated some institutions to do a wholesale re-examination of their courses with consequent revisions, while other institutions felt that the addition of a course or revision of some others would be adequate? This issue would, on its own merits, be an interesting research topic.

It would be helpful if some course revisions could be posted on the Web site. Its true that each institution differently divides and sequences the courses in the teacher education curriculum, but there is a common core of such courses at virtually every teacher training program. For example, every university offers courses in testing and measurement, methods of teaching high school English (and other similar courses), and educational psychology. It might be of great interest to members of the Renaissance Partnership Project and to educators at other institutions to examine some revisions that have been completed at other institutions, especially if a rationale/description of the changes was presented. Also, if student evaluations (either formal or informal) of the revised courses are available, these might be posted on the Web site.

Discover evidence of impact on student learning. The individual institutions of the Renaissance Partnership Project have engaged in a wide variety of activities aimed at improving teacher education for their students. The development of the teacher work samples, the mentoring programs, and the course revisions are the visible outcomes of this work. The question remains, however: Did these changes make a difference in the education students received? It is important to discover and document evidence that these changes have had the desired impact on students and this work should be undertaken immediately.

There are many ways to document evidence of student growth, including course grades, Praxis or other test results (where these are required), testimonials from students, demonstrated performance via projects and demonstrations, evidence from cooperating teachers, and so on. This issue of documenting success might indeed form the core of an interesting research project for some or all of the cooperating institutions. We would strongly recommend that whether or not all 11 institutions participate in an organized research program on this topic, all be required to begin the process of documenting impact on student learning. As these student achievement data are defined and collected, there needs to be a systematic effort to analyze the data and report the outcomes.

Address the workload issue. A problem lying beneath the surface of several comments during the interviews concerned the workload that the Renaissance Partnership Project activities have created. While few people actually complained, and it was clear that people were proud of the work and what they had accomplished, it was nevertheless evident that at some institutions the project work was being done by a few people. In any case, some people found it difficult to accomplish this work in a quality way along with their other regular jobs. As a management issue, this cannot be ignored nor denied. At least three strategies for addressing this issue might be considered:

- Survey the member institutions to see whether any have successfully addressed the workload issue. What did they do? What strategies did they implement? Were people given release time or a reduced teaching load to work on project activities? In short, find out what has been done to fix the problem in other places.
- Ask the member institutions whether they have tried nontraditional approaches to managing the workload. Does any institution permit job sharing? Is telecommuting being done by staff at any of the institutions? Have normal duties been taken away so working groups can dedicate time to any of these tasks?
- What strategies might be tried to redistribute the total workload so high-quality work continues to be the norm, while simultaneously recognizing that people only have so much energy to give to a job? Consider new ways to redistribute tasks so time is available to work on the Renaissance Partnership Project.

Integrate the projects into each university's culture. In many institutions, the Renaissance Partnership Project activities are a well-kept secret. Redesign of courses, development of teacher work samples, and development of mentoring programs are all important activities that redefine how the university carries out its mission. When innovations are not well-known and widely implemented, it is easy for the extant culture of the organization to brush these innovations aside once their immediate novelty wears off. Because the work of the project has sought to redefine the tactics and strategies used by the university, there must be efforts undertaken to ensure that these innovations become institutionalized.

Activities to integrate the Renaissance Partnership Project outcomes should begin now, not later. Some strategies to consider include publicizing people who have been successful in developing or implementing project products and processes. Rewards, both financial and non-financial, can be provided to these people along with the recognition from university presidents, provosts, or deans. Faculty and staff who are not participating in project activities can be invited to visit the Web site, network with others, and learn from colleagues who are heavily invested in the project.

Launch and sustain a public relations campaign. Underlying several of the recommendations above is a recommendation that Renaissance Partnership Project staff launch a systematic public relations campaign to educate others about the project, its accomplishments, its struggles, and its plans for

continuation. It will be crucial to determine which audiences for what purposes will be targeted in this campaign. For example, it might be that project staff decide to target five different audiences for various reasons. These might include boards of education, superintendents, and principals who traditionally hire the university's graduates; alumni and other potential donors; state legislators; colleagues at other universities within the state and nationally; and the university Board of Regents or Governors.

Each of these groups is interested in the Renaissance Partnership Project, its work, and the role played by their own university. Each group will have a strong interest in knowing either how it may contribute to the continuation of the work and/or how it can benefit from the work. A successful public relations campaign will carefully target its message to the various audiences. If the member universities have PR offices, efforts should be made to contact these professionals right away to get the campaign launched. It will probably be both important and efficient to have some aspects of the campaign directed centrally by project managers, while some of the tasks should be adapted to local situations.

Important efforts in this direction have been made. Many of the "awareness-level" PowerPoint presentations can be adapted for presentation to different audiences. The Web site includes much helpful information, but is essentially a passive means of information dissemination. If a public awareness/relations campaign is going to be successful, it will probably mean involving professionals who are trained at doing just this kind of work.

Seek continuation funding. Oscar Wilde is said to have observed that "no good deed goes unpunished." So it is with the Renaissance Partnership Project. Having worked hard for four years, it is now necessary to go to work to secure funding so that the work of the project can be continued. Of course, it could be that some member institutions do not wish to continue, this should be ascertained as part of planning to secure continuation funding. Next, a number of funding agents should be approached. The management of the project must receive a definitive answer from the U.S. Department of Education about the availability of continuation funding. If the answer is positive, then a group can be assembled to begin planning work to be undertaken in the next phase as well as preparing cost estimates. In addition, the management group of the project should consider whether there are some tasks or objectives that would be attractive to private philanthropic foundations. While most foundations are reluctant to simply continue work begun by someone else, it is often possible to re-package, adapt, or extend work begun in Phase I to make it attractive to new sponsors. It may be wise, for example, to propose dissemination of the teacher work sample activities to other universities in the state or continuing the networking activities through the bi-annual meetings. Too, it may be possible to "save" some money in the conduct of the final year to fund continuation of the key aspects of the Renaissance Partnership Project such as the bi-annual meetings, the Web site, and continued dissemination of products recently completed or currently under production. Finally, while this year and next year appear to be "tight" budget years for legislatures, efforts to secure "earmarked" funds could be successful, especially if there is a legislator who has been close to the individual institution's programs.

INTRODUCTION

Project Description

The Renaissance Partnership Project for Improving Teacher Quality was funded in September 1999 by a U.S. Department of Education Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant. Now in its fourth year, the goal of this project is to become accountable for the impact of teacher graduates on student achievement by developing systems to measure and improve teacher candidates' ability to facilitate student learning (Pankratz, n.d.).

The project is a five-year initiative by 11 teacher preparation institutions in 10 states to improve the quality of their graduates and teachers in local partner schools by focusing attention on PK-12 student learning (Pankratz, n.d.). All 11 institutions are members of the Renaissance Group, whose presidents, provosts, and deans have collaborated on issues of teacher preparation. The 11 institutions are listed in Table 1, along with their partner schools and businesses.

Table 1: Renaissance Partnership Project Institutions

Institution	City and State	Partner Schools	Partner Businesses
California State University	Fresno, CA	Central Unified School District	California Business Furnishings
Eastern Michigan University	Ypsilanti, MI	Ypsilanti Public Schools	Ypsilanti Area Chamber of Commerce
Emporia State University	Emporia, KS	Olathe School District	Birch Telecom
Kentucky State University	Frankfort, KY	Franklin County Public Schools	Investor's Heritage Insurance
Longwood University	Farmville, VA	Region 8 Superintendent Network (Prince Edward County Schools); Charlotte County Public Schools	Farmville Chamber of Commerce
Idaho State University	Pocatello, ID	League of Schools; Magic Valley School Partnership	Idaho Nuclear Engineering Environmental Lab.
Middle Tennessee State University	Murfreesboro, TN	Metro Nashville/Davidson School System; Rutherford County School System	Bell South
Millersville University	Millersville, PA	Lancaster School District	Lancaster Newspaper
Southeast Missouri State University	Cape Girardeau, MO	Charleston R-1 School District	JCT/Tel-Link
University of Northern Iowa	Cedar Falls, IA	Waterloo Community Schools	School Specialty
Western Kentucky University	Bowling Green, KY	Bowling Green City School System; Warren County School System	Weyerhauser Company

The 11 institutions have identified seven performance areas that, if improved, will significantly increase the ability of teacher candidates and school practitioners to facilitate learning of all PK-12 students (Pankratz, n.d.). These areas include

1. aligning instruction and assessment with state and local content standards
2. using the student's culture, context, and background to design instruction
3. using multiple assessments to plan, guide, and assess student learning
4. designing instruction for all students, including those with special needs
5. adapting instruction to achieve maximum student growth
6. analyzing and reporting learning growth of all students
7. reflecting on the teaching and learning process to plan future instruction and improve performance

These seven performance areas require a paradigm shift from teaching to learning, new organizational structures, and new systems of accountability (Pankratz, n.d.). Thus, seven project objectives have become the focus of development activities and actions over the five-year initiative:

1. developing accountability systems that regularly collect, analyze, and report performance data on teacher candidates and graduates
2. requiring teacher candidates to develop teacher work samples* as evidence of their ability to facilitate PK-12 student learning
3. developing mentoring teams consisting of teacher educators, school practitioners, and arts and science faculty to assist teacher candidates in achieving learning results
4. making significant course and program improvements that address critical teaching performances and mentoring processes
5. developing partnerships with businesses and schools/districts to expand learning opportunities for teacher candidates and PK-12 students
6. initiating new structures and processes for networking of people, ideas, and resources, including the development of a Web site
7. participating in a coordinated research program that links teacher performance to PK-12 student learning

*Teacher work samples (TWS) are exhibits of teaching performance that provide direct evidence of a candidate's ability to design and implement standards-based instruction, assess student learning, and reflect on the teaching and learning process; further, TWS can provide credible evidence of a candidate's ability to facilitate learning of all students.

Purpose and Audience

The purpose of this report is to provide a formative evaluation of the Title II Renaissance Partnership Project for Improving Teacher Quality. The evaluation took place during the end of the third year (started in August 2003) and over the course of the fourth year of the five-year grant. Findings from the evaluation can be used to further refine the direction and subsequent activities of the 11 partner institutions during the remainder of the fourth year and during the final year. The primary audience is the staff of Western Kentucky University (i.e., the project director and originator of the request for a formative evaluation). Secondary audiences include U.S. Department of Education staff, staff from the 11 participating universities, and others interested in improving teacher quality and student learning.

Evaluation Plan

Staff from AEL in Charleston, WV, contracted with staff at Western Kentucky University to evaluate the Title II Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality Project by addressing the following questions:

1. To what extent have the activities of the project achieved the project goals and objectives?
2. To what extent has the project achieved the goals and expectations of the Title II Partnership Program?
3. What factors, activities, and processes have contributed most to progress toward the changes desired to improve teacher quality?
4. What factors, activities, and processes have been barriers to progress or have contributed to lack of progress?
5. What are recommendations about the continued operation of the Renaissance Partnership that would likely result in greater effectiveness and productivity?
6. What can be learned from this project that will add to the knowledge base on improving teacher quality?

AEL conducted the evaluation over the course of one year (August 2002 through August 2003) using three major data collection strategies: surveys; semi-structured, in-depth interviews; and document review. Triangulation of resulting data provided a more comprehensive description than might be rendered by use of a single data collection method. Using several data sources in order to corroborate these is what Brewer and Hunter (1989) call “multimethod research.” This approach posits that the strengths of each method will compensate for the weaknesses in others, ultimately providing a more complete account of that being studied. The evaluation matrix in Table 2 presents the six evaluation questions, the data collection methods used to answer each question, and the relevant stakeholder groups for each collection method.

Table 2: Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation Question	Data Collection Method	Stakeholder Group
To what extent have the activities of the project achieved the project goals and objectives?	Survey	Partnership project directors Partnership faculty Project participants Business partners
	Document review	N/A
To what extent has the project achieved the goals and expectations of the Title II Partnership Program?	Survey	Partnership project directors Partnership faculty Project participants
	Document review	N/A
What factors, activities, and processes have contributed most to progress toward the changes desired to improve teacher quality?	Survey	Partnership project directors Partnership faculty Project participants Business partners
	In-depth interview	Partnership project directors Partnership Deans and Academic Vice Presidents
	Document review	N/A
What factors, activities, and processes have been barriers to progress or have contributed to lack of progress?	Survey	Partnership project directors Partnership faculty Project participants Business partners
	In-depth interview	Partnership project directors Partnership Deans and Academic Vice Presidents
	Document review	N/A
What are recommendations about the continued operation of the Renaissance Partnership that would likely result in greater effectiveness and productivity?	Survey	Partnership project directors Partnership faculty Local school district staff Project participants
	In-depth interview	Partnership project directors Partnership Deans and Academic Vice Presidents
What can be learned from this project that will add to the knowledge base on improving teacher quality?	Survey	Partnership project directors Partnership faculty Local school district staff
	In-depth interview	Partnership project directors Partnership Deans and Academic Vice Presidents

METHODS

Instruments

Interview protocol. The first instrument used in this evaluation was an interview protocol developed by AEL staff for use at the October 2002 Title II Renaissance Partnership Project for Improving Teacher Quality meeting held in Washington, DC. This protocol was reviewed and approved by Renaissance staff prior to its implementation and included five broad questions pertaining to progress in meeting project objectives, supportive and inhibiting factors, recommendations for improvement, and lessons learned for improving teacher quality. See Appendix B for a copy of the interview protocol.

Document review. A total of 62 documents were submitted by Renaissance staff to AEL staff for inclusion in the document review. These documents included the project proposal, draft products such as the teacher work samples manual, downloads from the project Web site, and copies of presentation slides. A 10-item rating form was developed by AEL staff for use in rating a subset of 10 representative documents. Using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Not at all, 5 = To a great extent), these documents were rated on the extent to which they described progress on goals, identified success factors, identified problem areas, identified possible solutions, identified recommendations, showed student learning increases, and described exemplary practices. In addition, using another 5-point scale (1 = Very poor, 5 = Excellent) these 10 representative documents were rated on their comprehensiveness, organization, and presentation. An experienced consultant was hired to review each of these documents and to prepare a draft summary. See Appendix C for a copy of the rating form.

Surveys. Seven surveys were developed by AEL staff and an experienced educational consultant for use with institutional coordinators, mentoring coordinators, assessment coordinators, teacher work sample coordinators, faculty members, school/district personnel, and student teachers. Given the limited involvement of business partners noted from the interviews, it was decided not to survey this particular stakeholder group. Draft surveys were submitted to an AEL staff member previously involved with the Renaissance Project for issues concerning validity and clarity; the revised surveys were then reviewed and approved by Renaissance staff.

The assessment coordinator survey included 10 items, the mentoring coordinator survey included 8 items, the teacher work sample coordinator survey included 12 items, the faculty survey included 20 items, the school/district personnel survey included 14 items, the student teacher survey included 18 items, and the institutional coordinator survey included 34 items. Obviously, the institutional coordinator was the longest of the seven surveys, and included items relevant to each of the seven topic areas of the Renaissance Project (assessment, teacher work samples, mentoring, program improvements, partnerships, networking, and research). See Appendixes D through J, respectively, for copies of the institutional coordinator survey, the assessment coordinator survey, the mentoring coordinator survey, the teacher work sample coordinator survey, the faculty member survey, the school/district personnel survey, and the student teacher survey. Further, Appendix K provides a matrix that lists specific survey items that were asked of multiple stakeholder groups.

Data Collection

Interviews. An AEL staff member and an experienced evaluation consultant conducted interviews of university presidents, provosts, institutional coordinators, academic deans, and assessment coordinators. Interviews of 12 assessment coordinators (2 staff members from two universities) were conducted during one group session by the AEL staff member; 11 institutional coordinators (2 staff members from one university) were split into two groups and interviewed by the AEL staff member and the consultant. An additional 12 interviews took place either individually or in pairs as interviewees were available, i.e., during breaks or at the beginning or end of previously scheduled meetings. These 12 interviews included 2 presidents, 2 provosts, and 9 academic deans.

While only a few presidents and provosts were interviewed, it was decided not to conduct group telephone interviews after the conference. This was due to two main reasons: (1) the overall consistency of the interview data that were gathered and (2) the difficulties encountered in trying to schedule times when the majority of interviewees could participate.

Document review. As stated earlier, a total of 62 documents were submitted for evaluative review. This process included documents completed and submitted from the beginning of this project through December 2002 so that sufficient time could be dedicated to reading and analyzing of all materials. These documents included the project proposal, draft products such as the teacher work samples manual, downloads from the project Web site, and copies of presentation slides. An experienced consultant was hired to review each of these documents and to prepare a draft summary. And, a 10-item rating form was used to rate a subset of 10 representative documents. As a measure of the internal consistency reliability of the rating form for this particular administration, a Cronbach Alpha coefficient of .20 was computed.

Surveys. The four surveys intended for key coordinator groups (institutional, mentoring, teacher work sample, and assessment) were mailed in late January 2003. Each survey kit included a paper copy of the survey, a cover letter from the project director, and a self-addressed (to AEL) return envelope. Surveys were sent to the full population for each coordinator group (11 institutional coordinators, 11 mentoring coordinators, 11 teacher work sample coordinators, and 12 mentoring coordinators). In April, e-mail reminders were sent to nonrespondents by the project director, asking that surveys be completed and returned to AEL as soon as possible. After several additional follow-ups, 100% response rates were achieved for each of these four groups (institutional, mentoring, assessment, and teacher work sample coordinators).

For the remaining three surveys (faculty, school/district personnel, and student teachers), the project director asked the institutional coordinator at each of the 11 institutions to select a convenience sample of 3 to 7 faculty members each from education and arts/sciences, to select a convenience sample of 3 to 7 school/district personnel, and to provide names for all of the student teachers who completed teacher work samples during the fall 2002 semester. Some universities submitted entire populations of school/district personnel and/or faculty members that were either more than or less than the requested convenience sample sizes. Because the samples were not drawn randomly from all of the institutions, subsequent findings reflect the perceptions of respondents but cannot be generalized to the entire populations of faculty members and

school/district personnel. Five of the institutions had more than 30 student teachers and the other 5 had fewer than 30; thus, this number became the sample size for those with more than 30 student teachers (one university did not provide any names).

The faculty and school/district personnel survey kits were mailed in early March 2003, and again included a paper survey, a cover letter from the project director, and a self-addressed (to AEL) return envelope. Because AEL staff did not have mailing addresses for the student teachers (some of whom had subsequently graduated), these survey kits were mailed in bulk to each institutional coordinator, along with a cover letter asking them to distribute the kits (either on campus or by mail). Follow-up packets were mailed in June, asking respondents to complete and return their surveys as soon as possible. (Again, the student teacher kits were mailed to the institutional coordinators for distribution.) However, because surveys were being returned anonymously, this meant that all survey recipients received a follow-up packet. The cover memo instructed recipients to disregard the follow-up kit if they had already returned their surveys.

The deadline for accepting returned surveys was July 2003. By that time, 36 of the 77 school/district personnel surveys were received, for a 47% response rate; 83 of the 130 faculty member surveys were received, for a 64% response rate; and 83 of the 213 student teacher surveys were received, for a 40% response rate. Several factors could have contributed to these low response rates. First, given delays in submission of names, these surveys were not distributed until March. Second, follow-ups were not approved until June, which was after the school semester concluded. And, third, many of the student teachers had already graduated and updated addresses could not be found.

As a measure of the internal consistency reliability of these surveys for this particular administration, Cronbach Alpha values were computed, resulting in coefficients of .62 for the mentoring coordinators, .76 for the assessment coordinators, .78 for the teacher work sample coordinators, .13 for the institutional coordinators, .72 for the faculty members, .89 for the school/district personnel, and .69 for the student teachers. The extremely low coefficient for the institutional coordinator scores may be the result of too few cases with a disproportionately large number of variables.

Data Analysis

Interviews. Written notes were transcribed into transcripts that were subsequently used to provide the narrative included in the findings section of this report. All transcripts were compiled for content analysis. Themes from the five broad questions were arranged under the seven topical headings of accountability systems, teacher work samples, mentoring, program improvement, partnerships, research, and networking; a final heading covered suggested recommendations for improving the project.

Document review. All 62 documents were reviewed in preparation for writing a qualitative summary discussing the progress of the project as described in the materials. Further, to add a quantitative measure, 10 representative documents were rated using a 10-item rating form. For this instrument, response frequencies, means, and standard deviations were generated.

Surveys. All survey data were hand-entered into SPSS databases. Quantitative analyses included frequencies for nominal and ordinal data, and frequencies and descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) for interval-level data. Qualitative analyses included coding of themes from open-ended items; these codes were then quantified by frequency. Narrative summaries for each survey are included in the findings section of this report.

FINDINGS

Document Review

Introduction

In all, 62 documents were submitted for evaluative review. These ranged from finished products (e.g., the originally submitted project proposal) to drafts of ongoing work (e.g., the draft manual for teacher work samples). A number of the documents were downloaded from the project Web site. Also, a number of sets of hard copies of presentation slides (PowerPoint) were submitted. For ease of using these documents, an inventory was created with nine categories or sections, which follows this introduction. The first section includes documents of general interest, including the proposal and three progress reports submitted to the U.S. Department of Education.

Following the general interest section, the next seven sections are arranged in order of the project objectives. For some objectives, there was fairly extensive documentation, while for others there was quite minimal information. Finally, the last section includes a narrative statement from each participating university that highlighted the work of that institution. For those documents for which a rating form was completed, an asterisk (*) has been added after the title. For additional documents considered within the comments section, a plus sign (+) has been added.

Of the 62 documents, 10 were selected for rating, using a form developed by AEL staff. The results of this activity are presented in Table 3. Seven items focused on the extent to which the documents described project progress; identified successes, problems, solutions, and recommendations for increasing efficiency and productivity; showed increases in student learning; and described development of exemplary practices. Each of these seven items was rated on a 5-point scale (1 = Not at all, 5 = To a great extent). Three items focused on the quality of the document (i.e., its comprehensiveness, organization, and presentation). Each of these three items was rated on a 5-point scale (1 = Very poor, 5 =Excellent). It is clear from inspection of the table that on five of the criteria in the Extent area, the average rating for 10 documents was greater than 3, the mid-point of the scale. It should be noted that on only one criterion was the rating well below the mid-point. That criterion related to the extent to which the document addressed “an increase in student learning in low-performing schools.” This area was not discussed in most of the documents that were reviewed. On the quality measures, the average rating on each criterion was equal to or greater than 3.5.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics for Document Review Rating Forms

Items	Response Options					Statistics	
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Std.Dev.
<i>Extent to which the document</i>							
- Describes progress on goals	1	1	2	4	1	3.33	1.22
- Identifies success factors	0	1	1	8	0	3.70	0.68
- Identifies problem areas	3	0	6	1	0	2.50	1.08
- Identifies possible solutions	0	0	2	8	0	3.80	0.42
- Identifies recommendations	1	0	2	5	2	3.70	1.16
- Shows student learning increases	7	1	0	1	0	1.44	1.01
- Describes exemplary practices	1	0	1	6	2	3.80	1.14
<i>Quality of the document</i>							
- Comprehensiveness	0	1	3	5	1	3.60	0.84
- Organization	1	0	3	5	1	3.50	1.08
- Presentation	0	1	3	6	0	3.50	0.71

Inventory of Documents Submitted

The documents submitted for review have been categorized using the nine section headings described above.

