DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 240 106 SP 023 813

AUTHOR O'Neal, Sharon F.
TITLE Supervision of Student Teachers: Feedback and Evaluation. Clinical Teacher Education -- Preservice Series.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
REPORT NO RDCTE-9047
PUB DATE Feb 83
NOTE 117p.; For related documents, see SP 023 801 and SP 023 803-806.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cooperating Teachers; *Feedback; Field Experience Programs; Formative Evaluation; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Student Attitudes; *Student Evaluation; *Student Teacher Relationship; *Student Teachers; Student Teacher Supervisors; Summative Evaluation; *Teacher Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *Student Teacher Evaluation

ABSTRACT

The types of evaluative feedback student teachers received regarding their classroom performance were investigated. Information was obtained from interviews, journals, conferences, rating scales, and evaluations involving 20 student teachers, 20 cooperating teachers, and 9 university supervisors. This report describes the formative and summative evaluation that took place during the course of student teaching experiences. Content of supervisory conferences and formal, final evaluations are compared to those university protocols regarding the formative and summative evaluation of student teachers. Interview and journal data as well as information reported on individual performance rating scales are described. These data are considered to reflect participants' perceptions, and concerns are compared to conference and final evaluation data to determine congruence. Conclusions are drawn from these findings and hypotheses suggested for future study. (Author/JD)

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education

The University of Texas at Austin

Austin, Texas 78712

SUPERVISION OF STUDENT TEACHERS: FEEDBACK AND EVALUATION

Sharon F. O'Neal

Report No. 9047

This Publication is One of

a Series on

Clinical Teacher Education--Preservice

Gary A. Griffin, Program Director and
Principal Investigator

February 1983

Preface

The capstone of a teacher preparation program is student teaching, the time when the prospective teacher demonstrates what has been learned about teaching and continues to learn how to do teaching. Under the guidance of a career teacher and with the assistance of a university-based supervisor, the teacher candidate becomes a member of the teaching force in the complex, ongoing world of the classroom.

Central to student teaching is the supervision of the process, the interactions between student teacher, cooperating teacher, and university supervisor that guide the experience. Although the supervision of student teachers is considered to be critical to a successful learning experience, it has received relatively little systematic research attention.

This report describes the supervision of student teaching from a variety of perspectives including discussion of university requirements, school system requirements, feedback procedures, evaluation procedures, and participants' perceptions of the process. The report is unique in that all parties to the experience are included, not only student teachers.

A major contribution of this report is the inclusion of descriptions of the methodological problems and benefits of working with qualitative data. The analysis systems and their evolution are discussed in the belief that these procedures and methods can be of use to others concerned with intricate systems of human interaction.

The report was written by Sharon O'Neal who combines a perceptive understanding of the issues of schooling with a finely-tuned analytic approach to analyzing and describing those issues clearly and sensitively. The report could not have taken shape, however, without the contributions made by Susan Barnes, Robert Hughes, Jr., Maria Defino, Hobart Hukill, Heather Carter, Hugh

Munby, and Lupita Guzman. The difficulties of dealing with large bodies of data was made more manageable by the assistance of Linda Mora, Luann McLarry, Freddie Green, and Vicky Rogers.

We are especially grateful to the more than two hundred participants in the study. They made us welcome in their university and school settings for a full semester, permitting us to become immersed in their professional lives. We offer them our admiration and gratitude.

This report is one of a series dealing with clinical preservice teacher education. The investigations which are reported in the series were conducted by the research team of the Research in Teacher Education program area of the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at The University of Texas at Austin. Inquiries about related reports can be directed to Communication Services, Research and Development Center, Education Annex, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712.

Gary A. Griffin
Principal Investigator

Abstract

This paper described in detail the evaluative feedback student teachers received regarding their classroom performance. The nature of this feedback was then discussed in terms of congruence with university protocols for "student teacher feedback" and participants' perceptions of feedback. Formative feedback, as characterized by supervisory conferences, revealed a concern with the methods and materials of teaching which were specific to the classroom at hand. Few evaluative statements regarding the student teachers' performance were shared. Institutional protocols asked that feedback promote skills in effective classroom management and instruction. Although formative feedback addressed classroom management and instruction, any information about "effective" or "good" classroom management and instruction was implicit. Summative feedback which was characterized through the final student teaching evaluations, revealed high ratings of student teachers. Clearly final evaluations served to address both cooperating teachers' and university supervisors' institutional responsibilities regarding the "grading" of student teachers. However due to the consistently high ratings given to all student teachers in the sample, those who utilize this information may not be able to distinguish one student teachers' performance from another.

Participants' perceptions of feedback, supervision and evaluation were examined through a number of data sources. Data revealed that cooperating teachers consistently expressed a concern with imparting knowledge to the student teacher regarding the specific methods and materials of teaching. Such concerns were consistent with their talk about teaching in supervisory conferences. Student teachers' perceptions of supervision and evaluation showed a predominant concern with the good personal relationships between themselves and their cooperating teachers. When questioned as to why they felt these relationships were good most stated that their teachers shared ideas, offered constructive criticism, held high expectations and maintained a collegial rapport with them. However, an examination of the summative evaluation they received showed that cooperating teachers offered few evaluative statements and dominated most interactions.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

Supervision of Student Teachers:

Feedback and Evaluation

Introduction

A major research investigation of preservice clinical teacher education, or student teaching, was conducted during the fall of 1981 by the Research in Teacher Education (RITE) program division of the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. Because feedback serves as the vehicle for both the instruction and subsequently the evaluation of the student teacher, regular observation and feedback are key ingredients to a successful student teaching experience. Therefore, one goal of this study was to describe in detail the nature of the feedback student teachers receive, regarding their performance, from their cooperating teachers and their university supervisors.

Rationale

The feedback student teachers receive throughout the course of their training may be an important variable to the success or failure of their training. Southall and King (1979) found, in their study of student teaching, that both cooperating teachers and student teachers identified lack of communication as their most frequent problem. In addition, student teachers appear to have direct preferences for the way in which feedback is delivered. In a study conducted by Copeland and Atkinson (1978), student teachers demonstrated a clear preference for directive supervisors in a conference situation. As Griffin, Hughes, Barnes, Carter, Defino, and Edwards (Note 1) pointed out, because student teachers are being asked to perform at acceptable levels within a certain time period and within various contexts, a lack of concreteprofessional advice may be frustrating. To ask student teachers to self-analyze, self-diagnose and self-evaluate under the watchful eye of the nondirective supervisor may be a difficult task indeed.

This report will describe those feedback systems which operated in the student teaching situations studied in this investigation. In addition, how those systems relate to participants' perceptions of feedback and evaluation and the universities' expectations for feedback and evaluation will also be described.

This report is part of series produced by the RITE program in their study of preservice teacher education. Therefore some reference to the Clinical Teacher Education - Preservice Study is indicated. For a more detailed rationale of this study, a literature review, a description of the methodology, as well as appended instruments, the reader is referred to Griffin, et al., (Note 1). A comparative analysis of the documents as well as additional information regarding the context of student teaching is detailed in Defino, Barnes, and O'Neal (Note 2). Further analysis and findings related to personal and professional characteristics, change, and outcomes, as measured by self-administered psychological tests, are presented in Hughes and Hukill (Note 3). A complete summary of all findings is detailed in the final report of this study (Griffin, Barnes, Defino, Edwards, Hukill, & O'Neal, Note 4).

Organization

This report will first provide a methodology section which details the analysis of both the quantitative and qualitative data collected for this study. Secondly a description of feedback systems and their relation to the participating universities expectations for feedback and evaluation as well as their relation to participants' perceptions of feedback and evaluation will be described. Finally a summary will be provided.

Methodology

Sample Description

The following analyses are based on data collected by the RITE staff from two sites. The first site was State University (SU)*, a large public university whose student teachers were assigned to elementary schools in either a mid-sized urban school district or a smaller suburban school district. These districts together are referred to as Lakeview. At this site data were collected on 43 cooperating teachers, 44 student teachers, and 13 university supervisors. The second site was a large, private university (Metropolitan University or MU) located in a large urban center. Data were collected on 45 cooperating teachers (39 at the elementary level, 6 at secondary), 49 student teachers (43 at the elementary level and 6 at secondary), and four university supervisors who were assigned to schools in the Urban school district. The sample was composed of a general and an intensive group of participants. At each site university supervisors, principals and others were asked to identify 10 effective cooperating teachers. These cooperating teachers (10 at each site) and the student teachers and university supervisors with whom they worked composed the intensive sample (20 cooperating teachers, 20 student teachers, nine university supervisors).

Procedures

The intensive subsample was drawn in order to gain more comprehensive data from that group. Both the intensive and general sample participants completed background questionnaires at the beginning of the student teaching experience and self-administered five instruments at the beginning, middle,

---

*Names of institutions and cities have been changed to protect anonymity.

and end of the student teaching experience. These instruments included the Educational Preference Scale (Lacefield & Cole, Note 5), Teacher Concerns Questionnaire (Fuller, 1969), Rigidity-Flexibility Index (Hughes, Griffin, & Defino, Note 6), Internal-External Locus of Control (MacDonald & Tseng, Note 7), and the Self-Perception Inventory (Soares & Soares, 1968). Two other measures, Paragraph Completion (Hunt, Greenwood, Noy, & Watson, Note 8) and Empathy Construct Scale (LaMonica, Note 9), were completed only at the beginning and end of the semester. In addition the Quick Word Test (Borgatta & Corsini, 1960) was self-administered only at the start of the semester while the Teacher Work-Life Inventory (Blumberg & Kleinke, Note 10) was administered only at the end of the semester. The intensive sample also kept journals, audiotaped their conferences, and participated in beginning, middle and end of semester interviews. Additionally, cooperating teachers and student teachers in the intensive sample were observed in their classrooms three and four times, respectively, over the course of the semester. The general sample responded in writing to abbreviated forms of the interview protocol at times coinciding with the interviews of the intensive sample.

Data Analysis

The major data sources for this report consisted of the interviews, journals and conferences of the intensive sample, published documents from the institutions involved, and participant rating scales and final evaluations completed by all participants. A discussion of the analysis of each data source follows.

Interview and journal data. In an effort to reduce the bulk of information found in the interviews and journals a coding scheme was developed. It was created with the following principles in mind:

1. The smaller the number of categories, the greater the chance of accurate coding.
2. Coding should aim at reducing bulk without expunging information and flavor.
3. The subjects' language should be preserved at all costs.

The first attempts at organizing interview and journal data resulted in a large and complex category system. The number of categories was reduced by focusing on the gross and significant topics addressed in each interview. The following four categories grew out of the data:

1. Background: Information placed in this category refers to the characteristics of the student teachers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors and the experiences and preparation that they had had prior to the current semester. Examples include formal course work, inservice training, and/or social service preceding the student teaching semester.

2. Teaching: This category includes all information about the student teachers', cooperating teachers', or university supervisors' experiences when they were in charge of instruction. (This could have been with one child, a group of children, or the entire class.) Any of the following information would be relevant: the topic of subject covered, the organization of the class activity, who planned and directed the activity, and who the participants were.

3. Supervision and Teacher Education: All statements about the experiences germane to the monitoring and evaluation of student teachers' performance and its improvement belong to this category. Information might refer to what was communicated, and when and how; what was observed, when and by whom; what was covered in student teaching

seminars; what were the participants' professional and personal relationships throughout the semester; and how well a participant responded to supervision.

4. Goals, Expectations and Ideals: Frequently, interviews contained information about the personal, behavioral and academic aims, aspirations and ambitions of the student teacher, the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor. Also found were statements couched in terms of ideal teaching, supervision or practice teaching experiences. This information is included here, as are any individual's goals for someone else, such as cooperating teachers' hopes for student teachers' progress, university supervisors' intentions for supervising student teachers at a later visit to the school, and student teachers' goals for children in their cooperating teachers' class.

5. Context: The Context category records everything about the setting in which the student teaching occurred: a description of the school, neighborhood and class population; a description of the classroom, the building. and any special facilities; a description of the materials, resources and resource personnel; and a description of any special conditions within or outside the classroom which are relevant and which prevail during the student teaching semester.

Each interview question was first classified according to its intended focus. Data analysts then read all the answers to one question. Those portions of the answers which seemed pertinent to the question were underlined. All answers to one question were then grouped together for ease of reading. Each data analyst then constructed a paragraph summarizing the answers to individual questions. These summaries noted the following four items; (1) most frequent answer; (2) differences in answers across role types

(student teachers, cooperating teachers, and supervisors) and across sites; (3) the least frequent answers; and/or, (4) a noteworthy area that was omitted altogether. Journal lines were classified and identified in a similar fashion.

This was done for the purpose of extracting identifiable "themes" or trends in response content. Often, the conceptualizations about background experiences, goals, etc. were expressed as themes common to all participant types in both locations, emphasizing the fact that people enter and leave the student teaching experience with sets of shared beliefs which may not otherwise be directly evident. In particular, themes extracted from interview data form the backbone of the discussion of informal processes of the university presented later in this report.

