To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting a dissertation written by Bonnie Peterson Eder entitled "The Relationship Between the Student Teachers' Self-reflection of Performance and the Student Teachers' Performance Evaluation as Viewed by their Evaluation Team." I have examined the final copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Education.

C. Glennon Rowell

Dr. C. Glennon Rowell, Dean, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Mary Sanner

Cynthia M. Gettys

Ian K. Smith

Lloyd D Davis

Accepted for the Council:

Associate Vice Chancellor and
Dean of The Graduate School

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE STUDENT TEACHERS' SELF-REFLECTION OF PERFORMANCE AND THE STUDENT TEACHERS' PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AS VIEWED BY THEIR EVALUATION TEAM

A Dissertation

Presented for the

Doctor of Education

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Bonnie Peterson Eder

August, 2000

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My life has been enriched through the help and encouragement of many individuals. The cohort group, a constant source of shared pain, endurance, and laughter has filled the last three years of my life with bitter/sweet memories. The greatest gift from them has been their friendship.

I am grateful to my dissertation committee, Dr. C. Glennon Rowell, Chair, for being willing to read and correct the first and following drafts of this dissertation. I am grateful to Dr. Mary Tanner for allowing me access to the program at UTC and also for serving on this committee, Dr. Dan Quarles, a willing "mechanic" to fix all my dissertation problems, Dr. Lloyd Davis, for his time and expertise in statistics, and Dr. Cynthia Gettys, for her help in developing this dissertation, assistance in collecting the data, and encouragement.

I am grateful to my friends and colleagues at A. W. Spalding School in Collegedale, Tennessee for their support and expectation that I would finish this monumental task. Ingrid inspired me by finishing her PhD, and Jean by letting me know she was chasing me from behind. My place between them provided support from both sides.

Thank you to my sons, Jeff and Justin, for thinking I had truly lost my mind, but still supporting me. Lastly, to Errol, my husband, who has put up with years of graduate school and has answered many distress calls for technical, editing, and moral support. Our shared dream has become reality.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this correlational study was to explore the relationship between the student teachers' self-reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team.

The study involved the use of a "Student Teaching Evaluation" instrument based on the Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth that has been adopted by the Tennessee State Department of Education as the procedure through which K-12 public school teachers are evaluated. This study focused on the student teachers' self-reflection as measured against their on-site evaluation team's appraisal. The subjects of the study were 108 student teachers in elementary and secondary education in attendance at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, during the Spring Semester of 1999, who were assigned to a Professional Development School (PDS) II to complete their student teaching and the student teachers' evaluation teams (teams of cooperating teachers employed by the Hamilton County Public Schools).

The "Student Teaching Evaluation" instrument focused on six areas: (1) planning, which included nine descriptors, six in which correlations were statistically significant at the .05 level. (2) teaching strategies, which included thirteen descriptors, six in which correlations were statistically significant at the .05 level. (3) assessment and evaluation, which included eleven descriptors, four in which correlations were statistically significant at the .05 level. (4) learning environment, which included eight descriptors, five in which correlations were statistically significant at the .05 level. (5) professional growth, which

included nine descriptors, eight in which correlations were statistically significant at the .05 level. (6) communication, which included six descriptors, three in which correlations were statistically significant at the .05 level.

Although the correlations on the majority of the descriptors indicated a statistically significant relationship between the student teachers' self-reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team, the practical significance of that relationship, as defined by Hinkle et al (1994), indicated a rather low practical correlation on each descriptor.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING

BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

The focus of the nation seems to be directed toward education as seen by presidential candidates such as Vice-President Al Gore and Governor George Bush. They are making educational issues part of their platforms. Governor George Bush made education his number one priority in the state of Texas, and education reforms are expected to be at the center of his campaign for the presidency (Bush, 1999).

Vice-President Al Gore has also chosen to focus on educational reform. One of his agenda items, for the 21st century, is improving teacher quality and elevating the teaching profession. These reforms call for rigorous tests for new teachers, mentors and professional support, tough standards for licensing or tenure, rigorous evaluations, removal of poor teachers, and rewards for good teachers (Gore, 1999). Teacher preparation is an important part of improving our nation's schools.

The most important goal of teacher preparation programs is to develop effective and quality teachers to fill the nation's classrooms. President Clinton has stated,"every community should have a talented and dedicated teacher in every classroom. [We have] an enormous opportunity for ensuring teacher quality well into the 21st century, if we recruit promising people into teaching and give them the highest quality preparation and training." Our country will need to hire 2.2 million teachers over the next decade, and more than half of them will be teachers who have never taught. Title II of the Higher Education Amendment of 1998 provides for new Teacher Quality Enhancement initiatives

developed by the United States Department of Education in response to the Nation's critical need for high-quality teachers (United States Department of Education, 1998). This new initiative, based on the Administration's proposal, provides grants to partnerships among teacher preparation institutions and high-need school districts. The proposal has two aspects that focus on the topic of this study: (1) implementing reforms that hold teacher education programs accountable for preparing high-quality teachers (2) ensuring that teachers are well-prepared for the realities of the classroom by providing strong hands-on classroom experience and strengthening links between the university and K-12 school faculties. Funds for these programs may be obtained through grants (United States Department of Education, 1998).

The State of Tennessee's program, "Goals 2000," is an attempt to implement those national goals for education. The purpose of "Goals 2000" is to provide funds for projects that focus on technology, innovative approaches, and building school and community partnerships. The funds are awarded through a competitive grant process. One of Tennessee's eight goals is to enhance "teacher education and professional development" (Tennessee Department of Education, 1998). Leaders of the State of Tennessee seem to view teacher education improvement as an important aspect of over-all educational improvement.

This study focused on one aspect of teacher education, the student teaching portion of the preparation. The student teaching experience, and other school encounters, has become a widely accepted part of the preparation for teaching. Its inclusion dates back to the medieval apprenticeship model. Many students view their student teaching

experience as the most important aspect of their teacher training (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990). If the student teaching portion is that important, then it should be one of the first areas to be studied in a teacher education program.

The traditional model of student teaching provided for the placement of a student teacher in an assigned school with one cooperating teacher for a period of time ranging from nine weeks to sixteen weeks. A college or university supervisor visited the assigned student teacher in his/her classroom, generally once or twice a week. This traditional model was called a "triad."

The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga (UTC), in an effort to improve its teacher education preparation program and ensure that its pre-service teachers are well-prepared with a strong hands-on classroom experience that is linked to their experiences at the university, implemented a new program in January, 1998. UTC provides a full-time, sixteen week (two eight-week segments), student teaching experience in two different Professional Development School (PDS) II sites. The student teachers are assigned to the various PDS II sites in groups, or cohorts, to provide support. The on-site evaluation team performs the usual tasks of a cooperating teacher such as orientation, guidance, and role modeling, but in addition, this team also evaluates the student teacher. This evaluation process by the on-site evaluation team empowers them with a significant increase in responsibility to the student teacher.

Several steps are involved in implementing this evaluation process. A minimum of two observations per team member for each placement are completed. After a reflective conference is completed for each observation, the observer/s complete the appropriate

form for each lesson. A mid-term progress report is completed and used as a basis for dialogue between the student teacher and the evaluator. The final evaluation form (Appendix B) is completed, and the ratings are shared with the student teacher. The final step is the completion of the student teacher's self-reflection on the final evaluation form (Appendix B). These two final evaluation forms (the team's final evaluation form and the student teacher's final evaluation form) comprise the base for this correlational study (Gettys, Baker, Taylor, in press).

The on-site evaluation team consists of novice and master teachers who work directly with the student teacher. The university professor serves as a supporter, consultant, confidant, and liaison between the university and the public school. He/she is assigned to a school as a professor-in-residence and is a full-time member of the faculty of the College of Education and Applied Professional Studies, University of Tennessee at Chattanooga (University of Tennessee at Chattanooga [UTC], 1999).

The evaluation team appraises the student teacher based on the new guidelines for the State of Tennessee. The Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth has been adopted by the Tennessee State Department of Education as the procedure through which K-12 public school teachers are evaluated. Using this Framework for evaluation during the semester the student teachers are in the PDS II enables them to become familiar with the procedures, domains, indicators, and measurements of the instrument. Not only does the use of the Framework provide effective feedback to the student teachers, but it also provides a link to their first year evaluations as beginning teachers. In addition, the Framework also provides a profile which the new teachers can use to evaluate themselves.

This profile enables them to move toward the worthy goal of becoming "reflective practitioners" (University of Tennessee at Chattanooga [UTC], 1999). The UTC program also includes a "self-assessment" component as one of the evaluation steps for both of the student teacher's eight week placements (University of Tennessee at Chattanooga [UTC], 1999).

The importance of developing a reflective practitioner can be traced to Dewey. He differentiated between "routine action" and "reflective action." It is the difference between the action that is taken for granted, and the active and careful consideration of a belief or form of knowledge in view of the evidence that supports it. In addition, further consequences to which this action leads are considered (Dewey, 1933, [as cited in Sprinthall, N., Reiman, & Sprinthall, L.,1996]). Several strategies, such as action research, ethnography, and curriculum analysis and development, have been used to prepare pre-service teachers to become reflective practitioners. As student teachers continue to develop these reflective teaching skills, they will be able to evaluate themselves and will continue to improve as professionals.

This correlational study explored the relationship between the student teachers' self-reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team. In addition, it provided one way to study the UTC students' development as reflective practitioners.

The Statement of the Purpose

The purpose of this correlational study was to explore the relationship between the student teachers' self-reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team.

Specifically:

Did the student teachers' reflection of their teaching skills correlate with the evaluation by their on-site evaluation team regarding the six areas investigated by the "Student Teaching Final Evaluation"?

Research Questions

1. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the student teachers' self-reflection of performance and their student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team for the planning category of the "Student Teaching Final Evaluation"?

2. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the student teachers' self-reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team for the teaching strategies category of the "Student Teaching Final Evaluation"?

3. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the student teachers' self-reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team for the assessment and evaluation category of the "Student Teaching Final Evaluation"?

4. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the student teachers' self-reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team for the learning environment category of the "Student Teaching Final Evaluation"?

5. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the student teachers' self-reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team for the professional growth category of the "Student Teaching Final Evaluation"?

6. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the student teachers' self-reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team for the communication category of the "Student Teaching Final Evaluation"?

Significance of the Study

The student teaching experience is the final field experience for the teacher education program. UTC student teachers are placed in two different PDS II sites for each of the two, eight-week, segments. In each segment the student teachers are evaluated based on the same criteria that will be used to evaluate them as classroom teachers. The Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth has been adopted by the Tennessee State Department of Education as the procedure through which K-12 public school teachers are evaluated. UTC used this Framework as a direct guide to develop its "Student Teaching Evaluation" instrument (See Appendix B). This study focused on the student teachers' self-reflection of their performance as measured against

their on-site evaluation team's assessment. A statistically significant relationship between the two performance evaluations indicates that the student teachers' evaluations and the evaluation of student teachers by their evaluation team correlate. It may suggest that the student teacher is developing as a reflective practitioner, but this type of study can not be used to prove or confirm that the students have, in reality, become reflective practitioners.

Limitations and Delimitations

One of the limitations of this type of study is that generalizations made about this study must be limited to those populations similar to the population of this study. The participants were limited to those student teachers in elementary and secondary education in attendance at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga who were assigned to a Professional Development School (PDS) II to complete their student teaching and their assigned evaluation team.

Another limitation is that the quality of the responses to the survey is dependent on the interest, honest self-reporting, and capability of the subject. It is the study's purpose to use this instrument as one method to evaluate the subject's capability in the area of self-reflection, but it does not attempt to measure the over-all capability of the student teachers.

This study is delimited to the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga. The researcher has delimited the study in this manner in order to survey the entire population of student teachers assigned to Professional Development Schools II for their student teaching semester.

Assumptions

1. The UTC evaluation instrument, based on the State of Tennessee's Framework, is valid and reliable.

2. The student participants will respond to the best of their ability and will be able to accurately reflect on their student teaching experience.

3. The student participants will respond to the survey in a responsible and candid manner that fairly represents the experience and opinion of each participant.

4. The on-site evaluation team members may consist of master teachers and novice teachers.

Definition of Terms

Clinical faculty are classroom teachers who have received special training by the university to enable them to work with student teachers.

Cooperating teachers are the classroom teacher/s to whom student teachers have been assigned.

Dyadic model involves the use of a cooperating teacher in a dual role of mentor and evaluator and the student teacher.

Evaluation team refers to a team of cooperating teachers that have been given the additional responsibility of evaluating the student teacher. It is the term used most frequently in the UTC program to refer to the group of on-site cooperating teachers.

Pre-service teacher is a student who is engaged in the teacher education program, but prior to a paid teaching position.