General Interest

1. Narrative for a Proposal: Improving Teacher Quality Through Partnerships That Connect Teacher Performance to Student Learning, by Western Kentucky University, July 8, 1999, 48 pages*
2. U.S. Department of Education Grant Performance Report covering 10/01/99 to 3/19/00
3. U.S. Department of Education Grant Performance Report covering 3/20/00 to 4/15/01*
4. U.S. Department of Education Grant Performance Report covering 4/16/01 to 5/31/02+
5. Renaissance Partnership Work Plan for Year 3, no date, no author
6. Draft (9/18/02) of Renaissance Partnership Work Plan for Year 4, no author
7. Hard copy of Web pages: <http://fp.uni.edu/itq/>, retrieved 9/6/02 and 9/9/02
8. Hard copy of Web pages: Project Overview (same address as above), retrieved 5/6/2002
9. Hard copy of presentation slides: Renaissance Partnership Program

10. Hard copy of presentation slides: Enhancing Teacher Quality—Title II State Grant: Teacher Performance Assessment Strand, presented by Roger Pankratz, November 2002*
11. Hard copy of presentation slides: The Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality: A Title II Partnership Grant, 1999-2004, presented by Roger Pankratz, no date+
12. Hard copy of presentation slides: Developing Standards-based Performance Assessment and Accountability Systems, presented by Roger Pankratz, no date+
13. Hard copy of presentation slides: Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality, presented by Roger Pankratz, no date
14. Proposal to AACTE Annual Meeting program committee to present a symposium at the 2003 annual meeting with related logistical correspondence
15. Meeting notes and follow-up correspondence related to meetings held January 15-18, 2002 and October 2, 2002*
16. Map showing the Renaissance Partnership institutions

Accountability Systems

1. Statement of project status related to Objective 1: Accountability/Data Management Systems
2. Rubric for An Institutional Accountability System*
3. Draft (6/3/02) of Manual for Collecting Credibility Evidence for Performance Assessments*
4. Hard copy of presentation slides: Use of Data to Inform Program Development and Improvement: Tools for Accountability Systems, presented by Roger Pankratz to Indiana Standards Board and Teacher Preparation Institutions, September 27, 2002
5. Hard copy of presentation slides: Enhancing the Capacity of the Data Management System (may be related to #5 above)
6. Hard copy of Web site (<http://fp.uni.edu/itq/DataManagement/DataManagement.htm>). Retrieved September 25, 2002, description of data management systems at partner institutions

Systematic Program Revision

1. Statement of project status related to Objectives 2b and 3b: Systematic program revision and improvement in quality of graduates

Teacher Work Samples

1. Statement of project status related to Objective 2: Teacher Work Samples
2. Hard copy of presentation slides: Using Teacher Work Samples in A Standards-based Teacher Preparation Program, presentation in Kansas City, MO, July 12-13, 2002
3. Hard copy of presentation slides: Teacher Work Sample at Longwood University
4. Hard copy of presentation slides: Establishing Credibility Evidence for Teacher Work Samples, presented by Stephanie Solzman
5. Hard copy of presentation slides: Using Teacher Work Samples in a Standards-based Teacher Preparation Program, July 12-13, 2002, presented at Emporia State University
6. The Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality: Teacher Work Sample: Performance Prompt; Teaching Process Standards, Scoring Rubrics. June 2002
7. The Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality: Teacher Work Sample Scoring Guide: Standards; Sources of Evidence; Assessment Indicators and Questions; Definition of Terms and General Considerations. June 2002*
8. Draft: A Classroom Assessment Primer, prepared by Nelson Maylone, June 2002*
9. Chart: Teacher Work Sample Benchmarks: June 2002
10. Feedback form: Discussion Questions About an Assessment Manual to Assist Teacher Candidates and Mentors in Developing High Performing Teacher Work Samples
11. Feedback compilation from workshop on Teacher Work Samples
12. Timeline “Ongoing Assessment Timeline (Tentative)”
13. Hard copy of presentation slides: Implementing Teacher Work Samples: A tool for assessing and improving teacher performance and becoming accountable for PK-12 student learning: A workshop for Oklahoma teacher educators, November 6, 2002
14. Hard copy of Web site document: Renaissance Teacher Work Samples (RTWS), retrieved from <http://fp.uni.edu/itq/RTWS/RTWS.htm>, September 25, 2002; this includes a work sample assignment that is identified as “copy 1/5/01”

Mentoring

1. Statement of project status related to Objective 3: Mentoring Teams
2. Hard copy of presentation slides: Team Mentoring and Teacher Work Samples: A Winning Combination for Shared Accountability
3. Hard copy of presentation slides: Team Mentoring at Millersville University
4. Notes: Emerging themes: Mentoring, November 2000
5. Management chart: Results of a survey on mentoring practices, challenges, and successes, dated before Autumn 2002
6. Notes from Mentor Coordinators Meeting, June 12, 2002
7. Agenda for Mentor Training, August 21 and 22, 2002, by Eastern Michigan University*
8. Outline for Mentoring Manual: A Guide for Coaching Teacher Candidates Through the Renaissance Teacher Work Sample
9. Hard copy of Web site document Team Mentoring, retrieved from
<http://fp.uni.edu/itq/TeamMentoring/Mentoring.htm>, September 25, 2002

Business Partners

1. Statement of project status related to Objective 4: Education Partnerships with Business
2. Hard copy of Web site document Business Partnerships, retrieved from
<http://fp.uni.edu/itq/BusinessPartnerships/business.htm>, September 25, 2002

Networking

1. Statement of project status related to Objective 5: Networking

Research

1. Statement of project status related to Objective 6: Research Programs (includes a schedule of dissemination activities)
2. Hard copy of Web site document Research and Dissemination: Investigations for Year 2, retrieved from <http://fp.uni.edu/itq/Research/Research.htm>, September 25, 2002

Participating Institutions

Individual member institutions submitted progress reports that were posted on the Web sites. Reports were downloaded for:

1. California State University-Fresno*
2. Eastern Michigan University+
3. Emporia State University+
4. Idaho State University+
5. Kentucky State University+
6. Longwood University+
7. Middle Tennessee State University+
8. Millersville University+
9. Southeast Missouri State University+
10. University of Northern Iowa+
11. Western Kentucky University+

Review of Specific Documents

General Interest

- *The progress reports* appeared to comprehensively discuss progress, problems, and solutions. However, much of the information was decontextualized and, therefore, difficult to interpret. For example, in the second progress report (March 20, 2000, to April 15, 2001), there was a discussion of the difficulty of recruiting professionals for mentoring teams. A table showed the numbers of teacher educators, arts and sciences faculty members, and school practitioners who were involved. The identified problem was recruitment of arts and sciences faculty. However, it was not possible to determine whether two arts and sciences faculty at California State University was a problem. There were only three teacher educators at this institution who were participating in the mentoring program. What was the difference between two and three? How big was the pool from which potential participants could be recruited? In fact, the ratio of arts faculty to education faculty overall was 3:4. At each institution except one, the ratio ran from about 2:3 to 4:5. Perhaps the problem was more imagined than real. Interestingly, the large participation by school people was not mentioned.

More troublesome, in terms of communication, was the reliance on specific non-specifics. That is, a number was given rather than identifying specific institutions that were experiencing success or lack thereof. It was reported in the same document that 10 institutions agreed to develop accountability systems. Then the report noted “7 of the 10 institutions report good progress on the development . . .” Two reported having some elements of the system but needing more help and 1 institution reported a fully developed system in operation. It was not clear which institutions were in these categories. Moreover, it was not clear if the same institutions were experiencing problems generally (which could indicate a lack of commitment) or if the problems were spread more or less evenly throughout the participants (which could indicate differing priorities for carrying out the work.) In any case, the solutions to the problem of building accountability systems may or may not have solved the identified problems.

Finally, it was mentioned that reliability and validity studies of the RTWS scoring have been produced. Unfortunately, these were not included in the documentation provided. Similarly, it was reported that five of the six sponsored research studies would be completed by fall 2002. None of these were included for review.

- A number of sets of *hard copies of PowerPoint presentations* were submitted. It was difficult to evaluate these because they were not intended to be the presentation but to support it and, of course, the presenter was not available. Nevertheless, the presentations tended to embody good characteristics of effective instruction. There was a slight tendency to present too much text on most of the slides and some of the print was quite small. It was not possible to know whether text lines came on the slides one by one (which would mitigate the criticism about too much text) nor how large the screen was (which would undercut the “too small” criticism). However, it was not always clear that viewers had a sense of an overview of what was to be presented. That is, for the most part, the presentations lacked much evidence of foreshadowing or of linking slides to one another. For example, one set showed the results of teacher education research (needs) and the results of a survey of new teachers about their degree of preparation to handle specific tasks/situations. The relationship between the content of these slides and what followed was not immediately clear. The PowerPoint set related to “Developing Standards-based Performance Assessment and Accountability Systems” did not demonstrate either of these problems. In addition, those sets that dealt with the project itself tended to be fairly straightforward and seemed to clearly describe a fairly complex project.
- The use of *e-mail to summarize meetings* seemed an especially felicitous practice. The author of the e-mail could re-cap the meeting soon after its occurrence and assign tasks to be completed, as well as provide additional information for the benefit of the recipients. This was a way to seek at least tacit agreement about what happened, without waiting for a formal minutes-type document. Especially in a highly collegial project, where all members were essentially independent and where everyone might not attend every meeting, this represented an attempt to effectively document progress.
- For each *objective, a template* that described progress was provided. This looked quite a lot like the corresponding section of the submitted progress reports. For the most part,

these were fairly comprehensive, in a score-keeping kind of way. That is, they described what had happened, indicated what needed to be done, but provided little analysis of why things were as they were.

Accountability Systems

- *Rubric for an Institutional Accountability System:* A rubric for self-study with four related standards was prepared. This seemed helpful both to set standards and to serve as a clarifier and as a prod for institutions to get on with the work proposed. Minor quibbles: On Standard 1, Above Standard was used to designate achievement of the standard task itself. See particularly the first, second, third, and fourth tasks. In Standard Two, this was not a problem, because the operational statement fragments were identified as “At Standard.” The last two tasks may have reflected the operational task at the Above Standard Level.
- *Manual for Collecting Credibility Evidence (Draft):* This document had a heavy tone. Admittedly, it was a draft and may have been polished in subsequent renditions. However, the writing was not especially friendly. An analysis of sentences randomly selected (one each from the first seven pages) revealed an average word count of about 24 words. In part, this was related to embedding lists as clauses, instead of relying on bullets or other typographic conventions to make the document easier to use. More important, however, was the lack of an overall structure. On page 2, four goals for conducting credibility studies were listed and the reader was told “Each of these goals will be addressed in the sections that follow.” But in fact, this did not happen. The first goal (alignment with standards) was discussed in the next section, but that led into a discussion of “acquainting the community with performance assessment guidelines,” which then led to “production and collection of performances.” And so on. Perhaps subsequent versions cleared up these problems.

Teacher Work Samples

- *A Classroom Assessment Primer (Draft):* This document relied heavily on two other sources. The document caused the reviewer to question why the sources on which it was based were not used in their original forms. The draft read well, provided good examples, and was efficient.
- *Hard copy of presentation slides: Implementing Teacher Work Samples (Oklahoma):* The slides did a good job of summarizing project history and introducing the conceptual framework for the development and use of teacher work samples. Especially helpful was the effort made to compare and contrast the Renaissance group’s work with similar work undertaken in Oklahoma, whose teachers were the target audience of this workshop. Similarly, the explanation of the Kentucky Scholastic Audit process and the alignment with the INTASC principles was helpful. There was also a good blend of quotations from teachers and student teachers and the more theoretical presentation.

- *Teacher Work Sample Scoring Guide:* This useful document generally presented one page per standard that provided much of the information that scorers would need: the standard, sources of evidence, indicators and guiding questions, definitions of terms and general considerations. This was a clear, comprehensive presentation of very complex ideas.

Mentoring

- *Agenda for Mentor Training:* This agenda is representative of many of the documents received that address this area. The agenda laid out an action-packed day and a half. This workshop had two huge goals: understanding the work sample and using mentoring strategies to influence student teachers. Was this too ambitious? The document clearly laid out what to do and how to do it. The concern was not the documentation, but the expectation.
- *An outline for a Mentoring Manual:* This two-page outline focused on how mentors support the aspiring teacher and was squarely directed toward development of the skills needed for completing the teacher work sample. There was some attention paid to processes of mentoring/conferencing, but the bulk of the emphasis was on helping the mentors learn to comment on the work samples. A one-page document (Emerging Themes) summarized results from interviews with mentor coordinators. This document made apparent some concern about the need to more closely align the mentoring component with the Work Sample component of the project. “Both tasks (i.e., forming mentoring teams/structures, training the teams, etc., and implementing the RTWS . . .) overlap considerably . . .”
- *Hard copies of mentoring workshop presentation slides:* Two sets of hard copies were reviewed. Again, the emphasis was on the role of the mentor in assisting with the development of teacher work samples. Very little attention was paid to mentoring processes and skills.

Participating Institutions

- *Institution-specific updates:* These were very helpful for getting a sense of each institution’s activity. They provided a means for synthesizing the objectives that were carefully developed by each institution. See Table 4 for a description of project updates covered in each institution’s newsletter.

Table 4: Description of Project Updates Covered in Institutional Newsletters

Institutions*	Accountability System	Teacher Work Sample	Mentoring	Business Partnerships	Networking	Research Projects	Curriculum Revisions
CSU-F	✓	✓	✓				
EMU	✓	✓	✓			✓	
ESU		✓	✓			✓	✓
ISU	✓	✓				✓	
KSU	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓
LU		✓					
MTSU	✓	✓	✓				
MU	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓
SMSU	✓	✓	✓				
UNI	✓	✓				✓	
WKU	✓	✓	✓			✓	

Key: CSU-F = California State University-Fresno; EMU = Eastern Michigan University; ESU = Emporia State University; ISU = Idaho State University; KSU = Kentucky State University; LU = Longwood University; MTSU = Middle Tennessee State University; MU = Millersville University; SMSU = Southeast Missouri State University; UNI = University of Northern Iowa; and WKU = Western Kentucky University.

Clearly, although the business partner's name may have appeared on the update, not one of the institutions discussed what they were doing with the partner. Similarly, there was virtually no mention of the relationship between the university and the cooperating school district. All of the institutions seemed heavily invested in the teacher work samples and mentoring objectives, with most also moving into accountability systems, while slightly more than half of the institutions (6 of 11) mentioned the research component of the project. Three of the institutions mentioned curriculum revision, while only one mentioned networking.

Summary

The documents submitted for review were chosen by the staff of the project and, therefore, were presumed to be representative of the types of work that had been done. Overall, the documents addressed general project administration and coordination and specific work that was undertaken for each of the project objectives. The documents indicated that the bulk of the work during the first three years focused on the teacher work samples and the mentoring objectives. To a lesser extent, there was attention paid to developing accountability systems. While research and university curriculum revision were mentioned frequently, little documentary evidence of these activities was submitted for review. Therefore, it was not possible to comment on these activities or the documentation that might have been generated. It was clear, however, that most of the institutions spent time and effort working on their own curricula to better align them with the goals and objectives of this project.

The paucity of research documentation pertaining to the project was a little surprising, in view of the fact that the research projects were scheduled for completion in the autumn of 2002; however, there were no draft reports submitted. Documentary evidence of the dissemination

activities (workshops, conference presentations, and meetings), on the other hand, was submitted in abundance. While there were assertions that courses were revised, there was no documentary evidence of the nature or extent of those revisions. Finally, the business partnerships generated no documentation.

The documentation provided gave little evidence of the relationship between teacher education and improved learning PK-12. While such a relationship was asserted in several documents, there was no evidence of improved student achievement, although there were some assertions that a percentage of education students performed better on the teacher work samples. There was also no evidence that teacher education graduates performed better with low-income students or students at risk of academic failure. Perhaps it was too early to tell, although apparently some of the students have graduated. In any event, no documentation of improved PK-12 outcomes was provided.

With respect to the quality of the documents, PowerPoint presentations were the most prevalent documentation that has been provided. The slides were clear, attractive, and comprehensive. Similarly, the management correspondence and the Web site provided high-quality documentation of the work of the project. One of the peculiarities of this project is that the work was carried out by co-equal partners who had a limited ability to require completion of tasks by their partner(s). Perhaps for this reason, there was no attention to which institution was not doing a particular task, nor was there much documentation of involvement on various tasks. The accountability systems were a good example of this problem—while the leader institutions were singled out for praise, the trailing institutions were not publicly identified.

Interviews

On October 2-3, 2002, in Washington, DC, 37 interviews were conducted with key groups and individuals involved with the Title II Renaissance Partnership Project for Improving Teacher Quality. Presidents, provosts, institutional coordinators, deans, program directors, and assessment coordinators were interviewed individually, in pairs, or in small groups.

Interviewees were asked about their institution's participation in the Title II Renaissance Partnership Project's objectives. Objectives discussed were accountability systems, teacher work samples, mentoring teams, program improvements, partnerships, networking, and research program. Questions centered around progress made on each objective, supporting and inhibiting factors, and lessons learned from working on the objective. Interviewees were also asked if they had recommendations for future work on the objectives.

In most cases, the interviewees/participants were knowledgeable about the specifics of their institution's progress in meeting the objectives of the project. While most of the participants saw their institution's progress as positive, several mentioned feeling overwhelmed due to time constraints and lack of buy-in from the whole faculty. When asked to identify factors that helped their institution meet the project goals, participants mentioned the Renaissance Project leadership. Participants stated that Roger Pankratz was terrific to work with, effective, and efficient. One participant said Pankratz showed real leadership and strength. Other supportive factors included faculty commitment from the very beginning, collaboration among the institutions, and strong support from leadership.

Participants were asked to indicate what factors had delayed or halted their institution's progress. Participants mentioned general factors such as the need for additional funding, lack of knowledge about setting up large databases, faculty turnover, and faculty resistance. Within some of the objectives, participants mentioned institution-specific factors that delayed progress.

The institutions participating in this project are separate organizations with goals, traditions, and relationships formed over time to help the institutions carry out their individual missions. While the institutions share a broad mission—preparing teachers for K-12 schools—each goes about this task in somewhat different ways. Therefore, finding ways to collaborate on this project presented a major challenge. While, each institution picked up those aspects of the project that seemed to offer a benefit (short- or long-term), the presidents, deans, and directors of teacher education most likely had different definitions of what the Renaissance Project should do and how it fit into a larger scheme of improvement. If one institution, for internal political reasons, chose not to advance a particular objective, there was little the consortium as a whole could do. On the other hand, these institutions share a belief in the value of the Renaissance Project and their common goal creates a network of shared work; however, there is a willingness to suspend judgment about not making progress precisely because of the realization that different institutions have different priorities.

The remainder of this section of the report provides a summary of the interviews, arranged by the seven objectives. A brief capsule summary is provided in italics at the end of each objective. The section concludes with participants' recommendations for future work.

Accountability Systems

One of the institutional problems the Renaissance Project was designed to overcome was the lack of an efficient and effective system for establishing institutional accountability for student outcomes. Many institutions of higher education have developed very sophisticated, computer-based systems for managing business functions but have made only modest progress on developing parallel systems to track programmatic outcomes. One objective of the Renaissance Project was to assist the participating institutions in developing such systems. Two different kinds of issues confronted the participating institutions: (1) identifying/building appropriate computer systems, and (2) identifying appropriate measures of student outcomes or achievement for which the institutions could be held accountable.

Several participants mentioned databases that were being developed to collect data for tracking students over time. One participant noted that his/her institution has created a task force to develop a large database from which to draw five years' of information about what teachers do on the job. Others noted that the Renaissance Project helped institutions look at qualitative and quantitative ways of measuring student performance and student learning, and at the standards to be attained by exiting students. Some participants were not sure what accountability systems were in place. Others said they were hiring people for this position or had just begun to establish an accountability system.

Participants saw the database as a key tool to indicate what teachers do well and what areas can be improved. One participant said it was exciting to realize that a student could be tracked through the teacher preparation program and into a career, and that having this information would inform the school about how to restructure or adjust its programs. Another added that the institution could ask the relevant questions and gather the appropriate data to determine how well a student was prepared to deal with teaching and learning in the classroom.

Three participants stated they had visited other institutions to learn about data storage systems that might be models for their institutions. Others said the accountability task fit well with the NCATE accreditation process and thus has been a driving force. One participant stated that a corporate sponsor set up the institution's database and that the partnership provided important support for their accountability system. Others mentioned hiring additional staff to help meet their goals. Money was always an issue. While the grant provided some funding, especially for travel and development, there was not a lot of money available for "big ticket" items, such as computer systems (hardware and software), to manage the institutional accountability objective. Participants mentioned lack of adequate funds as the cause of greatest delay with the accountability system. They cannot obtain adequate database systems and the staff to manage those systems without additional funding. One participant said concentrating on standardized and traditional tests has delayed progress on all reform efforts, including the

Renaissance Project. Another participant said they were still uncertain about what questions they want to be able to answer.

It seems difficult, then, to generalize about progress on this objective. Each of the cooperating institutions began the project at a different developmental point. Moreover, some institutions have probably given more priority to this objective than have others, perhaps because it fit into an existing priority for a given IHE. It can be said that all of the persons interviewed saw this objective as important, not only for the project overall, but for their particular institution. While there has been some cross-institution sharing, there does not seem to be a consensus about which elements of student performance will yield useful data, nor does there seem to be consensus about how best to solve the computer issues. In many case, interviewees stated that funding to support continued development and the personnel to manage the systems are not adequate.

