DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 080 458   SP 006 696

AUTHOR   Bryan, Carson; Quinlisk, Jon
TITLE   Student Teacher Evaluation Must Reside in the Neutral
                World of Documented Behavior.
NOTE   5p.

EDRS PRICE   MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS   Criteria; Evaluation Techniques; *Microteaching;
                *Performance Based Teacher Education; *Performance
                Criteria; Student Evaluation; *Student Teachers;
                *Student Teaching; Teacher Education; Teacher
                Interns

ABSTRACT
        Three problems have plagued the traditional methods
of evaluation of student teachers: the imposition of a supervisor's
philosophy on the student, semantic vagueness in a supervisor
checklist of a student's performance, and determining each student's
level of achievement. Wheeling College revised its field-based
secondary teacher preparation program to overcome these problems. The
competencies of a master teacher were identified and became the goals
of the students in the program. Each goal emphasized the student's
developing his style of teaching and shaping his curriculum
consistent with his philosophy and theory of learning, thus avoiding
differing educational philosophies. Semantic vagueness was dealt with
by identifying a progression of more demanding behaviors that
culminate in each particular goal behavior. The final problem of
determining each student's level cf achievement was accomplished by
providing tools to document student teacher performance (audio and
video tapes, clinical supervision feedback) with the responsibility
for utilizing these tools resting with the student teacher. (JA)

?14

STUDENT TEACHER EVALUATION MUST RESIDE IN THE NEUTRAL WORLD OF DOCUMENTED BEHAVIOR

Carson Bryan and Jon Quinlisk

In most professions, the internship is the program which attempts to answer the following question: How well does the person apply his knowledge and skills? In teacher preparation we consider student teaching as the most critical area of a student's professional education sequence. Regardless of the differences that teacher preparation programs have in education courses, they all have success in student teaching as the keystone to recommendation for entering the profession.

Today we are witnessing a national trend toward Performance-Based Teacher Education. In fact, Performance-Based Certification is being explored for possible implementation by many states. Colleges and Universities, whether moving to PBTE or just desiring to improve the student teaching experience, must face the problem of evaluating teacher performance.

Evaluation of a student teacher has traditionally been done two ways. One method of evaluation is where the supervisor observes the student teacher and makes evaluative comments. Often this method does not allow for basic differences in educational philosophy and may result in the supervisor imposing his values and philosophy of education on the student teacher. The other traditional method is the supervisory checklist. Usually the checklist is loaded

with semantic vagueness and we may find what one evaluator
considers as "rapport" another sees as "chaos", or one man's
"attention to individual needs" is another's "lack of plan-
ning". Since these two methods contain major weaknesses,
we are faced with the need for a meaningful and useful
method of evaluation.

At Wheeling College we wanted to revise our field-
based secondary teacher preparation program to make it
more effective. Almost immediately we had to find answers
to the problem of evaluation. As a first step in our quest
for a solution to the problem, we identified the competen-
cies a Master Teacher would exhibit regardless of his edu-
cational philosophy and values. The competencies, our
operational definition of a "good" teacher, became the goals
for students in our program. The goals we identified are:

   I   The student will identify the basic factors
       behind the operation of the school system
       and develop mechanisms for functioning with-
       in the structure.

  II   The student will structure classroom situa-
       tions to provide for productive learning.

 III   The student will control classroom situa-
       tions to provide for productive learning.

  IV   The student develops his style of relating
       to pupils and shapes the curriculum con-
       sistent with his philosophy and theory of
       learning.

V   The student develops and applies skills of self-evaluation.

VI   The student develops and applies change agent skills.

VII   The student uses the process of scholarly inquiry in solving educational problems.

We used the goals for approximately one semester with student teachers. Our evaluation of our students indicated that the goals eliminated the problems of conflict in philosophy and value by transcending the areas of disagreement inherent in differing educational philosophies. Our operational definition of a "good" teacher was compatible with the differing philosophies with which we came in contact.

The problem of semantic vagueness became our next task because we recognized that our goals were general enough for a variety of interpretations. To solve this problem we identified a progression of more demanding behaviors that culminate in the goal behavior. By specifying the goal behavior in more precise terms, the problem of semantic vagueness became negligible. Perhaps analysis of what we did with our goals (using Goal 1 as an example) can clarify this point.

Goal I (The student will identify the basic factors behind the operation of the school system and develop mechanisms for functioning within the structure.) has the following three objectives and procedures that increase in degree of difficulty:

Objective A. The student identifies persons and their

functions in the explicit power structure.

Procedure A. Each student procures and reads handbooks,

communications to faculty, and school board

information.

Objective B. The student identifies persons and their

functions in the implicit power structure.

Procedure B. Each student attends faculty meetings, eats

lunch with faculty, visits faculty lounges,

attends board meetings, interacts with a

variety of faculty members and fellow student

teachers.

Objective C. The student applies his intellectual schemes

for functioning within the structure.

Procedure C. Each student operates unhindered by external

pressures throughout the semester.

Successful completion of these objectives demonstrates

that Goal I has been met.

The final problem to be solved was how to determine

each student's level of achievement. To slip into the

enticement of evaluator judgments would negate our attempts

to eliminate the weaknesses found in the two traditional

methods. The solution we found was developing and employ-

ing a variety of ways to document the student's highest

level of behavior. Thus the Department provides the stu-

dent with the tools for documenting his behavior. The

tools include a learning environment to operate in, educa-

tional experiences, equipment, and instruments for deter-

mining progress. The responsiblity for using these tools

in documenting performance levels resides with the student teacher. The student teacher uses audio and video tapes, written records such as lesson plans and experience note-books, instruments for measuring pupil feedback, Clinical Supervision feedback, written tests, and conferences with supervisors to document his level of achievement. With the evidence from these sources provided by the student and using the performance levels as a criteria, evaluation of the student teacher's performance is freed from semantic vagueness and possible conflicts of value between the evaluator and the teacher.

Again using Goal I as an example, we have the following evaluations of the three objectives.

Evaluation of A.   The student receives 100% on a written test after the 3rd week. (The student continues taking the test until he achieves 100%)

Evaluation of B.   The student receives 100% on a written test concerning the process he would follow in solving situational problems. The test is given during the 7th or 8th week. (The student continues taking the test until he achieves 100%)

Evaluation of C.   Independent and documented assessment by student, classroom supervisor, and college supervisor.

Thus we solved our problem of how to accurately evaluate a student teacher by placing evaluation in the neutral world of documented behavior.