Conferences. To describe the supervision and formative evaluation of student teachers, audiotapes of all conferences conducted by intensive sample members were analyzed. Two sets of conference data existed: those conferences that involved the entire triad (i.e., student teacher, cooperating teacher, and university supervisor), and those conferences in which the cooperating teacher and student teacher were the only participants involved. A total of 148 conference tapes involving a student teacher and cooperating teacher were collected while only 5 conference tapes involving the entire triad were collected. Of the dyadic conferences collected, a sample of 76 were coded and analyzed.

The disparity of tapes collected involving the entire triad may be explained in a number of ways. First, only one of the universities involved in the study required three-way conferences as a part of the student teaching experience. In addition no one person of the triad was held responsible for making certain the three-way conferences were recorded and subsequently turned

in. In addition, the tape recorder was usually set up in the cooperating teacher's classroom. If the three-way conference took place in another location the recording of that conference may have been missed. Finally, three-way conferences are usually evaluative in nature and may have had great impact on the student teacher involved. It may be therefore that the student teacher felt uncomfortable recording this type of conference. Because the data from these few three-way conferences could not be considered as representative of the sample they were not included in this analysis.

Selected conference tapes were first transcribed and then coded using a variation of Weller's (1971) MOSAIC system of analysis. This coding system was developed to provide information about the process and the content of the conferences. In terms of process, the coding focused upon describing the exchange of information between the cooperating teacher and the student teacher. Who did the talking, to whom the talk was directed, and what type of talking occurred were described. In terms of content, the nature of the topics discussed in the conferences was examined. Three major categories were included under content: "teaching," "organization of student teaching," and "other." A summary of all categories and examples are provided in Appendix A. An overview of the analysis of the conference data is provided in Figure 1.

Process data were collapsed across all conferences. Mean frequencies and percentages were used to describe these conferences. Frequencies were derived from the number of typed lines contained within each statement. A statement was defined as one participant's turn in the conversation and may therefore have contained information about more than one topic.

Documents. In order to examine the student teaching programs at Metropolitan and State Universities, official university and public school documents were examined. The Director of Field Services at each university

Figure 1

Coding Categories Used in the

Analysis of Conference Data

Number of Lines	Process			Content													
				Teaching											Organization of Teaching		Not Applicable
				Generality		Focus				Domain							
	Who	Type	Direction	Classroom-Specific	General	Objectives	Methods and Materials	Execution and Instructional Interactions	Other	Cognitive	Affective	Social-Disciplinary	Other		Student Teaching Protocol	Student Teaching Activities	

and the Offices of Staff Development for each school system provided the RITE staff with documents which delineated the major roles and responsibilities of the participants in the student teaching experience.

Performance rating scales. Items for the performance rating scales were drawn from a number of sources. The items were behaviorally focused and were generated from research findings on the student teaching experience (Griffin, et al., Note 1), craft knowledge, including supervision experience of the RITE staff members, and interviews with university supervisors and cooperating teachers. (see Appendix B). The student teacher performance rating scale also included items from areas indicated on the university evaluation forms for student teachers. The items were rated on a 5-point Likert-response scale from "Strongly agree" to "Strongly disagree." The performance of each member of the triad was rated by that member as well as by the other two via approximately parallel forms. Each triad member was asked to rate the other two members in order to examine the consistency of the ratings from role to role, and, by inference, the commonality of their perspectives on the student teaching experience. Because each university supervisor was assigned to more than one triad, the university supervisors rated only those of their triads that were in the intensive sample or if none were, then two randomly selected triads from the general sample. This was done so as not to overburden them, yet to maintain a modicum of useful data. Means and standard deviations were then reported.

Final evaluations. The forms consisted, at both sites, of a series of five-point Likert-type items with blank spaces provided for comments to elaborate upon them (24 rating items on the Metropolitan University form, 11 on the State University form; see Appendix C. For purposes of the present analysis and discussion, the items on each form were grouped to create two

parallel sets of subscales (Metropolitan's were already grouped; those on the State University form were similarly grouped by the authors--no factor analysis was performed). Thus, five items on the State University form were labeled the "Teaching Competency" subscale, while 11 items on the Metropolitan University form served as the parallel. Some examples are: "Demonstrated skillful implementation of learning plans," "Presents lessons clearly and effectively," or "Demonstrated skillful choices of instructional methods based on children's needs and interests." Ten other items on the Metropolitan University form were labeled the "Professional Competency" subscale, as were four apparently parallel items on the State University evaluation form. Examples of the items included here are "Demonstrated ability to profit from feedback," "Attends to schedules and commitments," or "Handles situations with poise, self-control." The remaining items on the Metropolitan form pertained to the student teacher's "Personal Characteristics," and the remaining item on the State University form required an overall judgment of the student teacher. A variety of descriptive statistics was calculated on the mean ratings given the student teachers on parallel subscales of the evaluations.

In addition, participants responded to the instruments described above, as well as two rating scales generated by the RITE staff to assess participants' expectations for, and satisfaction with, the student teaching scale (see Hughes & Hukill, Note 3). Analyses of the questionnaires included calculation of descriptive statistics (e.g., standard deviations, frequencies, intercorrelation matrices, etc.) and inferential statistics (particularly ANOVAs of scores across participant roles, sample types, and sites).

Congruence of Feedback Systems With University Protocols

This section will focus on the feedback student teachers received as related to these guidelines established by the participating universities.

With regard to feedback systems, two data sources will be examined. First audio tapes of conferences in which the student teacher was involved were analyzed for both the content as well as the process of the interactions. Secondly, the content of the final evaluations of student teachers by their supervisors and cooperating teachers were examined.

University protocols dealing with the feedback and supervision of student teachers were extracted from official university publications. These were the "rules and regulations" which guide the feedback and subsequently the evaluation of student teachers.

Feedback Systems

Conferences. As the data in Table 1 indicate cooperating teachers tended to dominate the interactions in conferences. A mean total of 330.45 lines of type were transcribed for each conference. Of these 330 lines, cooperating teachers spoke approximately 72% of them, while student teachers uttered 28%. Because these conferences were dyadic in nature, the direction of the interaction was assumed (i.e. when a cooperating teacher spoke, his/her statement was directed toward the student teacher and vice versa).

Fourteen categories were used to describe the type of talk that occurred. Data describing the type of talk are displayed in Table 2. When examining the cooperating teachers' talk, the most frequently occurring type was "review". More specifically the cooperating teacher was coded as interacting by reviewing or commenting on classroom events or student teaching activities

Table 1

Cooperating Teacher-Student Teacher

Conference "Talk"

	Cooperating Teacher	Student Teacher	Total
Mean Number of Lines* per Conference	229.86	100.59	330.45
Mean Percentage of Talk by Participant per Conference	71.89	28.11	100.00

* "Lines" refers to the typed lines of a transcribed conference. An average count of 12 words appeared in each typed line of conference data.

Table 2
Process Data From Cooperating Teacher-
Student Teacher Conferences

		Type of Comment								
		** 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
operating eacher	Mean Frequency of Occurrence	46	12.01	15.56	81.91	16.79	23.41	6.03	*	26.86
	Mean Percentage	21.20	7.24	8.29	35.79	5.95	10.17	2.79	*	7.36
tudent eacher	Mean Frequency of Occurrence	*	*	1.88	20.95	*	15.68	19.76	7.70	23.32
	Mean Percentage	*	*	4.35	32.41	*	18.65	23.50	9.12	9.86

Blank cells indicate that the code was not used for that participant.

* Types of comments:
1. Gives directions
2. Asks about interests
3. Provides evaluative feedback
4. Reviews or comments on classroom events or student teaching events
5. Provides options
6. Describes interests and concerns
7. Acknowledgement
8. Offers suggestions
9. Other

more often than any other type of interaction. For example one cooperating teacher reviewed the following incident for a student teacher.

"I had a little girl two years ago who was partially blind ... her mother came up and registered her and didn't say a thing."

When examining the mean total of typed lines, the cooperating teachers reviewed or commented on classroom events in approximately 37% of these lines. The second most frequently occurring type of cooperating teacher behavior was "direction giving". Cooperating teachers gave their student teachers specific directions regarding instruction in approximately 21% of typed lines. For example, one cooperating teacher explained the following to her student teacher.

"The language unit you are going to be working on will be dictionary skills."

The least frequently occurring type of cooperating teacher statement was "acknowledgement or endorsement". This type of statement contained little information and consisted of the teacher providing his/her partner with a remark such as "yes", "right", "fine", etc. Cooperating teachers' typed lines were classified as acknowledgements in approximately 3% of their statements.

On the other hand, student teachers' statements were classified as acknowledgements in almost 24% of their typed lines. However, student teachers proved to be like their cooperating teachers in that the majority of their talk focused on classroom events. Approximately 32% of the student teachers' statements dealt with the review of classroom events or student teaching activities. The least frequently occurring type of student teacher interactions were those coded as "evaluation". An example of an evaluation statement by a student teacher follows.

"I feel good about the way the students are working independently at my

spelling center. Children need to learn how to work on their own."

In addition to classifying conference information as to the process of the interaction, conference statements were also analyzed with regard to what was said. Table 3 summarizes content information across all conferences and all participants. Three categories were included under content: "teaching," "organization of student teaching" and "not applicable." Each conference statement was classified in terms of one or more of these categories. As the data in Table 3 indicate, the majority of all conferences focused on teaching as opposed to the organization of student teaching. The teaching category included all talk dealing with the classroom teaching experience. For example, if a cooperating teacher said the following to his/her student teacher it would be classified as a teaching remark.

> "I noticed during your lesson that students were responding without raising their hands."

The organization of student teaching category referred to the training and supervision of the student teachers. An example of a statement coded under this category follows.

> "Before I observe your teaching I will always meet with you for a concerns conference ... at this conference you should be prepared to tell me what you want me to focus on during my observation."

On the average, 79.11% of each conference focused on teaching while 18.42% focused on the organization of student teaching.

Table 4 summarizes content information across all conferences by participant. As is evident from the data displayed in Table 4, when cooperating teachers' and student teachers' talk was examined separately no substantial differences were noted. For the most part, talk about teaching events occurred most often. In approximately 80% of all statements

Table 3
Content Data From Cooperating Teacher/
Student Teacher Conferences--All Participants

	Teaching	Organization of Student Teaching	Not Applicable
All Participants (i.e., Cooperating Teachers and Student Teachers)	*79.11%	18.42%	8.12%

*Percentages equal more than 100% because the "Teaching" category and the "Organization of Student Teaching" category were not mutually exclusive.

Table 4

Content Data From Cooperating Teacher/

Student Teacher Conference by Participants

	Teaching	Organization of Student Teaching	Other
Cooperating Teacher	*80.06%	18.33%	7.61%
Student Teacher	74.53%	20.00%	10.17%

*Percentages equal more than 100% because the "Teaching" category and the "Organization of Student Teaching" category were not mutually exclusive.

cooperating teachers focused on teaching events. Approximately 75% of the student teachers' statements dealt with teaching. In addition the teaching category was broken down into three subcategories; "generality", "focus", and "domain". Codings under the generality category indicated whether the teaching events discussed were specific to the immediate classroom and student teaching experience or were more general in nature. These more general statements might include information about past experiences or the application of theory from educational thought or related behavioral sciences. Weller (1971) stated that this might be considered "clinical analysis" vs. "the curriculum and methods course." An example of a specific statement made by a cooperating teacher to a student teacher follows.

> "Explain that they need to bring a piece of paper to the spelling center."

A general statement, however, would be as follows:

> "Research says that it helps if you state your expectations at the beginning of the lesson."

The focus category analyzed interactions for information dealing with instructional content and objectives, methods and materials, or the actual execution of the lesson. Statements coded as instructional content and objectives dealt with expected educational outcomes and/or the subject matter related to those outcomes. For example, a teacher's statement would be coded as instructional content and objectives if he/she said the following:

> "They are going to write, 'Is the cow purple?' instead of 'The cow is purple.'"

Statements coded as methods and materials dealt with the materials of instruction and/or those strategic operations designed to achieve objectives. An example of one of these "how to" statements follows.

"Just go through and review them at that point ... then take them through the word cards one at a time."

The subcategory "execution of lessons" focused on instructional interactions between the teacher, pupils and content or curriculum. An example of a statement coded as this subcategory follows.

"What I was trying to get them to do was write their answers in complete sentences but half the class never seemed to understand. I guess I'd better go back over this."

The third category determined what domain the instructional interaction focused upon (i.e. cognitive, affective, or social/disciplinary). The instructional domain was adapted from Bloom (Bloom, et al., 1956). Typed lines coded as pertaining to the cognitive domain focused on cognition, knowledge, understanding and learning. The cognitive domain was here restricted to cognitive interactions between pupils and subject matter. For example the following statement was coded as pertaining to the cognitive domain.

"I'm going to put a check-sheet up so they can check off when they've done each set of questions."

Typed lines pertaining to the affective domain focused on pupil interest, involvement and motivation. Typed lines coded as dealing with the affective domain follow.

(cooperating teacher speaking to student teacher about a certain pupil's behavior): "She was a non-volunteer and you encouraged her by saying 'Don't be nervous' and 'Very good.'"

When typed lines were coded as pertaining to discipline, control and social interactions they may have resembled the following statement.

"I think there should be a time limit or some people would spend an hour

at the spelling center. They should be limited to four at a time."