Teacher Work Samples (TWS)

Several of the objectives of the Renaissance Project spoke to the core mission of teacher training institutions: developing teacher work samples, developing mentoring programs, and redesigning courses to improve programs. Unlike the development of accountability systems, these objectives align closely and naturally with the professional interests, responsibilities, and experiences of people working on the Renaissance Project at each institution.

Objectives that speak to professional interest, that do not cost a lot of money, and that are seen as improving the delivery of services were well supported and have seen important progress for the most part. The example *par excellence* was the teacher work sample (TWS). The people engaged on this objective are clearly interested in the work, understand its complexity, yet feel that they can accomplish the task, and believe that it will bring about major improvements in the services that they deliver. Not surprisingly, more progress has been made on development of this objective than on any other objective.

Participants were very positive about the progress and benefits of the TWS at their institutions. One participant noted that faculty and student buy-in has occurred with TWS. One institution did a pilot test with seven students who implemented TWS, which allowed them to expose gaps in the program and allowed for more feedback and mentoring than would be available otherwise. Other participants described the TWS as moving ahead of the other goals of the project.

Participants mentioned most often that TWS created open communication among students, faculty, and cooperating teachers. One participant said TWS involvement was leading to increased trust and discussion of technical terms associated with the product, which enhanced the ability to create definitions of rubrics. Another participant added that TWS provided the ability for students to look at their own work. The TWS process provided students the opportunity to be reflective about their learning and its meaning for growth.

Collaboration with other institutions was mentioned as the biggest factor leading to success with TWS. Participants stated that being a part of this national project increases credibility and allows them to get things done at their institution. One participant said hiring professional facilitators for staff development helped increase the effectiveness of the TWS. Another participant commented that what was learned was fed immediately back into the program. One institution has redone components of the curriculum as a result of TWS involvement. Others added that the TWS model and its application to teaching have begun to be the core theme of their program and eventually will become a national model. One participant said the sound TWS methodology has had a big impact on the program.

One common delay with TWS for the institutions was time. Participants said TWS were very time consuming and labor intensive. One participant said the many demands on faculty to stay focused cause each work project to be delayed. Another difficulty has been establishing reliability across the TWS raters. One participant noted that institutions of higher education were expected to establish a TWS project, but were not provided professional development. At least some faculty were not interested in professional development or in TWS. Another participant mentioned that it was a challenge to balance local contextual factors with institutional standards.

The progress on the development of teacher work samples has been generally very good across the participating institutions. Progress at individual institutions has been shared throughout the project, simultaneously reinforcing the sense of accomplishment and sustaining the development activities at each site.

Mentoring

Development of mentoring programs, especially the training components, was progressing well at some institutions. Again, many teacher educators have a high level of professional interest in mentoring, and people who accepted responsibility for this aspect of the Renaissance Project were confident that they could be successful. Some institutions have reached the point of refining the mentoring system, while other institutions were proceeding at a slower pace. The slower buy-in at some institutions and some parts of institutions (notably schools of arts and sciences) probably reflected the impediment represented by a limited interest in the art of teaching as a self-contained goal. In addition, of course, there were institutional impediments (i.e., calculating how work as mentors would be counted as faculty load).

One participant said the Renaissance Project has brought about changes in expectations of student teachers; they can learn new leadership roles as they take the initiative to work with multiple mentoring teachers. Another participant added that establishing a mentoring center might be a significantly better arrangement than trying to coordinate individuals in various locations in mentoring relationships.

Overall, participants saw mentoring teams as a valuable tool for the project. Students could work with an individual mentor or they could have multiple mentors. Several participants mentioned that mentoring teams were not as far along as their particular institutions would like.

One institution developed a mentoring board and coordinated weekly colloquia to discuss TWS with students, reinforcing mentoring as a process that supports the development of the skills needed to build successful TWS. It also created a mentoring center that provided a physical location and a set schedule where students could interact with faculty individually. Development of the mentoring center helped to create a more logically manageable and effective program. One participant said they have teamed up administrators and department chairs with mentors and this has helped them all to better understand the complexities of a mentoring program.

Delays with mentoring teams included electronic communication problems between mentors and students, teachers and students dealing with the value-added data and their impact, and going to scale with mentoring teams with large student populations. One participant added that postsecondary programs had a particularly difficult time with mentoring programs.

The development of the mentoring programs, then, created some stresses for some institutions. While most of the people interviewed supported the notion of mentoring, they recognized the inherent difficulties of providing services to large numbers of students, given that there were relatively few faculty (either in colleges of arts and sciences or in schools of education) to support the students. Creative solutions to some of the other logistical problems were found and mentoring remained an important objective of the project.

Program Improvement

The third area of Renaissance Project work that directly spoke to the mission of enhancing teacher education was related to program improvements. One participant said the Renaissance Project made participating institutions feel more like they were on the cutting edge. The smaller institutions felt as if they were a part of a larger enterprise. One participant added that the TWS helped to show components of the curriculum that needed to be revised and helped to improve the entire program.

Program changes and improvements occurred frequently based on the work in all seven objective areas. One participant noted that TWS and mentoring teams created the quickest and most observable changes. Several participants mentioned the curriculum being revised in the undergraduate program. Another added that, at his/her institution, the masters degree remained the same, but led to more National Board Certified teachers. No additional comments were made in this area regarding delays in meeting project goals. Participants said they learned that changing course in operations could be a very positive experience and that many small changes could make a very positive difference in the larger teacher-preparation program.

In summary, then, there was good progress on the teacher work samples. Staff involved with this were enthusiastic about the work, saw real value in the efforts that have been expended, and view the TWS as a real contribution to the preparation of future teachers. Similarly, for those who worked on them, the mentoring programs provided a real service to students and to staff. Enthusiasm for the mentoring programs was somewhat dampened by problems of financial commitment, faculty buy-in, and scheduling, but overall, these programs were seen as moving ahead. Several participants saw a linkage between the TWS and program improvement

activities. The development of the TWS illuminated skills that the extant program was not providing to students but that were needed.

Partnerships

In the original proposal of the Renaissance Project, it was posited that each institution would develop a working relationship with at least one business in its geographic area. This objective was probably the least well developed at the time of the interviews. In some cases, the attention turned from partnerships with businesses to partnerships with elementary/secondary schools and/or to partnerships among collaborating Renaissance Project institutions. While this was an interesting adaptation (and probably a good thing), the project originally was intended to develop these partnerships with businesses.

Participants saw business partnerships as a potentially strong, but absent, aspect of the project. Participants were unclear on how to utilize the business partnerships. The partners were identified, but the partnerships were not implemented. Participants said the role of businesses must be defined better. Businesses needed to know what was expected of them. Several participants mentioned partnerships between the institutions and PK-12 schools. These partnerships were bringing together schools and higher education in new ways to form strong and close working relationships.

Participants saw the partnerships among the institutions as the most resourceful in meeting goals; partnerships with businesses were not mentioned as helpful in terms of meeting project goals. This objective (developing business partnerships) may have been viewed as independent of the other objectives and, therefore, failure to make progress did not threaten progress on the other objectives. However, at least one institution reported getting help from a business partner to develop its accountability system.

Participants reported that delays with business partners were due to not defining the role of the business partner. One participant said they had a business partner but they did not know what to do with it. Another added the institution had found a fit with the business partner and the college of education. Another participant was not sure how the business partnership added significant value to the Renaissance Project.

This objective appeared to have relatively little importance to most institutions. It was not clear why the objective dealing with institution/business interface was proposed. If working more closely with business was the answer, what was the question? Neither businesses nor institutions seemed to have any clear goal in mind. The businesses were reluctant to simply provide money to be spent as the institutions chose, and the institutions seemed unable to either identify tasks whose success depended on business involvement or to understand how this kind of collaboration could advance the mission of the institution.

Research

Most of the participating institutions of higher education have historically devoted more attention to teaching and service than to research. While research was always seen as important, most of the energy went to preparing students to teach in schools. Thus, some participants probably did not see this objective of the Renaissance Project as closely aligned to their core mission.

In interviews, it was clear that participants saw the value of such research, although the research program was not fully implemented at all of the institutions. One participant said data gathering and writing triggered curiosity, in faculty and students, to look at the disposition of prospective teachers and current teachers. Another participant added that the Renaissance Project involvement drove faculty to take different roles to advance research efforts with students, faculty colleagues, and other networked institutions. Most institutions reported just getting started on the research program. One institution was working on a longitudinal study and others were making conference presentations. Another institution progressed further in the research program, working on a book and articles. Other participants said they did not know or did not have an established research program at their institutions. One participant stated that networking was a major key to staying on the cutting edge of research and what is relevant in teacher preparation.

Participants thought the research program would be helpful if it could provide valid and reliable data that would encourage faculty to buy into the project. One participant said that students and faculty working together with common objectives helped to increase the quantity and quality of the research program. Some participants noted the opportunity for presenting at national conferences. Other institutions had not established specific research programs.

Some progress was made on this objective by some institutions. Finding connections between the impact of the other objectives, notably on the TWS and mentoring, and this objective could lead to further development of the research agenda across the various campuses. Moreover, the research objective could offer opportunities to spread participation in—and thereby knowledge of and support for—the Renaissance Project to areas of the institutions that have not yet actively participated.

Networking

Efforts to build networks and to communicate among the partner institutions have been strengths of this project. In part, this resulted from an adequate budget for travel, allowing representatives from the institutions to meet twice annually. Thus, individuals had an opportunity to develop relationships, develop feelings of responsibility toward one another, and to share successes and problems. While the impact on the people who actually participated in these meetings was probably strong, it is unlikely that the impact was very widespread. Presumably, those attending the meetings had institutional responsibility for ensuring that the tasks called for in the contracts were carried out. Moreover, they probably had a more profound

emotional attachment to the work. Finally, they valued the opportunity to meet with others from around the nation to talk about work important to them. Similarly, the support of travel to national conferences, along with the prestige of presentation, reinforced both the feelings of pleasure and importance that attended working on this project.

Participants saw networking among the institutions as a very helpful factor in meeting project goals. One participant said each institution was learning from the others (i.e., identifying similarities and what could be adopted or adapted from the other institutions). Another said networking led to more effective problem solving. Participants also saw networking with school systems through providing leadership as helpful in meeting the goals of the Renaissance Project. One participant said teacher educators have a much richer learning experience and can offer a richer learning experience to their students when they are part of a network of institutions that communicate regularly and share new and relevant ideas about teacher preparation components.

Participants viewed networking as a very supportive, effective, critical component of the project. Several participants mentioned that the Renaissance Project's Web site was a useful communication tool. One participant also noted that the Renaissance Project brought higher education institutions together, not just among the project participants, but also across the country. Another participant added that networking led to the creation of a 12-minute DVD, which describes the partnership project efforts.

Participants valued the networking opportunities provided by participation in the Renaissance Project. In some cases, the value grew from the prestige of being involved in a national program; in other cases, the value derived from opportunities to meet and work with like-minded colleagues in other institutions. The networking opportunities may have represented an important professional reward for persons who accepted additional work and responsibility.

Interviewee Recommendations

Participants were asked what recommendations they would suggest to improve the effectiveness or impact of the Title II Renaissance Partnership Project. Comments included expanding the Renaissance Project to include other institutions, requiring institutional responsibility to integrate strengths of the project, using funds for appropriate and effective tools to increase student learning, and placing a strong emphasis on dissemination and public relations about the effects of the Renaissance Project.

Accountability systems. Participants suggested reaching out to other institutions to learn and share information that would improve their accountability systems. One participant suggested seeking input from all faculty and providing expert training to staff about how to make use of the data. Another participant recommended developing and analyzing questions that needed answers as a guide to what data to gather and enter. One participant believed authentic assessment must be an integral part of the accountability system to give evidence of academic progress.

Teacher work samples (TWS). Participants mentioned several suggestions for improving TWS. None of the participants said to discontinue the TWS, but instead noted that the TWS should be a standard for the institutions. One participant said it was important to “stay the course” and to be aware that TWS might take four to five years to implement properly and bring about effective change. Another participant suggested that the institutions take learnings and immediately feed the information back into the program. One participant said it was important to get faculty and cooperating teachers’ buy-in to the concept and use of the TWS.

Mentoring teams. Two participants stated that it was essential for the mentoring teams to remain with the program. One participant said it might be necessary for the department head to take the initiative to set up a system to get the students and mentors together. Another participant suggested making the mentoring part of the teacher work samples component, and that all faculty and students may need to be working on the same content area. Other suggestions included advising that older students be matched with younger students, providing stipends for arts and sciences mentors to enhance the likelihood of good participation, having a mentoring team of three teachers for each student (college of education, arts and sciences, and the K-12 cooperating teacher), and having a master teacher in the mentoring center who has knowledge of TWS and good classroom practices.

Program improvements. One participant suggested that the program initiatives be extended (beyond the piloting stages) to others of the 700 students in the institution’s college of education. Another participant said the Renaissance Project initiatives have shown that rather than massive reorganization, minor adjustments could have enormous impact on program details.

Partnerships. One participant said instead of trying to work with business partnerships, institutions might fare better with political/legislative partners. Other participants suggested sharing the Renaissance work with the partners and getting the businesses to support the continuation of the Renaissance meetings. One participant recommended that networking and new communication avenues be promoted so that the business community and others would know whom to contact. It would appear that, for this objective to become meaningful, a clearer definition of the benefits to and responsibilities of both businesses and participating institutions should be articulated.

Research. Participants suggested sharing more information about each institution’s research program. One participant said all institutions could learn from the others about how to deal with pre- and post-treatment data. Another potential audience for project-related research might be faculty at the participating institutions.

Networking. Participants suggested a need for more understanding among one another about how to work together for mutual benefit. One participant added that the Web site could be improved and that it needed clarity for specific user groups. Participants suggested promoting and increasing the use of the Web site to improve the effectiveness of the program. One participant recommended providing leadership to other institutions and school systems, and bringing other institutions on board (e.g., technical colleges and institutions across the state and beyond).

Surveys

Assessment Coordinators

All 12 assessment coordinators returned their completed surveys (one of the institutions has 2 assessment coordinators), for a 100% response rate. Two respondents (17%) indicated they had not worked on a data management system, 2 (17%) indicated they had only identified the data to be collected, and 2 (17%) indicated they had a system for collecting and analyzing data but had not yet progressed to implementation. Therefore, the following results are based on the 4 respondents (33%) who indicated they regularly collect and analyze identified data and the 2 (17%) who indicated they not only collect and analyze data but also provide feedback to teacher candidates and mentors.

When asked to indicate which of four items were included in their data management system, all six of the assessment coordinators (100%) selected initial entry data, matriculation data, and student teaching data. Three respondents (50%) also selected post-graduation data, and described it as primarily survey data (employer, alumni, new teacher, and graduate program). Further, five assessment coordinators (83%) reported that they had piloted or field-tested the data management system. Most indicated that pilot testing occurred on individual parts of the system with selected groups rather than a comprehensive pilot or field test of the entire system. The majority of respondents (83%) reported that professional standards or guidelines were followed during the development of their data management systems. Three of the five (60%) specifically mentioned NCATE standards; the other two referred more broadly to professional and state standards or state and accreditation guidelines. Other specific responses included Virginia standards of learning, SPA standards, College of Education standards, human services conceptual framework, program evaluation standards, Kentucky new teaching standards, and program priorities/objectives.

When asked how many teacher candidates they enrolled in their institutions yearly, five of the six coordinators (83%) provided responses. These figures included 186, 650, 1,200, 2,000, and 3,000, resulting in a mean of 1,407 and a standard deviation of 1,118. When asked to indicate for what percentage of that enrollment the data management system was operational (from collecting data through feedback), three (50%) selected 76% - 100%, and one each (17%) selected 51% - 75%, 1% - 25%, and 0%.

The six respondents were then asked to select from 10 options all of the individuals who regularly received teacher candidate information through the data management system. Responses included dean of the College of Education (67%), mentoring team members (17%), cooperating teachers in the schools (17%), institutional coordinator, (67%), assessment coordinator (67%), teacher work sample coordinator (50%), mentoring coordinator (33%), teacher candidate (33%), faculty member (67%), and other (50%). The descriptions for those other individuals included a data coordinator, department chairs, state and national accreditation teams, and the director of institutional research.

When asked to rate the overall effectiveness of their data management systems, 67% of the respondents indicated they were somewhat effective. Seventeen percent each indicated their data management systems were very effective or somewhat ineffective.

Three of the six respondents (50%) indicated their systems included follow-up data on beginning teachers during their first year of teaching. Those three respondents then indicated how many teacher candidates graduate yearly from their institution. Responses included 180, 250, and 400, with a mean of 277 and a standard deviation of 112. Respondents were then asked for what percentage of the graduates the data management system provided such follow-up data. Sixty-seven percent selected 26% - 50%, the remainder selected 51% - 75%. Finally, respondents were asked to select from eight options all measures that the data management system included for graduate follow up. At least two of the three respondents (67%) selected seven of the eight options, as shown below. For the other measures, descriptions included “program standards and state teaching standards” and “retention in teaching profession, specific skills such as classroom management, assessment.”

Ability to facilitate learning of all students	100%
Accountability for the learning of all students	33%
Ability to evaluate teaching processes	67%
Ability to evaluate learning processes	67%
Skill in reflecting on the teaching/learning process	67%
Ability to focus on standards-based instruction	100%
Knowledge of state and local content standards	67%
Other	67%

Mentoring Coordinators

All 11 of the mentoring coordinators returned their completed surveys, for a 100% response rate. Coordinators were first asked to select from eight options all of the factors that serve as compensation for faculty members and participating school personnel involved in mentoring. Extra compensation for school personnel was most often noted by 73% of the coordinators, followed by extra compensation for faculty members (46%). Released time for faculty and built into faculty were the next most frequently mentioned methods of compensation, with 36% each. Less than 20% selected other (18%), special recognition (9%), in-kind benefits (9%), or special facilities for mentoring (0%).

When asked to indicate from four options all measures that had been taken for maintaining quality control for mentoring at their institution, the majority most often selected development of a common scoring rubric for the teacher work sample (82%). About half selected mandatory professional development for mentors (46%) or other (55%); only 9% selected reliability checks between two or more mentoring teams. Descriptions of other measures included training and professional development, monitoring of the work sample process, benchmarking, feedback surveys, and discussions at program meetings.

Mentoring coordinators were then asked to indicate the percentage of teacher candidates at their institutions who had either a mentor or a mentoring team. More than half (56%) of the respondents indicated that 76% - 100% of their teacher candidates had a mentor, followed by 22% each selecting 26% - 50% and 1% - 25%. For mentoring teams, almost half (44%) selected 1% - 25%, a third (33%) selected 76% - 100%, and 11% each selected 26% - 50% and 51% - 75%.

When asked to describe the composition of a typical mentoring team, about a third each (36%) chose a staff member from the College of Education and a cooperating teacher or a staff member from the College of Education, the College of Arts and Sciences, and a cooperating teacher. Eighteen percent selected other and 9% indicated the team was composed only of a staff member from the College of Education. For the two respondents who provided alternative compositions, one indicated the team was composed of a university supervisor, a cooperating teacher, and the mentoring coordinator. The other respondent said some mentoring occurred during classes with the individual instructors and that during student teaching their primary mentor was their university supervisor.

In terms of the frequency of meetings by mentors or mentoring teams, 27% of the respondents selected either once or twice a month and 9% said weekly. Of the 36% who indicated some other frequency, those responses included daily, as needed, by e-mail and phone, and that a mentoring center was available two to four times a month. When asked what format those meetings took, 54% of the respondents said sometimes individually and sometimes in groups, 27% said some other format, and 18% said meetings took place individually. Descriptions of the other formats included individually and with other students in groups of less than five, individually with secondary candidates or with other students in groups with elementary candidates, and by instructors in large or small groups or individually.

Mentoring coordinators were then asked to select from five options all tasks with which mentors or mentoring teams provided assistance. Designing standards-based units of instruction and assessing student learning were each selected by 91% of the respondents. Eighty-two percent selected preparing work sample teaching exhibits and 73% selected teaching units of instruction. Only 18% indicated some other type of task; the sole description focused on computing gain scores, analyzing reflection statements, and thinking about teaching/learning strategies to include if lessons were re-taught.

Nearly half of the respondents (46%) indicated that feedback by mentors or mentoring teams provided considerable value for improving teaching. About a fourth each (27%) selected some value for improving teaching or great value for improving teaching.

Teacher Work Sample Coordinators

All 11 of the teacher work sample coordinators returned their completed surveys, for a 100% response rate. Coordinators were first asked indicate the present status of the "Performance Prompt, Teaching Process Standards, and Scoring Rubrics for the Teacher Work

Sample" product. Almost three fourths (73%) indicated the product was being used as is, another 27% said the product had been modified and was now ready to use.

Teacher work sample coordinators were then asked to indicate the number of teacher candidates at their institutions with whom the prompt and scoring rubric were implemented in the fall of 2002. For elementary school-level candidates, numbers ranged from 0 to 70, with a mean of 33 and a standard deviation of 27. For middle school-level candidates, numbers ranged from 0 to 20, with a mean and standard deviation of 8. For high school-level candidates, numbers ranged from 0 to 52, with a mean of 18 and a standard deviation of 21.

When asked to indicate what percentage of teacher candidates attained a score of 3 or 17 or more of the 32 indicators on the scoring rubric, 9 of the 11 respondents selected one of the percentage options. More than half (56%) selected 51% - 75%. This was followed by 76% - 100% (22%), 26% - 50% (11%), and 0% (11%). The remaining two respondents indicated they used different scoring rubrics or scales.

College of Education faculty were noted most frequently as scoring the teacher work samples, by 54% of the respondents. Eighteen percent of the coordinators selected cooperating teacher; 9% each selected mentoring team members, work sample coordinator, or independent observer. Of the 27% who indicated some other person, descriptions included project teachers and faculty trained in St. Louis, professional block II faculty, and that they did not implement the work samples in the fall of 2002. More than half (54%) indicated that those using the scoring rubric underwent periodic reliability checks by independently scoring the work samples. Of those, two respondents said once a year, one said twice a year, and one said "1 of 10 scorers." Of those indicating there were no reliability checks, three respondents indicated they were in the process of setting up such a system and one said they did "intensive pre-scoring training and inter-rater reliability."

When asked how effective they found the teacher work samples compared to prior preparation of student teachers, 64% of the work sample coordinators indicated it was much more effective. Another 27% said it was somewhat more effective, and 9% felt it was less effective.