Professional Development Schools (PDS) can be compared to a teaching hospital. They were developed by universities and local school systems to educate novice teachers (Colburn, 1993). They are schools that provide superior opportunities for teachers, administrators, and university faculty to increase the relevance of their work (Holmes Group, 1986).

Professional Development School I , as the term is used at UTC, refers to the site of the first full-time, semester-long, initial field experience (generally during the student's sophomore or junior year) which is a voluntary component of the teacher preparation program (Bibler, Tanner, & Black, 1998).

Professional Development School II, as the term is defined at UTC, refers to the site of the semester-long (two, eight-week segments) student teaching placement at two different PDS II sites. This placement happens during the fall or spring of the student's senior year (Bibler et al., 1998).

Prospective teacher is a teacher in training, that has not yet been hired to teach.

Site-based Supervision involves supervision by one that is employed at the school site (generally the cooperating teacher, but may be the principal or appointee) rather than a "circuit rider" supervisor from the university.

Triads are cooperative student teaching programs that include a university supervisor, cooperating teacher, and a student teacher.

University supervisor is a person assigned to supervise a given student teacher.

SUMMARY

This chapter has provided the background for this study on the relationship between the student teachers' self reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team. The chapter has stated the purpose, discussed the importance of the study, provided limitations and delimitations, given assumptions, and furnished a list of terms and their definitions for this study.

Chapter two focuses on the review of the literature that was related to the topic of this study. Chapter three focuses on the methodology that was used to conduct this study. Chapter four presents the findings and the analysis of the study, and chapter five provides a summary, presents the conclusions, and gives recommendations for future study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter on the review of literature, an overview of student teaching programs, an historical base for student teaching, and a look at the traditional model will be provided. In addition, the chapter will provide research on the cooperating teacher's role and preparation, and the student teacher's prior experiences and role during the student teaching process. It will also include a look at the importance of reflective practice in the field of education.

THE STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM

Overview

Zeichner (1983) in a study on teacher education concluded that there appears to be at least four varieties of approaches to teacher education. Some programs emphasize behavioristic, personalistic, traditional-craft, inquiry-oriented, or a combination of several of these paradigms.

The behavioristic emphasizes the development of specific and observable skills related to student learning. The personalistic focuses on the self-perceived needs of the prospective teacher. The traditional-craft approach perceives teacher education as an apprenticeship with the student gaining knowledge from experienced practitioners. The inquiry-oriented approach encourages teachers to examine carefully their reasons for doing things and the consequences of their actions. Reflective action is a part of the inquiry-oriented approach (Zeichner, 1983).

The Tennessee Board of Education, the Tennessee Higher Education Commission, and the Tennessee Certification Commission in 1988 adopted the "Teacher Education Policy." A full semester (16 weeks) of student teaching or a one-year internship is viewed as a way to enrich the field experience of the teachers. Teacher education programs are approved in accordance with the state program standards and of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The performance of the educational facility's graduates is one of the factors used to provide a continuing approval rating from NCATE (Tennessee State Board of Education, 1995). Tennessee universities are aware of this, and strive to produce the best teachers possible by continuing to develop and improve their programs.

Support for student teaching as part of a student's preparation for teaching is almost universal. Student teaching is a required component for teacher certification in all 50 states (Watts, 1987). Many students view their student teaching experience as the most important aspect of their teacher training (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990).

The research on student teaching lacks outstanding research studies that can be used as a guide to the colleges and universities in developing their teacher preparation programs. A study was conducted using the list of North Central Association of Colleges and Schools' approved institutions of higher education that offer undergraduate teacher education programs. This list provided a sample of 227 out of a possible 412 institutions. "All institutions require pre-student teaching experiences, student teachers were never placed in the same classroom together, did not require a course in supervision for

cooperating teachers, and provided opportunities for student teaching in culturally diverse areas as much as their scope of range would allow" (Leslie, 1995).

The differences that were noted in the study were in the benefits to cooperating teachers, number of student teacher visits by the institution supervisor (commonly two times a week) and some on a "needs only" basis. Some institutions did not allow students to repeat an unsuccessful student teaching experience (Leslie, 1995).

If student teaching programs are to be a beneficial component of teacher education, schools of education must identify their objectives and continually assess their programs. In addition, they need to stay informed of available research and to utilize important developments to continually improve their program (Quick & Dasovich, 1994).

In the following two contrasting statements one can see the lack of harmony on the need for more research on student teaching.

> Literature on student teaching is almost excessive, to the point where much is produced annually, creating a case of exponential redundancy (Zimpher, 1991).
>
> Study and research related to student teaching can be characterized as meager, diverse, and trivial. Its meagerness is a function of the fact that the knowledgeable people who work with student teachers are essentially practitioners, not researchers. Its diversity is a function of the fact that there are few monies for research available in this area and thus the most common inquiry into student teaching has been of a one-time-only doctoral dissertation. These studies all conclude with a chapter advising others on ways to follow up on research, but rarely, if ever, is this done. The often trivial nature of this research is a function of

the fact that those who do an occasional study are unfamiliar with the basic nature of student teaching (Haberman, 1983 [as cited in Zimpher, 1987]).

There seems to be an excessive amount of case studies, but few well-documented research studies of student teaching programs. These statements would also indicate that much has been written about the topic, but little actual research has been conducted on the topic.

Historical

The history of student teaching is a long one that dates back to the 15th century (Morris, 1974 [as cited in Boydell, Katz ed., 1991]). By 1920, one third of the normal schools (teacher education programs in earlier days were often called normal schools) placed student teachers in the public schools as a culmination of their teaching preparation. The practice of placing student teachers in public schools has continued with very few exceptions (Veal, Rikard, 1998).

The weeks of student teaching have been compared to the medieval apprenticeship system. The student teacher learns his/her trade by observing a master or experienced craftsman, then first by small bits and in an increasing larger role, under the close scrutiny of the master, develops a product of his/her own (Schwebel, A., Schwebel, B., Schwebel, C., Schwebel, M., 1992).

Traditional

The traditional model of the student teaching program has been a cooperative program that includes among the assigned university professor, the cooperative or on-site teacher, and the student teacher. This is referred to in the literature as a "triad."

Zahorik (1988) in a study on the student teacher/supervisor role concluded that there are many and various approaches to supervision. Some supervisors emphasize pedagogical skills, some human relations, and others critical thinking and decision-making skills. Therefore, what the program emphasizes, and the student presumably learns, in their pre-service program is, in large part, a result of his or her relationship with the university supervisor. Students are exposed to a variety of skills, and the supervisor chooses which ones to emphasize.

The role of the university supervisor serves as an important link between the university and the site of the field experience. He/she defines and communicates to the school the goals and expectations for the student teacher and the cooperating teacher. The supervisor is often the only one willing to give critical comments to the student teacher (Zimpher, deVoss, & Notl, 1980). They have a tremendous evaluative power in the short term. The supervisor often brings his/her own agenda in addition to the agenda of the university (Zeichner, Liston 1985).

Veal and Rikard (1998) referred to two different types of triads in their qualitative study. The first one involves the cooperating teacher, the student teacher, and each pupil in the school classroom. When the university supervisor visits, the triad shifts to the university professor, the cooperating teacher, and the student teacher. The pupil in the classroom is no longer part of the triad; the student teacher is now the student. This shifting of triads can result in strained interpersonal relationships. The researchers referred to the two triads as "institutional" triads and "functional" triads.

The apex of power also shifts from the university supervisor in the institutional model to the cooperating teacher in the functional model. This shift of power can and frequently does create conflict between the supervisor and the cooperating teacher. The development of a partnership among the adults, rather than a hierarchy, with shared decision-making responsibilities and power sharing can help to eliminate this conflict (Veal & Rikard, 1998).

The universities that use a triad style of program often share the common problem of trying to connect the university classroom and the student teaching experience. Western New Mexico University is experimenting with using clinical faculty, or classroom teachers who are selected to participate in the process, enroll in an "Instructional Supervision Seminar" each semester a student teacher is assigned to them. A collaborative approach was established with the public schools, and the classroom teacher was paid $700.00 per semester per student teacher for participation in the program (Losee, 1993).

In the seminar with the university professor, the clinical faculty and the student teachers modeled exemplary teaching. In the first seminar, clinical faculty developed profiles of good teaching and then developed behaviors and characteristics that were a part of the profile. The profile was research based and achievable. Student teachers, in a separate seminar, focused on personal profiles and goals for their teaching experience. This process of teaming the university professor, the classroom teacher, and the student teacher enabled the triad to be more consistent in their coaching and evaluation. It also provided the classroom teachers/clinical faculty an opportunity to grow professionally and to make a contribution towards training new teachers (Losee, 1993).

Site-based Supervision

Keller and Grossman (1994) advocate the use of a "dyadic" model. This model eliminates the use of a university supervisor and would use the cooperating teacher to fulfill the role of supervisor and "on site" instructor. The authors recommend that the cooperating teachers be trained to provide this additional task. If this model is used, the cooperating teacher becomes notably more important in the student teaching program.

A pilot program was tested in 1969, at New York University, that assigned the supervising teacher to be the major person responsible for the growth of the student teacher. The supervising teachers received training through weekly half-day released times. University supervisors also provided weekly or bi-weekly seminars for the student teachers. The reactions to the pilot program were consistently favorable (Bebb & Monson, 1969).

There does appear to be some advantages to "site-based" supervision. According to Page, Page, Warkentin, & Dickinson (1994) "site-based" supervision: (1) is cost efficient (2) empowers the supervising teacher and (3) provides stress reduction for the student teacher. Georgia Southern University (GSU) is suggesting site-based supervision as an alternative, but not the only way to handle student teaching supervision. GSU's program assigns the responsibility for grading to the cooperating teacher (satisfactory or unsatisfactory). In addition, the university supervisor hosts the cooperating teachers on three occasions for two-hour seminars. Log responses are mailed weekly to the university supervisor. In addition, supervising teachers receive $500 for working with the student

teacher. The State Department of Education pays half and the university pays half of that amount.

In the comparison of the two groups (n=89) from GSU, the student teachers' perception of self was very close between the two models. For the specific student teaching skills section the 27 items indicate a more positive perception by those in a traditional student teacher relationship (the "triad" method).

In the GSU's study, out of 40 items, 24 were rated more positively by traditional student teachers, 12 by site-based student teachers, and two received the same ratings by both groups. The interviews offered clear support for site-based instruction, but also included additional information for consideration (Page et al. 1994).

Cooperating Teacher

One research study, (Connor & Killmer, 1995) supports the importance of the cooperating teacher in the student teaching experience, but there is a lack of information/research on the work that the cooperating teacher does in that role. Studies typically report that the student teaching portion of teacher education programs is the most helpful, and the cooperating teacher has a tremendous influence on the student teacher. In addition, the cooperating teacher is involved in a special relationship with another adult that requires him/her to be peers, but also requires him/her to supervise, instruct, and critique the student teacher. Koerner (1992) challenges the idea that being an effective classroom teacher means that person will always make an effective cooperating teacher.

The classroom teacher serves as a role model, explains pedagogical practices, and guides the student through the teaching process. The power and influence of the classroom teacher has been well-documented and has been perceived to be more in the areas of personal support and role development rather than in skill development(Karmas & Jacko, 1977) (Nagel, Driscoll, Grimala, 1991). When this same classroom teacher is expected to also evaluate the student to varying degrees, the power over the student teacher increases proportionately (Edgar & Warren, 1969 [as cited in Evans, 1991]).

There is also a lack of research on the selection process for cooperating teachers beyond years of experience, degree, and administrative recommendation (Connor & Killmer, 1995). The literature also suggests some concern about the expanded role of the cooperating teacher. Cooperating teachers, it is suggested, have not been trained sufficiently to describe and interpret the events that take place in the classroom. In the absence of well-documented observations, they seem to find it difficult to discern growth in the student teacher (Melnick, 1989). Kilgore (1979) reports that better results are achieved from the training if the cooperating teachers are trained in what the school of education wants and/or have a shared agenda for the student teacher.

In addition, Melnick (1989) reports that at the end of the student teaching semester, the overwhelming majority of the cooperating teachers rate the student teacher very high on their formal evaluations. This lack of variability may indicate a need for additional training in supervision.

Yamashita (1990[as cited in Connor & Killmer, 1995]) indicates that the cooperating teacher has a significant impact on the attitudes and teaching behaviors of the

student teacher. The college coordinator has little or no direct effect on the student teacher. The cooperating teacher's selection and training is a neglected aspect of teacher preparation programs. There is agreement among teacher educators that cooperating teachers need special training, but there is very little agreement about what the content of that special training should be.

Student Teachers

The students, themselves, bring a variety of previous experiences to the student teaching task. Some have had many experiences in working with children such as child care camp, Sunday School, etc. Other student teachers have limited experience. These experiences can help or hinder openness to the process of developing teaching skills. A firm and positive identity is an important indicator of occupational success in the teaching field (Walter & Stivers 1977).