As the data in Table 5 indicate, all participants tended to be highly specific when discussing teaching events. Typed lines were specific in approximately 91% of all statements dealing with teaching events. In addition, most teaching interactions focused on the methods and materials of instruction. Approximately 49% of each conference focused on the methods and materials of the teaching event, approximately 28% of each conference focused on instructional interactions and execution, while 18% of the conference time was devoted to the content and objectives of the teaching events being discussed. Under 6% of the data in this area dealt with a different focus than those stipulated. When the third subcategory, domain, was examined, mean frequencies indicated that cooperating teachers and student teachers tended to be most concerned with the cognitive domain. Concerns with the cognitive domain were addressed more often in instructional conversations dealing with teaching events than the other dimensions of instructional domain (i.e. affective and social/disciplinary). Talk dealing with the cognitive domain dominated 69% of the teaching event statements whereas approximately 21% of all teaching conversations addressed social/disciplinary concerns. The least frequently addressed area within instructional domains was the affective domain. Only 6% of the teaching event statements dealt with concerns in the affective domain.

Table 6 displays content data by participant. Student Teachers and cooperating teachers were not substantially different when the content of their teaching statements were examined. For example, both cooperating teachers' and student teachers' statements about teaching were most often specific in nature. In addition, both participants' statements focused for the most part upon the methods and materials of teaching.

Table 5

Content Data from Cooperating Teacher/Student Teacher Conferences Dealing with Teaching - Mean Number of Typed Lines and Percentages for All Participants*

		Generality		Focus				Domain			
		1*	2	1**	2	3	4	1***	2	3	4
All rticipants e., Cooperating Teachers nd Student Teachers	Mean Frequency of Occurrence	211.06	31.83	41.42	126.23	63.36	12.41	155.32	6.86	58.91	22.14
	Mean Percentage	90.71	9.29	18.45	49.20	27.53	5.12	69.14	3.41	21.42	6.12

e that percentages may not total to 100 due to rounding error.

egories
1. specific statements
2. general statements

1. content and objectives
2. materials and methods
3. execution
4. other

1. cognitive
2. affective
3. social/disciplinary
4. other

Table 6

Content Data from Cooperating Teacher/Student Teacher Conferences Dealing with Teaching - Mean Number of Typed Lines and Percentages by Participant*

		Generality		Focus				Domain			
		1*	2	1**	2	3	4	1***	2	3	4
erating achers	Mean Frequency of Occurrence	150.47	25.86	29.64	95.50	42.68	8.77	113.14	4.73	43.44	15.15
	Mean Percentage	89.67	10.30	17.70	50.98	26.11	5.47	69.02	3.39	21.44	6.18
lent chers	Mean Frequency of Occurrence	60.59	5.97	11.79	30.73	20.68	3.64	42.18	2.14	15.47	6.98
	Mean Percentage	91.33	7.12	21.06	41.98	31.12	4.45	67.64	3.53	20.77	6.53

that percentages may not total to 100 due to rounding error.

gories
1. specific statements
2. general statements

1. content and objectives
2. materials and methods
3. execution
4. other

*** 1. cognitive
2. affective
3. social/disciplinary
4. other

In addition to examining the content of the cooperating teacher-student teacher conversations in terms of teaching, these conversations were also examined for talk about the organization of the student teaching experience. All statements that referred to the training and supervision of the student teacher were included in this category and were coded in terms of "protocol" and "activities".

Protocol included all information about the structure, formal procedures, and the administration of student teaching. For example, one cooperating teacher said the following to her student teacher in reference to a university-provided list of requirements for student teaching:

> "Sending and escorting children to special classes, you are doing that. Continue recording needs and accomplishments of children, saving examples of writing. You need to do that."

Activities included all information about events in which the student teacher participated. These events might include observations, preparation of projects for methods classes, and/or the scheduling of teaching times. The following statement, made by a student teacher, was coded as pertaining to student teaching activities:

> "On Thursday I have a seminar. I'll ask (supervisor) about an observation time then since she didn't get to me this week."

Table 7 summarizes the conference data categorized as dealing with the organization of teaching.

As the data in Table 7 indicate, when the organization of student teaching was addressed, participants usually focused on the protocols of student teaching. Approximately 81% of the typed lines dealing with the organization of student teaching were devoted to the protocols of student

Table 7
Content Data from Cooperating Teacher/Student Teacher Conferences Dealing with the Organization of Student Teaching - Mean Numbers of Typed Lines and Percentages for All Participants

		Activities	Protocol
All Participants (i.e., Cooperating Teachers and Student Teachers	Mean Frequency of Occurrence Per Conference	6.80*	48.24
	Mean Percentages Per Conference	13.29	80.64

*Note that percentages do not add to 100% because they are the averages for all conferences; i.e., each conference contributed equally to the average regardless of each conference's duration.

teaching. The activities of student teaching were discussed in 13% of these typed lines.

In addition the content of the student teachers' and the cooperating teachers' conversations were examined individually. The data in Table 8 indicate that a similar pattern emerged. Again individual participants did not vary from the pattern established by the group as a whole. For the most part, cooperating teachers and student teachers spent the majority of time, when discussing the organization of student teaching, focusing on the protocols involved. Cooperating teachers focused on protocols in approximately 80% of their statements dealing with the organization of student teaching and student teachers focused on protocols in approximately 73% of their statements. In addition, cooperating teachers devoted around 12% of these statements to the activities themselves whereas student teachers spoke of the specific activities of student teaching in less than 11% of their teaching event conversations.

Thus, supervisory conferences were one avenue of feedback for student teachers. Final evaluations provided yet another source of feedback to student teachers. The following section will describe these evaluations in detail.

Final evaluation. One outcome of the student teaching experience was the final evaluation of student teachers by their supervisors and cooperating teachers. It is typically the final hurdle which student teachers must pass prior to applying for certification; thus, several questions about student teachers' final evaluations were asked. Foremost were two questions: (1) what formal processes and guidelines had been established by participating universities for this purpose, and (2) what did completed evaluations look like?

Table 8
Content Data from Cooperating Teacher/Student Teacher Conferences Dealing with the Organization of Student Teaching - By Participant Role

		Activities	Protocol
Cooperating Teachers	Mean Frequency of Occurrence Per Conference	5.24	35.02
	Mean* Percentage	11.86	79.03
Student Teachers	Mean Frequency of Occurrence Per Conference	1.56	13.23
	Mean* Percentage	10.35	72.98

*Note that percentages do not add to 100% because they are averages for all conferences, i.e., each conference contributed equally to the average regardless of each conference's duration.

The first question about the formal processes and guidelines vis-a-vis final evaluations was addressed in an earlier report (Defino, Barnes, & O'Neal, Note 2). To refresh the reader, each university published guidelines which stipulated who should complete the evaluation forms provided by the institutions, what should be done with them once completed (e.g., copies sent to placement offices; student teacher signatures), and so on. Both institutions in the study agreed to share with the RITE staff copies of the participating student teachers' completed evaluation forms (the reader is reminded that every possible precaution was taken to protect the anonymity of all participants).

A variety of descriptive statistics was calculated on the mean ratings given the student teachers on parallel subscales of the evaluations. For instance, the grand means (calculated across mean ratings for student teachers in both the intensive and general sample, at both Metropolitan and State Universities) are reported in Table 9, together with other descriptive statistics of the total sample. As evidenced by the table there was generally some variability in the evaluation ratings given to student teachers, but it should be noted that the means were relatively high for having been made on five-point scales. This is more pronounced for the Professional Competency subscale than it is for the Teaching Competency subscale, however. Note also the degree of kurtosis and negative skewness which characterize the distributions.

Summary. Audiotaped conferences between cooperating teachers and student teachers were transcribed and analyzed in terms of the process of the communication as well as the content of the interaction. In terms of the process of the conferences, the analysis focused on who did the talk, to whom the talk was directed, and what type of talking occurred.

Table 9

Descriptive Statistics for Student Teachers' Mean Ratings on Their Final Evaluations[1]

Subscale	Grand Mean	Standard Deviation	Kurtosis	Skewness
Teaching Competency	4.251	.901	7.137	-2.276
Professional Competency	4.448	.840	12.396	-3.107

[1]All evaluations were made on five-point Likert-type rating scales.

Conferences between student teachers and their cooperating teachers were dominated by the cooperating teacher. In addition most talk, whether it was initiated by the cooperating teacher or the student teacher, was classified as comments which dealt with classroom events or with student teaching activities. Cooperating teachers also spent approximately 20% of the conference time giving directions to their student teachers. Student teachers spent about the same amount of time simply acknowledging what the cooperating teacher had said. Student teachers and cooperating teachers rarely made evaluative remarks.

When the content of the talk from the conferences was analyzed all participants tended to spend time discussing teaching rather than the organization of student teaching or subjects that were outside the teaching realm. An average of 79.11% of all statements per conference were categorized as discussing teaching, whereas 18.42% of the statements dealt with the organization of student teaching and 8.12% were classified as not applicable to teaching. When the content of the conferences was examined for each participant, individuals did not vary from the pattern established as a group.

For category "teaching," most statements in the conferences were specific in nature, dealing with the materials and methods of teaching and focusing on the cognitive domain. Again, when individual participants were examined they did not deviate substantially from the group patterns. The category "organization of student teaching" was also broken down. Approximately 81% of all statements concerned with the organization of student teaching, dealt with protocols, whereas 13% of all statements were devoted to the activities of student teaching. When individual participants were examined similar trends were noted.

When the final evaluations of the participating student teachers were examined, ratings were found to be high and characterized by little variability than one might normally expect.

University Protocols

University protocols regarding formative evaluation and supervision do not differ substantially from institution to institution. Guidelines provided at each institution indicated that those who supervise student teachers should promote the effective application of instructional and management skills. However due to the absence of operational definitions one has difficulty determining exactly how cooperating teachers and university supervisors should accomplish this goal. The following section of this paper will delineate cooperating teachers' and university supervisors' supervisory responsibilities as stipulated by each participating institution.

State University. Cooperating teachers at State University are provided with a handbook which stipulates the following responsibilities.

1. Accept the student teacher as a professional.
2. Acquaint the student teacher with appropriate school policies, personnel, materials, resources, and special programs.
3. Allow the student teacher to assume responsibility as his/her readiness permits.
4. Encourage the student teacher to be creative and try new teaching strategies.
5. Require lesson plans from the student teacher prior to his/her teaching.
6. Observe the student teacher instructing the class on a regular basis (at least weekly) and provide written notes to both the student teacher and university supervisor.

7. Provide an organized feedback session for each observation, together with a written summary of the session results to both the student teacher and the supervisor (this need not be to the exclusion of notes taken by the student teacher).

8. Conduct regular cooperative planning sessions with the student teacher (a minimum of one each week).

9. Complete a student teaching assessment form at the end of the semester and discuss it with the student teacher. There should also be a mid-semester conference in which the student teacher is informed of his/her level of proficiency and is offered concrete suggestions for improvement.

10. Attend inservice meetings conducted for cooperating teachers.

In addition, the school district outlines the role of the cooperating teacher. Lakeview School District provides the cooperating teacher with an additional handbook which stipulates the following guidelines for supervision.

Cooperating teachers should:

1. Recognize that the professional and legal responsibility of the classroom remains in the hands of the regular teacher.
2. Accept the student teacher as a fellow professional.
3. Help the student teacher accept each child as a unique individual.
4. Plan with the student teacher the steps in assuming classroom responsibilities, and allow the student teacher to assume more responsibility as he/she exhibits readiness to do so.
5. Demonstrate effective teaching.
6. Encourage the student teacher to be creative and try new teaching strategies.
7. Plan for periodic evaluations with major emphasis on continuous

growth.

The university supervisors' responsibilities regarding observation, feedback and evaluation are delineated in the Handbook for University Student Teaching Supervisors (Note 11)[1]. University supervisors' regular observations of the student teachers, followed by feedback, is their most important function at State University. Observations and feedback serve as vehicles for both process evaluation and the instruction of student teachers. The following guidelines for observations are provided in the manual (paraphrased here):

1. Frequency: The generally accepted frequency of observation is once a week, with few exceptions. For those student teachers on half-semester programs such as kindergarten and special education, observation will be more frequent (approximately six per month). In some secondary programs, student teachers may be assigned to several schools with the same supervisor; in this case the frequency of observations may be somewhat lower. In no case should observations be made less often than every other week. Supervisors who feel that this is not a reasonable requirement should discuss their situations with the Director of Student Field Experiences.

2. Scheduling: It is sometimes desirable to schedule observations with the student teacher. This allows the student teacher to anticipate the supervisor's presence and he/she can plan carefully for that particular lesson. In general, this provides an opportunity for supervisors to see the student teachers doing their best work. It is equally important for supervisors to observe their student teachers without having scheduled

[1]Pseudonyms have been used in referencing university documents to protect anonymity of study participants.

the observation beforehand. In this way the supervisors are likely to see the student teachers as they usually teach.