Respondents were then asked to rate the preparation level of most student teachers (80% or more) with whom they had worked on completing the work samples on 11 separate skills. Ten of the 11 coordinators provided these ratings, using a scale of 1 (beginning) to 4 (expert); the remaining coordinator did not have access to this information. These results are shown in Table 5. In addition to the data provided in Table 5, inspection of the mean ratings per item found the lowest was 2.10 for planning for student differences, constructing tests, and analyzing student learning (standard deviations of 0.57, 0.32, and 0.57, respectively); the highest was 3.10 for specifying learning goals (standard deviation of 0.32).

Table 5: Ratings for 11 Skills by Teacher Work Sample Coordinators

Skills	Beginning	Developing	Proficient	Expert
Specifying learning goals	--	--	90%	10%
Assessing contextual factors	--	40%	50%	10%
Designing instruction	--	--	100%	--
Planning for student differences	10%	70%	20%	--
Constructing tests	--	90%	10%	--
Administering assessment	--	30%	70%	--
Analyzing student learning	10%	70%	20%	--
Providing prompt feedback	--	40%	60%	--
Self-evaluation and reflection	10%	60%	30%	--
Mastery of subject matter	--	30%	70%	--
Classroom management	11%	22%	67%	--

N = 10 for all items except classroom management, which has an *N* of 9.

When asked to what degree they believed the teaching standards were being met, 10 of the 11 coordinators responded. Seventy percent indicated that most candidates were meeting all standards and 30% indicated most candidates were meeting a subset of standards but that few candidates met all standards. Seventy-three percent of the 11 coordinators indicated that teacher candidates were prepared to meet the teaching standards as a regular part of their course work. Nine percent indicated this preparation took place in separate training sessions and 18% indicated some other method. One respondent said it depended on the group; the other noted as a regular part of course work, in separate training sessions, and individually as needed.

The next item on the teacher work sample coordinator survey appeared to be confusing to respondents. It asked how many of each of three groups (arts and science faculty members, teacher educators, and school practitioners) were trained to assist with teacher work samples. Six of the 11 coordinators provided actual numbers, the remaining 5 responded by checking the appropriate group(s). For the 6 who provided numbers for arts and science faculty members, 33% said 15 and 17% each said 35, 30, 5, and 2 (mean of 17, median of 15, and standard deviation of 13). For teacher educators, 17% said 8, 16, 20, 25, 30, and 100 (mean of 33, median of 22, and standard deviation of 34). For school practitioners, 17% each said 6, 26, 40, 50, 250, and 500 (mean of 145, median of 45, and standard deviation of 195). For the 5 respondents who checked the appropriate groups, 4 checked each of the three groups and 1 selected only the teacher educator group.

When asked the most common method for training the three groups (arts and science faculty members, teacher educators, and school practitioners), responses were fairly evenly split among half-day training sessions (27%), one-day training sessions (27%), two- or three-day training sessions (18%), and some other method (27%). Descriptions of these other methods included a three-hour training session, in a methods course, and a two-hour training session with individual support/conferences with coordinators.

Finally, teacher work sample coordinators were asked to indicate how many courses had been revised at their institutions as a result of implementing the teacher work sample methodology. Nine of the 11 coordinators responded. Twenty-two percent each indicated 3 or 6 courses had been revised. Eleven percent each indicated that 2, 5, 9, 14, or 50 courses had undergone revision (mean of 11, median of 6, and standard deviation of 15).

Institutional Coordinators

All 11 of the institutional coordinators returned their completed surveys, for a 100% response rate. This survey was the most extensive, with 34 items grouped within the seven topical categories of assessment, teacher work samples, mentoring, networking, business partnerships, research, and course revisions.

Assessment. Respondents were first asked to identify the status of their data management system for teacher candidate performance. More than half (54%) indicated they only had identified the data to be collected and 18% indicated they had a system for collecting and analyzing data but had not yet implemented it. Nine percent said they regularly collected and analyzed identified data and 18% said not only did they collect and analyze data but also provided feedback to candidates/mentors. The remaining assessment items are based on the responses of the three coordinators (27%) who reported current implementation of their management systems. When asked to select from a list of four options all items included in their data management systems, all three respondents (100%) selected each of the items, which included initial data entry, matriculation data, student teaching data, and post-graduation data. Descriptions for post-graduation data included employer surveys, new teacher surveys, graduate programs surveys, and teacher work samples.

These three respondents were then asked to indicate the percentages of teacher candidates for whom their data management systems were operational. Two coordinators (67%) selected 76% - 100%, the remaining coordinator selected 51% - 75%. Coordinators were then asked to select from nine options all people who regularly received teacher candidate information through the data management systems. All three coordinators (100%) selected dean of the college of education, institutional coordinator, and assessment coordinator; other percentages are shown below. Descriptions of other individuals included associate dean, state and accreditation teams, and director of institutional research.

Dean of the College of Education	100%
Mentoring team members	33%
Cooperating teachers in the schools	0%
Institutional coordinator	100%
Assessment coordinator	100%
Teacher work sample coordinator	67%
Mentoring coordinator	67%
Teacher candidate	33%
Other	67%

Two of the coordinators (67%) indicated their data management systems included follow-up data on beginning teachers during their first year of teaching. Of those two, one indicated there were 250 teacher candidate graduates per year, the other indicated 400. Both respondents indicated that their data management systems included follow-up data during the first year of teaching for 26% - 50% of those teacher graduates.

When asked to select from eight options all measures for graduate follow-up included in their data management systems, both institutional coordinators responded, as shown below. The sole description for some other measure was “Performance according to program (state) teachers standards.”

Ability to facilitate learning of all students	100%
Accountability for the learning of all students	50%
Ability to evaluate teaching processes	50%
Ability to evaluate learning processes	50%
Skill in reflecting on the teaching/learning process	50%
Ability to focus on standards-based instruction	100%
Knowledge of state and local content standards	50%
Other	50%

Teacher work samples. This part of the survey analysis again included all 11 institutional coordinators. Coordinators were asked to indicate the present status of the “Performance Prompt, Teaching Process Standards, and Scoring Rubrics for the Teacher Work Sample” product. More than half (54%) indicated the product was being used as is, the remaining 46% said the product had been modified and was now ready to use.

When asked to indicate what percentage of teacher candidates attained a score of 3 on 17 or more of the 32 indicators on the scoring rubric, 9 of the 11 respondents selected one of the percentage options. More than half (56%) selected 51% - 75%. This was followed by 26% - 50% (33%), and 76% - 100% (11%).

College of Education faculty were noted most frequently as scoring the teacher work samples, by 82% of the respondents. Nearly half each (46%) selected teacher work sample coordinator or some other individual. Respondents next selected cooperating teacher (27%), followed by teacher candidate’s mentoring team members as a team (18%) and independent observer specially trained for the scoring (18%). Of those indicating some other individual scored the teacher work samples, descriptions included graduate assistants, teachers in residence, college supervisors for student teachers, mentoring coordinators, assessment coordinators, trained professionals, project teachers, university students, and teaching supervisors.

Half (50%) indicated that those using the scoring rubric underwent periodic reliability checks by independent scoring of the work samples. Of those, descriptions of how often these checks took place included during the fall semester, formally on an annual basis, more frequently on an informal basis, once a semester for the pilot group, and once a year. Of those indicating there were no reliability checks, three respondents indicated they were in the process of setting up such a system and two indicated they were doing inter-rater reliability studies.

When asked how effective they found the teacher work samples compared to prior preparation of student teachers, 10 of the institutional coordinators responded by indicating it was much more effective; the remaining coordinator did not respond to this item.

Respondents were then asked to rate the preparation level of most student teachers (80% or more) with whom they had worked on completing the work samples on 11 separate skills. Six of the 11 coordinators provided these ratings, using a scale of 1 (beginning) to 4 (expert). Four coordinators indicated they did not have access to this information and 1 coordinator did not respond to this item. The results for the 6 respondents are shown in Table 6. In addition to the data in Table 6, inspection of the mean ratings per item found the lowest was 2.17 for providing prompt feedback (standard deviation of 0.75) and the highest was 3.33 for specifying learning goals (standard deviation of 0.52).

Table 6: Ratings for 11 Skills by Institutional Coordinators

Skills	Beginning	Developing	Proficient	Expert
Specifying learning goals	--	--	67%	33%
Assessing contextual factors	--	17%	83%	10%
Designing instruction	--	--	83%	17%
Planning for student differences	--	67%	33%	--
Constructing tests	--	50%	50%	--
Administering assessment	--	33%	67%	--
Analyzing student learning	--	50%	50%	--
Providing prompt feedback	17%	50%	33%	--
Self-evaluation and reflection	--	33%	67%	--
Mastery of subject matter	--	--	100%	--
Classroom management	--	50%	50%	--

When asked to what degree they believed the teaching standards were being met, 10 of the 11 coordinators responded. Sixty percent indicated most candidates were meeting a subset of standards but that few candidates met all standards, and 40% indicated that most candidates were meeting all standards.

Mentoring. Institutional coordinators were asked to indicate from eight options all factors that served as compensation for faculty and school personnel for their involvement with the mentoring component. Extra compensation for faculty or participating school personnel was most often selected, at 82% each. Nearly half (46%) selected “built into faculty load,” followed by released time for faculty (27%) and special recognition for tenure and/or promotion (18%). Nine percent each selected in-kind benefits and some other compensation; none of the coordinators selected special facilities for mentoring. The sole respondent who selected other compensation noted that faculty members received professional development money and public school faculty members received stipends.

When asked to indicate from four options all measures that had been taken for maintaining quality control for mentoring at their institution, the majority most often selected

development of a common scoring rubric for the teacher work samples (82%). About half selected mandatory professional development for mentors (54%). Thirty-six percent selected reliability checks between two or more mentoring teams; only 27% selected some other measure. Descriptions of other measures included surveys of instructors and supervisors meeting to discuss implementation issues; one coordinator responded with “don’t know.”

Institutional coordinators were then asked to indicate the percentages of teacher candidates at their institutions who had either a mentor or a mentoring team. Half (50%) of the respondents indicated that 76% - 100% of their teacher candidates had a mentor, followed by 38% selecting 1% - 25% and 12% selecting 51% - 75%. For mentoring teams, 46% selected 76% - 100%, 36% selected 1% - 25%, and 9% each selected 26% - 50% and 51% - 75%.

When asked to describe the composition of a typical mentoring team, more than half (64%) selected a cooperating teacher or a staff member from the College of Education, the College of Arts and Sciences, and a cooperating teacher. Twenty-seven percent selected a staff member from the College of Education and a cooperating teacher. Nine percent selected some other composition; this respondent indicated a staff member from the College of Education, a cooperating teacher, a graduate assistant or teacher in residence, and the college supervisor for student teaching candidates.

In terms of the frequency of meetings by mentors or mentoring teams, more than half of the institutional coordinators (54%) selected the “other” option, 18% each selected once or twice a month, and 9% selected less than once a month. Of the six respondents who indicated some other frequency, five noted such frequencies were as needed and the sixth said informally.

Coordinators were then asked to select from five options all tasks with which mentors or mentoring teams provided assistance. Eighty-two percent selected designing standards-based units of instruction, 73% selected assessing student learning, 64% selected teaching units of instruction, 46% selected preparing work sample teaching exhibits, and 18% selected other. One of these two respondents described the other task as analysis of student work; the other responded with “don’t know.”

Seventy percent of the respondents indicated that feedback by mentors or mentoring teams provided considerable value for improving teaching. Twenty percent felt it was of great value and 10% described it as having some value for improving teaching.

Networking. Institutional coordinators were asked to select from five options all that described their involvement with project networking. Almost all respondents (91%) selected networking with faculty at their respective institutions and 64% selected networking with individuals at other project institutions. Fifty-four percent each selected networking with teacher candidates or school practitioners; none of the respondents indicated there was no networking involvement. Further, 10 of the 11 coordinators responded when asked if they believed their networking would increase, decrease, or remain the same if the project continued. Half (50%) said it would remain the same, 40% said it would increase, and 10% said it would decrease.

Coordinators were then asked to select from 11 options all the ways in which they found the project Web site to be useful. More than half of the respondents selected obtaining information about the project (73%), downloading training materials (64%), downloading teacher work sample exemplars (64%), and keeping up-to-date with project events (64%); none of the respondents selected four of the available options, as shown below.

Obtaining information about various aspects of the project	73%
Downloading training materials	64%
Downloading teacher work sample exemplars	64%
Keeping up-to-date with the status of project events	64%
Staying in touch with faculty at my institution	0%
Contacting teacher candidates	0%
Staying in touch with school practitioners involved in the project	0%
Staying in touch with faculty at other project institutions	46%
Obtaining information about teacher candidate performance	27%
I do not use the Web site	9%
Other	0%

When asked what they would like to see added to the project Web site, three institutional coordinators provided comments. One said “no suggestions,” another said “the ability to upload to our pages in the site,” and the third said “more opportunities to actually have Web discussions.”

Business partnerships. When asked to describe the status of their institution’s business partnership, 10 of the 11 coordinators responded. Forty percent each said a partner had not yet been contacted or that a partner had been contacted but that no progress had been made. Ten percent said a partner had come aboard and been involved in some initial activities; another 10% said the partner was an operational member of the partnership.

In describing the nature of their business partner, 36% selected industry, 18% said retail operation, and 46% said some other industry. Descriptions of other industries included insurance companies, chamber of commerce, and telecommunications. When asked to describe an active business partner’s role, four institutional coordinators responded. Roles included advisory, consultative, and advocacy for project and teacher preparation; one respondent noted the partner was not active. When asked whether their business partners had made long-term commitments to the partnerships, 46% were not sure, 36% said yes, and 18% said no.

Research. Institutional coordinators were asked to select from six options all types of research in which they had been involved (either conducted or participated in). Nearly all of the coordinators indicated they had been involved in survey research (82%) and research of a ethnographic/descriptive/observational nature (64%). Less common were quasi-experimental (27%), correlational (27%), or experimental studies (18%). Only 9% (one respondent) indicated no involvement in any research efforts. Descriptions of research activities included the following:

- Using TWS as a measure of effectiveness; using a TWS template to add rigor to the clinical case study; impact of teaching on learning
- Comparison of TWS in PDS and non-PDS
- Phone interviews of assessment coordinators and student teachers; case studies of TQ student teachers into first years
- Reliability and validity studies
- Relationships among teacher candidate variables and prediction of performance on TWS
- Field experience level work sample - control group; phone interviews with faculty and student teachers; analysis of work sample score

Of the 10 coordinators who indicated some type of research involvement, 30% indicated their institutions were working with all 11 project institutions, 30% indicated they were working with more than one other institution, and another 30% indicated their institutions were working independently. The remaining 10% indicated working with only one other project institution.

Coordinators were then asked to select from nine options all individuals involved in conducting project-related research at their institutions. More than half of the respondents selected assessment coordinators (90%), institutional coordinators (80%), mentoring coordinators (70%), and teacher work sample coordinators (60%). Forty percent each selected college of education faculty or school practitioners. Twenty percent each selected college of arts and science faculty or teacher candidates. Ten percent (one respondent) selected other and said it was the college assessment committee.

Course revisions. Institutional coordinators were asked how many courses were revised as a result of implementing the teacher work sample methodology. This question was interpreted differently by respondents. Nine of the respondents provided actual numbers, which included 3, 5, 5, 5-6, 7, 8-10, 16, 20, and 30. One respondent said “50% within the teacher education program”; the remaining respondent said “several, but because of total curriculum alignment with standards in addition to theme of TWSM.”

Finally, coordinators were asked to describe any course revisions that were planned or implemented as a result of implementing the teacher work sample methodology. Ten of the coordinators provided comments, as shown in Table 7.

Table 7: Descriptions of Course Revisions as Described by Institutional Coordinators

- Development of a new (and required) course in “Assessment Practices”; current curriculum courses changed to include work sample components; emphasis is placed on an increasing number of components as the students progress through their program.
- Training for factors of TWS; format to fit TWS; added some content and skills.
- Student teaching—as of W 03 all 700+ student teachers do EMU adaptation of Renaissance TWS; assessment course and curriculum and methods course changed to include pre-assessment and analysis of student learning.
- Methods courses use TWS processes as critical performances; most certification areas of 5-12 and PK-12 have made changes to reflect TWS requirements.
- Components of TWS (e.g., contextual analysis and assessment plan) have been incorporated into appropriate courses (e.g., behavior management and assessment) in order to better prepare candidates for the TWS requirement in their Partnership semester.
- Complete internal redesign of EDU 309; complete redesign of student teaching; changes in EDU 204, 201, 301.
- Methods courses in elementary, early childhood, special education, and foundations have been revised to include work samples.
- Student teaching (initial and final) require a TWS; more emphasis on designing, conducting, and analyzing assessment; more emphasis on implications of student characteristics on design on instruction; more reflection; much more reliance on data.
- Integrating components of the TWS model in methods courses is one example of course revisions that have been implemented.
- Technology; diverse learners; level 1, 2, 3 field experience; student teaching seminar; classroom measurement; methods courses at all levels and content areas.

District/School Personnel Survey

Out of 77 district/school personnel surveys distributed, 36 completed surveys were received, for a 47% response rate. Respondents were first asked to rate, for 11 specific skills, the preparation level of most teachers (80% or more) with whom they had worked on teacher work samples. Rating options included 1 (beginning), 2 (developing), 3 (proficient), and 4 (expert). See Table 8 for these ratings. In addition to the data in Table 8, inspection of the mean ratings

per item found the lowest was 2.33 for planning for student differences (standard deviation of 0.76) and the highest was 3.00 for mastery of subject matter (standard deviation of 0.59).

Table 8: Ratings for 11 Skills by District/School Personnel

Skills	Beginning	Developing	Proficient	Expert
Specifying learning goals	3%	22%	67%	8%
Assessing contextual factors	3%	31%	56%	11%
Designing instruction	--	31%	61%	8%
Planning for student differences	11%	50%	33%	6%
Constructing tests	3%	44%	36%	17%
Administering assessment	3%	28%	58%	11%
Analyzing student learning	--	47%	44%	8%
Providing prompt feedback	3%	36%	53%	8%
Self-evaluation and reflection	6%	31%	53%	11%
Mastery of subject matter	--	17%	67%	17%
Classroom management	--	58%	33%	8%

When asked to what degree the seven teaching standards as a whole are being met, the majority (72%) reported that most candidates meet all standards, 19% reported most candidates meet a subset of standards but that few meet all, and 8% reported that all candidates meet all standards. When asked about the comprehensiveness of the teacher-candidate information they received, more than half (53%) reported receiving comprehensive information, 33% reported receiving partial information, and 14% reported not receiving any such information. Of those indicating they received at least partial information, the majority (63%) felt it was generally timely and useful. An additional 23% felt it was timely but of little use, and 13% felt it was of some use but often late.

Respondents were then asked to indicate the numbers of teacher candidates they had supervised who had conducted the teaching unit required of the teacher work sample. Responses ranged from 1 to 8, with a mean of 3.4 (standard deviation of 2.0). Next, respondents were to indicate the numbers of teacher candidates who successfully implemented or addressed each of seven specific components. For each component, responses ranged from 1 to 8; see below for means and standard deviations per component.

Component	Mean	Std. Dev
Contextual factors	3.21	1.98
Learning goals	3.18	1.91
Assessment	3.15	1.92
Design for instruction	3.24	1.95
Instructional decision-making	3.15	1.99
Analysis of student learning	3.25	2.06
Reflection and self-evaluation	3.28	2.05

When asked to describe the importance of the seven-process framework for successfully preparing teacher candidates for teaching, the majority (61%) reported it was very important. Twenty-five percent selected important and 14% chose somewhat important.

Respondents were then asked to describe the major strengths of the teacher work sample methodology. Of the 36 district/school personnel, 35 provided one or more strengths, for a total of 51. Of those, 33% focused on the teacher work sample methodology being a model for effective teaching (i.e., one respondent noted it creates a “total package” of instruction). Eighteen percent of the comments were idiosyncratic in nature, 14% focused on enhanced reflection, 12% on the methodology as an assessment tool, 8% on alignment with standards, 6% each on the specific focus and relationship-building aspects of the methodology, and 4% on the emphasis on improving the thinking process. See Table 9 for a summary of these categories, with representative comments.

Respondents were then asked to describe the major weaknesses of the teacher work sample methodology. Of the 36 district/school personnel, 34 provided one or more weaknesses, for a total of 41. Of those, 37% focused on the time-consuming nature of the methodology. Other weaknesses included inadequate preparation/support (18%), idiosyncratic comments (15%), methodology seems overwhelming to students (12%), and lack of communication among involved stakeholders (10%); 5% indicated no weaknesses. See Table 10 for a summary of comments, with representative comments.

When asked if they mentored any student teachers in conjunction with the teacher work sample, more than half of the district/school personnel (58%) responded positively and therefore completed the remaining four items. Respondents indicated they mentored anywhere from 1 to 10 student teachers, with a mean of 3 and a standard deviation of 2. Nearly all (81%) reported they mentored these student teachers individually, only 19% reported they mentored as part of a team.

When asked to select from six options how they most often met with student teachers, nearly two thirds (62%) indicated they met individually with each student teacher. Almost a fourth (24%) said they met both individually and in a group setting, and 5% reported meeting in a group of less than five. Ten percent reported some other type of arrangements; these two respondents described such meetings as e-mail or meeting individually, in a group of five or more, and as a guest speaker for a teacher work sample question-and-answer panel.

Finally, respondents were asked how often they met with student teachers. Nearly half (48%) selected daily, 24% selected weekly, 10% selected once a month, 5% each selected twice a month or less than once a month. Ten percent indicated some other frequency; these two respondents indicated these meetings took place as needed/as questions arose or some daily/some weekly.

Table 9: Major Strengths of Teacher Work Sample
Methodology as Described by District/School Personnel

Number of respondents = 35; number of discrete comments = 51

Category	Frequency	Percentage	Representative Comments
Model for effective teaching	17	33%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The TWS helps the student teacher get an “overall” picture of working in the classroom setting. - The program is very thorough and is designed as a step-by-step process.
Other	9	18%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I feel my interns have really felt like they made a very positive difference in children’s learning due to their efforts. The results are awesome. - Evaluating and assisting with the work sample has made me a better teacher. I can see that it sets a high standard for beginning teachers.
Reflection	7	14%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The methodology is very comprehensive and conducive to reflection insight. - It gives the student experience and an opportunity to look back and reflect on what did or did not work and ways to improve.
Assessment tool	6	12%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assessment based instruction—gives a clearer idea of what is to be accomplished and why. - Analyzing pre & post and having that information drive your planning and lessons.
Alignment with standards	4	8%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prepare them for our current district evaluation system. - Prepares them for our new evaluation process in our district—all encompassing.
Focus	3	6%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - One of the strengths is that the students focus on their target group and collect work samples. - Gives student teachers a specific focus and direction.
Relationship building	3	6%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Work place readiness—awareness of the entire school community. - Becoming familiar with the entire school community.
Improves thinking process	2	4%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It requires students to think about and plan instruction. - Develops a good thinking pattern.