Student teaching is, as are other transitions, experienced differently by each person. Some pre-service teachers are basically abandoned in a "sink or swim" model, and others are rigidly monitored. There are many variables on this continuum (McNaly, Cope, Inglis, Stronach,1997). The student teaching experience is not one of a single photocopied picture. There are a set of conditions, some sequential and some environmental factors, that are dependent on relationships. These relationships are built with and by the student teacher. The relationships include those with the professor, the mentor teacher, and the children/students. This combination of people and events leads to a unique teaching experience for each student teacher.

Studies have been done asking the students' opinion on their student teaching experiences. Most seemed to feel that they needed both a school-based mentor (classroom teacher) and a university-based tutor (or instructor). Each part of student teaching provided an important component of the whole. One particular descriptive study with a very small sample (n=27) indicated that students were interviewed during the academic process and at the end of their teacher preparation program (Williams, 1994).

Weaver and Stanulis (1996) relate the student teaching experience to a bridge connecting the preparation for teaching and a teaching career. As a student teacher develops his/her own personal style, ideas from the theories, discussions, dreams, and observations of the educational process are blended with the realities of the classroom and changes would seem to be inevitable.

What are the ways that the student teachers change or grow as a result of their student teaching experience? There appears to be disagreement about whether student teachers really change as a result of the over-all teacher preparation program. An impressive group of researchers report that generally prospective teachers remain unchanged by their educational program with respect to their view of themselves as teachers, their vision of what constitutes a good teacher, their beliefs about teaching, and the way they perceive themselves as students (Gore & Ziechner,1991; Aiken & Mildon, 1991; Shapiro, 1991; Florio-Ruane and Lensmire, 1990; Pigge & Marso, 1989; McLaughlin, 1991 [as cited in Cabello, Eckmier, & Baghiera, 1995]).

Cabello (1995) indicates that student teachers keep their "sense of mission," but the participants' concerns about their abilities changed. Initially they were concerned

about their lack of skill as teachers. After being in the classroom for a period of time, they became more concerned about instructional and management issues, shortage of needed supplies, and other perceived lack of materials. They also became concerned about pupil issues and interaction with parents.

Pigge & Marso (1997) express the conclusion that changes in attitude do occur in the transition from student to teacher. Teacher candidates were surveyed at the beginning of their training, at the end of their student teaching, and again after the completion of their fifth year of teaching. In this longitudal study in which changes in attitude were explored, the largest drop in positive attitude and the most diversity in attitude occurred after five years of teaching.

There are gaps in the literature in several areas:

1. Felder, Hollis, & Houston (1981 [as cited in Galluzzo, 1987]) indicated a lack of information on the processes and commitments for continuing teacher education evaluations.

2. Katz, Raths, Mohanty, Kurachi, Irving (1981) commented on the weak recommendations. Another bigger concern is what happens with the recommendations. There is no evidence of a change as a result of the recommendations that have been made. For example, discipline and management have been noted as areas of concern, but the programs appear to be unchanged.

3. There appears to be no meta-analyses and few overall examinations of studies in student teaching.

4. There are few replications of studies - no comparison of data from one university to another (Galluzzo, 1987).

5. There are few long-term studies on the life-processes of teachers and how it affects their career.

Research is so important to the student teaching program because of the alarming rate at which beginning teachers leave the profession. Adams (1978 [as cited in Galluzzo, 1987]) indicated that only 55% of the graduates took a teaching job after graduation. When checking again after three years, 91% of those that took a teaching job remained in teaching. After five years, only 42% remained in teaching. This shows a shocking pattern of exodus by graduates from their chosen field. As with most situations, the reasons may be many. Some possibilities are the need for improved teacher preparation programs, better research on teacher education, and studies of the life processes to determine the reasons for the career changes.

The Reflective Practitioner

An important aspect of the development of a professional teacher is the "reflection movement." Teacher educators have become very enthusiastic about reflective approaches. It is viewed as a crucial process for a teacher's professional growth. The work of Schon has had a significant impact on this movement. Schon's two books, The Reflective Practitioner (1983) and Educating the Reflective Practitioner (1987) have fueled this movement. Both books were an outgrowth of Schon's doctoral dissertation on Dewey's work. His second book explored the value of "coaching" or "guided reflection" as the mainstay of professional programs. He views the dialogue between the coach and

the student in a reflective kind of practicum as an essential element in the development of a teacher.

Another interesting theory defines reflection in terms of progressive developmental stages where the practitioner becomes increasingly more competent in his/her judgements (Ross, 1989). Apparently, the levels of reflective judgement may increase with age, education, and topic. In view of this research, teacher education programs may need to examine their programs to determine if they are indeed contributing to increasingly more mature reflective judgement and cognitive development on the part of the students.

SUMMARY OF THE REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The literature reports many contradictory studies on the student teaching experience and its many aspects. It does indicate a need for continuing research on the preparation of student teachers. Schools of Education must always be cost-conscious, and the use of on-site supervision is one way to keep the costs lower and provide a way to give the student teacher immediate follow-up on his/her teaching activities. The literature supports the idea of identifying clear objectives for the program and then assessing those objectives. The survey being used by the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga and in this study is an example of that kind of research.

In this program, the university professor is more likely to be viewed as a support person, and not the one to impress for a good grade. In addition, the student teacher will have someone outside of the evaluation process to consult with on any potential problems. The literature does seem to indicate that some training needs to be provided for the cooperating teachers/evaluation team, but what that training should include has not been

established. The student teaching experience is an extremely important one in the development of new teachers and deserves professional attention and research.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the methodology that was used in this study. The investigator will describe the subjects involved in the project, the instrument that was selected, the approval process, and the procedures that were used for the study. This study explored the relationship between the student teachers' self-reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team. The student participants were enrolled at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga during the spring semester of 1999 and were engaged in their second major field experience. The evaluation team members were teachers employed in the Hamilton County Professional Development Schools during the same time period.

The Professional Development Schools were selected through a collaborative effort between UTC and the Hamilton County Public Schools. These selected schools were chosen to provide opportunities for prospective teachers to combine theory and practice in real-life experiences. The model can be compared to teaching hospitals in the preparation of physicians. Approximately, one half of the prospective teachers voluntarily spend an initial semester, generally during their sophomore year, involved in field experience at a PDS I school. The UTC student serves as an assistant to the classroom teacher by observing, grading papers, designing bulletin boards, and various teaching-related activities. As the student progresses through the semester, the teacher may give him/her some actual teaching tasks.

The prospective teacher also completes a full semester of student teaching at two different PDS II sites. This semester of student teaching provides increasingly more frequent and complex teaching tasks. The student teacher, generally during the final semester of his/her undergraduate work, begins teaching one class and continues to increase his/her teaching load until he/she regularly assumes all the teaching and additional duties of the classroom teacher. By the time the prospective teacher graduates, he/she has been in the classroom for one full academic year (Bibler, et al. 1998).

Subjects

The participants were limited to those student teachers in elementary and secondary education in attendance at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga who were assigned to a Professional Development School II to complete their student teaching during the spring semester of 1999 and their assigned evaluation team. This enhanced student teaching program, as defined by UTC, is the semester long (two different PDS II sites for two eight-week segments) student teaching placement (Bibler et al., 1998).

Instrument

An evaluation instrument (see Appendix B) was used that had been developed through a peer review process by the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga. This student teacher evaluation instrument reflects the latest guidelines from the State of Tennessee/Education Department and specifically the state's Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth.

One area of concern was noted that involved the instrument used in this study. It contained grid blocks next to areas without descriptors, and some participants marked in

those areas. This weakness in the instrument was interpreted as an indication of apparent confusion inherent within the evaluation form.

The evaluation form consisted of a four point ordinal scale with Level 1 being "student teacher has not yet developed or used this skill," Level 2 being "student teacher is beginning to incorporate this skill in his/her instructional repertoire," Level 3 being "student teacher uses this skill appropriately and competently," and Level 4 being "student teacher uses this skill consistently with a high degree of competence and confidence."

The Framework is divided into six areas with seven to thirteen descriptors in each area for evaluating the student teacher. The first area of evaluation is "Planning." Under this heading are nine different descriptors. The descriptors focus on establishing long-term goals that reflect a student-centered curriculum, that address student needs at an appropriate level, and address the thinking process. This area also includes the evaluation of goal achievements and plans. It also focuses on matching the instruction to goals and objectives, provides for instruction that integrates the knowledge, skills, and methods for each related subject area, and integrates materials, human resources, and technology. In addition, the planning process includes the understanding and identifying of the various styles of student learning/performance and involves the meeting of the instructional needs of students from diverse cultures. (See Appendix B for a complete list of descriptors.)

The second area of evaluation is "Teaching Strategies," and it contains thirteen different descriptors. It includes the understanding of the process of inquiry for a discipline, the use of a variety of instructional roles, and the use of multiple explanations that focus on key ideas that provide a link to student understanding. The student teacher

is evaluated on the appropriateness of the pace of the lesson, providing clarification as needed, and the engagement of the students in active learning. This area also includes the development of student responsibility for using resources, providing for student practice, and engaging the students in generating knowledge. In addition, this area measures the student teacher's linking of student knowledge, developing the reflective capabilities of the students, and facilitating the internalization of learning. Organizing, preparing, and the monitoring of independent and group work to allow for full participation is also included in this area. (See Appendix B for a list of descriptors.)

Area three involves "Assessment and Evaluation." This area contains eleven descriptors. It measures the student teacher on the use of appropriate assessment strategies and instruments, appropriately interpreting assessment data, and the use of a variety of assessment techniques. It includes the use of information from a variety of sources, the monitoring and modifying of the teaching strategies in relation to student success, and assessing, analyzing, and communicating the effectiveness of instruction. This area also provides for the organization/maintenance of records, effective communication with parents/students, and the evaluation and progress of student attitudes towards learning. The student teacher is also measured on evaluating student achievement, the amount of progress of the students, and on the student teacher's ability to provide prompt feedback to students to enable them to move to the next level. (See Appendix B for a list of descriptors.)

"Learning Environment" is the fourth area of the evaluation and includes eight descriptors. It includes the use of strategies in which students work collaboratively,

independently, and purposefully, and the student teacher demonstrates flexibility and modifies procedures as the situations demand change. Another portion of this area focuses on assisting students in developing shared expectations for interactions and responsibilities, establishing and maintaining standards of mutually respectful interaction, and communicating and challenging students in a positive and purposeful manner. Another aspect of this learning environment area concentrates on management and includes the use of management techniques which foster self-control and self-discipline, the maximizing of the amount of class time engaged in learning, and the organizing, allocating, and managing of resources for the engagement of students in a productive learning environment. (See Appendix B for a list of descriptors.)

The fifth area, "Professional Growth," involves five descriptors with descriptor number five having six parts. It includes such professional responsibilities as record keeping, the completion of assigned tasks on schedule, the following of policies and procedures, the maintenance of confidentiality, and the fulfillment of legal responsibilities. The individual will also maintain a satisfactory record of punctuality and attendance. Another aspect of this area includes the demonstration of leadership and team membership skills, the promotion of a productive learning environment, the evidence of performance levels, and the ability to articulate their strengths and their areas for growth. He/she is also able to articulate a professional development plan to improve his/her performance and repertoire. (See Appendix B for a list of descriptors.)

The sixth and last area is "Communication." This area involves four descriptors with descriptor number four having four parts. It includes the demonstration of his/her

understanding of effective verbal and non-verbal communication, the modeling of effective communication strategies, and the use of appropriate grammar and word choice for the exchange of information. In his/her written communication he/she will communicate, with correct grammar, in an organized and logical manner, and will design the communication to fit the audience. (See Appendix B for a list of descriptors.)

Research Approval

Permission to conduct this study was given by the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, Education Department, and Dr. Mary Tanner, Dean. Dr. Cynthia Gettys, faculty member at UTC, served as contact person at the university for this study.

An application for permission to conduct the research (Form A) involving human subjects was completed and approved. A copy of that form is included. (See Appendix A.)

Procedure

Dr. Valerie Copeland Rutledge, Director of Student Teaching, incorporated the survey, on the final day of student teaching, as part of the evaluation process. The PDS II on-site evaluation team completed the surveys as part of their final evaluation of each student teacher. The surveys were completed by two separate evaluation teams, but only the teams' surveys from the second placement (last half of the semester) were used for this study. Dr. Cynthia Gettys and Dr. Valerie Copeland Rutledge believed that the students had gained experience from their first placement, and that the final survey was a better measure of the students' reflective skills.

This correlational study looked at the relationship between the student teachers' self-reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team. It is one method of determining the degree of correlation between the two groups. The study may suggest, but not prove, that the students are able to accurately evaluate themselves through the process of self-reflection.

