



Liberty University
School of Education

CPAST: Candidate Preservice Assessment of Student Teaching

Description of the Instrument

The Candidate Preservice Assessment Student Teaching (CPAST) is a proprietary formative and summative assessment implemented during the student teaching practicum (i.e., the culminating field experience of a teacher preparation program). Because the assessment is used as a coaching tool, it is used twice - once midway through the student teaching practicum and once at the end.

Note: Also see data for the “Pre-CPAST” Form, another EPP-wide Assessment Instrument, which is developmental in nature and aligns with the CPAST Form. It is used in the field placement experiences before the student teaching practicum.

The CPAST is completed in the designated student teaching course for 2022-23:

- UG: EDUC 476/477 and EDST 480/481
- MAT: EDST 590, 591, 592, 593, 599 and EDUC 590, 591, 592, 593

The CPAST Form was developed by a group of eight EPPs in Ohio over the course of three years and is intended to serve as a formative and summative assessment during the student teaching practicum. It is designed to prepare educators for future professional evaluations and is used during student teaching as a coaching tool to help candidates develop as a professional, create professional growth goals, and meet expectations of performance.

The CPAST Form is a 21-row rubric designed to measure teacher candidate’s pedagogical knowledge/skills and professional dispositions during the student teaching practicum, and CFA confirms the 21 items do measure those two constructs. The rows align with both InTASC and CAEP Standards, and a crosswalk between the CPAST and edTPA has also been developed.

EPPs that use the Form (23 from Ohio in Spring 2017; 41 [anticipated] from 10 states in 2017-2018) submit the following data for each candidate assessed with the CPAST Form to a database maintained by Ohio State University: midterm row scores, final row scores, and descriptive statistics (i.e., program licensure area, gender, race, and ethnicity).

At the end of each semester, Ohio State returns a report to each participating institution containing the EPP’s data - aggregated and disaggregated (by program and level, gender, race, and ethnicity) – as well as comparison data from all institutions who are using the CPAST Form. This data is used to inform the EPP about the performance of candidates in their individual

programs, by campus and level (grad vs. undergrad), and allows them to compare results to other institutions that use CFAST.

The CFAST Form is used by the university supervisor (US), the cooperating teacher (CT), and the candidate. During a Three-Way Conference at the midterm and end of the student teaching semester, the US meets synchronously with the CT and the candidate. All three individuals are expected to bring a proposed score for each row to this meeting. After a US guided conversation, the trio arrives at a consensus number for each row, which the US records as the candidate's scores.

The first year a US uses the CFAST Form to assess candidates' performance, s/he is required to take a 90-minute self-paced online training (administered through Qualtrics). At the conclusion of this training, there is a 10-question quiz, and the US is required to earn a score of at least 80%. If they do not achieve an 80%, there is a five-question supplemental quiz on which they must earn a 66%. To date, all supervisors have successfully passed the training assessment.

After the first year of training ("Initial Training"), a US is required to take a 30-minute online "Refresher Training," followed by five assessment questions (on which s/he must score a 66%). If s/he does not achieve 66%, there is a three-question supplemental quiz on which s/he must earn a 66%. To date, all US have successfully passed the refresher assessment training.

A training (without assessments) is also available for CTs and the candidates.

Standards Alignment

The CFAST has been aligned with the components of *CAEP Revised Initial Standard 1*, the InTASC Standards, the ISTE Technology Standards, and the Model Code of Ethics for Educators (MCEE).

^EPP Update Crosswalk: CAEP Revised INITIAL Standard 1	InTASC Standards
R1.1 Learner and learning	1-3
R1.2 Content	4-5
R1.3 Instructional practice	6-8
R1.4 Professional responsibility	9-10

Validity & Reliability

Validity

In summer of 2015, three content experts (a psychometrician, a K-12 teacher, and an EPP faculty member from another institution) were recruited to rate the clarity, importance and representativeness of each row of the CCAST, as well as their alignment to the proposed InTASC and CAEP Standards. The content validity ratio was calculated with their data and results suggest that the instrument has good content validity.