*Percents do not always equal 100 due to rounding.

Table 10: Major Weaknesses of Teacher Work Sample Methodology as Described by District/School Personnel

Number of respondents = 34; number of discrete comments = 41

Category	Frequency	Percentage	Representative Comments
Time consuming	15	37%	-To be successful it takes a great deal of time to complete the teacher work sample. -It is very time consuming. Some interns have not done a project of this length and difficulty.
Inadequate preparation/support	9	18%	-Unless they are led through it step by step the first semester, they are lost. -Not all components are taught in the college classes taken by the student teacher.
Other	6	15%	-The evaluation is somewhat subjective. -As the classroom teacher, I would like to be more a part of the entire process.
Overwhelming to students	5	12%	-The student teachers seem to be overwhelmed. -A certain element of stress it puts on the student teachers.
Lack of communication	4	10%	-The major weakness I see is not enough communication between the University, classroom teacher and student teacher. -There is little communication between the cooperating teacher and the supervisory teacher about the finished product.
No weaknesses	2	5%	-I see none. -I thought it was good so I'm not sure of a specific here.

*Percents do not always equal 100 due to rounding.

Faculty

Out of 130 faculty surveys distributed at the 11 participating IHEs, 83 completed surveys were received, for a 64% response rate. When asked if they had received training to prepare them for either mentoring or the teacher work sample, 63% indicated they had received mentoring training and 93% indicated they had received training on the teacher work sample. More than 90% indicated they believed the teacher work sample was either somewhat more effective (45%) or much more effective (46%) than preparation of student teachers prior to their involvement in the project.

Respondents were then asked to rate, for 11 specific skills, the preparation levels of most teachers (80% or more) with whom they had worked on teacher work samples. Rating options included 1 (beginning), 2 (developing), 3 (proficient), and 4 (expert). See Table 11 for these

ratings. In addition to the data provided in Table 11, inspection of the mean ratings per item found the lowest was 2.24 for planning for student differences (standard deviation of 0.62) and the highest was 2.79 for specifying learning goals and mastery of subject matter (standard deviations of 0.60 and 0.63).

Table 11: Ratings for 11 Skills by Faculty Members

Skills	Beginning	Developing	Proficient	Expert
Specifying learning goals (<i>n</i> =72)	--	31%	60%	10%
Assessing contextual factors (<i>n</i> =71)	1%	34%	56%	8%
Designing instruction (<i>n</i> =71)	1%	25%	69%	4%
Planning for student differences (<i>n</i> =71)	8%	61%	30%	1%
Constructing tests (<i>n</i> =72)	8%	50%	39%	3%
Administering assessment (<i>n</i> =71)	4%	45%	45%	6%
Analyzing student learning (<i>n</i> =71)	6%	48%	44%	3%
Providing prompt feedback (<i>n</i> =69)	1%	29%	67%	3%
Self-evaluation and reflection (<i>n</i> =71)	3%	41%	49%	7%
Mastery of subject matter (<i>n</i> =72)	1%	28%	61%	10%
Classroom management (<i>n</i> =70)	4%	54%	41%	--

When asked to what degree they believed the seven teaching standards as a whole were being met by student teachers they worked with, more than half (58%) reported that most candidates met all standards. More than a third (38%) reported that most candidates met a subset of standards but that few met all. Three percent reported that some candidates met some of the standards but that few met all and only 1% reported that all candidates met all standards. Almost half of the respondents (48%) rated the seven-process framework as very important for successfully preparing student teachers for teaching. A third rated it as important, 15% as somewhat important, 1% as unimportant, and 2% as very unimportant.

Respondents were then asked to describe the major strengths of the teacher work sample methodology. Of the 83 faculty respondents, 77 provided one or more strengths, for a total of 130. Of those, 25% focused on the teacher work sample methodology as an assessment tool, 15% on the methodology as a model for effective teaching, 15% on idiosyncratic comments, 12% on the focus on contextual factors, 12% on the methodology as a planning tool, 11% on enhanced reflection, 5% on the thinking process, and 4% on alignment with standards. See Table 12 for a summary of these categories, with representative comments.

Respondents were then asked to describe the major weaknesses of the teacher work sample methodology. Of the 83 faculty respondents, 76 provided one or more weaknesses, for a total of 112. Of those, 31% focused on the time-consuming nature of the methodology. Other weaknesses included incomplete coverage of teaching preparation (18%), methodology seems overwhelming to students (16%), idiosyncratic comments (14%), complex terminology (6%), viewed as an “add-on” assignment (5%), and too rigid (4%); 5% indicated no weaknesses. See Table 13 for a summary of comments, with representative comments.

Table 12: Major Strengths of Teacher Work Sample
Methodology as Described by Faculty Members

Number of respondents = 77; number of discrete comments = 130

Category	Frequency	Percentage	Representative Comments
Assessment tool	33	25%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Focus on assessment plan as integral to designing instruction. - The process illustrates how important assessment is both prior to teaching a unit and after.
Model for effective teaching	20	15%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It prepares student teachers to be more effective in the classroom. - Presents explicit instruction in effective teaching processes.
Other	20	15%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - They follow and make an assertive effort to address each of the 7 processes. - It allows subject area specialists to help with student teachers so that corrections can be made to actual content.
Focus on contextual factors	16	12%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Students assess contextual factors when designing instruction. - Focus on contextual information and application of this throughout unit of instruction.
Planning tool	15	12%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Captures the continuum of planning. - Combination of all the planning skills.
Reflection	14	11%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The quality of student reflection increased significantly. - Fosters reflectivity.
Improves thinking process	7	5%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forces students to think systematically. - Ideally it improves the thinking process a teacher goes through when planning, teaching, and assessing.
Alignment with standards	5	4%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Students align course outcomes with national, state, and local standards. - Aligns well with state standards.

*Percents do not always equal 100 due to rounding.

Table 13: Major Weaknesses of Teacher Work Sample
Methodology as Described by Faculty Members

Number of respondents = 76; number of discrete comments = 112

Category	Frequency	Percentage	Representative comments
Too time consuming	35	31%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It takes a lot of the student's time in proportion to the end product. - The time required to complete [the] TWS limits attention to other areas of teaching, especially classroom management.
Non-standards based	20	18%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is only one part of teacher preparation (i.e., says nothing about management, teacher-student relationships, professional dispositions, professional writing, etc.). - All instances and standards are not covered.
Overwhelming to students	18	16%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Over loads some students who need to really spend time getting teaching mechanics mastered. - Overwhelming because of such new requirements and way of thinking.
Other	16	14%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Few students consider the fact that they could have constructed a flawed test. - Inconsistency in expectations and scoring within department.
Terminology	7	6%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Terminology is often too complex for beginning teachers. - I feel that the language of the TWS is sometimes confusing and hard for teacher candidates to understand.
Buy-in	6	5%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are still some who view the methodology as an additional assignment rather than a way to approach effective teaching and learning. - The TWS, as it is, is not embedded into our curriculum and has become one more add-on assignment.
No weaknesses or I don't know	6	5%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I don't see a weakness. - Unsure at this time.
Too rigid	4	4%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tends to be too behaviorist/directed instruction. - Can be too rigidly applied.

*Percents do not always equal 100 due to rounding.

When asked for their perceptions of the operational status of their data management systems for teacher candidates, nearly half (48%) reported they were not aware of a data management system. More than a fourth (26%) reported their systems provided some useful information but were only partially operational, 6% reported the systems were operational but not providing information in a useful manner, 9% reported the systems were fully operational for some but not all candidates, and 10% reported the systems were fully operational for all teacher candidates with timely information.

Faculty members were asked to indicate from six options all types of research in which they had been involved concerning teacher candidates. Nearly half (44%) reported they had not been involved in any research activities. Another 43% reported involvement with survey research; 34% with ethnographic, descriptive, or observational research; 21% with correlational studies; 13% with quasi-experimental studies, and 10% with experimental research. Twenty-nine faculty members provided one or more descriptions of their research activities, resulting in 40 descriptions. Nearly half of the descriptions (48%) were idiosyncratic, such as “writing mentoring and assessment manual” and “ongoing right now.” More than a third of the research descriptions (35%) denoted descriptive, comparative, or correlational studies. Other descriptions focused on survey research (8%), interviews (5%), and observations (5%).

Of those individuals who had been involved in research concerning teacher candidates, more than half (56%) reported that their institutions were working with all 11 project institutions. Twenty-two percent reported working with more than one project institution, 8% reported working with one other project institution, and 14% reported their institutions were working independently. When asked to select from nine options all individuals involved in their institution’s project-related research, at least half selected assessment coordinator (55%), teacher work sample coordinator (50%), and college of education faculty (52%). Twenty-nine percent selected institutional coordinator, 24% selected mentoring coordinator, 14% selected college of arts and science faculty, 12% each selected school practitioners or teacher candidates, and 7% selected some other individual. Descriptions of these others included data coordinator, program coordinator, and don’t know.

When asked to describe the status of an assessment coordinator at their institutions, 35% of the respondents said this coordinator provided partial information about teacher candidates and 28% said the assessment coordinator provided comprehensive information about teacher candidates. A fourth (25%) reported having such coordinators but were unsure of their role and 12% said their institutions did not have assessment coordinators. Of those respondents with assessment coordinators at their institutions, 69% indicated that the information provided by these coordinators was generally timely and useful, 17% indicated the information was of some use but often late, 8% indicated it was often late and of little use, and 6% indicated it was timely but of little use. Further, nearly half (47%) reported that the assessment coordinators provided data for the research project(s) being conducted in connection with the project; an additional 43% did not know, and 10% responded negatively.

When asked if they were aware of any course changes implemented as a result of the teacher quality project, 84% responded affirmatively. Nearly two thirds (61%) reported mentoring student teachers in conjunction with the teacher work sample activity. The number of

student teachers mentored ranged from 1 to 40, with a mean of 12 and a standard deviation of 10. About two thirds (63%) reported mentoring these student teachers on their own; 37% reported mentoring as part of a team.

Faculty members were asked to select from six options the mode of meeting with student teachers. Nearly half (45%) reported they sometimes met individually and sometimes as a group. Thirty-five percent reported meeting with each student teacher individually, 12% reported meeting with student teachers in groups of five or more, and 8% reported some other method. Descriptions of these other methods included a combination of classes and individually, via the Internet, via e-mail, and "methods students only." When asked how often they met with student teachers, a third selected twice a month and 22% selected weekly. Other responses included once a month (16%), some other frequency (14%), less than once a month (10%), daily (2%), and never (2%). Descriptions of other frequencies included as needed, daily, once in person and then as needed with e-mail and phone, and by e-mail.

Student Teachers

Out of 213 student teacher surveys distributed, 83 completed and usable surveys were received, for a 40% response rate. Respondents were first asked what grade level(s) they taught in the fall of 2002. More than 80% (82%) selected elementary, 15% selected middle/junior high, and 21% selected high school. When asked what unit(s) they taught, more than half of the respondents selected science (64%), social studies (56%), language arts (54%), and mathematics (54%). Forty-five percent selected English, 29% other, and 26% history. Other unit descriptions included health/physical education (28%), music/art (24%), reading (16%), Spanish (12%), business (8%), science (4%), special education (4%), and technology (4%).

When asked to indicate from five options all types of data collected concerning their performance during their student teaching, the majority selected observations of my teaching performance (99%) and evaluations of my lessons plans (95%). Fewer selected scores on published tests (39%), scores on tests in subject areas (31%), and scores of tests on pedagogical knowledge (28%).

Student teachers were asked to indicate from seven options anyone who had been involved in designing their teacher work sample. All respondents indicated they had been involved, 58% cooperating teacher, and 46% selected college of education staff member. Other responses included teacher work sample coordinator (27%), mentors (15%), other individuals (12%), and college of education and arts and science staff (8%). Descriptions of other individuals included peers, master teachers, student teaching advisor or supervisor, university supervisor or professor, and a school teacher.

When asked to select from six options all sources of evidence that their teaching performance directly affected student performance, 95% selected scores on pre/post assessment. This was followed by hand-in assignments (78%), student participation in classroom discussion (71%), scores on subject matter tests (69%), scores on scoring rubrics (68%), and student group projects (55%).

Student teachers were then asked to rate the adequacy of training received for seven teaching processes. For each factor, the most frequent response was very adequate. See Table 14 for a complete summary. In addition to the frequency data provided in Table 14, inspection of the mean ratings per process, the lowest was 3.31 for assessment (standard deviation of 0.88) and the highest was 3.61 for self-evaluation and reflection (standard deviation of 0.71).

Respondents were then to select all of the seven teaching processes that were included in their teacher work samples. All of the student teachers selected contextual factors, learning goals, design for instruction, instructional decision making, analysis of student learning, and self-evaluation and reflection; 99% selected assessment. Responses were mixed, though generally positive, when student teachers were asked to rate the importance of the seven-process framework for successfully preparing them for teaching. Twenty-nine percent each rated it as either very important or somewhat important; 28% rated it as important. Eight percent rated it as somewhat unimportant, 2% rated it as unimportant, and 4% rated it as very unimportant.

Table 14: Adequacy Ratings of Teaching Processes as Described by Student Teachers

Factor	Not at all Adequate	Somewhat Inadequate	Somewhat Adequate	Very Adequate
Contextual factors	2%	10%	29%	60%
Learning goals	4%	8%	24%	64%
Assessment	6%	10%	32%	52%
Design for instruction	2%	12%	24%	62%
Instructional decision making	4%	10%	34%	52%
Analysis of student learning	4%	12%	29%	56%
Self-evaluation and reflection	2%	6%	20%	71%

Respondents were asked to describe the major strengths of the teacher work sample methodology. Of the 85 student teachers, 80 provided one or more strengths, for a total of 145. Of those, 26% focused on the teacher work sample methodology as an assessment tool, 17% on enhanced reflection, 13% on planning, 12% on contextual factors, 11% on idiosyncratic comments, 6% on creating units, 5% on organization, 5% on its impact on future teaching, 3% on the seven-process framework, and 2% on design for instruction. See Table 15 for a summary of these categories, with representative comments.

Respondents were then asked to describe the major weaknesses of the teacher work sample methodology. Of the 85 student teachers, 79 provided one or more weaknesses, for a total of 108. Of those, 25% focused on the time-consuming nature of the methodology and 15% each were labeled as confusing or overwhelming. Another 15% of the comments were idiosyncratic in nature; additional categories included unrealistic (11%), repetitious (5%), inadequate representation of student work (3%), contextual factors (2%), and mentors (2%). Six percent of the comments denoted some positive aspect of the methodology. See Table 16 for a summary of these categories, with representative comments.

Table 15: Major Strengths of Teacher Work Sample
Methodology as Described by Student Teachers

Number of Respondents = 80; number of discrete comments = 145

Category	Frequency	Percentage	Representative Comments
Assessment	38	26%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Learning the importance of pre/post assessment. - How to accurately evaluate learning while meeting the learning goals and state standards.
Reflection	25	17%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Offers teachers the ability to look at the bigger picture and the effects of their teaching. - Valuable documentation of how my teaching affected my students learning.
Planning	19	13%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The TWS really makes you pre-plan for teaching. - Planning for instruction, accurate and well developed lesson plans.
Contextual factors	18	12%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The contextual factors were valuable in helping to recognize the students in my classroom. - Contextual factors were important because it really varies how you teach students according to demographics.
Miscellaneous	16	11%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Variety of teaching ideas. - The support I received from my mentoring team was great.
Creating units	9	6%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It allows students to see the thought process that is involved in creating a unit. - How to use a unit or theme to educate students in several subject areas.
Organization	8	5%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The major strength of the TWS is the way it is formatted. - It let me know step by step what I needed to do and how I would be graded.
Impact on future teaching	7	5%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I think it prepares you to actually have a class and be on your own as a teacher. - Prepares teacher candidate for what lies ahead.
Seven-process framework	5	3%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The teacher work sample allowed me to thoroughly think about the seven teaching processes and how they affect student learning. - Following the seven-process framework results in a well-planned unit that promotes student learning.
Design for instruction	3	2%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design for instruction. - The design for instruction section.

*Percents do not always equal 100 due to rounding.

Table 16: Major Weaknesses of Teacher Work Sample
Methodology as Described by Student Teachers

Number of respondents: 79; number of discrete comments=108

Category	Frequency	Percentage	Representative Comments
Time consuming	28	25%	- The TWS is time consuming. - It took up a lot of my time from student teaching.
Confusing	16	15%	- It is very confusing in the beginning. - It was hard to know what was expected of the assignment from the directions.
Overwhelming	16	15%	- It was hard to fit everything in. - We had too much other work to do also.
Miscellaneous	16	15%	- It is not an accurate measure of assessing a teacher. - The project was difficult to adapt to a music classroom.
Unrealistic	12	11%	- Doesn't accurately convey all teaching strategies. - It's impossible time wise to go into so much detail.
Positive comments	7	6%	- It's worth it in the end. - I don't feel there were weaknesses.
Repetitious	6	5%	- Some of the areas seem repetitive, could possibly be combined. - Some areas seemed to overlap.
Inadequate representation of student work	3	3%	- Many of the numbers did not adequately show student learning. - Not reflective of actual student learning.
Contextual factors	2	2%	- The portion on contextual factors seems unfair to a point. We are supposed to change our teaching because one student has difficulties or students live in a particular area. That cheats the students. - Narrow. Limited to ideas within particular region, ideas from other regions would be helpful.
Mentors	2	2%	- Lack of support from cooperating teachers. - Having a mentor who is not involved directly in the program is useless . . . because they don't understand the program.

*Percents do not always equal 100 due to rounding.

When asked to select from five options the one best description of their mentoring experience during the fall of 2002, nearly half (43%) selected a staff member from the college of education and a cooperating teacher. Eighteen percent selected a staff member from the college of education, 17% selected a staff member from both the college of education and the college of arts and sciences as well as a cooperating teacher, 13% selected some other composition, and 8% indicated they did not have a mentor or a mentoring team. Other descriptions included classroom teachers, cooperating teacher with principal, cooperating teacher with retired teacher/administrator, a college of education staff member, a trio of college of education staff with a cooperating teacher and a master teacher, and a trio of two college of education staff members and a cooperating teacher; two respondents indicated they were supposed to have a mentor but were never contacted.

Of those who indicated some type of mentor, respondents most often indicated they met twice a month (25%), followed by weekly (24%), once a month (15%), daily (12%), or less than once a month (7%). Seventeen percent indicated some other frequency; descriptions were each unique and therefore portrayed in Table 17.

Again, of those indicating some type of mentor, 35% indicated they sometimes met individually and sometimes as a group and 33% indicated they met individually. Seventeen percent reported meeting with other student teachers in groups of five or more; 11% reported meeting with others in groups of less than five. One percent reported never meeting with their mentors and 3% indicated some other method; descriptions included “brief times of reflection during specials” and “individually and in class with a different instructor.”

Eighty-nine percent of those respondents with mentors indicated they did receive feedback about their teaching performance. Of those receiving feedback, 37% noted the feedback had considerable value for improving their teaching, 31% reported the feedback was of great value, 30% reported it was of some value, and 2% reported it was of little value. Further, 98% reported the feedback was timely enough that they could apply it to their teaching.

Those student teachers who indicated they had some type of mentor were then asked to select from six options all teaching-related tasks for which their mentors provided assistance. More than half of the respondents selected teaching units of instruction (58%), assessing student learning (58%), and preparing their work sample teaching exhibit (53%). Forty-seven percent selected designing standards-based units of instruction, 18% indicated they did not receive assistance with any of the six tasks, and 4% indicated they received assistance with some other task. These descriptions included lesson plan/unit design, research materials and ideas, contextual factors, and general encouragement and moral support.

Finally, student teachers were asked if anyone had discussed with them the possibility of having a mentor or mentoring team to support them during their first year of teaching. More than half (58%) responded affirmatively.

Table 17: Other Frequency Distributions of Mentor Meetings as Described by Student Teachers

- A total of four scheduled visits and one unscheduled visit.
- About every five weeks.
- Cooperating teacher - daily; science mentor - arranged meetings as necessary; supervising teacher - monthly at least.
- Cooperating teacher daily.
- I met with my mentor once.
- My first placement - once a week; second placement - once a month.
- My ISU mentor came at least every two weeks, but I talked with my cooperating teacher daily about my teaching experience.
- Not sure - none.
- Once a week as a class, useless.
- Supervisor - four times scheduled; cooperating teacher - when convenient for her about once every three weeks.
- We met a few times throughout the whole experience.
- We met once in person and corresponded via e-mail every two or three weeks.
- Whenever I had questions - I met with cooperating teacher daily.

Key Survey Findings by Topic Area

Accountability systems. Assessment coordinators at 5 of the 11 institutions and institutional coordinators at 3 of the 11 institutions reported regularly collecting and analyzing data through a data management system. These systems, which for the most part were piloted in fragmented or small-scale ways, seemed to focus mostly on initial entry data, matriculation data, and student teaching data. These systems were aligned with professional standards such as NCATE or state standards. Three of these five data management systems were operational for more than 75% of their teacher candidate enrollment. Information from these systems most often went to institutional coordinators, deans of the college of education, assessment coordinators, and faculty members. Overall, these systems were viewed as somewhat effective. The majority of the systems included follow-up data on beginning teachers during their first year

of teaching. These data most often focused on the ability to facilitate learning for all students and the ability to focus on standards-based instruction.

Teacher work samples. All 11 of the teacher work sample coordinators and institutional coordinators indicated they were implementing the teacher work sample methodology. Across institutions, the methodology was used with an average of 33 elementary school-level candidates (standard deviation of 27), 8 middle school-level candidates (standard deviation of 8), and 18 high school-level candidates (standard deviation of 21). More than half of both types of coordinators indicated that 51 to 75% of their teacher candidates attained a score of 3 on 17 or more of the 32 indicators on the scoring rubric. Two thirds of the work sample coordinators and nearly all of the institutional coordinators reported the teacher work sample was much more effective than the prior teacher preparation program. Work sample and institutional coordinators rated the preparation level of most student teachers as more than 90% proficient or expert in specifying learning goals, designing instruction, assessing contextual factors, and mastery of subject matter; none of the ratings by district/school personnel or faculty members reached this level. Seventy percent of the work sample coordinators, 40% of the institutional coordinators, 72% of the district/school personnel, and 58% of the faculty members indicated that most candidates met all teaching standards. More than half of the student teachers described their training on each of the seven teaching processes as very adequate, and all reported including all seven processes in their work samples. Major strengths of the teacher work sample methodology were described as a model for effective teaching, enhanced reflection, use as an assessment tool. Major weaknesses were described as the time-consuming nature of the methodology, inadequate preparation/support, and viewed as overwhelming to students.