The surveys were identified by a name only until the surveys were matched by Dr. Cynthia Gettys. The original pool of students consisted of 123 students. Two of the students were guest placements from another university, so they were eliminated (for two reasons, they were not UTC students and because their evaluation forms did not match UTC's forms). Sixteen other matched surveys contained missing data, but three of those surveys were able to be used in this study by scoring missing values as a "1" on the ordinal scale per the directions on the survey (student teacher has not yet developed or used this skill). All of the usable surveys were then coded with a matching number which yielded a total of 108 matched surveys. The names were then deleted from each form. Neither the students' or the cooperating teachers' names were available to the researcher and were not used or published in this study. The survey data would have been generated by the university whether this study was conducted or not.

The matched and number coded forms were obtained, following the spring semester of 1999, from Dr. Cynthia Gettys. The forms will be returned to the university following the completion of this dissertation.

Some of the survey forms were returned with uncompleted sections and the evaluation team indicated that they were unable to evaluate the student teacher in some

areas. Dr. Cynthia Gettys indicated that the directions on the survey forms informed the participant to score the student teacher on a level one if the student teacher had not used a given skill. Thus, those missing values were scored as one. The 56 descriptors multiplied by the number of returned evaluation team forms (108) equaled a total of 6,048 entries. Out of this field of 6,048 entries, 88 were scored a level one (student teacher has not yet developed or used this skill). For this small number of missing values, Dr. Cynthia Gettys, UTC professor and dissertation committee member, provided additional scoring interpretations and suggestions for this study.

On the student forms, there were also some missing values. The total possible entries for the student forms were 6,048 entries. There were six of these entries that were scored a level one because the student teacher had not used a given skill. There was one form, included in this field of forms, that was returned with the backside of the form blank. The backside of the form was not scored and remains classified as "missing values" in this study.

The researcher entered all data into Microsoft Excel, and with the assistance of Dr. Lloyd Davis, statistics professor at UTC, the researcher transferred the data to the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) located in the UTC computer lab. After all data were transferred to the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), a Kendall's tau and a Spearman's rho (p) were run for each variable to determine whether there was a correlation between the student teachers' self-reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team on each variable.

The Kendall's tau and the Spearman's rho are both nonparametric statistical tests. The Kendall's tau is a statistical test that measurers the association between ordinal variables. The Spearman's rho (p) test is a statistical test that is used for ranked ordinal data. Ordinal data involve the use of scores that are ranked from highest to lowest and categorized within that order. Because of the likelihood of a large number of tied rankings, the statisticians on the dissertation committee (Dr. Lloyd Davis & Dr. Dan Quarles) felt that both tests should be used because the Kendall's tau handles tied rankings better than the Spearman's rho. If there was a discrepancy between the results of the two tests, the Kendall's tau was the deciding voice for whether two variables were significant (Champion, 1970).

For both tests the size of the correlation coefficient, or a measure of the relationship between two variables, indicated the degree of relationship between any two variables. Any interpretation in regards to causation can only be considered if it is appropriate that the variables under investigation provide a logical basis for that type of interpretation (Hinkle, Wiersma, Jurs, 1994).

The Kendall's tau and the Spearman's rho tests were analyzed for statistical significance at the .05 level. SPSS software marks the correlations with one asterisk if the results were statistically significant at the .05 level, and with two asterisks if the test results were statistically significant at the .01 level. The results were reported using those same markings and levels.

After the computer analysis of each variable, a table was developed for each category to show the pairs of variables, the test results, and the degree of statistical

significance for each pair. Tables II through VII display the same SPSS codes for marking the variables (one or two asterisks to indicate the level of statistical significance).

The results were then interpreted for practical levels of significance. Table I was used to classify each of the correlations from very high to little or no correlation.

After the evaluations were analyzed following the procedure described, the correlation results for each descriptor were discussed in chapter four. Each category's analysis was also discussed. In addition, the over-all results of the evaluations were summarized to determine the degree of statistical significance between the student teachers' surveys and the evaluation teams' surveys. Following that procedure, the variables were analyzed and summarized for practical significance levels.

SUMMARY

This chapter on methodology contained a description of the subjects of the study, the UTC 1999 spring semester student teachers (assigned to Professional Development Schools II) and their assigned evaluation team. The evaluation instrument (Appendix B) was explained and the procedures that were followed in conducting this study were outlined. Procedures for securing permission to conduct this study were also explained.

TABLE I

RULE OF THUMB FOR INTERPRETING THE SIZE OF A CORRELATION COEFFICIENT

Very high positive (negative) correlation	.90 - 1.00 (-.90 to -1.00)
High positive (negative) correlation	.70 - .90 (-.70 to - .90)
Moderate positive (negative) correlation	.50 - .70 (-.50 to - .70)
Low positive (negative) correlation	.30 - .50 (-.30 to -.50)
Little, if any, correlation	.00 - .30 (.00 to -.30)

(Hinkle, Wiersma & Jurs, 1994)

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the results of this study, the relationship between the student teachers' self-reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team. The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga (UTC) has adopted a student teacher evaluation form based on the State of Tennessee's Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth. This evaluation form was used by the student teacher to evaluate his/her growth as a pre-service teacher and was also used by the school-based evaluation team to evaluate the pre-service teacher. This study was a correlational study to determine the relationship between the two matched surveys. There were 108 student teachers and their evaluation teams that participated in this study.

Each pair of matched evaluations was analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The Kendall's tau and the Spearman's rho correlational tests were used for each matched variable for a total of 56 matched variables.

The evaluation was divided into six broad categories which include (1) planning (2) teaching strategies (3) assessment and evaluation (4) learning environment (5) professional growth (6) communication. The correlation for each descriptor's analysis was discussed, then each category was discussed as a group, then the total survey results were summarized. The correlation for each descriptor's analysis was interpreted for the level of practical significance using Hinkle et al. (1994) Table I (page 37) for the "Rule of

Thumb for Interpreting the Size of a Correlation Coefficient." The analysis of the "r" indicates the strength of the correlation. In addition the "r" must be squared to indicate the coefficient of determination, or the proportion of variability that the two variables share (Voelker & Orton, 1993). The bottom two categories, of the Hinkle et al. (1994) Table I (page 37), were referred to in this analysis as "low correlations."

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS OF THE STUDY BY CATEGORIES

Planning

This section deals with the planning of instruction. The student teachers at UTC were taught a variety of lesson plan formats. The student teachers were expected to establish appropriate instructional goals and objectives. They were then expected to plan instruction based on their knowledge of the subject matter, the students that they were teaching, the community goals, and the curriculum goals of their particular school. In their planning they were to adapt their instruction to students of diversity or special need students (Bibler, et al., 1998).

Table II displays an overview of the analysis, and it also displays the results of SPSS data for Kendall's tau and Spearman's rho. Each correlation is marked as to the level of statistical significance, including the interpretation for each correlation's level of practical significance using the Hinkle et al. (1994) Table I (page 37) for the "Rule of Thumb for Interpreting the Size of a Correlation Coefficient."

For descriptor one, establishes long-term goals reflecting a student-centered curriculum, SPSS correlations indicated a .193 for Kendall's tau and a .204 for Spearman's rho. The students' self-reflection of performance and the student teachers'

TABLE II

PLANNING

Descriptors	Kendall	Spearman	Hinkle
1. Establishes long-term goals reflecting a student-centered curriculum	.193*	.214*	little, if any
2. Establishes goals and objectives which address student needs at the appropriate level	.203*	.213*	little, if any
3. Establishes goals and objectives which address the thinking process.	.305**	.322**	low positive
4. Evaluates goal achievement/plans.	.187*	.200*	little, if any
5. Matches instruction to goals and objectives, strategies, assessments and student needs.	.226*	.235*	little, if any
6. Provides instruction integrating knowledge, skills, and methods from related subject areas.	.093	.100	little, if any
7. Provides instruction integrating materials, human, resources, and technology.	.227*	.246*	little, if any
8. Understands and identifies different student approaches to learning and performance.	.169	.182	little, if any
9. Meets instructional needs of students from diverse cultures with different learning needs.	.144	.161	little, if any

*Correlation is statistically significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).
**Correlation is statistically significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team indicated a statistically significant relationship for this population at the .05 level. The student teaching portion of the teacher preparation training was for a semester, or 16 weeks, but this was in two different settings. For elementary education majors, typically, one placement may be in lower grades and one placement in upper grades. So in spite of the semester long student teaching experience, the placement in each setting was only eight weeks. It may not have been clear how long 'long-term" was in the student teacher placement scenario. The student teachers and their evaluation team may define it differently based on their experiences and perceptions.

Correlations for the second descriptor, establishes goals and objectives which address student needs at the appropriate level, indicated .203 for Kendall's tau and .213 for Spearman's rho. According to SPSS data, these correlations were statistically significant at the .05 level, so the students' self-reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team for descriptor number two indicated a statistically significant relationship. The practical significance was indicated as "little, if any" practical significance.

Perhaps, a possible explanation for a low practical significance was because it takes time to identify and become sensitized to student needs. Once the needs are identified, it required additional time for planning and experimentation to meet those student needs at the appropriate level.

For descriptor number three, establishes goals and objectives which address the thinking process, the Kendall's tau yielded a correlation of .305 and the Spearman's rho a

correlation of .322. According to SPSS data, these correlations were statistically significant at the .01 level of significance. This correlation showed the highest level of statistical significance for the category. The practical significance showed a "low positive" correlation, or the second level on the Hinkle et al. (1994) chart.

Because of the large population in this study (108 matched forms), it was easier to have statistically significant numbers, but the practical significance helps to put those numbers into perspective. The results, however, do indicate that there is a degree of agreement on whether the student teachers could and did establish goals and objectives that addressed the thinking process.

Correlations for the fourth descriptor, evaluates goal achievement/plans, indicated a Kendall's tau of .187 and a Spearman's rho of .200. Both of the tests were statistically significant at the .05 level of significance. The practical significance was a "little, if any" correlation. Correlations for this fourth descriptor focused on the evaluation portion of planning. In comparing the correlations for descriptor number four to the correlations for descriptor number three (establishing goals and plans which address the thinking process), number three showed a "low positive" placement, a somewhat stronger relationship. It would seem that these two descriptors were somewhat related, and the results showed a slight degree of difference, but both of the correlations were still in the low categories for the practical significance.

For the fifth descriptor, matches instruction to goals and objectives, strategies, assessments, and student needs, the SPSS correlations returned a .226 for Kendall's tau and a .235 for Spearman's rho. The correlations for both tests were statistically significant

at the .05 level. The practical significance was a "little, if any" relationship. Again, due to the large numbers of the population (108 matched forms), the statistical significance was clear, but practically speaking, it was not strong enough to support a high degree of confidence in the relationship.

Correlations for descriptor number six, provides instruction integrating knowledge, skills, and methods from related subject areas, were not statistically significant. The Kendall's tau was .093 and the Spearman's rho was .100. The practical significance was, "little, if any," a low correlation. The results were low enough that the relationship may have occurred by chance.

For the seventh descriptor, provides instruction integrating materials, human resources, and technology, the correlations indicated a statistically significant relationship at the .05 level. Kendall's tau yielded a score of .227 and Spearman's rho yielded a .246. There was a low relationship between the students' self-reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team for this descriptor. The practical significance was interpreted as "little, if any." Again, because of the large numbers in the population, it was easier to obtain statistically significant results, but practically speaking, it was a low correlation.

Correlations for number eight descriptor, understands and identifies different student approaches to learning and performance, were not statistically significant. SPSS data yielded scores of .169 for Kendall's tau and .182 for Spearman's rho. The practical significance was also very low. Confidence in this relationship was not supported by the results.

For the last descriptor for this category, number nine, meets instructional needs of students from diverse cultures with different learning needs, the correlations were too low to be statistically significant. SPSS data indicated that the scores were .144 on the Kendall's tau and .161 on the Spearman's rho. Again, as in the correlations for descriptor number eight, the practical significance was very low, and the relationship between the two variables was not supported by the analysis.

In looking at the planning of instruction category, there were six of the nine descriptors, numbers one, two, three, four, five, and seven, whose correlations were significant at the .05 level. Correlations for descriptor numbers six, eight, and nine were not statistically significant. For research question number one, is there a statistically significant relationship between the student teachers' self-reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team for the planning category of the "Student Teaching Final Evaluation," the results indicate an overall statistically significant relationship.

A majority of the correlations were statistically significant, but when using the Hinkle et al. (1994) Table I (page 37) for the "Rule of Thumb for Interpreting the Size of a Correlation Coefficient," the degree of practical significance was low. On only one descriptor, number three, establishes goals and objectives which address the thinking process, was the correlation level above "little, if any." In spite of the statistically significant relationship on this variable, the practical interpretation, of a "low positive" interpretation for number three, is still a rather low correlation. When the "r" factor is

squared, less than 10% of the relationship between the two variables can be attributed to each other.