3. Records: The university provides supervisors with forms to be used for this purpose. The forms are in triplicate, with no carbon paper needed, and include copies for the student teacher, cooperating teacher, and university supervisor. The supervisor's record of the observations should be anecdotal in nature. The anecdotal records should include descriptions of specific behaviors and be non-evaluative in tone. Because the records form the basis of the feedback sessions, supervisors should record what transpired in context, avoiding vague generalities. An appendix is provided in the handbook with examples of statements. Cooperating teachers need to be provided with records of both the observation and corresponding feedback forms.

4. Contents: Items focused on by the supervisor during an observation should be partly determined during the previous feedback session. Identification of behaviors in a feedback session is a means of determining which events are to be recorded and which may be filtered out, because it is impossible to record everything that transpires. In addition, supervisors should observe an instructional behavior without the prior knowledge of the student teacher. For example, if the supervisor wished to focus on the cognitive level of questions generally asked by the student teacher, he/she would not inform him/her of this beforehand, so that baseline frequencies could be obtained. When choosing behaviors to observe, supervisors should restrict the observation to a very few (one to three) identified or "target" behaviors. There are several reasons for this: first, the student teacher will be able to focus on only one or two classroom behaviors for

improvement at any one time; and secondly, this is also likely the supervisor's limit, in terms of recording information in an anecdotal record.

The Handbook for University Student Teaching Supervisors (Note 11) also outlines the purpose and mechanics of the final student teaching evaluation. The purpose of the final evaluation is twofold: it should inform the student of his/her progress in student teaching and communicate to hiring officials the adequacy of the student teacher's performance in the classroom. Supervisors are therefore asked to make evaluations as accurate and realistic as possible. In particular, they are warned against inflated marks on the rating scale portion of the evaluation forms.

Metropolitan University. The cooperating teachers in the Urban Unified School District are also provided with a handbook which stipulates their role in the supervision of student teachers. The following responsibilities (paraphrased for brevity) are delineated.

The cooperating teacher will:

1. Safeguard the welfare of their students by maintaining an acceptable instructional program at all times.
2. Perform all regular classroom duties under the direction of the principal.
3. Acquaint the student teacher with the school, the school faculty and staff and the pupils.
4. Provide the student teacher with copies of all texts, manuals, school bulletins and forms.
5. Attempt to establish the student teacher as a leader in the classroom.
6. Observe the student teacher, record all observations in detail and

provide feedback to the student teacher at weekly conferences.

7. Evaluate the performance of the student teacher.
8. Confer with the university supervisor frequently to provide him/her with informed evaluations of the student teacher's progress.
9. Participate in inservice education classes and professional meetings dealing with the supervision of student teachers.

University supervisors' responsibilities at Metropolitan University are less explicitly stated. The Teacher Education Guidelines for Elementary and Secondary Schools (Note 12) discussed the university supervisor's roles and responsibilities with regard to the supervision of student teachers. Information regarding initial orientation meetings, school placements, and university policies is stipulated in this publication. Although the term "observation" is not directly used, this publication does state that the supervisor will provide "direct supervision of classroom instruction by student teachers" (p. 18). In addition, supervisors are required to assist student teachers in their self-evaluation of progress.

Discussion

The overall thrust of the guidelines from both institutions seems to be one of shared professionalism as well as the promoting of the student teachers' skills in effective classroom management and instruction. In addition cooperating teachers at each site were expected to serve in an evaluative capacity.

Conferences to some degree exemplified the guidelines offered for the supervision of student teachers. For example, talk about teaching occurred most often during cooperating teacher-student teacher conferences. Few of the statements made, however, were of an evaluative nature. It is therefore difficult to determine whether or not the participants were making value

statements about classroom management and instruction. It should be noted that when the content of the statements about classroom teaching were examined in detail, cooperating teachers focused on the methods and materials of instruction in over 50% of their statements. In addition their conversations pertained to how the lesson interacted with the students in 26.11% of their conversations. Thus the content of conferences was addressing classroom management and instruction but if cooperating teachers were telling their student teachers what constituted effective or good classroom management and instruction, the message was implicit. In addition, conferences were dominated by cooperating teachers' talk. Therefore, these conferences may not have exemplified cooperative planning sessions, or even a sense of shared professionalism.

Clearly, final evaluations served to address both cooperating teachers' and university supervisors' responsibilities regarding the "grading" of student teachers. Because, overall, student teachers were rated quite high, the value of such feedback may be questioned. In other words, student teachers may not have been able to distinguish the evaluation of their performance from that of their peers. Final evaluations were completed, thus satisfying each university's expectations for those who supervise student teachers, yet the completed forms themselves contained little information that would distinguish one student teacher from another.

Congruence of Feedback Systems with Participants' Perceptions

Participants' Perceptions

Participants' perceptions of supervision and evaluation were gathered through journals, individual interviews and questionnaires. All journal entries of the triad (i.e. the student teacher, the cooperating teacher, and

the university supervisor) were examined for any comments dealing with the supervision and evaluation of student teachers. Interviews, which were conducted with each member of the triad, were examined and any information dealing with feedback was extracted and analyzed. Questionnaires consisted of performance rating scales which were completed by each member of the triad. A complete description of these scales can be found in Griffin, et al., (Note 4). These scales appear in their entirety in Appendix C.

Journals. Five categories were established to identify information contained in journals. These five categories are: (1) Background; (2) Teaching; (3) Supervision; (4) Goals, Expectations and Ideals; and, (5) Context. Trained coders classified information contained in journals according to these five categories. To obtain information with regard to participants' perceptions of supervision and formative evaluation, category three, Supervision, was examined.

The information in the journals dealing with supervision was subdivided further. Data guided the development of these categories to avoid the forcing of information into a preconceived classification system. Percentages were derived from frequency counts of journal lines devoted to individual categories. Four general subcategories within supervision emerged: (1) Teaching; (2) Protocols of Teaching; (3) Personal Relationships; and, (4) Other.

Information coded as "teaching" dealt with all supervisory statements focusing on the performance of the student teacher and/or the pupils during classroom instruction. For example, the following cooperating teacher's journal statement was coded in the teaching category:

"She (student teacher) seems to be doing an excellent job. The only

criticism is that she has been cautious in trying new instructional techniques."

Journal information coded as "Protocols of Student Teaching" focused on comments dealing with the university's and school district's expectations for supervision of the student teacher. An example of a cooperating teacher's comment classified as protocol follows:

"Tomorrow morning I'm teaching because the student teachers have their regular methods class (DUMB - in the middle of their all day assignment - they lose continuity).

The personal relationship category included all general statements regarding the association of the cooperating teacher and student teacher. The following statement was extracted from a student teacher's journal and exemplifies a comment coded in the personal relationship category.

"My cooperating teacher is great. She shows concern for me."

The data in Table 10 indicate that while cooperating teachers and university supervisors focused on teaching more than any other area, student teachers appeared to be more concerned with personal relationships. When cooperating teachers made comments, which were classified as dealing with supervision, 62.6% of their journal lines focused on teaching. Likewise, university supervisors comments dealing with supervision focused on teaching in 75.3% of their journal lines. Further examination of this category revealed that both cooperating teachers and university supervisors made general evaluative statements about the student teacher most often. Following these general statements their specific concerns dealt with the student teachers' ability to manage pupils' behavior, student teachers' lesson delivery and the student teachers' ability to write lesson plans.

Table 10
Content Data from Journals
Percentage of Journal Lines Devoted to Topic
by Participant

	Teaching	Protocols of Student Teaching	Personal Relation-ships	Other
Cooperating Teachers	62.6%	21.1%	8.6%	7.9%
Student Teachers	24.3%	19.6%	45.8%	10.3%
University Supervisors	75.3%	4.1%	11.3%	9.3%

When student teachers' journals were examined for comments dealing with supervision, 45.8% of their journal lines were devoted to general statements about their personal relationships with their cooperating teacher. On the other hand, cooperating teachers were least concerned with personal relationships. Only 8.6% of their journal lines dealing with supervision were devoted to the personal relationship with their student teacher. University supervisors were least concerned with the protocols of student teaching. Only 4.1% of their journal lines devoted to supervision dealt with protocols. Student teachers, like university supervisors, were least concerned about the protocols of student teaching. Approximately 20% of their journal lines dealing with supervision focused on the protocols of student teaching.

Interviews. In addition to examining journal data, interview data was also analyzed in an attempt to determine participants' supervisory concerns. As with the journal data, interview questions and answers classified according to the same five categories: (1) Background; (2) Teaching; (3) Supervision,; (4) Goals, Expectations and Ideals; and, (5) Context. The following section will explore the interview data found in the Supervision category and attempt to further determine participants' perceptions of supervision and formative evaluation. Again all three participants' (i.e., cooperating teachers', student teachers', university supervisors') concerns were reported.

Of the 20 student teachers who were asked whether or not they were satisfied with their student teaching experience, 18 reported yes, one said no and one did not choose to answer. When asked to express why they were satisfied with the experience 14 stated that their satisfaction was directly related to their cooperating teachers' experience and knowledge. Four explained satisfaction as a result of the context of the classroom situation (i.e., classroom size, resources available, and good students). In addition,

13 reported an "excellent" relationship with their cooperating teachers and 6 reported a "good" relationship with the cooperating teachers. These student teachers based this opinion, in part, on their cooperating teachers' supervisory skills. Such qualities as constructive criticism, high expectations, a willingness to share ideas and a collegial rapport were mentioned as reasons for these excellent and good relationships.

On the other hand, student teachers felt their university supervisors could have been more helpful. Most student teachers reported a desire to be observed more frequently by their supervisor and at a variety of times during the teaching day. In addition, student teachers felt that the amount of time supervisors had observed had not provided them with an accurate indication of their teaching abilities.

While there was some variation in the number of observations made by university supervisors (from two per week to one every two to three weeks), most made weekly observations. A definite difference was noted between the accuracy of student teacher expectations at the two sites. All student teachers at State University expected weekly observations, and their supervisors met this expectation. In contrast only one university supervisor at Metropolitan University had communicated in such a manner that the student teachers' expectations matched the estimated frequency of observations (one every two weeks).

A part of the problem of mismatch between expectations and actual numbers of observations may be due to differences in terminology. Many Metropolitan University supervisors mentioned making "visits" to the classroom or "passing through" the classroom as well as making observations. The visits were very informal, brief, and apparently intended to quickly ascertain "how things were going." The function of these visits was apparently to keep lines of

communication open and put in an appearance to demonstrate availability. The university supervisors at both sites also stated that short, frequent visits were enough to give them a sense of the adequacy of the student teacher's performance although five student teachers at State University and three at Metropolitan University stated that the university supervisors could have been more helpful to them if they had made more and longer observations as well as observations of different subjects held at various times of day in the classroom. Some of the student teachers stated that the university supervisors had not spent (or not been able to spend) enough time observing to get an accurate indication of the student teachers' teaching abilities. The cooperating teachers also echoed this feeling, although to a lesser degree. They were more aware and forgiving of the many demands upon the time of the supervisors, especially the graduate students at State.

One of the most noticeable differences between the sites occurred in the frequency, style, and substance of the feedback given the student teachers regarding their performance. At State University weekly individual conferences were held. These were usually immediately after an observation, but also were seen to occur at a later, scheduled time. In contrast, only one university supervisor at Metropolitan University held weekly conferences. Again the apparent differences may be related to the structure of the student teaching programs. State University supervisors were formally required to hold feedback sessions after an observation, while it does not appear that Metropolitan University supervisors were required to do so. The latter group tended to meet with student teachers for conferences on an "as-needed" basis rather than regularly. In addition the Metropolitan University supervisors each taught the university methods classes which the student teachers took concurrently with their classroom experience. Only one State University

supervisor was teaching a concurrent methods class, although all State University supervisors were required to hold weekly seminars for their respective student teachers. The Metropolitan University supervisors in particular tended to depend upon these regularly scheduled class meetings to make contact with individual student teachers before and after the classes.

University supervisors also differed on the degree to which student teachers expressed satisfaction with the content of the feedback provided by the supervisors. Student teachers as a group reported emphasis on lesson plans, although individuals mentioned a wide variety of other subjects such as helpful ideas for presenting lessons. Five student teachers could not remember receiving any specific, helpful feedback. The major difference between the sites was in the apparent degree of satisfaction experienced by the student teacher in relation to the helpfulness of the university supervisors' feedback: seven student teachers at Metropolitan University said that all of the feedback given by the university supervisor was helpful, while only one student teacher at State University stated that the university supervisor made suggestions which did not apply to his particular class setting. In the opinion of the student teacher, this was due to the supervisor's unfamiliarity with the school. Others said that the style of observation (anecdotal record), feedback (self analysis), and/or conferencing (broad, open-ended questions in the feedback forms) at State University was not helpful. (See Appendix D for copies of university observation forms.)

Another major responsibility of the university supervisor was to evaluate the performance of the student teacher. Most university supervisors simply used the university-provided forms and adopted implicitly the criteria therein. Supervisors at both universities held mid-semester and end-of-semester evaluations with the student teachers; however, only at State

University was inclusion of the cooperating teacher in a conference with the other two participants required.

