

Measure 3. Teacher Candidates' Dispositions Means and Instrument Rater Agreement

Teacher candidates' dispositions are regularly observed and evaluated by college faculty, college supervisors, and clinical instructors. Each of the 38 items on the evaluation instrument are aligned with InTASC Standards and reflect the dispositions needed to teach effectively. Rater agreement is a way to establish how closely the clinical instructors' and college supervisors' evaluations of teacher candidates align. When candidates are evaluated, the clinical instructor and college supervisor each independently code an observation using the instrument. Agreement between these two raters' codes is evidence that the coding scheme is objective and the instrument reliable. Generally, we want our data to be objective, so it is important to establish high inter-rater reliability. When calculating the agreement data below, we wanted to ascertain if raters were within one point of one another; that is, if the clinical instructor rated a candidate as 7 on a particular item and the college supervisor rated the student as 8, we were satisfied with this level of agreement, as both ratings indicate proficient performance. In addition to looking at agreement, we examined the overall mean and subcategory means disaggregated by rater role. In short, we wanted to see if either clinical instructors or college supervisors were noticeably "harder" evaluators.

Overall, rater agreement was very high, with the combined items and all subcategories above 85%. During the last two years, we have been monitoring rater agreement for the "participates in professional development opportunities" subscale. We noticed a lack of communication between clinical instructors and college supervisors regarding professional development opportunities available to and attended by candidates in any given placement, so we highlighted this topic in our training and encouraged more regular communication between clinical instructors and college supervisors about candidates' professional development. This year's high agreement (100%) suggests those efforts have been beneficial. In the combined items and all subcategories, clinical instructor and college supervisor means were within .846 of one another. Neither clinical instructors nor college supervisors consistently rated candidates higher across the subscales, further underscoring their similarity in ratings.

In terms of candidate performance, candidate means were all well above the EPP target of 5. We have no concerns regarding candidates' dispositional preparation and support at this time.

Table 1. Rater agreement and means by rater role for dispositions combined items and subcategories

Categories	Means		
	Percent Agreement	CI	CS
All items	97.51%	7.727	7.989
Demonstrates sensitivity to students	92.05%	7.330	7.477
Participates with others in a collaborative manner	100%	7.556	7.460
Treats others with respect	100%	7.143	7.682
Demonstrates lifelong learning	96.83%	7.286	7.429
Participates in professional development opportunities	100%	7.708	7.375
Demonstrates effective decision-making skills	100%	7.417	7.167
Works effectively with diverse learners	96.15%	7.5	7.792
Displays excitement about teaching	100%	7.846	7.769