



The Teacher Candidate in the Clinical Experience

MEES for Teacher Candidates User Manual

Revised Summer 2023



Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
Implementation.....	3
Scoring.....	4
EPP and State Use of Scores.....	4
Training of Evaluators and Inter-Rater Reliability	4

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

Introduction

The performance assessment used during the culminating clinical experience for teacher candidates was developed through collaboration between faculty and staff in Missouri Educator Preparation Programs (EPP) and personnel at the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE). It is based upon the Missouri Educator Evaluation System (MEES) and is often referred to as the MEES for Teacher Candidates. Developers also incorporated feedback from practicing PK-12 educators.

Since the fall of 2018, DESE has required that EPPs assess all student teachers using the instrument, and candidates must receive a passing score to qualify for certification. The score required for certification eligibility is set by the State Board of Education, informed by insight and data provided by DESE and the Missouri Technical Advisory Committee for Educator Preparation.

The MEES for Teacher Candidates consists of nine separate rubrics, each aligned with one standard of the [Missouri Teacher Standards](#). Below, for example, is the rubric for Standard 7.

Standard 7: Student Assessment and Data Analysis. The teacher candidate understands and uses formative and summative assessment strategies to assess the learner's progress and uses both classroom and standardized assessment data to plan ongoing instruction.				
0-The teacher candidate does not possess the necessary knowledge; therefore, the standard is not evident or is incorrect in performance.	1-The teacher candidate can articulate the necessary knowledge but does not demonstrate in performance.	2-The teacher candidate can articulate the necessary knowledge and demonstrates in performance with some success.	3-The teacher candidate can articulate the necessary knowledge and effectively demonstrate it in performance.	4-The teacher candidate adapts and develops the lesson according to the teaching environment/ student response.
Student Progress Monitoring				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides no evidence of data from assessments to monitor the progress of students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Articulates the importance of collecting assessment data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses formative and/or summative assessment data to monitor the progress of the class as a whole. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses formative and/or summative assessment data to effectively monitor the progress of individual students and the class as a whole. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyzes trend data to respond instructionally, resulting in a positive impact on student learning
Formative Assessment				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides no awareness that formative assessments are needed to guide future instruction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Articulates the need to use formative assessment strategies to gather data on student understanding to guide future instruction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses some formative assessment strategies to partially gather data on student understanding and sporadically implements adjustments to plan future instruction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses formative assessment strategies to effectively gather data about student understanding and uses it to plan future instruction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses multiple assessments to accurately monitor, analyze, and adjust mid-lesson instruction, to increase the progress of each student and the class as a whole.
Assessment Records				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides no evidence of an understanding of maintaining student assessment records. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Articulates a process for maintaining student assessment records. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confidentially maintains student assessment records, though processes are inconsistent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintains student assessment records consistently and confidentially. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintains detailed student assessment records consistently and confidentially and uses the data to inform collaboration with data teams, students, and families.

Implementation

Formative Implementation

The instrument should be used by both University Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers throughout the culminating clinical experience so that the teacher candidate is familiar with the expectations and has time to make adjustments. EPPs determine, however, how often a candidate should be provided with a formal score. Evaluators should conference regularly with the teacher candidate regarding progress in the areas of the instrument's indicators. The [Teacher Candidate Formative Assessment Tool](#) is an optional observational instrument that EPPs may choose to use.

Summative Implementation

Toward the end of the culminating clinical experience, the Cooperating Teacher and University Supervisor use the MEES for Teacher Candidates to provide a summative evaluation of the candidate.

After conferencing with the candidate and each other, both evaluators submit scores for each of the nine standards.

Scoring

During the culminating clinical experience, both the Cooperating Teacher and the University Supervisor use the rubrics to generate scores for each of the nine standards according to the following guidelines:

- Rubrics are analytic, not holistic; evaluators should select the descriptors that best match the evidence provided in classroom observations, artifacts, interviews, and other sources.
- Each indicator should be scored independently based solely on the evidence available.
- Candidates must be scored on all indicators.
- While “snapshot” classroom observations are essential opportunities for evaluators to document evidence, some indicators require evidence that may not be observable in a class period.
 - Scores on the MEES for Teacher Candidates should never be generated solely based upon a classroom observation but, instead, should be grounded in the assessment of the entire body of evidence available.
 - That evidence should include, but is not limited to, classroom observations, personal interviews and discussions, and artifacts (e.g. lesson plans, classroom rules).
 - There are no statewide mandates regarding the types of artifacts used, but individual EPPs may have such requirements.
- The mean of all indicator scores in a standard is the score for the entire standard. Using Standard 7 (above) as an example, an evaluator may assign scores of 2, 4, and 2 for the three indicators. The mean of these three indicator scores is 2.7 (score should be reported to one (1) decimal). In this case, the teacher candidate would receive a score of 2.7 for Standard 7.
- Using the process developed by the EPP, evaluators will submit scores for each of the nine (9) standards.

EPP and State Use of Scores

- During the annual fall data reporting process EPPs must submit the Cooperating Teacher’s and University Supervisor’s nine standard scores (18 total) for each program completer.
- If a Teacher Candidate has two cooperating teachers with time equally split between them, the scores for the standard will be averaged by the EPP.
- The number derived from adding all 18 standard scores together is the number used to determine eligibility for certification. In Academic Year 2023-24, the required score is **42**.
- Candidates must meet or exceed the minimum passing score in order to be recommended for certification.

Training of Evaluators and Inter-Rater Reliability

Because the MEES for Teacher Candidates requires subjective scoring, inter-rater reliability is important. All evaluators (Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors) need to learn to consistently identify the same kinds of behaviors (or lack thereof) at each rating level. EPPs are responsible for ensuring that must ensure that all evaluators engage in regular training to calibrate scoring.

While EPPs have the ultimate responsibility for making sure that teacher candidates are equitably evaluated, statewide trainings and materials are available. Training experiences shared across the state

are valuable because they provide opportunities for different evaluators compare their ratings of the same artifacts and observations to those produces by other evaluators. This work can help decrease the range of scores given based upon similar evidence. For more information about training opportunities, please contact DESE's Educator Preparation Section at: eqprep@dese.mo.gov