Regardless of the criteria contained on the evaluation form (Appendix D), university supervisors concentrated on different aspects of student teachers' performances, based on their perceptions of their student teachers' needs or occasionally on the personal preference of the supervisors. In the final evaluation a heavy emphasis was placed by university supervisors on classroom and behavioral management, followed by teaching skills, rapport with students, and evidence of classroom students' learning. When evaluating a particular lesson after observation, however, the university supervisors reported a different focus. When asked how they judged the success of an individual lesson, university supervisors responded most often that it depended on the students teachers' rapport with the pupils, their teaching skills, and the student teachers' knowledge of the academic content, respectively.

In contrast to the university supervisors with their weekly or biweekly observations, most cooperating teachers indicated that they observed the student teachers almost continuously. These observations were rarely formal and usually produced short, jotted notes as written records; only three of the Lakeview cooperating teachers reported making the university-requested weekly observations using self-carbon anecdotal forms. Three cooperating teachers reported deliberate non-use of the requested forms, because their student teachers did not think they "got anything out of these observations."

Cooperating teachers also differed in the foci of their observations. Ten stated that their major focus was on the preparation and delivery of lessons by the student teachers while eight reported looking mainly at behavior management and the student teacher's control of the classroom because "that's where it's at." To a lesser extent, cooperating teachers also

concentrated on classroom students' success in the lesson, student responses to the student teacher, the general atmosphere of the classroom, the personality of the student teacher, how the student teacher handled him/herself in the class, and how the student teacher felt about his/her performance.

Just as most cooperating teachers observed informally and continuously, feedback on performance was also given to the student teachers informally and continuously. Every opportunity to talk during the day was seized while short, encouraging notes were often left by cooperating teachers on lesson plans or notebooks. Some cooperating teachers chose to "hit everything" since time was short and the student teacher had much to learn; other cooperating teachers took one behavior at a time to avoid overwhelming the student teachers with constant surveillance and feedback. Three cooperating teachers who had completed a training program for supervision of student teachers used the observation-feedback system that they had learned in that program.

Cooperating teachers and student teachers reported that the feedback consisted mainly of suggestions for teaching, followed by evaluation of the actual teaching and lesson plans. Thirteen student teachers indicated ways in which their cooperating teachers could have been more helpful in their feedback. Student teachers had specific requests related to the activities of teaching: more sharing of ideas for lessons, help with lesson content, more guidance in preparing the first unit, help with questioning, and help with long range goals for that particular grade level. Other student teachers requested more informal communication, more constructive criticism, and more sharing of information in general by the cooperating teacher.

Another major responsibility of the cooperating teacher was to evaluate the performance of the student teacher. Thirteen of the intensive sample

cooperating teachers used the university-provided forms as the basis of their evaluations while six based their evaluations upon how the students in the class responded to the student teachers, either socially or academically. One other cooperating teacher, who was working with a student teacher for the first time, had the impression that cooperating teachers were not included in the evaluation process, a definite misconception. Despite formal evaluation processes, the practice of evaluation at these sites was at variance with those established processes.

In addition both cooperating teachers and university supervisors were asked to describe the major responsibilities associated with their roles. Cooperating teachers reported that they wanted to give the student teacher a "good experience." They defined a good experience as one in which the student teacher learned to be confident about her/his teaching through effective control of the classroom and effective teaching methodology. Cooperating teachers were asked to expand this notion of "effectiveness" and describe exactly what they focused on when supervising the student teacher. Most mentioned lesson plans, time management, behavior management and material preparation. One cooperating teacher focused on what the students were learning.

When university supervisors were asked what qualities constituted a good university supervisor most reported interpersonal communication skills as crucial. Such statements as "one must like people." "be willing to listen," "communicate well," "be a good observer" were mentioned repeatedly. In addition most university supervisors viewed their responsibilities to the student teachers and cooperating teachers differently.

With student teachers, university supervisors assumed an almost contradictory role of evaluator and caretaker. On the one hand they wanted to

be the student teacher's "security blanket" and "middle man." On the other hand they knew they must ultimately evaluate this person's work. Responsibilities to cooperating teachers included such things as communicating the importance of planning and meeting the needs of the individual student teacher.

Performance ratings. Perceptions of participants' regarding supervision were also tapped through the use of performance ratings. Each member of each triad was rated by the other two members of the triad, as well as by him or herself. For example, the student teachers would rate their own performances as student teacher and their respective cooperating teachers and university supervisors would rate them as well. The rating forms were adapted to the perspective of each role, but aside from this, were parallel. Thus, each student teacher's performance was rated from three perspectives. The performance of the cooperating teachers and university supervisors were rated in a similar fashion.

As indicated in Table 11, the mean performance ratings were at the top end of the scale. These results may indicate that a wider scale should be used to allow for greater discrimination. However, use of five-point scales is still standard practice as evidenced by the official final evaluation forms from both sites. In the following section on correlational results it is shown that the performance rating scales and the final evaluation forms are highly correlated. The self-ratings were higher than the performance ratings by the two other members of each triad in all role groups (Table 11). Although it appears that cooperating teachers in the intensive sample were rated more highly than those in the general sample by their respective university supervisors, the difference was not significant according to the hierarchical analyses of variance discussed later. This can probably be

Table 11

Means and Standard Deviations of Performance Ratings

	Possible Range	SU $\bar{X}$	SU s.d.	MU $\bar{X}$	MU s.d.	Intensive Sample $\bar{X}$	Intensive Sample s.d.	General Sample $\bar{X}$	General Sample s.d.
f-ratings	1-5	4.51	.34	4.68	.35	4.62	.33	4.59	.36
ings by STs	1-5	4.15	.97	4.29	.73	4.29	.91	4.20	.84
ings by USs	1-5	3.94	.87	4.76	.27	4.54	.47	3.61	.99
f-ratings	1-5	4.42	.36	4.30	.43	4.28	.36	4.38	.41
ings by CTs	1-5	4.03	.72	3.96	.66	4.00	.68	3.99	.69
ings by USs	1-5	4.00	.67	4.54	.20	4.23	.53	4.00	.73
f-ratings	1-5	4.49	.27	4.64	.32	4.47	.33	4.57	.21
ings by STs	1-5	4.04	.55	3.90	.55	3.84	.38	4.20	.64
ings by CTs	1-5	4.19	.48	4.31	.85	4.26	.39	4.20	.53

attributed to the relatively low number of general sample ratings by university supervisors. Recall that Metropolitan University supervisors rated only their intensive sample cooperating teachers. Furthermore, the Metropolitan supervisors not only rated their cooperating teachers but also had nominated them to be in the intensive sample in the first place. Thus, we would expect higher ratings of the intensive sample cooperating teachers by the Metropolitan supervisors which in turn would tend to inflate the mean of all of the ratings of intensive cooperating teachers by their university supervisors. It appears, then, that the apparent differences in performance ratings is simply an artifact of the research design and would be so even if the differences were significant. Student teachers were rated about equally by their university supervisors and their cooperating teachers, as were cooperating teachers by their student teachers and university supervisors. In contrast to this pattern, however, university supervisors were rated more favorably by their cooperating teachers than by their student teachers. It may be that the cooperating teachers and student teachers employ different standards. This is a reasonable explanation, given the very different role of each and should be borne in mind when considering the evaluations of one group by another. These observed differences were confirmed by subsequent analysis of variance.

Summary. Cooperating teachers' journals reflected a concern for their student teachers' capabilities in behavior management, lesson planning and lesson delivery. University supervisors' journals showed similar concerns and, in fact, may have had some impact on cooperating teachers' foci. When cooperating teachers were asked (in interview situations) what their primary responsibilities were, they reported a need to guide student teachers into effective, competent instructors. This notion of effectiveness included

competence in lesson planning, time management, behavior management, and materials preparation. Again, university supervisors addressed similar concerns which may have influenced how cooperating teachers articulated these primary responsibilities.

When performance rating scales were examined, mean performance ratings were at the top end of the scale. In other words, each member of the triad positively rated the other two members of their triad. Each member tended to give themselves higher performance ratings than they gave the other two members of their triad. Student teachers and cooperating teachers were rated equally high by other members of their triad. University supervisors, however, were rated more favorably by their cooperating teachers than by their student teachers.

Discussion

Previous sections in this report have described feedback systems for student teachers (i.e., supervisory conferences and final evaluations) and university supervisors', cooperating teachers' and student teachers' perceptions of feedback. Participants' perceptions, as previously reported, were gathered through journals, individual interviews and questionnaires. These perceptions will now be compared to actual supervisory and evaluative incidences.

Cooperating teachers' perceptions of supervision and the formative evaluation of the student teacher appear consistent with what actually occurred in the supervisory conference. Cooperating teachers' journals reflected a concern for their student teachers' capabilities in behavior management, lesson planning and lesson delivery. Because university supervisors' journals showed similar concerns, they may have had some impact on the cooperating teachers foci. When cooperating teachers were asked in

interview situations what their primary responsibilities were, they said they wanted to guide student teachers into effective, competent instructors. This notion of effectiveness included competence in lesson planning, time management, behavior management and in material preparation. Again, university supervisors expressed similar concerns which may have influenced how cooperating teachers articulated these primary responsibilities.

When the content of conferences was examined it was noted that cooperating teachers were indeed interested in explaining to their student teacher how to teach. They commented most often on classroom teaching events. These comments were specific in nature, usually focusing on an immediate classroom situation. In addition cooperating teachers spoke of the materials and methods involved in teaching. When their comments were classified according to instructional domain, it was noted that the cognitive domain was focused upon most often.

Therefore, in many ways the concerns of cooperating teachers, as noted throughout their individual journals and interviews, were reflected in the formative evaluation and supervision of their student teachers. In other ways, however, differences were noted. For example, cooperating teachers made evaluative remarks in their journals regarding their student teachers' performance in the classroom. During supervisory conferences however, few evaluative statements were found. Thus cooperating teachers appeared to be able to make judgments about their student teachers instructional capabilities but seemed unwilling to share these judgments.

Student teachers' concerns however were quite different and may not have coincided with what actually occurred during supervisory conferences. Both the journals and individual interviews of student teachers showed a dominant concern with personal and professional relationships with their cooperating

teachers. While journal comments were, for the most part, of a general nature, the interviews provided more insight into what constituted a "good" relationship. Such supervisory skills as offering constructive criticism, establishing high expectations, a willingness to share materials and ideas and a collegial rapport were accredited for having solidified the student teacher/cooperating teachers' relationship. Conversely, student teachers felt that university supervisors remained out of touch with their individual classroom situations throughout the semester.

When the process of conferences was examined it was noted that student teachers rarely participated in most interactions. When they did participate, although 32% of their comments focused on classroom events, 24% of their comments were of an acknowledgement-type nature, (e.g., "yes," "OK," "fine," etc.). Such interactions might better typify a "teacher-student" relationship rather than one exemplifying collegiality. Because good personal relationships were important to the student teacher it is possible that being "seen and not heard" in a conference was safer than making a substantial comment that might be viewed as incorrect or in direct disagreement with their cooperating teachers. In addition, university supervisors may have influenced their student teachers to some degree.

University supervisors stated that good interpersonal skills were crucial for effective supervision. When asked to define these skills, supervisors listed the ability to like people, being willing to listen, and being kind, understanding and positive as some of the required qualities. Such concerns may have influenced to some degree how student teachers viewed relationships within their individual triads.

With regard to summative evaluations, examination of the data from the final evaluations indicated that most student teachers' ratings fell at the

high end of a Likert-type response scale. Such high ratings are congruent with data obtained through performance rating scales which were individually computed by participants. As previously reported, performance rating scales asked each participant to rate the other two members of the triad as well as themselves. Data indicated that all participants were pleased with the quality of each participants' performance throughout the student teaching experience. Thus, participants reported being pleased with the performance of their other triad members. In addition, cooperating teachers and university supervisors rated student teachers highly on the formal, final evaluation.

Conclusions

Formative Evaluation and Feedback

When the process of cooperating teachers' talk during conferences with their student teachers was analyzed it was noted that few evaluative remarks were made. Instead cooperating teachers tended to describe and explain teaching. An analysis of the content of cooperating teachers' conference talk revealed a predominating theme of how to use certain materials and methods in specific circumstances. The cognitive domain was focused on more than any other instructional domain. Cooperating teachers' perceptions of their roles as supervisors indicated a concern for guiding student teachers toward competence in classroom management, lesson planning and lesson delivery. University protocols for cooperating teachers echoed some of these concerns. Protocols focused on cooperating teachers' responsibilities to student teachers. These responsibilities included maintaining a professional partnership with student teachers, helping student teachers to become effective classroom managers and instructors and evaluating the student teachers' performance.

There are numerous possible explanations for the cooperating teachers' lack of evaluative statements during conferences. At one site, State University, cooperating teachers were told to place the burden of formative evaluation on the student teacher. The university's philosophy regarding evaluation was that student teachers must learn to evaluate their own work. Therefore, those who supervised student teachers were instructed to provide opportunities for self-assessment. The cooperating teachers at Metropolitan University may have been operating under the same premise, even though it was not an explicitly stated responsibility.

Secondly, the method of data collection may have been threatening to both participants. Because all conferences were audiotaped, cooperating teachers may have felt uncomfortable providing any sort of negative feedback and therefore left out evaluative remarks.