One possible explanation for the lack of a stronger relationship may be due to the student teacher not having adequate planning time with the specific teacher to whose classroom the student teacher has been assigned prior to the student teaching experience. The student teachers and their evaluation team need to have some kind of understanding of what is expected, and who is responsible for which portion of the curriculum prior to the actual practice teaching experience. The test results suggest that the coordination of the planning aspect may not have taken place in a substantial number of cases.

Teaching Strategies

The teaching strategies category focuses on the understanding of concepts, tools for teaching, and the structure of a given discipline. It centers on providing access to information through meaningful experiences. It includes the demonstration, understanding, and use of a variety of instructional approaches to encourage the student's development. It encourages the student teacher to create a learning environment that encourages active engagement and a student's ownership of his/her learning (Bibler et al., 1998).

Table III displays an overview of the analysis, and also displays the results of SPSS data for Kendall's tau and Spearman's rho. Each correlation is marked as to the level of statistical significance, including an interpretation for each correlation's level of practical significance using the Hinkle et al. (1994) Table I (page 37) for the "Rule of Thumb for Interpreting the Size of a Correlation Coefficient." This category contains thirteen descriptors.

TABLE III

TEACHING STRATEGIES

Descriptors	Kendall	Spearman	Hinkle
1. Understands concepts, assumptions, and processes of inquiry central to discipline.	.146	.157	little, if any
2. Varies instructional role regarding content, purposes of instruction, and student needs.	.158	.168	little, if any
3. Uses multiple explanations of concepts, captures key ideas, links student understanding.	.154	.164	little, if any
4. Paces the lesson appropriately.	.025	.026	little, if any
5. Clarifies directions and explanations when students misunderstand.	.108	.111	little, if any
6. Engages students in active learning to promote critical thinking and problem-solving.	.292**	.309**	little, if any
7. Helps students assume responsibility for identifying and using varied learning resources.	.273**	.298**	little, if any
8. Provides practice activities which support the achievement of instructional goals.	.036	.037	little, if any
9. Engages students in generating knowledge	.242**	.254**	little, if any
10. Links learning to students' prior knowledge, experiences, and cultural backgrounds.	.089	.097	little, if any
11. Elicits examples of student thinking that simulate reflection on own and others' ideas.	.183*	.200*	little, if any
12. Facilitates internalization of learning and development of employability skills.	.310**	.340**	low positive
13. Organizes, prepares, monitors independent and group work allowing for full participation.	.183*	.198*	little, if any

*Correlation is statistically significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).

**Correlation is statistically significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

Correlations for descriptor number one, understands concepts, assumptions, and processes of inquiry central to discipline, were .146 for Kendall's tau and .157 for Spearman's rho. For the students' self-reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team, there was no statistically significant relationship.

The practical significance for the correlations on descriptor number one was at the lowest level, "little, if any." From a practical viewpoint, the relationship was not strong enough to rule out the possibility that the results could have occurred by chance. Interpreting someone's understanding can be a bit nebulas, so perhaps this lack of consistency was understandable.

For the second descriptor, varies instructional role regarding content, purposes of instruction, and student needs, the SPSS correlation data indicated a .158 for Kendall's tau and .168 for Spearman's rho. The students' self-reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team did not indicate a statistically significant relationship. The practical significance was judged at the lowest level, "little, if any." Again, the results could have occurred by chance.

For descriptor number three, uses multiple explanations of concepts, captures key ideas, links student understanding, the correlations between student perceptions and his/her evaluations team's perceptions showed a Kendall's tau of .154 and a Spearman's rho of .164. This did not indicate a statistically significant correlation for this descriptor. The practical significance was again at the lowest level.

The fourth descriptor, paces the lesson appropriately, does not indicate a significant relationship between the students' self-reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team on this descriptor. The Kendall's tau indicated .025 and the Spearman's rho indicated .026; both of the tests were too low to be considered statistically significant. The practical significance was judged to be "little, if any." It was interesting to note that the first four descriptors in this category dealt with the complex practice and use of strategies for teaching. Perhaps, this would provide an explanation for the low significance levels. These are strategies that require experimentation and practice to implement.

The fifth descriptor, clarifies directions and explanations when students misunderstand, the SPSS correlation data indicated a .108 for Kendall's tau and a .111 for Spearman's rho. This correlation of relationship also indicated test results that were too low to be considered statistically significant. The practical significance for this correlation was at the lowest level of "little, if any." This descriptor would require the student teacher to recognize that the pupils had not understood something that was taught, to select a better method or strategy, then teach the missing concept. New teachers sometimes lack the skills to adapt that quickly under the pressures of student teaching.

For descriptor number six, engages students in active learning to promote critical thinking and problem-solving, the correlational tests for relationship showed that the Kendall's tau was .292 and the Spearman's rho was .309 which indicated a statistically significant relationship at the .01 level of significance. The practical significance was at the high end of the lowest category, "little, if any." There seems to be an emphasis in

education on active learning, so perhaps this would account for the somewhat higher statistical and practical significance levels.

Correlations for the seventh descriptor, helps students assume responsibility for identifying and using varied learning resources, also indicated a statistically significant relationship at the .01 level of significance. SPSS data yielded a Kendall's tau of .273 and a Spearman's rho of .298. The practical significance again placed the correlations for this descriptor at the lowest level, but near the next level. The resources for education have expanded a great deal with the addition of computers, internet, and a variety of teaching strategies, so perhaps the student teachers have adopted some of these ideas. There may be gaps in the perceptions of the student teachers and their evaluation team, but it appeared to be a somewhat stronger correlation for this descriptor than for some of the others.

For descriptor number eight, provides practice activities which support the achievement of instructional goals, the correlations were too low to be considered statistically significant. The Kendall's tau yielded a .036 and the Spearman's rho a .037. The practical significance was also very low, the "little, if any" category. There was little agreement between the ratings of the student teachers' opinion and their evaluation teams' opinion on this descriptor.

Correlations for the ninth descriptor, engages students in generating knowledge, were statistically significant. The Kendall's tau indicated a .242 and the Spearman's rho a .254; both tests were statistically significant at the .01 level. The practical significance was still at the lowest level. Because of the large numbers in the population (108 matched evaluation forms), it was much easier to get statistically significant results. The practical

significance gives a fuller picture to the figures than merely statistical test results. In addition, this descriptor would appear to be easier to observe than descriptor numbers one through five.

The number ten descriptor, links learning to students' prior knowledge, experiences, and cultural backgrounds, SPSS correlation data yielded .089 on the Kendall's tau and .097 on the Spearman's rho. Neither correlation was statistically significant. The practical significance was judged very low, "little, if any." This is a rather complex descriptor that involves a variety of teaching skills.

Correlations for the eleventh descriptor, elicits examples of student thinking that simulate reflection on own and others' ideas, were statistically significant at the .05 level. The Kendall's tau showed a .183 and the Spearman's rho a .200. The practical significance was still at the lowest level, "little, if any." This descriptor would seem to be difficult to judge, for example, the student may be engaged in reflection, but it may not be obvious to the observer from his/her position.

Correlations for descriptor number twelve, facilitates internalization of learning and development of employability skills, were statistically significant. The test results yielded a Kendall's tau of .310 and Spearman's rho of .340. This relationship was statistically significant at the .01 level. The practical significance was at the next to lowest level, "low positive." This descriptor deals with employability skills and the student teachers and their evaluation team showed more agreement on this descriptor. Perhaps, the discussions between them about concerns for employment, that often manifest themselves in the student's senior year, would account for the higher levels.

Correlations for the last descriptor for this section is number thirteen, organizes, prepares, monitors independent and group work allowing for full participation, were statistically significant at the .05 level. The Kendall's tau yielded a .183 and the Spearman's rho .198. The practical significance was at the lowest level, "little, if any." This descriptor looked at several different tasks in one descriptor, and this may have been the reason for a lower level of significance.

In looking at the "Teaching Strategies" category, there were six of the thirteen correlations, numbers six, seven, nine, eleven, twelve, and thirteen, that were statistically significant. Numbers one, two, three, four, five, eight, and ten were not statistically significant. For research question number two, is there a statistically significant relationship between the student teachers' self-reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team for the teaching strategies category of the "Student Teaching Final Evaluation," the results did not show a statistically significant relationship on the majority of the correlations.

For one descriptor, number twelve, facilitates internalization of learning and development of employability skills, a "low positive" correlation, on the Hinkle et al. (1994) Table I (page 37) for the "Rule of Thumb for Interpreting the size of a Correlation Coefficient," was found. This is still considered a low practical significance, because when the "r" factor is squared, less than 10% of the relationship between the two variables can be attributed to each other. Correlations for the remaining descriptors all showed "little, if any" (which is a lower category) on the Hinkle et al. (1994) chart. As a whole, correlations for the teaching strategies category were interpreted as not statistically significant, and

from a practical viewpoint, the practically significant correlations were, at best, rather low correlations.

Teaching strategies represents an area that involves a continual growth experience. It was not a surprise to see the levels of differing opinions in this category. Experienced teachers may have equally differing opinions for this category. If the evaluation team and the student teacher shared a similar teaching preparation experience, the results may be more consistent between the two groups. A training program, taught by UTC professors, for the evaluation teams may produce higher correlations for this category.

Assessment and Evaluation

This section centers on the assessment and evaluation of the teaching process. It includes the use of appropriate strategies and instruments to generate information about students and their ongoing progress and then to use that information to make decisions for the instructional process. It also involves the communication and evaluation of the students' performance and progress to parents and others who need the information. In addition, this section includes reflection on teaching practice (Bibler et al, 1998).

Table IV displays an overview of the analysis. It also displays the results of SPSS data for Kendall's tau and Spearman's rho. The correlation for each descriptor has been marked as to the level of statistical significance, and includes an interpretation for the correlations of each descriptor's level of practical significance as interpreted from the Hinkle et al. (1994) Table I (page 37) for the "Rule of Thumb for Interpreting the Size of a Correlation Coefficient."

TABLE IV

ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION

Descriptors	Kendall	Spearman	Hinkle
1. Uses assessment strategies and instruments appropriate to learning expectations.	.131	.139	little, if any
2. Uses information from a variety of sources to make instructional decisions.	.362**	.381**	low positive
3. Interprets assessment data appropriately and uses it for diagnosis and instruction.	-.030	-.032	little, if any
4. Organizes and maintains useful records; communicates effectively with parents/students.	-.025	-.025	little, if any
5. Provides prompt and immediate feedback to students to move them to the next level.	.172	.186	little, if any
6. Uses a variety of assessment techniques to evaluate curriculum and instruction.	.162	.177	little, if any
7. Monitors and modifies teaching strategies in relation to student success.	.201*	.216*	little, if any
8. Uses student performance data to improve instruction.	.046	.051	little, if any
9. Assesses, analyzes, and communicates accurately the effectiveness of instruction.	.278**	.303**	little, if any
10. Evaluates student achievement and determines amount of progress.	.194*	.208*	little, if any
11. Evaluates student attitudes toward learning and determines amount of positive change.	.169	.181	little, if any

*Correlation is statistically significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).

**Correlation is statistically significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

For descriptor number one, uses assessment strategies and instruments appropriate to learning expectations, SPSS data returned correlations in which the Kendall's tau was .131 and the Spearman's rho was .139, neither of which indicated a statistically significant relationship between the student teachers' self-reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team. The practical significance was judged to be at the lowest level, "little, if any." This descriptor called for the matching of assessment instruments to appropriate activities. This may be open to a wider range of interpretations that some of the other descriptors.

For descriptor number two, uses information from a variety of sources to make instructional decisions, the Kendall's tau returned a correlation of .362 and the Spearman's rho a correlation of .381. This indicated a statistically significant relationship at the .01 significance level. The practical significance was interpreted at the "low positive" level. Although not a strong correlation, it does indicate some relationship. When the "r" factor is squared, less than 10% of the relationship between the two variables can be attributed to each other. This descriptor would seem to provide for a more concise interpretation than some of the other descriptors; the students use a variety of sources, or they do not use a variety of sources.

Correlations on the third descriptor, interprets assessment data appropriately and uses it for diagnosis and instruction, indicated little correlation between the two variables of this descriptor. The Kendall's tau indicated -.030, and Spearman's rho indicated -.032. Both of the test results were too low to be considered statistically significant. The practical significance was at the lowest level. The student teacher may feel that he/she interpreted

the data correctly, but the evaluation team may disagree, or the differing opinions may be related to the use of the data, or a combination of both portions.

Correlations on the fourth descriptor, organizes and maintains useful records; communicates effectively with parents/students, were low. Both the Kendall's tau and the Spearman's rho yielded a -.025. The practical significance was also at the lowest level. The descriptor embodies two different tasks, as compared to most of the other descriptors which described only one task, and perhaps this provided for a larger range of interpretations in this category.

Correlations for descriptor number five, provides prompt and immediate feedback to students to move them to the next level, a Kendall's tau of .172 and a Spearman's rho of .186 were found. There was not a statistically significant correlation for this descriptor between the student teachers' self-reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team. The practical significance was judged, "little, if any." Perhaps, the participants disagreed on what was prompt and immediate.