Mentoring teams. The most common form of compensation for mentoring was extra financial compensation for school personnel and faculty members. Common scoring rubrics were the measure most often used for maintaining quality control of mentoring systems. The majority of the 11 institutions had mentors for more than 75% of their teacher candidates; mentoring teams were less common. Mentoring meetings usually took place a couple of times a month or as needed, and occurred both individually and in small groups. Mentors most often provided assistance with designing standards-based units of instruction, assessing student learning, preparing work sample teaching exhibits, and teaching units of instruction. About half of the mentoring coordinators, three fourths of the institutional coordinators, and a third of the student teachers reported that mentors provided considerable value for improving teaching.

Program improvements. Institutional coordinators reported from 3 to 30 courses that were revised as a result of implementing the teacher work sample methodology. Nearly half of the teacher work sample coordinators reported that either 3 or 6 courses had been revised. Nearly all faculty members reported awareness of course changes resulting from this project.

Partnerships. Institutional coordinators reported mixed progress in this area. One said a business partner became an operational member of the partnership, one said a business partner was identified and became involved in initial activities, and four said business partners had been identified but that no progress had been made. The remaining four coordinators said business partners had not yet been contacted. Roles for business partners were defined as advisory,

consultative, or advocacy. A third of the business partners made long-term commitments to the partnerships.

Research. The most common forms of research with which institutional coordinators reported involvement were survey or ethnographic/descriptive/observational. Institutions were fairly evenly split among working with all other project institutions, working with more than one other institution, or working independently. Assessment, institutional, and mentoring coordinators were most often identified as being involved in such project-related research. Faculty members had a slightly different perception on these areas. While survey and ethnographic/descriptive/observational research were most common, nearly half reported no research involvement. And, more than half reported their institutions were working with all project institutions. Finally, they reported that assessment coordinators, teacher work sample coordinators, and college of education faculty were most often involved in such research.

Networking. Most of the 11 institutional coordinators reported networking both with faculty at their respective institutions and with individuals at other project institutions. About half expected that level of networking to remain the same; an additional 40% expected it to increase. The Web site was most often used to obtain information about the project, keep up-to-date with project events, and download training materials or teacher work sample exemplars.

CONCLUSIONS

A number of conclusions can be drawn from the findings presented within this formative evaluation of the Title II Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality Project. These conclusions are organized by the six broad evaluation questions. This section ends with a summary analysis of the congruence between conclusions drawn from this evaluation and progress noted in the most recent Renaissance Year 4 progress report.

Evaluation Question One

To what extent have the activities of the project achieved the project goals and objectives? There are differing levels of progress in achieving specific project goals and objectives. This progress also varies for each of the 11 participating institutions.

The teacher work sample objective is clearly the most advanced. All work sample and institutional coordinators report using the “Performance Prompt, Teaching Process Standards, and Scoring Rubrics for the Teacher Work Sample” product. Further, nearly all these coordinators believe the work sample methodology is more effective when compared to prior preparation methods for student teachers. This component of the project seems to have tremendous faculty support across institutions.

The mentoring objective also has been met to a high degree. About half of the assessment and institutional coordinators report that their institutions have mentors for more than 75% of their teacher candidates. About a third of the assessment coordinators and half of the institutional coordinators report that their institutions have mentors for more than 75% of their teacher candidates. However, only about half of student teachers report having some type of mentoring.

Progress has been made to some extent for the accountability and networking objectives, yet these areas show a marked difference in progress across institutions. About half of the assessment coordinators report that their institutions have a fully implemented data management system; however, only a fourth of the institutional coordinators share this viewpoint. Nearly all of the institutional coordinators report networking with faculty members within their institutions; more than half also network with faculty at other institutions, with teacher candidates, and with school practitioners. Some institutions have developed closer working relationships with schools and/or school districts than have others. The number of courses revised as a result of this project range across institutions from 3 to 30; most of these revisions are described as inclusion of the teacher work sample methodology or assessment practices.

The least progress toward project goals has been in the objectives of business partners and research. In fact, many of the project staff are unsure of the exact purpose and intent of the business partnerships. Only one institution has an operational business partner; eight either have not identified a business partner or have not moved beyond initial contact with a business. For research, most of the institutional coordinators report involvement in survey research; about two thirds are involved in studies of an ethnographic, descriptive, or observational nature. Less than a third of the coordinators are involved in correlational, quasi-experimental, or experimental studies.

Evaluation Question Two

To what extent has the project achieved the goals and expectations of the Title II Partnership Program? The project is clearly aimed toward achieving the goals and expectations of the Title II Partnership Program. Some activities seem to have more widespread acceptance and support across the institutions, and so more time and effort are currently being spent in these areas.

While there is not yet any clear-cut evidence that this project is achieving its goal of improving student achievement, there are indications that such an outcome is certainly within reach. Survey data reveal that faculty and school personnel perceive student teachers are most skilled in the areas of specifying learning goals, mastering subject matter, and designing instruction. These teaching strengths bode well for actually impacting student learning in the classroom. However, respondents perceive student teachers as most weak in the area of planning for student differences, which also has direct repercussions in the classroom.

The impact of this project within the 11 participating institutions is spreading. Nearly all of the education and arts and science faculty members surveyed indicate they have received training in the teacher work sample methodology. Further, about two thirds have received training in mentoring.

Evaluation Question Three

What factors, activities, and processes have contributed most to progress toward the changes desired to improve teacher quality? There seem to be a number of factors common across the institutions that are contributing to the success of the project.

Across program objectives, there is a strong leadership component, faculty commitment and buy-in, and collaboration both within and across institutions. For teacher work samples, respondents note that it is of professional interest, it is not too expensive to implement, and it improves service delivery. As a result, faculty members are more interested and willing to complete activities pertaining to this objective. Mentoring is also perceived to be of professional interest, although more so for education faculty than for arts and science faculty members, despite two thirds of arts science faculty having been trained.

A strength of the accountability or data management systems is the willingness of institutions making most progress in this area to share and model their systems with staff of other institutions. Success factors for partnering and networking included adequate travel budgets for fostering working relationships, sharing successes and problems, and opportunities for conference presentations. The ability to learn from one another, problem solve, and discuss how to adapt or adopt systems or methods was seen as one of the major strengths of this project.

Evaluation Question Four

What factors, activities, and processes have been barriers to progress or have contributed to lack of progress? There was a high level of consensus regarding those factors that are impeding the progress of the project.

Across the institutions and across program objectives, the major issues are time constraints and a feeling of being “overwhelmed.” Also high on the list of impediments are faculty resistance to change and high faculty turnover. Some institutions are experiencing financial difficulties in funding “big ticket” items such as computers and software for the data management system or additional staff to carry out project activities.

Barriers are also present for specific program objectives. For example, in addition to the need for additional funding to purchase hardware and peripherals, some respondents note a need for more knowledge about setting up and running large databases (i.e., the data management system). Others note the time-consuming and labor-intensive nature of the teacher work samples. For mentoring, staff identified problems in communication between faculty and students and the difficulties in scaling up to mentor large student populations. For the partner objective, project staff are struggling to understand and then express to businesses exactly what their roles might be in such a partnership. The contributions of businesses to the project and the value they might add is ambiguous at best.

Evaluation Question Five

What are recommendations about the continued operation of the Renaissance Partnership that would likely result in greater effectiveness and productivity? During the project staff interviews, a number of recommendations were made for improving effectiveness and productivity; these are described below. Specific recommendations emerging from the evaluation activities and analyses are provided in the next section.

Project staff see a need for their institutions to take on more responsibility for ensuring that project activities are undertaken and that objectives are met. They also feel that the dissemination and public relations aspects of the project should be expanded to make others more aware of the project and its successes to date.

Interviewees believe that more information sharing across institutions is needed for all of the institutions to develop and implement data management systems. They also note the need for allowing time to properly implement the teacher work samples before expecting desired outcomes. They note the need to expand the mentoring systems across all institutions and for all student teachers; the provision of stipends may help to increase faculty participation as mentors.

Other recommendations include the need to continue recognizing and making minor adjustments to program details and courses, sharing information across institutions about research endeavors, and clearly identifying the responsibilities of institutions and businesses in a partnership and the benefits such an arrangement provides for both entities.

Evaluation Question Six

What can be learned from this project that will add to the knowledge base on improving teacher quality? A number of learnings have been voiced and codified as a result of this formative evaluation.

Survey respondents view the teacher work sample methodology as a “total” package for instruction. They see it as a comprehensive model for effective teaching. This is a very important learning from this evaluation of the Renaissance Teacher Quality Project.

Survey respondents note that having a specific goal pertaining to research has resulted in faculty and students working together on common objectives. And, such collaboration has led to an increase in the quantity and quality of such endeavors.

Interviewees report that networking and bi-annual meetings help their institutions stay on the “cutting edge” of teacher preparation. And, such collaboration benefits smaller institutions by allowing them to be part of a larger entity with more visibility. Networking also results in a richer learning experience for teacher educators, which eventually translates into a richer learning environment for their students.

Congruence of Conclusions and Year 4 Progress Report

The Year 4 Progress Report for the Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality was sent to AEL in September 2003. This provided a serendipitous opportunity to triangulate findings and conclusions from this evaluation with the perceptions of project staff concerning their progress to date. Conclusions related to five of the seven objectives seem to align quite well with progress noted in the year 4 report. These five objectives include teacher work samples, mentoring, partnerships, networking, and course revisions. There is less congruity between this evaluation and the progress report for the remaining objectives of accountability systems, and research projects. These objectives are discussed below.

- **Accountability system:** As part of data collected via surveys for this evaluation, 6 of the 11 institutions reported regularly collecting and analyzing data through a data management system, compared to the year 4 progress report, which states that all 11 institutions have such systems. Part of the discrepancy may be due to the fact that the year 4 progress report, which is a self-assessment report based on institutional coordinators’ judgment in collaboration with the deans of colleges of education, notes these systems “are near or meet standards based on five performance accountability criteria” (Pankratz, 2003). These data management systems are works in progress, and they may not have been as fully developed when the surveys were administered in January 2003 as when the progress report was produced.

- **Research projects:** This evaluation found some evidence of ongoing research, and respondents indicated they were involved to some extent. The progress report noted a great deal more of this type of endeavor. This may be due to the fact that much of the research noted in the progress report seems to have recently been completed, and respondents may not have included these studies in their survey responses.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on all the data collected during this evaluation, we offer 11 recommendations for the Renaissance Partnership Project to consider. These 11 are briefly identified below, followed by a complete discussion of each.

- Implement fully the teacher work samples.
- Continue mentoring programs for all students across all institutions.
- Encourage more research studies.
- Reconsider the business partner objective.
- Accelerate progress on the data management systems.
- Continue making course revisions.
- Discover evidence of impact on student learning.
- Address the workload issue.
- Integrate the projects into each university's culture.
- Launch and sustain a public relations campaign.
- Seek continuation funding.

Implement fully the teacher work samples. Just as developing the accountability system may be the greatest opportunity for institutional improvement, the development of teacher work samples has, without doubt, the greatest potential to make a contribution to the practice of teacher education. Most of the data collected in this formative evaluation indicate that the people who have worked to develop and implement teacher work samples have experienced great satisfaction from the work and recognize the potential for improving the teaching skills of those enrolled in their institutions. The public relations value alone of this activity cannot be over-estimated. Therefore, it is important for the Renaissance Partnership Project to ensure that the three institutions that are not implementing the teacher work samples be brought on board very soon. Much of the difficult development work has been done, so it is hard to understand the lag in these institutions, especially given that the teacher work samples were a centerpiece of the initial proposal. Perhaps these institutions could be brought into a cooperative relationship with one other institution that has been successful in developing and using the teacher work samples. Through this mini-partnership, the “assisted” institution could be brought up to speed, while the “assisting” institution would benefit from the opportunity to review its own work and think about “what I’d do differently, if I had it to do over.”

It might be necessary and possible for the Renaissance Partnership Project to develop a set of work standards that must be met to remain in the project. Thus, if all institutions were aware of these benchmark standards and one institution, for whatever reason, was unprepared or unable to meet these standards, then that institution would no longer be a cooperating member. Even though the Renaissance Partnership Project as an entity has little power to coerce its members to do anything, the project will be judged by the efforts of all members. Therefore, they may need to discuss ways to ensure that all institutions are able to pass muster on each of the stipulated objectives.

Continue mentoring programs for all students across all institutions. The mentoring component of the Renaissance Partnership Project program has been highly successful in some institutions, less so in others. Mentoring is time/emotion-intensive work, but the potential pay-offs are great. Some institutions have made slow progress on this objective and should be assisted in overcoming whatever difficulties they are facing. There exists a real opportunity for the Renaissance Partnership Project, as well as each individual institution to motivate mentoring teams to continue and expand their efforts. It would be possible, for example, for the Renaissance Partnership Project to sponsor an annual Mentor Team of the Year. This could also be done at each institution. In addition, students who have been mentored could be invited to write up their experiences and these writings could be posted on the Web site. This would not only be a welcome reward to the mentors, but it could provide a way for persons not in the Renaissance Partnership Project who are interested in mentoring programs to connect with experts in the field. Similarly, when the mentoring manual is prepared, it can be publicized on the Web site. Staff should assume that this manual will be in great demand and be prepared to distribute it in fairly large numbers, because many universities are interested in mentoring but are not sure how to set up such programs.

Encourage more research studies. While the faculty and staff of teacher-training institutions have historically been more engaged with the use of research-based knowledge than with its creation, the Renaissance Partnership Project offers an opportunity to make important contributions to the development of research-based knowledge. It seems clear that many faculty and staff of the partner institutions are interested in participating in research activities. Several steps can be taken to elevate the status of the research activities.

- Greater visibility and credibility should be given to those studies sponsored by the partnership institutions that have been completed or are underway.
- Compile a sourcebook or data file listing all the research work that is being sponsored by Renaissance Partnership Project institutions. This could be posted on the Renaissance Web site and updated periodically.
- Similarly, the Web site could be used to highlight or feature specific studies that are being undertaken.
- Encourage and advocate cross-institutional cooperative research studies.

In addition to these efforts, the Renaissance Partnership Project can provide support for research at the collaborative level. This can be done by encouraging faculty and researchers at individual organizations to publish their results in peer-reviewed journals and make presentations at conferences, including the American Educational Research Association (AERA) and similar organizations. By creating a peer-review network within the Renaissance Partnership Project, researchers can receive valuable feedback from sympathetic reviewers before offering the work to a larger national audience. In addition to creating important relationships across institutions, such a network could stimulate multi-institution studies, because much of the work being done in individual universities is similar to that being done in other parts of the Renaissance Partnership Project. Further, research results could be posted to the Web site to further expand their visibility and to reach other audiences. Finally, institutions should aggressively find ways to reward research activities. This could range from bearing the costs of travel to national conferences for presentations to publicizing the researcher at his/her home institution to finding ways to support research efforts on behalf of the Renaissance Partnership Project.

Reconsider the business partner objective. The notion of partnerships for organizational change is based on the idea of synergy: two heads are better than one. However, synergy only works when the partners are clear about the goals of the partnership and believe that all parties will benefit in some way from the partnership. The institutions cooperating in the Renaissance Partnership Project have presented a very mixed record in terms of creating and using partnerships with businesses. Two fundamental questions might be addressed by the institutions: What do we think the business partners can bring to this initiative that we need? What can we provide to the business partners that would serve as an incentive for them to participate? If the answers to these questions are not positive, then staff should consider dropping this activity as an objective. Clearly, those institutions that have created and are using partnerships with business should be free to continue these. However, as a project-supported effort, this requirement could be dropped. This would have the effect of freeing up energy and resources to support other activities and obviating the need to “make work” for the business partners and for the participating institutions.

If the answers to the questions are positive, then perhaps the efforts that have been taken should be examined to see which strategies have worked and which have not. The institutions that have created partnerships could be instrumental in educating other institutions about how they created the relationship, what they expect from the partnership, and how they have been able to sustain the relationship. It may be that a higher level of institutional involvement (perhaps at the provost/president) level will be necessary.

Finally, if the business partnership requirement cannot be eliminated, and if reasonable efforts to jump-start these relationships cannot be undertaken, then it may be enough to restructure the requirement such that its current status can be considered adequate to meet the contractual obligations of the Renaissance Partnership Project.

Accelerate progress on data management systems. In the long term, the development of data management systems for institutional accountability may be the greatest contribution to the practice of higher education that the Renaissance Partnership Project will make. Some member institutions have made excellent progress on this objective; others have been slower.

The Renaissance Partnership Project should bring its professional and moral suasion to bear in an effort to motivate and assist those institutions that are making slower progress. The interviews with the university presidents and provosts indicate that this activity is a priority among all the institutions. Therefore, the “leader” universities may be able to play a more active role in assisting other institutions to make progress. By sharing evaluation targets, software, strategies, and so on, these leader institutions may be able to share successes, offer technical assistance (both formal and informal), and exchange information with other universities. It may be that a working group conference could help get this effort going. At such a conference, the persons responsible for implementing this objective along with the institutional leadership could come together to present progress reports, while smaller, more specialized working groups could help solve problems that are being encountered by others. It is certainly true that this objective entails large investments of time, talent, and money. It is anticipated, however, that the outcomes are well worth pursuing, even in a time of fiscal restraint in most states and, consequently, in state-supported universities.

Continue making course revisions. Because knowledge about teaching and learning is always expanding and changing, it is important that faculty of the various universities continue to revise courses currently offered and consider developing of new courses as appropriate. Member institutions of the Renaissance Partnership Project report that such course revision/creation activities have been an ongoing part of their work. However, some institutions report far more revised courses than others. Why should this be so? What motivated some institutions to do a wholesale re-examination of their courses with consequent revisions, while other institutions felt that the addition of a course or revision of some others would be adequate? This issue would, on its own merits, be an interesting research topic.

It would be helpful if some course revisions could be posted on the Web site. Its true that each institution differently divides and sequences the courses in the teacher education curriculum, but there is a common core of such courses at virtually every teacher training program. For example, every university offers courses in testing and measurement, methods of teaching high school English (and other similar courses), and educational psychology. It might be of great interest to members of the Renaissance Partnership Project and to educators at other institutions to examine some revisions that have been completed at other institutions, especially if a rationale/description of the changes was presented. Also, if student evaluations (either formal or informal) of the revised courses are available, these might be posted on the Web site.

Discover evidence of impact on student learning. The individual institutions of the Renaissance Partnership Project have engaged in a wide variety of activities aimed at improving teacher education for their students. The development of the teacher work samples, the mentoring programs, and the course revisions are the visible outcomes of this work. The question remains, however: Did these changes make a difference in the education students received? It is important to discover and document evidence that these changes have had the desired impact on students and this work should be undertaken immediately.

There are many ways to document evidence of student growth, including course grades, Praxis or other test results (where these are required), testimonials from students, demonstrated performance via projects and demonstrations, evidence from cooperating teachers, and so on.

This issue of documenting success might indeed form the core of an interesting research project for some or all of the cooperating institutions. We would strongly recommend that whether or not all 11 institutions participate in an organized research program on this topic, all be required to begin the process of documenting impact on student learning. As these student achievement data are defined and collected, there needs to be a systematic effort to analyze the data and report the outcomes.

Address the workload issue. A problem lying beneath the surface of several comments during the interviews concerned the workload that the Renaissance Partnership Project activities have created. While few people actually complained, and it was clear that people were proud of the work and what they had accomplished, it was nevertheless evident that at some institutions the project work was being done by a few people. In any case, some people found it difficult to accomplish this work in a quality way along with their other regular jobs. As a management issue, this cannot be ignored nor denied. At least three strategies for addressing this issue might be considered:

- Survey the member institutions to see whether any have successfully addressed the workload issue. What did they do? What strategies did they implement? Were people given release time or a reduced teaching load to work on project activities? In short, find out what has been done to fix the problem in other places.
- Ask the member institutions whether they have tried nontraditional approaches to managing the workload. Does any institution permit job sharing? Is telecommuting being done by staff at any of the institutions? Have normal duties been taken away so working groups can dedicate time to any of these tasks?
- What strategies might be tried to redistribute the total workload so high-quality work continues to be the norm, while simultaneously recognizing that people only have so much energy to give to a job? Consider new ways to redistribute tasks so time is available to work on the Renaissance Partnership Project.

Integrate the projects into each university's culture. In many institutions, the Renaissance Partnership Project activities are a well-kept secret. Redesign of courses, development of teacher work samples, and development of mentoring programs are all important activities that redefine how the university carries out its mission. When innovations are not well-known and widely implemented, it is easy for the extant culture of the organization to brush these innovations aside once their immediate novelty wears off. Because the work of the project has sought to redefine the tactics and strategies used by the university, there must be efforts undertaken to ensure that these innovations become institutionalized.

Activities to integrate the Renaissance Partnership Project outcomes should begin now, not later. Some strategies to consider include publicizing people who have been successful in developing or implementing project products and processes. Rewards, both financial and non-financial, can be provided to these people along with the recognition from university presidents, provosts, or deans. Faculty and staff who are not participating in project activities can be invited

to visit the Web site, network with others, and learn from colleagues who are heavily invested in the project.

Launch and sustain a public relations campaign. Underlying several of the recommendations above is a recommendation that Renaissance Partnership Project staff launch a systematic public relations campaign to educate others about the project, its accomplishments, its struggles, and its plans for continuation. It will be crucial to determine which audiences for what purposes will be targeted in this campaign. For example, it might be that project staff decide to target five different audiences for various reasons. These might include the following:

1. boards of education, superintendents, and principals who traditionally hire the university's graduates
2. alumni and other potential donors
3. state legislators
4. colleagues at other universities within the state and nationally
5. the university Board of Regents or Governors

Each of these groups is interested in the Renaissance Partnership Project, its work, and the role played by their own university. Each group will have a strong interest in knowing either how it may contribute to the continuation of the work and/or how it can benefit from the work. A successful public relations campaign will carefully target its message to the various audiences. If the member universities have PR offices, efforts should be made to contact these professionals right away to get the campaign launched. It will probably be both important and efficient to have some aspects of the campaign directed centrally by project managers, while some of the tasks should be adapted to local situations.