A third possibility is that cooperating teachers found themselves in a most difficult role. As supervisors of student teachers they must assume a role of teacher and evaluator as well as that of professional colleague. Perhaps talking about teaching was a way of implicitly telling student teachers what they viewed as quality instruction, therefore relieving the burden of evaluation.

In addition to the lack of evaluative remarks, cooperating teachers tended to focus on how to use specific materials and methods in immediate classroom situations. Little or not talk focused on underlying philosophies or ultimate goals for children. Listening to conferences one felt cooperating teachers were describing for student teachers a "cookbook" approach to learning and instruction. Teachers may have been implicitly communicating to student teachers their ultimate instructional goals and underlying philosophies through the methods they advocated.

With regard to student teachers, conference behavior and concerns elicited from journals and interviews were also examined. When the process of student teachers' conference talk was examined, it was noted that student teachers did not participate as often as cooperating teachers. In fact, cooperating teachers dominated over 70% of all conference talk. When student teachers did talk, 32% of their statements were classified as dealing with classroom events, yet 24% of their statements were classified as acknowledgements, containing little if any content. Student teachers' perceptions of supervision and formative evaluation, as determined through a content analysis of journal and interview data, showed a predominant concern with the good personal relationships between themselves and their cooperating teachers. When questioned as to why they felt their relationships with their cooperating teachers were good most stated that their teachers shared ideas, offered constructive criticism, held high expectations for student teachers and maintained a collegial rapport with them. Conferences however showed that cooperating teachers offered few evaluative statements and dominated most interactions.

Again numerous possible explanations exist for the discrepancy between student teachers' perceptions of supervision and formative evaluation and the occurrence of supervision and formative evaluation during the conferences. A few will be discussed here.

First, if student teachers viewed their cooperating teachers as evaluators, to say little during conferences may have been safer than offering comments that may have been either incorrect or in direct disagreement with their cooperating teachers. A second explanation may have been that their knowledge of what constitutes an effective relationship colored how they perceived their relationship with their cooperating teachers. For example,

they know a good cooperating teacher-student teacher relationship should be one where constructive criticism is offered, where high expectations are sought and a collegial rapport exist. Student teachers felt their relationships with their cooperating teachers was good, therefore they were characterized by the above notions. Finally, student teacher-cooperating teacher relationships extended well beyond their conferences. Qualities enumerated by the student teacher may have, in fact, been present throughout other interactions.

In addition, journal and interview data analysis revealed a lack of concern on the part of student teachers with how their instruction might or might not be impacting students. In fact, when making evaluative statements about their teaching, no student teacher commented on the effectiveness of their lesson in terms of what pupils may have learned. One possible explanation lies with the quantitative findings of this study. When results from the Teacher Concerns Questionnaire (Fuller, 1969) were examined, student teachers were most concerned with self (as opposed to concerned with teaching tasks and the impact of teaching on students) throughout the course of the semester. Also, cooperating teachers and university supervisors did not report concerns with the student teachers impact on students. Their lack of acknowledgement may have influenced the student teachers' concerns as well. One possible explanation for this lack of stated concern could be that the importance of instructional impact was assumed. Perhaps no problems existed with regard to the impact of instruction and therefore it was not mentioned.

Summative Evaluation and Feedback

Cooperating teachers' and university supervisors' perceptions of the student teachers' performance (as measured by performance rating scales) and the student teachers' formal, final evaluations are indicative of the highest

quality performance on the part of the student teachers. Two possible conclusions may be drawn: first, the scales used to assess the student teachers may in some way have forced the distributions to assume these shapes; second, the student teachers may in fact, on the average, have shown a "consistent" or "commendable" application of the competencies listed, as a function of the training obtained through their universities and placements.

Some comments are in order here. The verbal explanations appended to the numeric continua on each institution's evaluation forms are different: for State University, a rating of five is intended to represent a "high degree of excellence" while one is "unsatisfactory;" the same numerical ratings on the Metropolitan University form are equated with "consistently" and "rarely." It is therefore clearly arguable that two distinct dimensions may underlie the rating continua.

Implications and Recommendations for Future Study

In light of these findings it seems prudent to offer recommendations for the training of student teachers. First student teachers are naive consumers. To offer them information in an implicit fashion may not guarantee their comprehension of that information. Those who supervise student teachers may therefore want to be more explicit with regard to their ultimate goals for children as well as the philosophy which underlies their chosen mode of instruction. In addition, cooperating teachers and supervisors may want to provide student teachers with less situation-specific information and explicitly state their ultimate goals for pupils. Because these future teachers may teach in a very different context from the one in which they received their training, highly specific information may be of little use to them. Secondly, those who conference with student teachers should be sensitive to their reluctance to participate. Because communication is

central to instruction cooperating teachers and university supervisors may want to elicit more conference participation from student teachers to determine if they have in fact comprehended the information being provided.

A third recommendation for teacher training deals with student teacher expectations. Supervisors of student teachers may want to clarify their specific expectations. Whether they are to serve as evaluators of the student teacher's performance or promote the skill self-evaluation in student teachers, their charge must know what they view as effective instruction and why. Such information could only serve to help student teachers become more knowledgeable as they go about selecting instructional methods and materials suited to their own needs.

Lastly, those final evaluations examined in this study did not qualitatively distinguish one student teacher from another. Either the final evaluation forms themselves should be reexamined or those who compute them should be trained in the process. Such reexamination and training could lead to a more reliable and valid instrument.

Findings from this study revealed that (1) cooperating teachers were concerned with imparting knowledge to student teachers about the specific methods and materials of instruction, (2) student teachers were most concerned with their personal relationships with their cooperating teachers, (3) cooperating teachers tended to dominate supervisory interactions with their student teachers, and (4) student teachers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors rate one another's performance highly. Questions therefore remain regarding the training of student teachers.

Knowle (1973) felt that adults as learners must be treated differently in an educational setting. Cooperating teachers are in fact dealing with adult learners as they go about the business of training student teachers. Would

the supervision and formative evaluation of student teaching be significantly changed if cooperating teachers built their supervision around adult learning theory?

In addition, sensitivity to the concerns of the student teacher might alter how one goes about evaluation and supervision. Fuller's (1969) concerns theory stated that early in their careers teachers are initially concerned with self protection and consolidation. Later their concerns shift to the task demands of their jobs and as they mature professionally their concerns focus on the impact of their instruction on students. According to perceptions of supervision reported in journals and interviews student teachers in the study were operating at a self-concerns level while teachers appeared more concerned with the tasks of teaching. If cooperating teachers were made aware of the levels of concern model, how might this affect their supervision and evaluation "style?"

In addition, in view of the uniformly high means observed on final evaluation, the following questions are raised. First is the general issue of comparability of ratings across various teacher education institutions, or, when is an "A" really and "A"? What does a high rating at any given institution mean? What are the actual behavioral referents for the grades? From the point of view of the prospective employer, do equally high ratings across candidates from several institutions imply equal quality in instructional skills? It would seem possible that the lack of an agreed-upon codified knowledge base (Griffin, et al., Note 1) may be contributing to this problem.

A second, related issue is that of so-called "grade inflation." The reader will note that one of the institutions specifically cautioned its supervisors against assigning inflated ratings to student teachers (Defino, et

al., Note 2), and the site difference was in a direction consistent with this recommendation (i.e., the State University mean was significantly lower). Thus, it is possible to ask again: (1) are supervisors and cooperating teachers generally prone to a positive response bias in evaluating student teachers; (2) why might this be the case; (3) what are the effects of inflated ratings upon the individuals being rated, upon the rater (e.g., whose interests are being rewarded with the high ratings), and upon the profession as a whole (how well is quality control being served); and (4) how might this tendency be altered, if it ought to be? All of these have serious implications for practitioners in teacher education, and warrant further research.

Report Summary

This report described the formative and summative evaluation that took place during the course of the student teaching experiences. The content of supervisory conferences and formal, final evaluations were compared to those university protocols regarding the formative and summative evaluation of student teachers. Interview and journal data as well as information reported on individual performance rating scales were described. These data were considered to reflect participants' perceptions of and concerns with evaluation. These perceptions and concerns were also compared to conference and final evaluation data to determine congruence. Finally, conclusions were drawn from these findings and hypotheses suggested for future study.

Reference Notes

1. Griffin, G.A., Hughes, R., Jr., Barnes, S., Carter, H., Defino, M.E.,& Edwards, S. The student teaching experience (Research Proposal submitted to National Institute of Education). Austin, TX: The University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, June 1981.

2 Defino, M., Barnes, S., & O'Neal, S. The context of clinical preservice teacher education: The student teaching experience. Austin, TX: The University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, September 1982.

3. Hughes, R., Jr., & Hukill, Hobart. Participant characteristics, change, and outcomes in preservice clinical teacher education. Austin, TX: The University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, July 1982.

4. Griffin, G., Barnes, S., Defino, M., Edwards, S., Hukill, H., & O'Neal, S. Clinical Preservice Teacher Education: Final Report of a Descriptive Study. Austin, TX: The University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, in press.

5. Lacefield, W.E., & Cole, H.P. Starting point for curricular change: A preexposition and suitability measure for client groups. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, February 1973.

6. Hughes, R., Jr., Griffin, G.A., & Defino, M.E. Personality factors in the student teaching triad. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York City, March 1982.

7. MacDonald, Jr., A.P., & Tseng, M.S. Dimensions of internal versus external control revisited: Toward the development of a measure of generalized expectancy. Unpublished manuscript, West Virginia University, 1972.

8. Hunt, D.E., Greenwood, J., Noy, J.E., & Watson, J. Assessment of conceptual level: Paragraph completion method. Toronto: Ontario Institute of Studies in Education, June 1973.

9. LaMonica, E. Construct validity of an empathy instrument. Unpublished manuscript, New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1980.

10. Blumberg, A., & Kleinke, D.J. An instrument for describing the work-life of teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, California, April 1981.

11. (Doe, J.) Handbook for university student teaching supervisors. (Lakeview, Southwestern State: State University), 1979).*

12. (Doe, J.) Teacher Education Guidelines for Elementary and Secondary Schools. (Urban, Western State: Urban Unified School District), 1975.*

*Pseudonyms, indicated by enclosure of names in parentheses, have been used in referencing documents to protect the anonymity of study participants.

References

Borgotta, E.F., & Corsini, R.J. The quick word test. Journal of Education Research, 1960, 54, 15-19.

Copeland, W.D., & Atkinson, D.R. Student teachers' perceptions of directive and nondirective supervisory behavior. Journal of Educational Research, 1978, 71, 123-127.

Fuller, F.F. Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization. American Educational Research Journal, 1969, 6, 207-226.

Soares, A.T., & Soares, L.M. Self-perceptions of student teachers and the meaningfulness of their experience. The Journal of Teacher Education, 1968, 19, 187-191.

Southall, C., & King, D. Critical incidents in student teaching. Teacher Educator, 1979, 15, 34-36.

Weller, R.H. Verbal communication in instructional supervision. New York: Teachers College Press, 1971.

Appendix A

Description and Examples of the Conference Coding System

Description of the Conference Coding System

Tape-recorded conferences between student teachers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors from State University and Metropolitan University were selected and coded according to the procedures described in the conference coding manual. Both two-way (Cooperating Teacher-Student Teacher, University Supervisor-Cooperating Teacher, and University Supervisor-Student Teacher) and three-way (Cooperating Teacher-Student Teacher-University Supervisor) conferences were included in the coding system. The system was developed to provide information about the process and the content of the conferences. In terms of process, the coding focused upon describing the exchange of information between and among the CT (Cooperating Teacher), ST (Student Teacher), and US (University Supervisor): who did the talking, to whom was the talk directed, and what type of talking occurred. In terms of content, the coding focused upon describing the nature of the topics discussed in the conferences.

Conferences representing each of the triads were selected and coded. Coders were trained in the coding system to a reliability of .75 and information was recorded on conference coding sheets. Information recorded in the conference was organized into statements and each statement was then coded in terms of process and content. A statement referred to all the uninterrupted talk of one participant. Once the statements were numbered, the actual coding of the process and content of the conference began.

Process

Every statement was coded in terms of process to identify who was talking, what type of statement was made, and to whom the statement was directed. This information provided an indication of the type of exchanges

that occurred among student teachers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors.

The "Who" category listed the person speaking. The following codes were used in this category: CT-1 (Cooperating Teacher), ST-2 (Student Teacher), US-3 (University Supervisor), and O-4 (Other Person). The "Type" category included the type of statement made by the person speaking. Specific "type" coding categories for each participant indicated whether directions, questions, concerns, replies, etc. were offered by the participants. Eight types of statements were coded for the CT and US and six were coded for the ST. The "Direction" category listed the recipient of the talk and consisted of the same codes as the "Who" category. A summary of the process coding categories and examples of each are provided in Figure A.1.

Content

The content of each conference was also coded to describe the nature of the topics discussed in the conference. Three major categories were included under Content: Teaching Events, Organization of Student Teaching Events, and Other.