For descriptor number six, uses a variety of assessment techniques to evaluate curriculum and instruction, correlations were too low to be considered statistically significant. The Kendall's tau indicated a .162 and the Spearman's rho a .177. Using the Hinkle et al. (1994) Table I (page 37) to interpret the practical significance, it was judged to be "little, if any." This descriptor called for the participants to judge a variety of techniques which may have contributed to a wider range of results between the matched forms.

Correlations on the seventh descriptor, monitors and modifies teaching strategies in relation to student success, were (Kendall's tau) .201 and (Spearman's rho) .216. This indicated a statistical significance at the .05 level. "Little, if any" was the practical significance interpretation. There appears to be a degree of agreement between the groups for this descriptor.

For descriptor number eight, uses student performance data to improve instruction, correlations were Kendall's tau of .046 and Spearman's rho of .051. These scores did not indicate a statistically significant relationship. The practical significance level was also at the lowest level. It appeared that opinions differed from the student teachers and their evaluation team regarding the use or non-use of student performance data to improve instruction.

Correlations on the ninth descriptor, assesses, analyzes, and communicates accurately the effectiveness of instruction, were on the Kendall's tau .278 and Spearman's rho .303. The scores indicated a correlation that was statistically significant at the .01 level of significance. The practical significance was judged to be at the "little, if any" level. There appeared to be a measure of agreement between the groups for this descriptor.

For descriptor number ten, evaluates student achievement and determines amount of progress, correlations showed a Kendall's tau of .194 and a Spearman's rho of .208. Both tests indicated a statistical significance level at the .05 level. The practical significance was low at the "little, if any" level. This descriptor describes a skill (for example, grades) with which both student teachers and classroom teachers are more familiar.

Correlations for the last descriptor for this category, number eleven, evaluates student attitudes toward learning and determines amount of positive change, were for the Kendall's tau .169 and the Spearman's rho .181. The practical significance was at the lowest level, "little, if any." Attitude is an area that can be interpreted in a variety of ways and with varying degrees of change. Perhaps, this variety of interpretations accounts for the low levels of agreement for this descriptor.

In looking at the assessment and evaluation category as a whole, correlations on four descriptors out of eleven were considered statistically significant: number two, uses information from a variety of sources to make instructional decisions; number seven, monitors and modifies teaching strategies in relation to student success; number nine, assesses, analyzes, and communicates accurately the effectiveness of instruction; and number ten evaluates student achievement and determines amount of progress. The remaining correlations were not statistically significant.

As a whole, the assessment and evaluation category did not show a statistically significant correlation for a majority of the category's descriptors. For research question number three, is there a statistically significant relationship between the student teachers' self-reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team for the assessment and evaluation category of the 'Student Teaching Final Evaluation," the category did not show a strong enough relationship to be considered statistically significant.

The correlations on descriptor number two, uses information from a variety of sources to make instructional decisions, showed a "low positive" correlation level on the

Hinkle et al. (1994) Table I (page 37) for the 'Rule of Thumb for Interpreting the Size of a Correlation Coefficient." From a practical interpretation, the "low positive" interpretation for descriptor number two was still a low correlation. When the "r" factor is squared, less than 10% of the relationship between the student teachers' self-reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team can be attributed to each other. The other descriptors showed a practical interpretation of "little, if any", which was an even lower level of correlation.

The results for the assessment and evaluation category can be interpreted as not statistically or practically significant, and the correlations for the four descriptors that were significant were, at best, low correlations. Assessment and evaluation may often be quite subjective and this may explain the low correlation figures.

Learning Environment

The learning environment section focuses on the creation of the learning environment that promotes the development of student abilities. In addition, it assesses the effective management of classroom resources (Bibler et al., 1998).

Table V displays an overview of the analysis. It also displays the results of SPSS data for Kendall's tau and Spearman's rho. Each correlation is marked as to the level of statistical significance and includes an interpretation for each correlation's level of practical significance using the Hinkle et al. (1994) Table I (page 37) for the "Rule of Thumb for Interpreting the Size of a Correlation Coefficient." This category contains eight descriptors.

TABLE V

LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

Descriptors	Kendall	Spearman	Hinkle
1. Uses strategies in which students work collaboratively, independently, and purposefully.	.238*	.249**	little, if any
2. Assists students in developing shared expectations for interactions and responsibilities.	.065	.070	little, if any
3. Establishes and maintains standards of mutually respectful interaction.	.068	.072	little, if any
4. Uses management techniques which foster self-control and self-discipline.	.211*	.225*	little, if any
5. Communicates and challenges students in a positive, purposeful manner.	.194*	.197*	little, if any
6. Organizes, allocates, and manages resources to engage students in productive learning.	.049	.052	little, if any
7. Maximizes the amount of class time spent in learning.	.218*	.233*	little, if any
8. Demonstrates flexibility and modifies procedures as situations demand.	.222*	.231*	little, if any

*Correlation is statistically significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).

**Correlation is statistically significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

Correlations for the first descriptor, uses strategies in which students work collaboratively, independently, and purposefully were statistically significant at the .05 level for the .238 on the Kendall's tau and .249 on the Spearman's rho. Practically speaking, the correlations for this first descriptor were judged at the "little, if any" level. This descriptor provided for a three-fold result, perhaps this variety of interpretations could provide a clue to the rather low practical correlations.

For descriptor number two, assists students in developing shared expectations for interactions and responsibilities, correlation results from the SPSS data were a Kendall's tau of .065 and a Spearman's rho of .070, which were too low to be considered statistically significant. The practical significance was also at the lowest level. This descriptor seems vague; this may be one of the reasons why the significance levels were low.

For the third descriptor, establishes and maintains standards of mutually respectful interaction, correlations of .068 on the Kendall's tau and .072 on the Spearman's rho were found. These outcomes indicated levels too low to be statistically significant. This descriptor may represent differing opinions as to what was a respectful interaction or the difficulty that some student teachers have in establishing mutual respect between themselves and their new students. The student teacher is sometimes viewed as "not a real teacher."

For correlations on descriptor number four, uses management techniques which foster self-control and self-discipline, the students' self-reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team were statistically significant at the .05 level. The Kendall's tau indicated a .211 and the

Spearman's rho a .225 test results. The practical significance level was at the lowest level of "little, if any." Although developing management techniques can be a challenge, there was a level of agreement on this descriptor.

The fifth descriptor in the learning environment category, communicates and challenges students in a positive, purposeful manner, a Kendall's tau score of .194 and a Spearman's rho score of .197 were found. These correlations were statistically significant at the .05 level. The practical significance was at the lowest level. Because of the large number of evaluation forms (108 matched forms), it was easier to obtain statistically significant results. The practical significance provided a fuller picture of the results. The two groups of participants had only low levels of agreement, practically speaking.

For another descriptor, number six, organizes, allocates, and manages resources to engage students in productive learning, the SPSS correlation results showed .049 and .052 on the Kendall's tau and the Spearman's rho, respectively; there was no statistically significant correlation for this descriptor. The practical significance was also at the lowest level of interpretation. This descriptor was multi-faceted; perhaps, the variety of items to assess increased the variability of results.

For the seventh descriptor, maximizes the amount of class time spent in learning, a Kendall's tau of .218 and a Spearman's rho of .233 were derived. SPSS indicated that these correlations were statistically significant at the .05 significance level for the two variables (the student teachers' self-reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team). The statistically significant levels were not high enough to raise the practical significance above the lowest level. This

descriptor focused on an area of potentially differing opinions, for example, what maximizing means, or someone's view of what was the most important way to spend class time.

For the last descriptor in the learning environment category, number eight, demonstrates flexibility and modifies procedures as situations demand, a Kendall's tau of .222 and a Spearman's rho of .231 were found. These correlations were statistically significant at the .05 level. The practical significance level was also at the lowest level. What is flexible to one individual is often perceived as rigid to another person; this may create a variety of interpretations.

Correlations on five out of eight descriptors were statistically significant in this category. In summarizing the learning environment category, it could be described as having a majority of the correlations that were statistically significant. This is the strongest showing in any category to this point. For research question number four, is there a statistically significant relationship between the student teachers' self-reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team for the learning environment category of the "Student Teaching Final Evaluation," there was a statistically significant relationship.

Although the results indicate a statistically significant relationship, the practical aspects need to be considered. Every correlation for each descriptor, as indicated on the Hinkle et al. (1994) Table I (page 37) for the 'Rule of Thumb for Interpreting the Size of a Correlation Coefficient," indicated a "little, if any" practical significance. The relationship

was interpreted, from a practical point of view, as low. The learning environment of a classroom takes time and experience to develop, so this category has provided a variety of returns.

Professional Growth

This section centers on three areas, (1) the student teacher collaborates with colleagues and appropriate others (2) the student teacher engages in professional development (3) the student teacher performs professional responsibilities efficiently. There are nine descriptors in this section (Bibler et al., 1998).

Table VI displays an overview of the analysis. It also displays the results of SPSS data for Kendall's tau and Spearman's rho. Each correlation is marked as to the level of statistical significance, including the practical interpretation for each correlation based on the Hinkle et al. (1994) Table I (page 37) for the "Rule of Thumb for Interpreting the Size of a Correlation Coefficient." This category contains nine descriptors with descriptors number five through nine under the heading, "performs professional responsibilities efficiently."

Correlations for the first descriptor, demonstrates productive leadership or team membership skills, the Kendall's tau and the Spearman's rho were .198 and .213, respectively. Both correlations were statistically significant at the .05 level. The students' self-reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team indicated a statistically significant relationship between the two variables. In looking at the practical significance, the Hinkle et al. (1994) chart was used to

TABLE VI

PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

Descriptor	Kendall	Spearman	Hinkle
1. Demonstrates productive leadership or team membership skills.	.198*	.213*	little, if any
2. Participates in collegial activities to make the school a productive learning environment.	.222*	.246*	little, if any
3. Provides evidence of performance levels and articulates strengths and areas for growth.	.195*	.210*	little, if any
4. Articulates a professional development plan to improve performance and repertoire.	.294**	.324**	little, if any
5. Maintains accurate and up-to-date records.	.150	.157	little, if any
6. Completes assigned tasks on schedule.	.257**	.269**	little, if any
7. Maintains a satisfactory record of punctuality and attendance.	.284**	.298**	little, if any
8. Follows applicable policies and procedures.	.194*	.199*	little, if any
9. Maintains confidentiality and fulfills legal responsibilities.	.227*	.232*	little, if any

*Correlation is statistically significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).

**Correlation is statistically significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

interpret the practical significance at the lowest level, "little, if any." The participants did not agree, to any great degree, on the student's performance for this descriptor.

For descriptor number two, participates in collegial activities to make the school a productive learning environment, a .222 on the Kendall's tau and a .246 on the Spearman's rho were found. These results indicated a statistically significant correlation at the .05 level. The practical significance was at the lowest level. It may be difficult for the evaluation team to know what activities in which the student teacher is involved outside of the Professional Development School.

Correlations for the third descriptor, provides evidence of performance levels and articulates strengths and areas for growth, were .195 (Kendall's tau) and .210 (Spearman's rho). The results were statistically significant at the .05 level. The practical significance followed the same pattern of the category, "little, if any." This descriptor called for evidence of performance or the articulation of strength and growth areas. This may have been done, but not recalled by a larger portion of one particular group.

Correlations on descriptor number four, articulates a professional development plan to improve performance and repertoire, were for the Kendall's tau .294 and the Spearman's rho .324. They were statistically significant at the .01 level. The practical significance level was "little, if any," but very close to the next level. It appeared that the participants were more in agreement on the development plan than on any other area in the category of professional growth.

Descriptor number five, maintains accurate and up-to-date records, comes under the more general heading of performs professional responsibilities efficiently. Correlations

for this descriptor (Kendall's tau .150 and Spearman's rho .157) were not statistically significant. From a practical viewpoint, this was a low correlation. There appeared to be a lack of agreement on whether the records were either accurate or up-to-date. It is difficult to determine if the issue was one or the other, or both.

Correlations for the sixth descriptor, completes assigned tasks on schedule, were .257 for Kendall's tau and .269 for the Spearman's rho. Both correlations were significant at the .01 level. On the test of practical significance the correlations were "little, if any." There seems to be some agreement about whether given tasks were completed on schedule or not.

Another descriptor, number seven, maintains a satisfactory record of punctuality and attendance, had correlations of .284 and .298 for the Kendall's tau and the Spearman's rho, respectively. These were significant at the .01 level. The practical significance was still at the lowest level, "little, if any," but very close to the next level. There appears to be some agreement about whether the student teacher was punctual and maintained a satisfactory record of attendance.