Important efforts in this direction have been made. Many of the "awareness-level" PowerPoint presentations can be adapted for presentation to different audiences. The Web site includes much helpful information, but is essentially a passive means of information dissemination. If a public awareness/relations campaign is going to be successful, it will probably mean involving professionals who are trained at doing just this kind of work.

Seek continuation funding. Oscar Wilde is said to have observed that "no good deed goes unpunished." So it is with the Renaissance Partnership Project. Having worked hard for four years, it is now necessary to go to work to secure funding so that the work of the project can be continued. Of course, it could be that some member institutions do not wish to continue, this should be ascertained as part of planning to secure continuation funding. Next, a number of funding agents should be approached. The management of the project must receive a definitive answer from the U.S. Department of Education about the availability of continuation funding. If the answer is positive, then a group can be assembled to begin planning work to be undertaken in the next phase as well as preparing cost estimates. In addition, the management group of the project should consider whether there are some tasks or objectives that would be attractive to

private philanthropic foundations. While most foundations are reluctant to simply continue work begun by someone else, it is often possible to re-package, adapt, or extend work begun in Phase I to make it attractive to new sponsors. It may be wise, for example, to propose dissemination of the teacher work sample activities to other universities in the state or continuing the networking activities through the bi-annual meetings. Too, it may be possible to "save" some money in the conduct of the final year to fund continuation of the key aspects of the Renaissance Partnership Project such as the bi-annual meetings, the Web site, and continued dissemination of products recently completed or currently under production. Finally, while this year and next year appear to be "tight" budget years for legislatures, efforts to secure "earmarked" funds could be successful, especially if there is a legislator who has been close to the individual institution's programs.

REFERENCES

- Brewer, J., & Hunter, A. (1989). *Multimethod research: A synthesis of styles*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. (1994). *The program evaluation standards: How to assess evaluations of educational programs, (2nd edition)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pankratz, R. (n.d.). *Project overview*. Retrieved August 20, 2003, from <http://fp.uni.edu/itq/ProjectOverview/Index.htm>
- Pankratz, R. (2003). *The Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality: Year 4 performance report grant*. Bowling Green, KY: Western Kentucky University.

APPENDIXES

Appendix A:

Completed Evaluation Standards Checklist

Checklist for Applying the Standards

To interpret the information provided on this form, the reader needs to refer to the full text of the standards as they appear in Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, *The Program Evaluation Standards* (1994), Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.

The Standards were consulted and used as indicated in the table below (check as appropriate):

Descriptor	The Standard was addressed	The Standard was partially addressed	The Standard was not addressed	The Standard was not applicable
U1 Stakeholder Identification	✓			
U2 Evaluation Credibility	✓			
U3 Information Scope and Selection	✓			
U4 Values Identification	✓			
U5 Report Clarity	✓			
U6 Report Timeliness and Dissemination	✓			
U7 Evaluation Impact	✓			
F1 Practical Procedures	✓			
F2 Political Viability	✓			
F3 Cost Effectiveness	✓			
P1 Service Orientation	✓			
P2 Formal Agreements	✓			
P3 Rights of Human Subjects	✓			
P4 Human Interactions	✓			
P5 Complete and Fair Assessment	✓			
P6 Disclosure of Findings	✓			
P7 Conflict of Interest	✓			
P8 Fiscal Responsibility	✓			
A1 Program Documentation	✓			
A2 Context Analysis	✓			
A3 Described Purposes and Procedures	✓			
A4 Defensible Information Sources	✓			
A5 Valid Information	✓			
A6 Reliable Information	✓			
A7 Systematic Information	✓			
A8 Analysis of Quantitative Information	✓			
A9 Analysis of Qualitative Information	✓			
A10 Justified Conclusions	✓			
A11 Impartial Reporting	✓			
A12 Metaevaluation	✓			

The Program Evaluation Standards (1994, Sage) guided the development of this (check one):

- request for evaluation plan/design/proposal
 evaluation plan/design/proposal
 evaluation contract
 evaluation report
 other: _____

Name Kimberly S. Cowley Date 8/21/03

(signature)

Position or Title Research & Evaluation Specialist

Agency ABL

Address P. O. Box 1348, Charleston, WV 25325

Relation to Document Co-Author
(e.g., author of document, evaluation team leader, external auditor, internal auditor)

Appendix B:

Interview Protocol

Title II Renaissance Partnership Project for Improving Teacher Quality
Group Interview Protocols, October 2-3, 2002, Washington, DC

1. How would you describe your institution=s progress in meeting the objectives related to the Title II Renaissance Partnership Project?

Accountability systems

Teacher work samples

Mentoring teams

Program improvements

Partnerships

Networking

Research program

2. What factors have helped your institution achieve the progress it has made toward the Title II Renaissance Partnership Project goals?

Accountability systems

Teacher work samples

Mentoring teams

Program improvements

Partnerships

Networking

Research program

3. What factors have delayed or halted your institution's progress in the Title II Renaissance Partnership Project?

Accountability systems

Teacher work samples

Mentoring teams

Program improvements

Partnerships

Networking

Research program

4. What recommendations would you suggest to improve the effectiveness or impact of the Title II Renaissance Partnership Project?

Accountability systems

Teacher work samples

Mentoring teams

Program improvements

Partnerships

Networking

Research program

5. What things have you learned as a result of your participation in the Title II Renaissance Partnership Project that would contribute to the knowledge base on improving teacher quality?

Accountability systems

Teacher work samples

Mentoring teams

Program improvements

Partnerships

Networking

Research program

Appendix C:

Document Review Rating Form

AEL Rating Form for Renaissance Documents

Indicate the extent to which the document:	<i>Not at all</i>			<i>To a great extent</i>	
	1	2	3	4	5
describes progress made on project goals					
identifies factors helping project success	1	2	3	4	5
identifies problems hindering project success	1	2	3	4	5
identifies possible solutions to problems areas	1	2	3	4	5
identifies recommendations for enhancing project effectiveness and productivity	1	2	3	4	5
shows an increase in student learning in low-performing schools	1	2	3	4	5
describes development of exemplary practices for teacher educators	1	2	3	4	5
Indicate the quality of:		<i>Very Poor</i>		<i>Excellent</i>	
the comprehensiveness of the document	1	2	3	4	5
the organization of the document	1	2	3	4	5
the presentation of the document	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix D:

Institutional Coordinator Survey

Title II Renaissance Partnership Project for Improving Teacher Quality

Institutional Coordinator Survey: January 2003

Please fill out this survey as completely as possible, following any noted skip patterns, according to your perceptions of your institution's progress related to the Renaissance project. Thank you, in advance, for taking the time to provide this information.

Your institution: _____

Your role (other than Renaissance institutional coordinator): _____

Assessment

1. Identify the status of your data management system for teacher candidate performance.
(Check the one that best applies.)

- _____ a. Have not worked on a data management system
- _____ b. Only identified the data to be collected
- _____ c. Have a system for collecting and analyzing data, but have not yet implemented
- _____ d. Regularly collect and analyze identified data
- _____ e. Regularly collect and analyze data and provide feedback to candidates/mentors

If you selected option a, b, or c, please go to Question #8.

If you selected option d or e, please continue.

2. What items does your data management system include? *(Check all that apply.)*

- _____ a. Initial entry data (e.g., demographic and ability data such as GPA, degree area, standardized test scores, ACT scores)
- _____ b. Matriculation data (e.g., local processes/procedures and/or national assessments)
- _____ c. Student teaching data (e.g., teacher work samples and/or student data from schools)
- _____ d. Post graduation data (e.g., internship performance data and/or data from school role groups on student learning) (describe): _____

3. Indicate the percentage of your teacher candidates for whom the data management system is operational (i.e., is working from collecting data through providing feedback). (*Check the one that best applies.*)

- a. 0%
- b. 1 - 25%
- c. 26 - 50%
- d. 51 - 75%
- e. 76 - 100%

4. Who regularly receives data management system information about teacher candidates? (*Check all that apply.*)

- a. Dean of the College of Education
- b. Mentoring team members
- c. Cooperating teachers in the schools
- d. Institutional coordinator
- e. Assessment coordinator
- f. Teacher work sample coordinator
- g. Mentoring coordinator
- h. Teacher candidate
- i. Other (describe): _____

5. Does your data management system include follow-up data on beginning teachers in their first year of teaching? (*Check the one that best applies.*)

- a. Yes
- b. No (*please go to Question #8*)

6. How many teacher candidates graduate from your institution yearly? _____

Of that number, for what percent does your data management system include follow-up data during their first year of teaching?

- a. 0%
- b. 1 - 25%
- c. 26 - 50%
- d. 51 - 75%
- e. 76 - 100%

7. What measures does your data management system include for graduate follow up?
(Check all that apply.)

- a. Ability to facilitate learning of all students
- b. Accountability for the learning of all students
- c. Ability to evaluate teaching processes
- d. Ability to evaluate learning processes
- e. Skill in reflecting on the teaching/learning process
- f. Ability to focus on standards-based instruction
- g. Knowledge of state and local content standards
- h. Other (describe): _____

Teacher work samples

8. The pilot testing of the “Performance Prompt, Teaching Process Standards, and Scoring Rubrics for the Teacher Work Sample” was conducted in spring 2001. What is your perception of the present status of this product? *(Check the one that best applies.)*

- a. Is being used as is
- b. Has been modified and is now ready to use
- c. Is in the process of being modified
- d. Has not been used or modified
- e. Other (describe): _____

9. The scoring rubric for the teacher work sample contains 32 indicators across seven teacher work sample processes. To successfully meet an indicator, a score of 3 is required. What percentage of teacher candidates attain a score of 3 on the majority (e.g., 17 or more) of the indicators? *(Check the one that best applies.)*

- a. 0%
- b. 1 - 25%
- c. 26 - 50%
- d. 51 - 75%
- e. 76 - 100%

10. Who scores the teacher work sample? *(Check all that apply.)*

- a. Teacher candidate’s mentoring team members as a team
- b. Cooperating teacher
- c. College of Education faculty
- d. Teacher work sample coordinator
- e. Independent observer specially trained for the scoring
- f. Other (describe): _____

11. Do those using the scoring rubric go through periodic reliability checks by independently scoring the same teacher work samples? (*Check the one that best applies.*)

- a. Yes (how often: _____)
 b. No

If No, what procedures are being developed or currently are followed to check reliability?

12. Compared to the preparation of student teachers before involvement in the project, how effective do you find the teacher work sample? (*Check the one that best applies.*)

- a. Less effective
 b. About as effective
 c. Somewhat more effective
 d. Much more effective

13. For each of the skills listed below, rate the preparation level of most student teachers (80% or more) with whom you work when they have completed the teacher work sample. *Rate each skill as 1 (beginning), 2 (developing), 3 (proficient), or 4 (expert).*

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> a. Specifying learning goals | <input type="checkbox"/> Do not have access to this information |
| <input type="checkbox"/> b. Assessing contextual factors | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> c. Designing instruction | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> d. Planning for student differences | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> e. Constructing tests | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> f. Administering assessment | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> g. Analyzing student learning | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> h. Providing prompt feedback | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> i. Self-evaluation and reflection | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> j. Mastery of subject matter | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> k. Classroom management | |

14. Teacher work samples include seven teaching standards related to seven processes that teacher candidates are to meet. To what degree do you believe the standards as a whole are being met? (*Check the one that best applies.*)

- a. Few if any meet any standards
 b. Some candidates meet a subset of the standards, but few meet all
 c. Most candidates meet a subset of the standards, but few meet all
 d. Most candidates meet all standards
 e. All candidates meet all standards

Mentoring

15. Serving as a mentor requires time and effort on the part of faculty and participating school personnel. Which of the factors listed below serve as compensation for such involvement? (*Check all that apply.*)
- a. Released time for faculty
 b. Extra compensation for faculty
 c. Extra compensation for participating school personnel
 d. Special facilities for mentoring
 e. Built into faculty load
 f. Special recognition for tenure and/or promotion
 g. In-kind benefits (i.e., free tuition for graduate study)
 h. Other (describe): _____
16. Maintaining quality control across mentors is an issue that requires attention, especially in colleges with large enrollments in teacher preparation programs. What measures have been taken for maintaining quality control at your institution? (*Check all that apply.*)
- a. Development of a common scoring rubric for the teacher work sample
 b. Mandatory professional development for mentors
 c. Reliability checks between two or more mentoring teams
 d. Other (describe): _____
17. What percent of teacher candidates at your institution have either a mentor or a mentoring team? (*Check the one that best applies for each column.*)
- | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Percent with a Mentor | Percent with a Mentoring Team |
| <input type="checkbox"/> a. 0% | <input type="checkbox"/> a. 0% |
| <input type="checkbox"/> b. 1 - 25% | <input type="checkbox"/> b. 1 - 25% |
| <input type="checkbox"/> c. 26 - 50% | <input type="checkbox"/> c. 26 - 50% |
| <input type="checkbox"/> d. 51 - 75% | <input type="checkbox"/> d. 51 - 75% |
| <input type="checkbox"/> e. 76 - 100% | <input type="checkbox"/> e. 76 - 100% |
18. Describe the composition of a typical mentoring team. (*Check the one that best applies.*)
- a. A staff member from the College of Education
 b. A staff member from the College of Education and a cooperating teacher
 c. A staff member from the College of Education, the College of Arts and Sciences, and a cooperating teacher
 d. Other (describe): _____

19. How often do mentors or mentoring teams typically meet? (*Check the one that best applies.*)

- a. Daily
- b. Weekly
- c. Twice a month
- d. Once a month
- e. Less than once a month
- f. Never
- g. Other (describe): _____

20. Which of the following tasks do mentors or mentoring teams usually provide assistance with? (*Check all that apply.*)

- a. Designing standards-based units of instruction
- b. Teaching units of instruction
- c. Assessing student learning
- d. Preparing work sample teaching exhibits
- e. Other (describe): _____

21. How valuable is the feedback typically provided by mentors or mentoring teams? (*Check the one that best applies.*)

- a. Little practical value
- b. Some value for improving teaching
- c. Considerable value for improving teaching
- d. Great value for improving teaching

Networking

22. Check all the options below that describe your involvement with project networking. (*Check the one that best applies.*)

- a. No involvement
- b. Networking with faculty at this institution
- c. Networking with teacher candidates at this institution
- d. Networking with school practitioners
- e. Networking with individuals at other project institutions

23. As the project continues, do you believe your networking involvement will:

- a. Increase
- b. Decrease
- c. Remain about the same

24. Check all the options below for which you have found the project web site useful.

- a. Obtaining information about various aspects of the project
- b. Downloading training materials
- c. Downloading teacher work sample exemplars
- d. Keeping up-to-date with the status of project events
- e. Staying in touch with faculty at my institution
- f. Contacting teacher candidates
- g. Staying in touch with school practitioners involved in the project
- h. Staying in touch with faculty at other project institutions
- i. Obtaining information about teacher candidate performance
- j. I do not use the web site
- k. Other (describe): _____

25. What would you like to see added to the project web site?

Business partnerships

26. One of the goals of the project is involvement of a business partner to support teacher preparation. What is the status of a business partner for your institution?
(Check the one that best applies.)

- a. Has not yet been contacted (*please go to Question #30*)
- b. Has been contacted, but no other progress
- c. Has been contacted and involved in discussions
- d. Has come aboard and been involved in some initial activities
- e. Is now an operational member of the partnership
- f. Other (describe): _____

27. What industry does your business partner represent? (*Check the one that best applies.*)

- a. Bank or financial institution
- b. Industry
- c. Retail operation
- d. Professional service (e.g., law firm)
- e. Other (describe): _____

28. If you have a business partner as an active member of the partnership, please describe the partner's role. Be specific about the support provided teacher preparation.

29. Do you feel your business partner has made a long-term commitment to the partnership?

- a. Yes
- b. No
- c. Not sure

Research

30. A component of the project is research about project impact on teacher candidates, faculty, etc. *Check all the types of research in which you have been involved (either conducted yourself or participated in).*

- a. Experimental, i.e., full control of experimental variables and conditions
- b. Quasi-experimental, i.e., partial control of experimental variables and conditions
- c. Correlational, i.e., focusing on relationships between variables
- d. Ethnographic/descriptive/observational
- e. Survey
- f. I have not been involved in any research (*please go to Question #33*)

If you selected any combination of options a, b, c, and d, list the specific name(s) of the "research," either completed or in progress.

31. With how many institutions is your institution involved in conducting project-related research? (*Check the one that best applies.*)

- a. My institution is not doing any research
- b. My institution is working independently
- c. My institution is working with one other project institution
- d. My institution is working with more than one other project institutions
- e. My institution is working with all 11 project institutions

32. Who is involved in conducting project-related research at your institution? (*Check all that apply.*)

- a. Institutional coordinator
- b. Assessment coordinator
- c. Teacher work sample coordinator
- d. Mentoring coordinator
- e. College of Education faculty
- f. College of Arts and Science faculty
- g. School practitioners (e.g., cooperating teachers)
- h. Teacher candidates
- i. Other (describe): _____

Course revisions

33. As a result of implementing the teacher work sample methodology, about how many courses have been revised at your institution?

34. Describe in a general way (i.e., types of courses or nature of expected changes) any course revisions that have been planned or implemented as a result of implementing the teacher work sample methodology.

Appendix E:

Assessment Coordinator Survey

Title II Renaissance Partnership Project for Improving Teacher Quality

Assessment Coordinator Survey: January 2003

Please fill out this survey as completely as possible, following any noted skip patterns, according to your perceptions of your institution's progress related to the Renaissance project. Thank you, in advance, for taking the time to provide this information.

Your institution: _____

Your role (other than Renaissance assessment coordinator): _____

1. Identify the status of your data management system for teacher candidate performance.
(Check the one that best applies.)

- a. Have not worked on a data management system
- b. Only identified the data to be collected
- c. Have a system for collecting and analyzing data, but have not yet implemented
- d. Regularly collect and analyze identified data
- e. Regularly collect and analyze data and provide feedback to candidates/mentors

*If you selected option a, b, or c, please stop at this point and return this survey.
If you selected option d or e, please continue completing this survey.*

2. What items does your data management system include? *(Check all that apply.)*

- a. Initial entry data (e.g., demographic and ability data such as GPA, degree area, standardized test scores, ACT scores)
- b. Matriculation data (e.g., local processes/procedures and/or national assessments)
- c. Student teaching data (e.g., teacher work samples and/or student data from schools)
- d. Post graduation data (e.g., internship performance data and/or data from school role groups on student learning) (describe): _____

3. Have you piloted or field tested your data management system?
(Check the one that best applies.)

- a. No
 b. Yes (describe): _____

4. Were any professional standards or guidelines followed in developing your data management system? *(Check the one that best applies.)*

- a. No
 b. Yes (describe): _____

5. How many teacher candidates do you have enrolled in your institution yearly? _____

Of that number, for what percent is the data management system operational, i.e., working from collecting data through feedback? *(Check the one that best applies.)*

- a. 0%
 b. 1 - 25%
 c. 26 - 50%
 d. 51 - 75%
 e. 76 - 100%

6. Who regularly receives data management system information about teacher candidates?
(Check all that apply.)

- a. Dean of the College of Education
 b. Mentoring team members
 c. Cooperating teachers in the schools
 d. Institutional coordinator
 e. Assessment coordinator
 f. Teacher work sample coordinator
 g. Mentoring coordinator
 h. Teacher candidate
 i. Faculty member
 j. Other (describe): _____

7. How would you rate the overall effectiveness of your data management system? (*Check the one that best applies.*)
- a. Very effective
 b. Somewhat effective
 c. Somewhat ineffective
 d. Very ineffective
8. Does your data management system include follow-up data on beginning teachers in their first year of teaching? (*Check the one that best applies.*)
- a. Yes
 b. No (*please stop at this point and return your survey*)
9. How many teacher candidates graduate from your institution yearly? _____
- Of that number, for what percent does your data management system include follow-up data during their first year of teaching? (*Check the one that best applies.*)
- a. 0%
 b. 1 - 25%
 c. 26 - 50%
 d. 51 - 75%
 e. 76 - 100%
10. What measures does your data management system include for graduate follow up? (*Check all that apply.*)
- a. Ability to facilitate learning of all students
 b. Accountability for the learning of all students
 c. Ability to evaluate teaching processes
 d. Ability to evaluate learning processes
 e. Skill in reflecting on the teaching/learning process
 f. Ability to focus on standards-based instruction
 g. Knowledge of state and local content standards
 h. Other (describe): _____
-

Appendix F:

Mentoring Coordinator Survey

Title II Renaissance Partnership Project for Improving Teacher Quality

Mentoring Coordinator Survey: January 2003

Please fill out this survey as completely as possible according to your perceptions of your institution's progress related to the Renaissance project. Thank you, in advance, for taking the time to provide this information.

Your institution: _____

Your role (other than Renaissance mentoring coordinator): _____

1. Serving as a mentor requires time and effort on the part of faculty and participating school personnel. Which of the factors listed below serve as compensation for such involvement? (*Check all that apply.*)

- _____ a. Released time for faculty
- _____ b. Extra compensation for faculty
- _____ c. Extra compensation for participating school personnel
- _____ d. Special facilities for mentoring
- _____ e. Built into faculty load
- _____ f. Special recognition for tenure and/or promotion
- _____ g. In-kind benefits (i.e., free tuition for graduate study)
- _____ h. Other (describe): _____

2. Maintaining quality control across mentors is an issue that requires attention, especially in colleges with large enrollments in teacher preparation programs. What measures have been taken for maintaining quality control at your institution? (*Check all that apply.*)

- _____ a. Development of a common scoring rubric for the teacher work sample
- _____ b. Mandatory professional development for mentors
- _____ c. Reliability checks between two or more mentoring teams
- _____ d. Other (describe): _____

3. What percent of teacher candidates at your institution have either a mentor or a mentoring team? (*Check the one that best applies for each column.*)

Percent with a Mentor

- a. 0%
- b. 1 - 25%
- c. 26 - 50%
- d. 51 - 75%
- e. 76 - 100%

Percent with a Mentoring Team

- a. 0%
- b. 1 - 25%
- c. 26 - 50%
- d. 51 - 75%
- e. 76 - 100%

4. Describe the composition of a typical mentoring team. (*Check the one that best applies.*)

- a. A staff member from the College of Education
- b. A staff member from the College of Education and a cooperating teacher
- c. A staff member from the College of Education, the College of Arts and Sciences, and a cooperating teacher
- d. Other (describe): _____

5. How often do mentors or mentoring teams typically meet? (*Check the one that best applies.*)

- a. Daily
- b. Weekly
- c. Twice a month
- d. Once a month
- e. Less than once a month
- f. Never
- g. Other (describe): _____

6. How do mentors or mentoring teams typically meet with teacher candidates? (*Check the one that best applies.*)

- a. Individually
- b. With other student teachers in a group of less than five
- c. With other student teachers in a group of five or more
- d. Sometimes individually and sometimes in groups
- e. Never meet with teacher candidates
- f. Other (describe): _____

7. Which of the following tasks do mentors or mentoring teams usually provide assistance with?
(Check all that apply.)

- a. Designing standards-based units of instruction
- b. Teaching units of instruction
- c. Assessing student learning
- d. Preparing work sample teaching exhibits
- e. Other (describe): _____

8. How valuable is the feedback typically provided by mentors or mentoring teams?
(Check the one that best applies.)

- a. Little practical value
- b. Some value for improving teaching
- c. Considerable value for improving teaching
- d. Great value for improving teaching

Appendix G:

Teacher Work Sample Coordinator Survey

Title II Renaissance Partnership Project for Improving Teacher Quality

Teacher Work Sample Coordinator Survey: January 2003

Please fill out this survey as completely as possible according to your perceptions of your institution's progress related to the Renaissance project. Thank you, in advance, for taking the time to provide this information.