Teaching events. All statements that referred to the classroom teaching experience were included in this category and were coded in terms of "generality," "focus," and "domain." This part of the coding system was adapted from Weller's (1971) MOSAICS coding system. Codings under the "Generality" category indicated whether the teaching events discussed were specific to the classroom and the immediate student teaching experience (S-1) or were more general in nature and included generalizations, past experiences, or applications of theory from educational thought or related behavioral sciences (G-2). The "Focus" category indicated what type of topic was discussed and included the following subcategories: Objectives and Content

(O-1), Methods and Materials (M-2), Instructional Interactions (I-3), or Not Applicable (N/A). The "Domain" category described the nature of the topic and contained four subcategories: Cognitive (C-1), Affective (A-2), Social/Disciplinary (D-3), or Not Applicable (N/A). A summary of the codings for Teaching Events and specific examples for each are included in Figure A.2.

Organization of student teaching events. All statements that referred to the training and supervision of the student teacher were included in this category and were coded in terms of "protocol" and "activities." "Protocol" included all information about the structure, formal procedures, and the administration of student teaching. "Activities" included all information about activities and events in which the student teacher participated such as classroom observations, preparation of projects for methods classes, and scheduling of teaching times. Examples of "protocol" and "activities" statements are included in Figure A.3.

Other. Content information that could not be coded as a Teaching Event or an Organization of a Student Teaching Event was coded in this category. Topics coded as Other included topics unrelated to the student teaching experience, irrelevant information, and unintelligible remarks.

Number of Lines

The final step in the conference coding process was the recording of the number of lines in each statement. These numbers were listed under their respective CT, ST, or US participant's heading.

CT-1 or US-1 Gives direction

(CT to ST) The language unit you are going to work on will be dictionary skills.

CT-2 or US-2 Asks about ST interests

(CT to ST) We had talked about your concern with pupil participation...Is this still something that concerns you or is there anything else?

CT-3 or US-3 Provides evaluation feedback

(CT to ST on evaluating students' work) You have them checking papers and returning papers, but talking individually about errors is a really good thing. They benefit when they learn what they did wrong.

CT-4 or US-4 Reviews or comments on classroom events or student teaching events

(CT to ST) I had a little girl two years ago who was partially blind...Her mother came up and registered her and didn't say a thing...This child was later adopted because her mother abused her.

CT-5 or US-5 Clearly provides options

(CT to ST) The top group could meet with me while you are doing spelling with those that need it...We could do it that way if you would be more comfortable or vice versa.

CT-6 or US-6 Described own interests

(CT to ST) I wish we had those math impact cards for language.

Figure A.1. Examples of Process Codes - Type

CT-7 or US-7 Acknowledgement or endorsement

"Yes," "Right," "Fine," "Terrific"

CT-9 or US-9 Other

"Is the teaching store open on Saturday?"

ST-3 Provides evaluation comment

"The spelling unit went well. All but three student mastered the work lists."

ST-4 Comments on planning, classroom events, or student teaching activities

(ST, in talking about a classroom activity says) Most of the students will do it on their own.

ST-6 Asks questions (describes interests and concerns)

(ST to CT regarding students calling out answers to questions without raising hand) My big main concern is going to be calling out...and raising hands...you know.

ST-7 Acknowledgement or endorsement

"Yes," "Right," "Fine," "Terrific"

ST-8 Offers suggestions

(ST to CT regarding a word card activity) I would explain that they need to bring up a piece of paper when they do it, and once they get the word cards set up they can copy the sentences they made down on their paper.

ST-9 Other

"Is the teaching store open on Saturday?"

1. Generality

S-1 (Specific): Pedagogical moves that focus on the objectives, methods, or instructional interactions for the particular class on which supervision is based. These may relate to the class either in the past or the future.

Example

Explain that they (students) need to bring a piece of paper when they do it...Have the words cards set up and they can copy it down on their paper.

G-2 (General): Pedagogical moves that focus on generalized objectives, methods or instructional interactions. These may include generalizations, past experience, or application of theory from educational thought and related behavioral sciences.

Example

I have learned and read that research says that it helps if you state your expectations at the beginning of a lesson.

2. Focus

C-1 (Objectives and Content): Expected educational outcomes and the content or subject matter related to these outcomes.

Example

They are going to write "Is the cow purple?" instead of "The cow is purple."

M-2 (Methods and Materials): Materials of instruction and strategic operations designed to achieve objectives. ("how to..." generally with future tense)

Figure A.2. Examples of Content Codes - Teaching Events

Example

Just go through and review them at that point...then take them through the first one with word cards and show them how to lay it out.

I-3 (Instructional Interactions): Interactions between the teacher, pupil(s), and content or curriculum. (generally past or present tense)

Example

What I was trying to do was get them to say what it described...They did get to the point where they would say that in the sentence "The rocky hill..." "rocky" described "hill"...I guess I ought to go back over this and make sure they understand.

3. Domain

C-1 (Cognitive): Pertaining to cognition, knowledge, understanding, and learning. The cognitive domain is restricted to cognitive interactions between pupil(s) and subject matter. Subjects like art, music, or psychomotor activities are considered cognitive.

Example

I'm going to get a check-sheet up so they can check off when they've done each set of questions...so they know what they've done.

A-2 (Affective): Pertaining to interest, involvement and motivation. Affective interaction between pupils and subject matter.

Example

(CT speaking to ST about a student's behavior during a math lesson) She was a non-volunteer and you encouraged her--"Don't be nervous and very good."

D-3 (Social or Disciplinary): Pertaining to discipline, control and social interactions. Interactions between teacher and pupil(s) or pupil(s) and pupil(s).

Example

(CT speaking with ST about the operation of a learning center) I think there should be a time limit or some people would spend an hour over there. They should be limited to four at a time.

Student Teaching Protocol - Comments that focus on the structure, formal procedures and/or the administration of student teaching.

Example

Before I (CT) observe your teaching, I will always meet with you (ST) for a concerns conference...at this conference you should be prepared to tell me what you want me to focus on during my observation.

Student Teaching Activities - Activities included all information about events in which the student teacher participated. These events might include observations, preparation of projects for methods classes, and/or the scheduling of teaching times.

Example

On Thursday I (ST) have seminar. I'll ask her (US) about an observation time then since she didn't get to me this week.

Examples of Content Codes -

Not Applicable

Not Applicable - Information coded in this category dealt with personal activities outside the realm of student teaching.

Example

I (ST) used to go ice skating when we lived in Chicago.

Figure A.3. Examples of Content Codes - Organization of Student Teaching

Appendix B

Performance Rating Scales

ST by CT and US (II)

ST by Self (III)

CT by ST (I)

CT by US (II)

CT by Self (III)

US by ST (I)

US by CT (II)

US by Self (III)

Student Teacher Scale by both CT and US (II)

Please think about your work this semester with the student teacher. Consider each of the following statements very carefully. As far as possible make a precise judgment about the degree to which this person's behavior is similar or dissimilar to each statement. Please indicate your exact degree of agreement or disagreement.

	Strongly Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree	No Information
1. The student teacher was not adequately prepared for class.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. The student teacher organized materials so they were available when needed.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. The student teacher created an enjoyable classroom atmosphere.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. The student teacher was not effective in managing student behavior.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. The student teacher did not demonstrate an adequate knowledge of subject matter.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. The student teacher did not use a variety of teaching methods and techniques.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. The student teacher used concrete as well as visual materials.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. The student teacher demonstrated skill in the use of creative and thought-provoking questions.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. The student teacher paced instruction to maintain student interest.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. The student teacher did not provide adequate feedback to pupils on their performance in the class.	1	2	3	4	5	6

	Strongly Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree	No Information
11. The student teacher was not sensitive to student difficulties in learning.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. The student teacher takes individual differences into account when planning and carrying out instruction.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. The student teacher demonstrated acceptance of students from different cultural backgrounds.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. The student teacher did not gain the respect of the students.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. The student teacher commonly practiced self-evaluation for the purpose of improving his/her teaching.	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. The student teacher initiated communication with colleagues.	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. The student teacher did not create a learning atmosphere.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. The student teacher was not effective in communicating with parents.	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. The student teacher was effective in communicating with administrators.	1	2	3	4	5	6
20. The student teacher used methods appropriate to the objective of the lesson.	1	2	3	4	5	6
21. The student teacher was not dependable in attendance at the school.	1	2	3	4	5	6

	Strongly Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree	No Information
22. The student teacher independently developed instructional materials for the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5	6
23. The student teacher is ready to begin their own teaching assignment.	1	2	3	4	5	6
24. Students were not able to learn new content and skills introduced by the student teacher.	1	2	3	4	5	6
25. The student teacher was able to motivate students toward a learning goal.	1	2	3	4	5	6
26. The student teacher ignored the specific suggestions which I offered for his/her consideration.	1	2	3	4	5	6
27. The student teacher was willing to have me observe his/her teaching frequently.	1	2	3	4	5	6
28. The student teacher was unwilling to participate in all areas of teaching.	1	2	3	4	5	6
29. The student teacher was willing to discuss problems which arose.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Student Teacher Scale by Self (III)

Consider carefully the following statements. Indicate your agreement or disagreement with each statement as accurately as possible.

		Strongly Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree
1.	I was not adequately prepared for class.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	I organized materials so they were available when needed.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	I created an enjoyable classroom atmosphere.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	I was not effective in managing student behavior.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	I did not demonstrate an adequate knowledge of subject matter.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	I did not use a variety of teaching methods and techniques.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	I used concrete as well as visual materials.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	I demonstrated skill in the use of creative and thought-provoking questions.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	I paced instruction to maintain student interest.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	I did not provide adequate feedback to pupils on their performance in class.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	I was not sensitive to student difficulties in learning.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	I take individual differences into account when planning and carrying out instruction.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	I demonstrated acceptance of students from different cultural backgrounds.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	I did not gain the respect of the pupils.	1	2	3	4	5

		Strongly Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree
15.	I commonly practice self- evaluation for the purpose of improving my teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	I initiate communication with colleagues.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	I did not create a learning atmosphere.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	I was not effective in communicating with parents.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	I was effective in communicating with administrators.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	I used methods appropriate to the objective of the lesson.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	I was not dependable in attendance at school.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	I independently developed instructional materials for the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	I am ready to begin my own teaching assignment.	1	2	3	4	5
24.	Students were not able to learn new content and skills introduced by me.	1	2	3	4	5
25.	I was able to motivate students toward a learning goal.	1	2	3	4	5
26.	I ignored the specific suggestions which my supervising/master teacher offered.	1	2	3	4	5
27.	I was willing to be observed frequently.	1	2	3	4	5
28.	I was unwilling to participate in all aspects of teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
29.	I was willing to discuss problems which arose.	1	2	3	4	5

Cooperating Teacher by Student Teacher (I)

Please think about your work this semester with the master teacher/supervising teacher. Consider each of the following statements very carefully. As far as possible, make a precise judgment about the degree to which this person's behavior is similar or dissimilar to each statement. Please indicate your exact degree of agreement or disagreement.

	Strongly Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree	No Information
1. The master/supervising teacher and I had frequent conferences.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. The master/supervising teacher and I had useful conferences.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. The master/supervising teacher did not provide specific feedback on my performance.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. The master/supervising teacher offered specific suggestions for my consideration.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. The master/supervising teacher was supportive of my teaching efforts.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. The master/supervising teacher did not allow enough independence for me to develop my own style of teaching.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. The master/supervising teacher modeled or demonstrated a variety of teaching methods and techniques in his/her own teaching.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. The master/supervising teacher did not provide encouragement to me on a personal basis.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. The master/supervising teacher did not observe my teaching frequently enough to judge my performance adequately.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. The master/supervising teacher encouraged me to participate in all aspects of teaching (parent conferences, administrative work, grading, teaching, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5	6

	Strongly Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree	No Information
11. The master/supervising teacher was not available if problems arose.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Cooperating Teacher by University Supervisor (II)

Please think about your work this semester with the master teacher/supervising teacher. Consider each of the following statements very carefully. As far as possible make a precise judgment about the degree to which this person's behavior is similar or dissimilar to each statement. Please indicate your exact degree of agreement or disagreement.

Focus on how the master/supervising teacher worked with the student teacher.

	Strongly Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree	No Information
1. The supervising/master teacher offered specific suggestions for my student teacher's consideration.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. The supervising/master teacher did not allow my student teacher to develop his/her own style of teaching.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. The supervising/master teacher modeled a variety of teaching methods and techniques in his/her own teaching.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. The supervising/master teacher provided my student teacher with encouragement on a personal basis.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. The supervising/master teacher observed my student teacher frequently.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. The supervising/master teacher encouraged the student teacher to participate in all aspects of teaching (parent conferences, administrative work, grading, teaching, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. The supervising/master teacher was available to discuss problems which arose.	1	2	3	4	5	6

	Strongly Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree	No Information
8. The supervising/master teacher was not supportive of the student teacher.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Focus on how the master/supervising teacher worked with you.

9. The supervising/master teacher was available for conferences.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. The supervising/master teacher did not contribute toward useful conferences.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. The supervising/master teacher did not provide specific feedback on my performance as a university supervisor/coordinator.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. The supervising/master teacher offered specific suggestions for my consideration.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. The supervising/master teacher provided me with encouragement for my work with the student teacher.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. The supervising/master teacher resisted my efforts at directing the student teacher's classroom experience.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Cooperating Teacher by Self (III)

Consider the following statements carefully. Indicate your agreement or disagreement with each statement as accurately as possible.