After the content analysis was completed, Ohio State collected data from 1203 teacher candidates from 23 EPPs in Ohio in the 2015-2016 academic year. The supervisors from these EPPs had all successfully completed the “Initial Training” described above. Data collected from these EPPs was analyzed for validity. Specifically, a confirmatory factor analysis was conducted to examine the construct validity of the instrument. The model fit indexes indicated the hypothesized two-factor model fit the data reasonably well and all the items are moderately or strongly associated with their corresponding latent factors, suggesting that the CCAST demonstrates good construct validity.

Longitudinal measurement invariance of the instrument was tested through a hierarchy of nested models to examine whether the same constructs are measured across time. The results suggest that the instrument has weak factorial invariance, suggesting the same latent variances are being measured across time.

Reliability

As previously noted, Ohio State collected data from 1203 teacher candidates from 23 EPPs in Ohio in the 2015-2016 academic year, and the supervisors from these EPPs had all successfully completed the “Initial Training” described above. Internal consistency reliability was examined by calculating Cronbach Alpha coefficient. The results suggest that the subscales and the total scale of the CCAST display good internal consistency.

Of the 1203 teacher candidates, 32 were recruited to participate in an inter-rater reliability study, in which each teacher candidate was evaluated by two supervisors – their primary university supervisor (i.e., the supervisor who was formally assigned by the EPPs to supervise the teacher candidate during the student teaching), and a secondary rater (i.e., a supervisor who completed a minimum of three observations of the teacher candidates throughout the semester). Adjacent agreement and Kappa-n statistics were used to determine the inter-rater reliability of supervisors’ ratings on the CCAST assessment. The results indicate that supervisors’ ratings of teacher candidates’ performance on the CCAST display good inter-rater reliability.

Data Tables

The CCAST is administered each semester.

The following pages provide data cycles for 2022-23.

CCAST Rubric *CCAST Form Revised 6/21/2017 © 2017*

- Comparison of Overall Scores to the National data provided

CPAST Rubric Overview

Valid and Reliable Instruments for Educator Preparation Programs (VARI-EPP) Candidate Preservice Assessment of Student Teaching (CPAST)


Rubric and assignments may not be shared without permission

- [Pedagogy](#) Evaluation
- [Dispositions](#) Evaluation

Pedagogy		Alignment	Dispositions	
Planning for Instruction and Assessment			Professional Commitment and Behaviors	
A. Focus for Learning: Standards and Objectives/Targets	InTASC 7a		N. Participates in Professional Development	CAEP 1.4^
B. Materials and Resources	InTASC 7b		O. Demonstrates Effective Communication with Parents or Legal Guardians	InTASC 10d
C. Assessment of P-12 Learning	InTASC 6b		P. Demonstrates Punctuality	InTASC 9o
D. Differentiated Methods	InTASC 2c		Q. Meets Deadlines and Obligations	InTASC 9o
			R. Preparation	InTASC 3d
Instructional Delivery			Professional Relationships	
E. Learning Target and Directions	InTASC 7c		S. Collaboration	InTASC 10b
F. Critical Thinking	InTASC 5d		T. Advocacy to Meet the Needs of Learners or for the Teaching Profession	InTASC 10j
G. Checking for Understanding and Adjusting Instruction through Formative Assessment	InTASC 8b		Critical Thinking and Reflective Practice	
H. Digital Tools and Resources	CAEP 1.3^		U. Responds Positively to Constructive Criticism	InTASC 9n
I. Safe and Respectful Learning Environment	InTASC 3d			
Assessment				
J. Data-Guided Instruction	CAEP 2.3			
K. Feedback to Learners	InTASC 6d			
L. Assessment Techniques	InTASC 7d			
Analysis of Teaching				
M. Connections to Research and Theory	CAEP 1.3^			

LU Data sets for Fall 2022 & Spring 2023

Fall 2022



Spring 2023