Correlations for the eighth descriptor, follows applicable policies and procedures, were .194 on the Kendall's tau and .199 on the Spearman's rho. This placed the results in the .05 statistical significance level. The lowest level was the level for practical significance. There could possibly be differing opinions about what policies and procedures applied to a given situation, and whether they were followed or not. Also, whose policies and procedures apply, the assigned school or the university? There may not have been agreement among the participants.

Correlations for the final descriptor for this section, number nine, maintains confidentiality and fulfills legal responsibilities, were Kendall's tau .227 and Spearman's rho .232. The results placed these correlations in the .05 level of statistical significance. The practical significance was again at the lowest level. In many cases, this information may not be known, so the reported results could vary from the actual situations.

In summarizing the professional growth category, it could be described as having a majority of the correlations that were statistically significant. Eight out of nine correlations were statistically significant in this category. For research question number four, is there a statistically significant relationship between the student teachers' self-reflection and the student teachers' evaluation by their evaluation team for the learning environment category of the "Student Teaching Final Evaluation," there was a statistically significant relationship.

Although the results indicate a significant relationship, the practical significance needs to be considered. The correlations on every descriptor, as indicated on the Hinkle et al. (1994) Table I (page 37) for the 'Rule of Thumb for Interpreting the Size of a Correlation Coefficient", indicated a "little, if any" practical significance. This practical significant relationship can only be interpreted, from a realistic point of view, as a low one.

This category showed a much higher number of statistically significant correlations than most of the other categories. There seemed to be several descriptors that contained a more objective type of description, such as punctuality, attendance, and maintaining accurate records. It would appear to be an easier category to assess.

Communication

The communication section of the student teaching final evaluation focuses on two areas: (1) use of appropriate verbal and non-verbal techniques to communicate effectively with students, parents, and appropriate others and (2) writes clearly and correctly. There are a total of six descriptors in this section (Bibler, et al. 1998).

Table VII displays an overview of the analysis. It also displays the results of SPSS data for Kendall's tau and Spearman's rho. Each correlation is marked as to the level of statistical significance, including the interpretation for each level of practical significance using the Hinkle et al. (1994) Table I (page 37) "Rule of Thumb for Interpreting the Size of a Correlation Coefficient." There were six descriptors, with descriptor numbers four, five, and six under the more general heading, "writes clearly and effectively."

For descriptor number one, demonstrates an understanding of effective verbal and non-verbal communication, correlations of .259 on the Kendall's tau and .267 on the Spearman's rho were found. These results indicated correlations that were statistically significant at the .01 level of significance. The practical significance was interpreted as "little, if any, " a low practical relationship. Because of the large numbers in the research population, (108 matched forms) it was easier to obtain statistically significant results, but the practical significance provided a fuller picture of the relationship between the variables. Judging someone's understanding can be a difficult process. In addition, this descriptor called for determining the effectiveness of verbal communication, which required a rather quick judgement on the part of the participants.

TABLE VII

COMMUNICATION

Descriptors	Kendall	Spearman	Hinkle
1. Demonstrates an understanding of effective verbal and non-verbal communication.	.259**	.267**	little, if any
2. Models effective communication strategies in all interactions with students.	.157	.162	little, if any
3. Uses appropriate grammar and word choice for clear, concise exchange of information.	.217*	.223*	little, if any
4. Uses correct grammar.	.125	.130	little, if any
5. Organizes information logically.	.097	.098	little, if any
6. Designs communication appropriate to the audience.	.247**	.250**	little, if any

*Correlation is statistically significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).
**Correlation is statistically significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

Correlations for the second descriptor, models effective communication strategies in all interactions with students, were .157 on the Kendall's tau and .162 on the Spearman's rho. These results placed them in the not statistically significant correlation category. The practical significance was also not significant. The two participants (student teachers and their evaluation team) apparently did not agree whether or not, or to what degree, this descriptor was met.

Another descriptor, number three, uses appropriate grammar and word choice for clear, concise exchange of information, showed correlations of .217 and .223 on the Kendall's tau and the Spearman's rho, respectively. These results indicated a statistically significant level of .05. The practical significance level was again at the lowest level. This

descriptor is somewhat easier to judge than a verbal exchange, so perhaps this accounts for a bit higher level of statistical significance.

Descriptor number four, uses correct grammar, comes under the broader heading, writes clearly and effectively. Correlations (the Kendall's tau - .125 and the Spearman's rho - .130) were not statistically significant. The practical significance level was at the "little, if any," level. Perhaps, the difference may be that the student teacher was not fully aware when he/she has used incorrect grammar, and so assumed that it was correct.

Correlations on the fifth descriptor, organizes information logically, were not statistically significant. The Kendall's tau indicated a score of .097 and the Spearman's rho a score of .098. The practical significance was also interpreted at the lowest level, "little, if any." There appeared to be little agreement between the participants on this descriptor.

The final correlations for this section, descriptor number six, designs communication appropriate to the audience, provided a Kendall's tau result of .247 and a Spearman's rho of .250. The results indicated a correlation that was statistically significant at the .01 level. The practical significance was still at the lowest level. This would imply a somewhat higher level of agreement. It may have centered on whether it was appropriate or not for the given audience.

Correlations on the communication section were significant for three of the six descriptors. For research question number six, is there a statistically significant relationship between the student teachers' self-reflection and the student teachers' evaluation by their evaluation team for the communication category of the "Student Teaching Final Evaluation," there was a statistically significant relationship. Correlations for half of the

descriptors were statistically significant, and correlations for the other half of the descriptors were not statistically significant.

In looking at the practical viewpoint, none of the correlations for the descriptors had any interpretation other than "little, if any" on the Hinkle et al. (1994) Table I (page 37) for the "Rule of Thumb for Interpreting the Size of a Correlation Coefficient." The correlations can be interpreted as statistically significant, but practically speaking, the correlations were low.

The communication category can often be an area where people disagree on whether effective communication has taken place, whether the communication was appropriate for a given audience, and the individual's word choice to convey the concise exchange of information. The interesting part of the results for this category were that higher scores were obtained on communication descriptors than more objective descriptors such as, uses correct grammar, organizes information logically, and models effective communication strategies. It was really unclear as to why that occurred.

Literature Links

In comparing the information from the review of the literature and the results of this study, there were areas where others found similar results. There was a lack of research on the selection process for cooperating teachers (Conner & Killmer, 1995). The cooperating teachers, it is suggested, have not been trained sufficiently to describe and interpret the events that take place in the classroom and find it difficult to discern growth in the student teacher (Melnick, 1989) (Kilgore, 1979). In this study, the student teachers were sometimes supervised by novice teachers as well as master teachers. Approximately one-

fourth of the survey forms from the evaluation teams in this study showed little if any variation on the rating scale. Some forms gave one particular number throughout the entire form, which may suggest a lack of variability in interpreting events. Melnick (1989) found this lack of variability and suggested that it may indicate a need for additional training in supervision.

McNaly, et al. (1997) describe the student teaching experience as a continuum between a "sink or swim" and a rigidly monitored process. The experience is dependent on relationships and is unique to each situation. This may suggest a measure of complexity in the student teacher/evaluation team relationship and may explain the lack of strong correlations on the evaluation instruments.

Ross (1989) suggested that the practice of reflection is a progressive development. If that is true, then perhaps the student teachers are not as far along on the reflective practitioner developmental scale as their evaluation team, therefore, the evaluation surveys do not show a closer relationship because of the different stages of development of perception on the many variables in this study between the two groups.

SUMMARY

This chapter, on the results of the study, included the six categories of the evaluation form (planning, teaching strategies, assessment and evaluation, learning environment, professional growth, and communication) and the correlations of both the Kendall's tau and the Spearman's rho for each separate descriptor along with a summary of each category. Correlations for 32 of the 56 descriptors, or 57%, were statistically significant at the .05 level. SPSS data indicated that a statistically significant relationship

existed between the student teachers' self-reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team for 57% of the correlations. Correlations for 24 of the 56 descriptors, or 43%, were not statistically significant.

In addition, practical interpretations for each category were presented according to Hinkle, et al. (1994). All of the correlations for this study indicated low practical significance levels.

This chapter also contained links from this correlational study to the literature research. The summary, conclusions, and recommendations for this study are presented in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

INTRODUCTION

The goal of this research study was to determine the relationship between the student teachers' self-reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team, comprised of master and/or novice teachers. The purpose of this chapter is to summarize the results, provide a conclusion, and to provide recommendations for further study.

Summary

The purpose of this correlational study was to explore the relationship between the student teachers' self-reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team. Specifically, did the student teachers' reflection of their teaching skills correspond with their evaluation by the on-site team regarding the six areas investigated by the "Student Teaching Final Evaluation"?

The subjects of the study were student teachers in elementary and secondary education in attendance at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga who were assigned to Professional Development Schools (PDS) II to complete their student teaching during the spring semester of 1999 and their assigned evaluation team. There were ten different PDS II sites in which the students were assigned to do their student teaching.

In this chapter, each research question was explored separately and compared with the results of the SPSS analysis for Kendall's tau and Spearman's rho. In addition, each question was analyzed for practical significance using the Hinkle et al. (1994) Table I (page

37) "Rule of Thumb for Interpreting the Size of a Correlation Coefficient." There were six research questions that this study explored.

1. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the student teachers' self-reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team for the planning category of the "Student Teaching Final Evaluation"? There were six of the nine descriptors, numbers one, two, three, four, five, and seven, whose correlations were statistically significant at the .05 level of significance. The correlations for numbers six, eight, and nine were not statistically significant. For research question number one, the analysis indicated a statistically significant relationship. When using the Hinkle et al. (1994) Table I (page 37) for the "Rule of Thumb for Interpreting the Size of a Correlation Coefficient," the degree of relationship was low. The correlations for descriptor number three were interpreted as a "low positive" rating on the interpretation chart. The correlations on the remaining descriptors all had "little, if any" practical significance.

2. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the student teachers' self reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team for the teaching strategies category of the 'Student Teaching Final Evaluation"? There were only six (numbers six, seven, nine, eleven, twelve and thirteen) of the thirteen descriptors for this category that had correlations that were statistically significant. Correlations for numbers one, two, three, four, five, eight, and ten were not statistically significant. SPSS data did not show statistically significant relationships for a majority of the correlations.

Descriptor number twelve showed a "low positive" correlation on the Hinkle et al. (1994) Table I (page 37) for the "Rule of Thumb for Interpreting the Size of a Correlation Coefficient." This was still considered a low correlation. The remaining correlations for the descriptors all showed "little, if any" (which is the lowest category) on the Hinkle et al. (1994) chart. As a whole, correlations for the teaching strategies category were interpreted as not statistically significant, and from a practical viewpoint, the correlations for the descriptors that were practically significant were, at best, low correlations.

3. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the student teachers' self-reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team for the assessment and evaluation category of the "Student Teaching Final Evaluation"?

The results for the assessment and evaluation category were interpreted as not statistically significant, because out of eleven descriptors, only four of the eleven correlations were statistically significant. Those four were, at best, low correlations from a practical viewpoint.

4. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the student teachers' self-reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team for the learning environment category of the 'Student Teaching Final Evaluation"? Correlations for five of the eight descriptors were statistically significant for this category.

The practical aspects also need to be considered. Correlations for every descriptor, as indicated on the Hinkle et al. (1994) Table I (page 37) for the 'Rule of Thumb for

Interpreting the Size of a Correlation Coefficient," specified a "little, if any" practical significant. This practical significant relationship was interpreted as a low relationship.

5. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the student teachers' self-reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team for the professional growth category of the "Student Teaching Final Evaluation"? SPSS data indicated that eight out of nine correlations were statistically significant in this category.

Although the SPSS data indicated a statistically significant relationship, the practical aspects needed to be considered. The correlations for each descriptor, as indicated on the Hinkle et al. (1994) Table I (page 37) for the 'Rule of Thumb for Interpreting the Size of a Correlation Coefficient," indicated a "little, if any" practical significance, so the practical significant relationship was interpreted as a low one.

6. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the student teachers' self-reflection of performance and the student teachers' performance evaluation as viewed by their evaluation team for the communication category of the "Student Teaching Final Evaluation"? The communication section yielded correlations that were statistically significant for three of the six descriptors. SPSS data indicated that correlations for half of the descriptors were statistically significant and half were not statistically significant.

In looking at the category from a practical viewpoint, correlations for all of the descriptors listed the interpretation as "little, if any" on the Hinkle et al. (1994) Table I (page 37) for the "Rule of Thumb for Interpreting the Size of a Correlation Coefficient." The practical significance for this category was interpreted as a low relationship.

Conclusions

There were several findings that deserve attention. In spite of the lack of research on the selection process for cooperating teachers (Conner & Killmer, 1995), it would seem that preference for student teaching placements should be given to experienced teachers, not novice teachers. It takes time for an individual to develop his/her teaching style, and it may be difficult to be in the process of developing that style and to also be involved in the training of another person.