	Strongly Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree
1. I had frequent conferences with the student teacher.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I had useful conferences with the student teacher.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I provided specific feedback to the student teacher on his/her performance.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I offered specific suggestions to the student teacher for his/her consideration.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I was supportive of the student teacher's teaching efforts.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I allowed enough independence for the student teacher to develop his/her own style of teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I modeled or demonstrated a variety of teaching methods and techniques in my own teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I provided enccouragement to the student teacher on a personal basis.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I observed the student teacher frequently enough to judge his/her performance adequately.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I encouraged the student teacher to participate in all aspects of teaching (parent conferences, administrative work, grading, teaching, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
11. I was available if problems arose.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I provided specific feedback to the university supervisor/coordinator on his/her performance.	1	2	3	4	5

	ngly		Neutral		Strongly Disagree
13. I offered specific suggestions regarding the student teacher to the university supervisor/coordinator for his/her consideration.		2	3	4	5
14. I was supportive of the university supervisor/coordinator.	1	2	3	4	5

University Supervisor by Student Teacher (I)

Please think about your work this semester with the university supervisor/coordinator. Consider each of the following statements very carefully. As far as possible, make a precise judgment about the degree to which this person's behavior is similar or dissimilar to each statement. Please indicate your exact degree of agreement or disagreement.

	Strongly Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree	No Information
1. The university supervisor/ coordinator and I did have frequent conferences.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. The university supervisor/ coordinator and I had useful conferences.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. The university supervisor/ coordinator did not provide specific feedback on my performance.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. The university supervisor/ coordinator offered specific suggestions for my consideration.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. The university supervisor/ coordinator was supportive of my teaching efforts.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. The university supervisor/ coordinator did not allow enough independence for me to develop my own style of teaching.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. The university supervisor/ coordinator modeled or demonstrated a variety of teaching methods and techniques in his/her own teaching.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. The university supervisor/ coordinator did not provide encouragement to me on a personal basis.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. The university supervisor/ coordinator did not observe my teaching frequently enough to judge my performance adequately.	1	2	3	4	5	6

		Strongly Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree	No Information
10.	The university supervisor/ coordinator encouraged me to participate in all aspects of teaching (parent conferences, administrative work, grading, teaching, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5	6
11.	The university supervisor/ coordinator was not available if problems arose.	1	2	3	4	5	6

University Supervisor by Cooperating Teacher (II)

Please think about your work this semester with the university supervisor/coordinator. Consider each of the following statements very carefully. As far as possible, make a precise judgment about the degree to which this person's behavior is similar or dissimilar to each statement. Please indicate your exact degree of agreement or disagreement.

Focus on how the university supervisor/coordinator worked with the student teacher.

	Strongly Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree	No Information
1. The university supervisor/ coordinator offered specific suggestions for student teacher's consideration.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. The university supervisor/coordinator did not allow my student teacher enough freedom to develop his/her own style of teaching.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. The university supervisor/coordinator modeled a variety of teaching methods and techniques in his/her own teaching.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. The university supervisor/coordinator provided my student teacher encouragement on a personal basis.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. The university supervisor/coordinator did observe my student teacher frequently.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. The university supervisor/coordinator encouraged my student teacher to participate in all aspects of teaching (parent conferences, administrative work, grading, teaching, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5	6

	Strongly Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree	No Information
7. The university/supervisor was available if problems arose.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. The university supervisor/coordinator was not supportive of the student teacher.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Focus on how the university supervisor/coordinator worked with you.

9. The university supervisor/coordinator was available for conferences.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. The university supervisor/coordinator did not contribute toward useful conferences.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. The university supervisor/coordinator provided specific feedback on my performance as a cooperating teacher.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. The university supervisor/coordinator offered specific suggestions for my consideration.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. The university supervisor/coordinator provided me with encouragement for my work with the student teacher.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. The university supervisor/coordinator resisted my efforts at directing the student teacher.	1	2	3	4	5	6

University Supervisor by Self (III)

Consider the following statements carefully. Indicate your agreement or disagreemen with each statement as accurately as possible.

	Strongly Agree		Neutral		Strong Disagr
1. I had frequent conferences with the student teacher.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I had useful conferences with the student teacher.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I provided specific feedback to the student teacher on her/his performance.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I offered specific suggestions to the student teacher for his/her consideration.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I was supportive of the student teacher's teaching efforts.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I allowed enough independence for the student teacher to develop her/his own style of teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I modeled or demonstrated a variety of teaching methods and techniques in my own teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I provided encouragement to the student teacher on a personal basis.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I observed the student teacher frequently enough to judge her/his performance adequately.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I encouraged the student teacher to participate in all aspects of teaching (parent conferences, administrative work, grading, teaching, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
11. I was available if problems arose.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I provided specific feedback to the master/supervising teacher on his/her performance.	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree
13. I offered specific suggestions regarding the student teacher to the supervising/master teacher for his/her consideration.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I was supportive of the supervising/master teacher.	1	2	3	4	5

Student Teaching Satisfaction Scale

Consider each of the following statements carefully. Please indicate, as far as possible, the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

	Strongly Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree
1. I believe I spent enough time teaching the class to be able to assume a full-time teaching position.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Feedback on my performance was adequate.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I had sufficient opportunity to practice the teaching or management strategies of greatest concern to me as a future teacher.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I was observed frequently enough by my cooperating/master teacher for her/him to judge fairly my performance.	1	2	3	4	5
5. My cooperating teacher helped to make my student teaching a worthwhile learning experience.	1	2	3	4	5
6. My cooperating teacher gave me clear, useful feedback for improving my performance.	1	2	3	4	5
7. My university supervisor observed me frequently enough for her/him to judge my performance adequately.	1	2	3	4	5
8. My university supervisor helped to make my student teaching a worthwhile learning experience.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I believe I was successful in teaching new ideas and skills to students.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I had sufficient opportunity to interact with other school personnel.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I had the opportunity to conference or to work with parents.	1	2	3	4	5

		Strongly Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree
12.	The students responded favorably to my teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	I had the opportunity to manage the administrative details of the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	I believe I gained a good perspective of what a career in teaching is all about.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	I learned how to effectively implement different teaching and management strategies.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	I learned how to have successful conferences with parents.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	I had access to all necessary materials for instructing my class.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	I learned how to manage efficiently the administrative work of the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	My cooperating teacher was an invaluable resource person in helping me to teach this class.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	I enjoyed being in the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	I feel my student teaching experience was valuable.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	I feel so confident of my teaching skills that I am ready to take a class of my own.	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix C

Final Evaluation Forms

(Use dark ink or type to complete this form)

STATE UNIVERSITY

Final Evaluation of Student Teaching

ELEMENTARY

Student's Name _____ _____ _____ _____
(Last) (First) (Middle) Semester, Year

_____ _____ Subject (If applicable) _____
School Where Student Teaching Was Done Teaching Level—Kindergarten, Primary, Intermediate

Explanation of Ratings:
5 High degree of excellence
4 Commendable
3 Satisfactory
2 Minimally acceptable
1 Unsatisfactory

NOTE: This rating compares *this* student teacher with other student teachers and/or with a reasonable expectation of performance for one who is qualified to *enter* the teaching profession.

Please indicate your rating for each of the categories by placing *a check mark* at the appropriate place on the line. Check marks need not be made on the numbers; they may be made anywhere along the continuum.

	1	2	3	4	5
I. 1. Demonstrated competence with behavioral management.					
2. Demonstrated competence managing the principal environment, e.g., materials and space.					
3. Demonstrated competence in evaluating students.					
4. Demonstrated competence in planning.					
5. Demonstrated skillful choices of instructional methods based on children's needs and interests.					
6. Demonstrated adequate health and vitality.					
7. Demonstrated an effective communication with adults.					
8. Demonstrated effective communication with children.					
9. Demonstrated ability to profit from feedback.					
10. Demonstrated skillful implementation of learning plans.					
II. Overall student teaching performance.					

COMMENTS

This evaluation is based on my observation of the student's work during student teaching and in my professional opinion fairly reports his/her performance. (Draw a line through title not applicable.)

Signed by: _____
University Supervisor or Supervising Teacher

I have read this evaluation

_____
Student's Signature

The student's signature means that he (or she) has seen the completed form; it does not imply that he/she agrees with the evaluation.

F-42, 43

STUDENT PERFORMANCE For each category, cite *observable behaviors* which you believe describe the student's performance.

1. Demonstrated competence with behavioral management.

2. Demonstrated competence in managing the principal environment, e.g., materials and space.

3. Demonstrated competence in evaluating students.

4. Demonstrated competence in planning.

5. Demonstrated skillful choices for instructional methods based on children's needs and interests.

6. Demonstrated adequate health and vitality.

7. Demonstrated effective communication with adults.

8. Demonstrated effective communication with children.

9. Demonstrated ability to profit from feedback.

10. Demonstrated skillful implementation of learning plans.

FINAL EVALUATION

METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION—DEPARTMENT OF TEACHER EDUCATION

DIRECTED TEACHING EVALUATION.....Term, 19.....

Name_____Course No._____Units_____

School_____District_____Supervising Teacher_____

Subject/Grade Taught_____From_____To_____

Clock Hours Per Day_____Total Clock Hours_____Univ. Supervisor_____

DIRECTIONS: Encircle the appropriate number for each item.
Explanation: 1. rarely, 2. occasionally, 3. adequately, 4. frequently, 5. consistently

I. PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCIES

1.	Seeks new insights, information and competencies for personal and professional growth	1 2 3 4 5
2.	Accepts and uses constructive suggestions	1 2 3 4 5
3.	Communicates and works effectively with school personnel and/or parents	1 2 3 4 5
4.	Makes sound decisions and acts on them wisely	1 2 3 4 5
5.	Acknowledges divergent views; respects values of others	1 2 3 4 5
6.	Fulfills responsibilities with enthusiasm	1 2 3 4 5
7.	Displays professional behavior and manner in line with ethical standards	1 2 3 4 5
8.	Attends to schedules and commitments; meets deadlines	1 2 3 4 5
9.	Handles situations with poise, self-control	1 2 3 4 5
10.	Establishes rapport and interacts positively with students	1 2 3 4 5

II. TEACHING COMPETENCIES

1.	Demonstrates competence in basic skills (written expression and subjects taught)	1 2 3 4 5
2.	Employs creative, worthwhile ideas and materials; facilitates pupil creativity	1 2 3 4 5
3.	Uses effective reinforcement and control techniques	1 2 3 4 5
4.	Shares objectives with pupils and encourages pupil self-discipline	1 2 3 4 5
5.	Plans on a daily and long-term basis, selecting appropriate motivational techniques	1 2 3 4 5
6.	Prescribes appropriate strategies for specific needs related to growth and learning theory	1 2 3 4 5
7.	Diagnoses needs based upon identified objectives	1 2 3 4 5
8.	Presents lessons clearly and effectively; adapts plans to meet emerging needs	1 2 3 4 5
9.	Organizes environment and activities for optimum learning	1 2 3 4 5
10.	Assesses own competencies, modifies own behavior realistically	1 2 3 4 5
11.	Pupils meet objectives and achieve in relation to their capabilities	1 2 3 4 5

III. PERSONAL QUALITIES

1.	Presents a professional appearance	1 2 3 4 5
2.	Has effective voice and speech patterns	1 2 3 4 5
3.	Possesses sense of humor and uses it appropriately	1 2 3 4 5

COMMENTS: In writing, clarify, and expand on above ratings giving pertinent information as to socio-economic level, classroom situations, organization or unique problems.

FOR USE OF UNIVERSITY SUPERVISOR OR COORDINATOR

Recommended_____ Units Credit_____ Not Recommended_____

Please check if: First Semester Report_____ Second Semester Report_____

Date:_____ Signed:_____

(University Supervisor or Coordinator)

ED TE FORM 350

Appendix D

Field Observation Forms

METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY

FIELD COORDINATION/VISITATION SHEET

School of Education

TO: _____ REG.: _____

FM: _____ DATE: _____

Areas Covered During Visitation:

( )	Curriculum Techniques	( )	Student Assessment
( )	Classroom Organization	( )	Test Interpretation
( )	Classroom Environment	( )	Student Motivation
( )	Record Keeping	( )	Application of University
( )	Classroom Control		Course Activities

DESSEMINATION INFORMATION REGARDING: _____

COMMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS: _____

ASSIGNMENT(S): _____

_____

STUDENT'S SIGNATURE

STUDENT TEACHING
FEEDBACK REPORT

State University
College of Education
Office of Student Field Experiences

Student Teacher: _____ Supervisor _____

School: _____ Grade/Subject/Period _____ Date: _____

1. Things the student teacher did which were effective in achieving the desired ends:

2. Things the student teacher did which did not help him or her achieve the desired ends:

3. Alternative things that could be done to achieve the ends not reached in 2 above:

4. Some areas on which improvement will be attempted:

STUDENT TEACHING
ANECDOTAL RECORD

State University
College of Education
Office of Student Field Experiences

Student Teacher: _____ Observer _____

School: _____ Grade/Subject/Period _____ Date: _____

This is the _____ observation of this student teacher this semester.
(Number)