Your institution: _____

Your role (other than TWS coordinator): _____

1. The pilot testing of the "Performance Prompt, Teaching Process Standards, and Scoring Rubrics for the Teacher Work Sample" was conducted in spring 2001. What is your perception of the present status of this product? (*Check the one that best applies.*)
 a. Is being used as is
 b. Has been modified and is now ready to use
 c. Is in the process of being modified
 d. Has not been used or modified
 e. Other (describe): _____

2. Indicate the number of teacher candidates at your institution for whom the teacher work sample prompt and scoring rubric were implemented in the fall of 2002.
 - a. Elementary: _____
 - b. Middle school: _____
 - c. High school: _____

3. The scoring rubric for the teacher work sample contains 32 indicators across seven teacher work sample processes. To successfully meet an indicator, a score of 3 is required. What percentage of teacher candidates attain a score of 3 on the majority (e.g., 17 or more) of the indicators? (*Check the one that best applies.*)
 a. 0%
 b. 1 - 25%
 c. 26 - 50%
 d. 51 - 75%
 e. 76 - 100%

4. Who scores the teacher work sample? (*Check all that apply.*)

- a. Teacher candidate's mentoring team members as a team
- b. Cooperating teacher
- c. College of Education faculty
- d. Teacher work sample coordinator
- e. Independent observer specially trained for the scoring
- f. Other (describe): _____

5. Do those using the scoring rubric go through periodic reliability checks by independently scoring the same teacher work samples? (*Check the one that best applies.*)

- a. Yes (how often: _____)
- b. No

If No, what procedures are being developed or currently are followed to check reliability?

6. Compared to the preparation of student teachers before involvement in the project, how effective do you find the teacher work sample? (*Check the one that best applies.*)

- a. Less effective
- b. About as effective
- c. Somewhat more effective
- d. Much more effective

7. For each of the skills listed below, rate the preparation level of most student teachers (80% or more) with whom you work when they have completed the teacher work sample. *Rate each skill as 1 (beginning), 2 (developing), 3 (proficient,) or 4 (expert).*

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> a. Specifying learning goals | <input type="checkbox"/> Do not have access to this information |
| <input type="checkbox"/> b. Assessing contextual factors | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> c. Designing instruction | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> d. Planning for student differences | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> e. Constructing tests | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> f. Administering assessment | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> g. Analyzing student learning | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> h. Providing prompt feedback | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> i. Self-evaluation and reflection | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> j. Mastery of subject matter | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> k. Classroom management | |

8. Teacher work samples include seven teaching standards related to seven processes that teacher candidates are to meet. To what degree do you believe the standards as a whole are being met? (*Check the one that best applies.*)

- a. Few if any meet any standards
- b. Some candidates meet a subset of the standards, but few meet all
- c. Most candidates meet a subset of the standards, but few meet all
- d. Most candidates meet all standards
- e. All candidates meet all standards

9. How are teacher candidates prepared to meet the seven teaching standards?
(*Check the one that best applies.*)

- a. As a regular part of their course work
- b. In separate training sessions
- c. Individual help is provided as needed
- d. Other (describe): _____

10. How many of each of the following groups are trained to assist with teacher work samples?

- a. Arts and science faculty members _____
- b. Teacher educators _____
- c. School practitioners _____

11. What is the most common method for training the above groups?
(*Check the one that best applies.*)

- a. Two- or three-day training sessions
- b. One-day training sessions
- c. Half-day training sessions
- d. Other (describe): _____

12. As a result of implementing the teacher work sample methodology, how many courses have been revised at your institution?

Appendix H:

Faculty Survey

Title II Renaissance Partnership Project for Improving Teacher Quality

Faculty Survey: January 2003

Please fill out this survey as completely as possible, following any noted skip patterns, according to your perceptions of your institution's progress related to the Renaissance project. Thank you, in advance, for taking the time to provide this information.

Your institution: _____

Your role and department: _____

1. Have you received training to prepare you for mentoring or for working with the teacher work sample? (*Check the one that best applies for each column.*)

Mentoring Training

Teacher Work Sample Training

- ____ a. Yes ____ a. Yes
____ b. No ____ b. No

2. Compared to the preparation of student teachers before involvement in the project, how effective do you find the teacher work sample? (*Check the one that best applies.*)

- ____ a. Less effective
____ b. About as effective
____ c. Somewhat more effective
____ d. Much more effective

3. For each of the skills listed below, rate the preparation level of most student teachers (80% or more) with whom you work after they have completed the teacher work sample. *Rate each skill as 1 (beginning), 2 (developing), 3 (proficient), or 4 (expert).*

- ____ a. Specifying learning goals
____ b. Assessing contextual factors
____ c. Designing instruction
____ d. Planning for student differences
____ e. Constructing tests
____ f. Administering assessment
____ g. Analyzing student learning
____ h. Providing prompt feedback
____ i. Self-evaluation and reflection
____ j. Mastery of subject matter
____ k. Classroom management

4. Teacher work samples include seven teaching standards related to seven processes that teacher candidates are to meet. To what degree do you believe the standards as a whole are being met for the student teachers you work with? (*Check the one that best applies.*)

- a. Few if any meet any standards
- b. Some candidates meet a subset of the standards, but few meet all
- c. Most candidates meet a subset of the standards, but few meet all
- d. Most candidates meet all standards
- e. All candidates meet all standards

5. How important is the seven-process framework for successfully preparing teacher candidates for teaching?

- a. Very important
- b. Important
- c. Somewhat important
- d. Somewhat unimportant
- e. Unimportant
- f. Very unimportant

6. What are the major strengths of the teacher work sample methodology?

7. What are the major weaknesses of the teacher work sample methodology?

8. What is your perception of the operational status of the data management system for teacher candidates? (*Check the one that best applies.*)

- a. I am not aware of a data management system
- b. Provides some useful information, but is only partially operational
- c. Is operational, but does not provide information in a timely manner
- d. Is fully operational for some but not all teacher candidates
- e. Is fully operational for all teacher candidates and information is timely

9. A component of the project is research about project impact on teacher candidates, faculty, etc. *Check all the types of research in which you have been involved (either conducted yourself or participated in).*

- a. Experimental, i.e., full control of experimental variables and conditions
- b. Quasi-experimental, i.e., partial control of experimental variables and conditions
- c. Correlational, i.e., focusing on relationships between variables
- d. Ethnographic/descriptive/observational
- e. Survey
- f. I have not been involved in any research (*please go to Question #12*)

If you selected any combination of options a, b, c, and d, list the specific name(s) of the “research,” either completed or in progress.

10. With how many institutions is your institution involved in conducting project-related research? (*Check the one that best applies.*)

- a. My institution is not doing any research
- b. My institution is working independently
- c. My institution is working with one other project institution
- d. My institution is working with more than one other project institutions
- e. My institution is working with all 11 project institutions

11. Who is involved in conducting project-related research at your institution? (*Check all that apply.*)

- a. Institutional coordinator
- b. Assessment coordinator
- c. Teacher work sample coordinator
- d. Mentoring coordinator
- e. College of Education faculty
- f. College of Arts and Science faculty
- g. School practitioners (e.g., cooperating teachers)
- h. Teacher candidates
- i. Other (describe): _____

12. What is the status of an assessment coordinator at your institution? (*Check the one that best applies.*)

- a. We do not have an assessment coordinator (*please go to Question 15*)
- b. We have one, but I do not know what he/she does
- c. Provides partial information about teacher candidates
- d. Provides comprehensive information about teacher candidates

13. How timely is the teacher-candidate information provided by the assessment coordinator? (*Check the one that best applies.*)

- a. Generally timely and useful
- b. Timely, but of little use
- c. Of some use, but often late
- d. Often late and of little use

14. Does your assessment coordinator provide data for the research project(s) being conducted in connection with the project? (*Check the one that best applies.*)

- a. Yes
- b. No
- c. I don't know

15. Are you aware of any course changes that have been implemented as a result of the Title II Renaissance Partnership Project for Improving Teacher Quality?

- a. Yes
- b. No

16. Do you mentor any student teachers in conjunction with the teacher work sample activity?
(Check the one that best applies.)

- a. Yes
 b. No (*please stop and return this survey*)

17. How many student teachers do you mentor in this capacity? _____

18. Do you mentor these student teachers on your own or as part of a mentoring team?
(Check the one that best applies.)

- a. Mentor on my own
 b. Mentor as part of a team

19. How do you meet with student teachers? (*Check the one that best applies.*)

- a. Meet with each student teacher individually
 b. Meet with other student teachers in a group of less than five
 c. Meet with other student teachers in a group of five or more
 d. Sometimes meet individually and sometimes as a group
 e. Never meet with student teachers
 f. Other (describe): _____

20. How often do you meet with student teachers? (*Check the one that best applies.*)

- a. Daily
 b. Weekly
 c. Twice a month
 d. Once a month
 e. Less than once a month
 f. I have never met with student teachers as part of a mentoring team
 g. Other (describe): _____

Appendix I:

School/District Personnel Survey

Title II Renaissance Partnership Project for Improving Teacher Quality

District/School Personnel Survey: January 2003

Please fill out this survey as completely as possible, following any noted skip patterns, according to your perceptions related to the Renaissance project. Thank you, in advance, for taking the time to provide this information.

Your institution: _____

1. For each of the skills listed below, rate the preparation level of most student teachers (80% or more) with whom you work when they have completed the teacher work sample. *(Rate each skill as 1 (beginning), 2 (developing), 3 (proficient), or 4 (expert).)*
 - _____ a. Specifying learning goals
 - _____ b. Assessing contextual factors
 - _____ c. Designing instruction
 - _____ d. Planning for student differences
 - _____ e. Constructing tests
 - _____ f. Administering assessment
 - _____ g. Analyzing student learning
 - _____ h. Providing prompt feedback
 - _____ i. Self-evaluation and reflection
 - _____ j. Mastery of subject matter
 - _____ k. Classroom management

2. Teacher work samples include seven teaching standards related to seven processes that teacher candidates are to meet. To what degree do you believe the standards as a whole are being met? *(Check the one that best applies.)*
 - _____ a. Few if any meet any standards
 - _____ b. Some candidates meet a subset of the standards, but few meet all
 - _____ c. Most candidates meet a subset of the standards, but few meet all
 - _____ d. Most candidates meet all standards
 - _____ e. All candidates meet all standards

3. How comprehensive is the teacher-candidate information you receive?
(Check the one that best applies.)
 - _____ a. Do not receive any teacher-candidate information (*please go to Question #5*)
 - _____ b. Receive partial information about teacher candidates
 - _____ c. Receive comprehensive information about teacher candidates

4. How timely is the teacher-candidate information you receive? (*Check the one that best applies.*)

- a. Generally timely and useful
- b. Timely, but of little use
- c. Of some use, but often late
- d. Often late and of little use

5. Indicate the number of teacher candidates you have supervised who have conducted the teaching unit required of the teacher work sample.

6. These candidates were to include the seven components listed below in their teaching. Indicate the number of candidates who successfully implemented or addressed each component. (*The minimum would be 0 and the maximum would be the number you indicated above.*)

- a. Contextual factors
- b. Learning goals
- c. Assessment
- d. Design for instruction
- e. Instructional decision-making
- f. Analysis of student learning
- g. Reflection and self-evaluation

7. How important is the seven-process framework for successfully preparing teacher candidates for teaching?

- a. Very important
- b. Important
- c. Somewhat important
- d. Somewhat unimportant
- e. Unimportant
- f. Very unimportant

8. What are the major strengths of the teacher work sample methodology?

9. What are the major weaknesses of the teacher work sample methodology?

10. Do you mentor any student teachers in conjunction with the teacher work sample?
(Check the one that best applies.)

- a. Yes
 b. No (*please stop and return this survey*)

11. How many student teachers do you mentor in this capacity? _____

12. Do you mentor these student teachers on your own or as part of a mentoring team?
(Check the one that best applies.)

- a. Mentor on my own
 b. Mentor as part of a team

13. How do you meet with student teachers? (Check the one that best applies.)

- a. Meet with each student teacher individually
 b. Meet with other student teachers in a group of less than five
 c. Meet with other student teachers in a group of five or more
 d. Sometimes meet individually and sometimes as a group
 e. Never meet with student teachers
 f. Other (describe): _____

14. How often do you meet with student teachers? (Check the one that best applies.)

- a. Daily
 b. Weekly
 c. Twice a month
 d. Once a month
 e. Less than once a month
 f. I have never met with student teachers as part of a mentoring team
 g. Other (describe): _____

Appendix J:

Student Teacher Survey

Title II Renaissance Partnership Project for Improving Teacher Quality

Student Teacher Survey: January 2003

This survey is for teachers who completed their student teaching during the fall of 2002; all questions pertain to that period of time (i.e., fall 2002).

Please fill out this survey as completely as possible, following any noted skip patterns, according to your perceptions related to the Renaissance project. Thank you, in advance, for taking the time to provide this information.

Institution you attended: _____

1. What grade level(s) did you teach in the fall of 2002? (*Check all that apply.*)

- a. Elementary school
- b. Middle/junior high school
- c. High school

2. What unit(s) did you teach? (*Check all that apply.*)

- a. English
- b. History
- c. Language Arts
- d. Mathematics
- e. Science
- f. Social Studies
- g. Other (describe): _____

3. What types of data were collected concerning your teacher performance during your student teaching? (*Check all that apply.*)

- a. Scores on published tests such as PRAXIS
- b. Scores on tests in subject areas (e.g., math, French)
- c. Scores on tests of pedagogical knowledge (e.g., learning theory)
- d. Evaluations of my lesson plans
- e. Observations of my teaching performance

4. Who was involved with designing your teacher work sample? (*Check all that apply.*)

- a. Myself
- b. College of Education staff member
- c. College of Education and Arts and Science College staff
- d. My cooperating teacher
- e. Teacher work sample coordinator
- f. Mentor(s)
- g. Other (describe): _____

5. What was the source(s) of evidence that your teaching performance directly affected the performance of your students? (*Check all that apply.*)

- a. Scores on subject matter tests
- b. Hand-in assignments
- c. Student group projects
- d. Student participation in classroom discussion
- e. Scores on pre/post assessments
- f. Scores on scoring rubrics

6. For each of the seven teaching processes listed below, indicate the adequacy of the training you received. (*Check the one description that best applies for each process.*)

	Not at all Adequate	Somewhat Inadequate	Somewhat Adequate	Very Adequate
a. Contextual factors	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Learning goals	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. Assessment	_____	_____	_____	_____
d. Design for instruction	_____	_____	_____	_____
e. Instructional decision making	_____	_____	_____	_____
f. Analysis of student learning	_____	_____	_____	_____
g. Self-evaluation and reflection	_____	_____	_____	_____

7. Your teaching unit (part of the teacher work sample) was to include the seven components listed below. *Check all of the components that you have successfully implemented or addressed.*

- a. Contextual factors
- b. Learning goals
- c. Assessment
- d. Design for instruction
- e. Instructional decision making
- f. Analysis of student learning
- g. Self-evaluation and reflection

8. How important was the seven-process framework for successfully preparing you for teaching?

- a. Very important
- b. Important
- c. Somewhat important
- d. Somewhat unimportant
- e. Unimportant
- f. Very unimportant

9. What are the major strengths of the teacher work sample methodology?

10. What are the major weaknesses of the teacher work sample methodology?

11. Select the option that best describes your mentoring experience during the fall of 2002.
(Check the one that best applies.)

- a. I didn't have a mentor or a mentoring team (*please go to Question #18*)
- b. A staff member from the College of Education
- c. A staff member from the College of Education and a cooperating teacher
- d. A staff member from the College of Education, the College of Arts and Sciences, and a cooperating teacher
- e. Other (describe): _____

12. How often did you meet with your mentor or mentoring team? (*Check the one that best applies.*)

- a. Daily
- b. Weekly
- c. Twice a month
- d. Once a month
- e. Less than once a month
- f. I never met with my mentor or mentoring team
- g. Other (describe): _____

13. How did you usually meet with your mentor or mentoring team? (*Check the one that best applies.*)

- a. Individually
- b. With other student teachers in a group of less than five
- c. With other student teachers in a group of five or more
- d. Sometimes individually and sometimes in groups
- e. Never met with mentor(s)
- f. Other (describe): _____

14. Did you receive feedback from your mentor or mentoring team about your teaching performance? (*Check the one that best applies.*)

- a. Yes
- b. No (*please go to Question #17*)

15. How valuable was the feedback you received? (*Check the one that best applies.*)

- a. Little practical value
- b. Some value for improving my teaching
- c. Considerable value for improving my teaching
- d. Great value for improving my teaching

16. How timely was the feedback you received? (*Check the one that best applies.*)

- a. Timely, so that I could apply it to my teaching
- b. Late, so that it was of little value

17. Your teacher preparation program included a number of teaching-related tasks. For which tasks did you receive assistance from your mentor or mentoring team? (*Check all that apply.*)

- a. Designing standards-based units of instruction
- b. Teaching units of instruction
- c. Assessing student learning
- d. Preparing my work sample teaching exhibit
- e. Did not receive assistance with any of the above tasks
- f. Other (describe): _____

18. Did anyone discuss with you the possibility of having a mentor or mentoring team to support you in your first year of teaching? (*Check the one that best applies.*)

- a. Yes
- b. No

Appendix K:

Matrix of Survey Questions

by Multiple Stakeholder Groups

Matrix of Survey Questions by Multiple Stakeholder Groups

Items	Institu-tional	Assessme-nt	Mentoring	TWS	Faculty	District	Student Teacher
Assessment							
Identify the status of your data management system for teacher candidate performance.	Q1	Q1					
What items does your data management system include?	Q2	Q2					
Indicate the percentage of your teacher candidates for whom the data management system is operational, i.e., is working from collecting data through providing feedback.	Q3	Q5b					
Who regularly receives data management system information about teacher candidates?	Q4	Q6					
Does your data management system include follow-up data on beginning teachers in their first year of teaching?	Q5	Q8					
How many teacher candidates graduate from your institution yearly?	Q6a	Q9a					
Of that number, for what percent does your data management system include follow-up data during their first year of teaching?	Q6b	Q9b					
What measures does your data management system include for graduate follow up?	Q7	Q10					
How timely is the teacher-candidate information provided by the assessment coordinator?					Q13	Q4	
Mentoring							
Serving as a mentor requires time and effort on the part of faculty and participating school personnel.	Q15		Q1				
Which of the factors listed below serve as compensation for such involvement?			Q1				
Maintaining quality control across mentors is an issue that requires attention, especially in colleges with large enrollments in teacher preparation programs. What measures have been taken for maintaining quality control at your institution?	Q16		Q2				
What percent of teacher candidates at your institution have either a mentor or a mentoring team?	Q17		Q3				
Describe the composition of a typical mentoring team.	Q18		Q4				
How often do mentors or mentoring teams typically meet?	Q19		Q5		Q20	Q14	Q12
How do mentors or mentoring teams typically meet with teacher candidates?			Q6		Q19	Q13	Q13
Which of the following tasks do mentors or mentoring teams usually provide assistance with?	Q20		Q7				Q17
How valuable is the feedback typically provided by mentors or mentoring teams?	Q21		Q8				Q15
Do you mentor any student teachers in conjunction with the TWS activity?					Q16	Q10	
How many student teachers do you mentor in this capacity?					Q17	Q11	
Do you mentor these student teachers on your own or as part of a mentoring team?					Q18	Q12	

Q=Question

Matrix of Survey Questions by Multiple Stakeholder Groups (continued)

Items	Institutional	Assessment	Mentoring	TWS	Faculty	District	Student Teacher
Teacher Work Sample							
The pilot testing of the “Performance Prompt, Teaching Process Standards, and Scoring Rubrics for the TWS” was conducted in spring 2001. What is your perception of the present status of this product?	Q8			Q1			
The scoring rubric for the TWS contains 32 indicators across seven TWS processes. To successfully meet an indicator, a score of 3 is required. What percentage of teacher candidates attain a score of 3 on the majority of the indicators?	Q9			Q3			
Who scores the TWS?	Q10			Q4			
Do those using the scoring rubric go through periodic reliability checks by independently scoring the same TWS?	Q11a			Q5a			
If no, what procedures are being developed or currently are followed to check reliability?	Q11b			Q5b			
Compared to the preparation of student teachers before involvement in the project, how effective do you find the TWS?	Q12			Q6	Q2		
For each of the skills listed below, rate the preparation level of most student teachers with whom you work when they have completed the TWS.	Q13			Q7	Q3	Q1	
TWS include seven teaching standards related to seven processes that teacher candidates are to meet. To what degree do you believe the standards as a whole are being met?	Q14			Q8	Q4	Q2	
How important is the seven-process framework for successfully preparing teacher candidates for teaching?					Q5	Q7	Q8
What are the major strengths of the TWS methodology?					Q6	Q8	Q9
What are the major weaknesses of the TWS methodology?					Q7	Q9	Q10
Research							
A component of the project is research about project impact on teacher candidates, faculty, etc. Check all the types of research in which you have been involved.	Q30				Q9		
With how many institutions is your institution involved in conducting project-related research?	Q31				Q10		
Who is involved in conducting project-related research at your institution?	Q32				Q11		
Course Revisions							
As a result of implementing the TWS methodology, about how many courses have been revised at your institution?	Q33			Q12			

Q=Question