The training of the cooperating teachers in an evaluation team seems to be critical. In spite of the lack of research on the training process (Melnick, 1989) (Kilgore, 1979), the need was, nevertheless, indicated. The "Student Teaching Final Evaluation" instrument is a complex one, and some agreement on the use of the form would seem to be an important part of this evaluation process. Hamilton County teachers are trained on the instrument by their administrators. In addition, as an evaluation team member, they are trained on the document by the UTC Professors in Residence at each PDS II site. That training may need to include more details on the interpretations of the various descriptors. Videos, role plays, or other means of communication could provide additional assistance to the evaluation team. An evaluation of the training process should be conducted to determine whether the training goals are being met.

Again, this training should be evaluated to determine whether it is working. When 25% of the evaluation teams are rating the student teachers high in every area, it may be that they view the student teachers to be outstanding, or it may suggest a possible problem area.

Perhaps, the evaluation teams are unable to detect variability in the skills of the student teachers. In addition there may be some emotional issues attached to this instrument, because it is the instrument that is also used to evaluate classroom teachers in Tennessee. Perhaps, the evaluation team is influenced by that knowledge.

Melnick (1989) found this lack of variability in his research. With some additional training or a better kind of training, perhaps the forms would indicate more variability in interpreting events that occur. If the evaluation team is responsible for evaluating the student teacher, as it is at UTC, then that training would seem to be vital to the success of the program.

In the triad model, the university supervisor sees many student teachers and through training and experience, he/she becomes an expert on evaluating the student teachers. Most cooperating teachers or evaluation teams do not have the benefit of that type of additional training or the exposure to a large variety of student teachers that would enable them to evaluate the student teachers in comparison to others. This lack of professional training and experience points to the need for effective training and to the importance of building a core of evaluation team members to enhance the professionalism of the program. The UTC evaluation teams are used repeatedly (at least twice each year). It may be desirable to observe and evaluate the training of the evaluation teams.

UTC is also providing some training to cohort groups of student teachers on the use of the document. Another area of concern is the development of the relationship between the student teacher and his/her evaluation team. Some guidelines should be provided for that process. McNaly, et al., (1997) indicated that there is a wide range of encounters that

student teachers experience. Without making the process so structured as to interfere with the uniqueness of the relationship, there does seem to be a need for attention to the matching of the student teacher's needs and the evaluation team that can best meet those needs.

Ross (1989) talked about the development of reflective practice as being a progressive development. Because this evaluation instrument is used throughout the student's preparation and after the student is hired as a teacher, attention should be given to developing reflective skills. This document could become one way to assess that development. The research by Ross (1989) would also seem to add credibility to the need for using experienced teachers as members of the evaluation team.

The student teachers and their evaluation team meet together to examine the results of the "Student Teaching Final Evaluation." This process should provide an opportunity for the student teachers to obtain specific feedback on the various descriptors of the evaluation and could aid in their development as reflective practitioners. The student teachers would then be able to compare their perception of their performance with their evaluation team's perception of the student teachers' performance. Not only would this enrich the student teaching experience, but it would also provide a head start on the students' first year teaching evaluations.

Recommendations for Further Research

A replication of this study should be done with a few changes in the survey form. One of the concerns with the instrument was that it contained grid blocks next to areas without a descriptor, so it appeared that some respondents marked incorrectly as evidenced

by markings in those blocks. This may have slightly tainted the results of this study. In addition, the survey combines two separate concepts into one level. For example, in level one, the direction is given "student teacher has not yet developed or used this skill." The difference between not developed and not used is, or may be, quite wide, and may be two very different concepts. This level also contained the "not demonstrated" on a given skill. The student teacher may have developed, used, and/or demonstrated this skill, but it was not observed by the evaluation team. The survey may need another level to deal with this problem.

Additional research would be helpful to determine whether the correlations on the descriptors that were found to be statistically significant in this study were concepts that were stressed in the teacher training program at UTC. If so, then additional training in the other areas would be suggested to enable the students and evaluation team to show higher levels of statistical significance and practical significance.

Further research should be done, with this instrument, using trained university supervisors to validate the capability of the evaluation team to evaluate the student teacher. Additional training for the evaluation teams would seem to assist them in evaluating student teachers. According to the literature, it is uncertain what that training should involve (Yamashita (1990[as cited in Connor & Killmer, 1995]), however, it would seem reasonable to provide sessions that would include a careful look at the evaluation instrument with examples that would help the team to look for certain behaviors/attitudes in the student teaching process. Further research should be conducted following this type of training.

In addition, a follow-up study of this same group of student teachers three years later, with their administrators serving as their team evaluators, would seem to be a worthy research project. This kind of study would be one way of assessing whether self-reflection skills are developmental and may suggest that the two groups in this study are merely at different developmental stages in their journey towards reflective teaching.

Some experienced supervisors of student teachers perceive that student teachers rate themselves lower than others rate them. This would support the concept that "self-evaluation" is usually lower than "outside" evaluation.

Another possible explanation for the lack of stronger correlations may be that the range of the ordinal scale is too restricted and does not show the relationships that may actually exist. Another related explanation may be that the nonparametric tests that were used in this study do not lend themselves to this type of statistical evaluation. The tests that were used seem to be the best ones that are available, but nevertheless, they may not be adequate for this study.

It is hoped that this study will encourage others to continue to research the student teaching experience as well as the broader field of teacher education. This study then ends with the need for further research.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Bebb, A. M., & Monson, J.A. (1969). A new model for the supervision of student teaching. New York, New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 034 736)

Bibler, T., Tanner, M., & Black, S. (in press). The Vision: Establishment and Development of the PDS Program. In C. M. Gettys (Ed.), Collaboration on the teacher education scene: An academic year in the classroom. Chattanooga, TN. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. Pending)

Book, Cassandra L. (1996). Professional development schools. In J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 194 - 210). New York, NY: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

Boydell, Deanne. (1991). Issues in teaching practice supervision research: A review of the literature. In L. G. Katz, & J. D. Raths (Series Eds.) & L. G. Katz (Vol.Ed.), Advances in Teacher Education: Vol. 4. (pp. 137-154). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Bush, George W. (1999). The Bush Record on Education. [On-line]. Available: <http://www.georgewbush.com/issues/domestic/education/record.asp>

Cabello, B., Eckmier, J., Hooshang, B. (1995). The Comprehensive Teacher Institute: Successes and pitfalls of an innovative teacher preparation program. The Teacher Educator 31 (1) 43-55.

Champion, D. J. (1970). Basic statistics for social research. Scranton, PA: Chandler Publishing.

Colburn, Alan. (1993). Creating Professional Development Schools. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Connor, K & Killmer, N. (1995). Evaluation of cooperating teacher effectiveness . Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 394 950)

Evans, Hyacinth L. (1991). A framework for designing field experiences: A Jamaican Study. In L. G. Katz & J. D. Raths (Series Eds.) & L. G. Katz (Vol. Ed.), Advances in Teacher Education: Vol. 4 (pp. 155-172). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Galluzzo, G. R. (1987). Teacher education program evaluation: Organizing or agonizing. In L. G. Katz & J. D. Raths (Series Eds.) L. G. Katz & J. D. Raths (Vol. Eds.), Advances in Teacher Education: Vol. 2 (pp. 221-237). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Gettys, C. M., Baker, D. & Taylor, C. (in press). The Evaluation: A Connection to the Tennessee Framework for Teachers. In C. M. Gettys (Ed.), Collaboration on the teacher education scene: An academic year in the classroom. Chattanooga, TN. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. Pending)

Gore, Al. (1999). Gore 2000. [On-line]. Available: <http://www.algore2000.com/agenda/education>

Guyton, E. & McIntyre, D. J. (1990). Student teaching and school experiences. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), M. Haberman & J. Sikula (Assoc. Eds.), Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 514-534). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Hinkle, D. E., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (1994). Applied Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's Teachers. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.

Karmos, A. H. & Jacko, C. M. (1977). The role of significant others during the student teaching experience. Journal of Teacher Education, 28 (5), 51-55.

Katz, L., Raths, J., Mohanty, C., Kurachi, A., Irving, J. (1981). Follow-up studies: Are they worth the trouble? Journal of Teacher Education, 32 (2), 18-24.

Keller, D.L. & Grossman, J. A. (1994). A model for improving the pre-service teacher/cooperating teacher dyad. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 377 181)

Kilgore, A. M. (1979). Pilot project shows definite link between pre-, in-service education. Journal of Teacher Education, 30 (4), 10-12.

Koerner, M. E. (1992). The cooperating teacher: An ambivalent participant in student teaching. Journal of Teacher Education, 43 (1), 46-56.

Leslie, C. E. (1995). A descriptive and comparative study of the student teaching programs in the north central region. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 380 447)

Losee, S. (1993). Toward quality field experiences: The role of clinical faculty. Paper presented at the National Conference on Creating the Quality School, Oklahoma City, OK. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 364 498)

McNally, J., Cope, P., Inglis, B., Stronach, I. (1997). The student teacher in school: conditions for development. Teaching and Teacher Education, 13, 485-498.

Melnick, S. A. (1989). Cooperating teachers: What do they see in the classroom? San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 307 724)

Nagel, N., Driscoll, A, Grimala, G. (1991). Criteria and selection of cooperating teachers involved in alternative teacher education programs. New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 335 340)

Page, F. M., Page, J. A., Warkentin, R., Dickinson, T. (1994). Redefining student teaching supervision. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 372 040)

Pigge, F. L., Marso, R. N. (1997, March). Development of Attitude toward Teaching Career in a Longitudinal Sample of Teacher Candidates Progressing through Preparation and Five Years of Teaching. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Quick, B. & Dasovich, J. A. (1994). The role of the supervisor: Meeting the needs of early childhood preservice teachers. Nashville, TN. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 388 637)

Ross, D. D. (1989). Five steps in developing a reflective approach. Journal of Teacher Education, 39 (2), 22-30.

Schwebel, A., Schwebel, B. L., Schwebel, C. R., Schwebel, M. (1992). The Student Teacher's Handbook (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ.

Sprinthall, N. A., Reiman, A., & Thies-Sprinthall, L. (1996). Teacher Professional Development. In J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 666-699). New York, NY: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

Tennessee Department of Education. (1998). Goals 2000. [On-line]. Available: <http://www.state.tn.us/education/gls2000.htm>

Tennessee State Board of Education. (1995). Student, teacher, and school performance 1995. Tenth annual reported submitted to the Governor and the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee. Nashville, TN (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 385 002)

University of Tennessee at Chattanooga. (1999). Student Teaching Handbook. University of Tennessee at Chattanooga.

United States Department of Education. (1998). Improving teacher quality, recruitment, and preparation. [On-line]. Available: <http://www.ed.gov/offices/OPE/heatqp/tqp.sum.htm/>

Veal, M. L. & Rickard, L. (1998). Cooperating teachers perspectives on the student teaching triad. Journal of Teacher Education, 49 (2), 108-119.

Voelker, D. H., Orton, P. Z., Bobrow, J. (Series Ed.) (1993). Statistics. Lincoln, NE: Cliffs Notes Incorporated.

Walter, S. A. & Stivers, E. (1977). The relation of student teachers' classroom behavior and Ericksonian ego identity. Journal of Teacher Education, 28 (6), 47-50.

Watts, Doyle. (1987). Student teaching. In L. G. Katz & J. D. Raths (Series Eds.) M. Haberman & J. M. Backus, (Vol. Ed.), Advances in Teacher Education: Vol. 3 (pp. 151-167). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Weaver, D, & Stanulis, R.. (1996). Negotiating preparation and practice: Student teaching in the middle. Journal of Teacher Education, 47 (1), 27-36.

Williams, E. Anne. (1994). Roles and responsibilities in initial teacher training - student views. Educational Studies, 20 (2), 167-180.

Zahorik, J. A. (1988). The observing-conferencing role of university supervisors. Journal of Teacher Education, 38 (2), 9-16.

Zeichner, K. M. (1983). Alternative paradigms of teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 34 (3), 3-9.

Zeichner, K. & Liston, D. (1985). Varieties of discourse in supervisory conferences. Teaching and Teacher Education, (1), 155-174.

Zimpher, N. L. (1987). Current trends in research on university supervision of student teaching. In L. G. Katz & J. D. Raths (Series Eds.) & M. Haberman & J. M. Backus (Vol. Ed.), Advances in Teacher Education: Vol. 3 (pp. 118-150). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Zimpher, N. L., deVoss, G. G., Nott, D. L. (1980). A closer look at university student teacher supervision. Journal of Teacher Education, 31 (3), 11-15.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

MEMORANDUM

TO: Ms. Bonnie Peterson Eder
727 Tee Top Drive
Cohutta, GA 30710

Dean Rowell
404 Claxton Addition
Campus Mail

FROM: Ian Rocket

SUBJECT: Approval of Form A Review - Use of Human Subjects in Research

DATE: September 30, 1999

The Committee has reviewed your Form A and has approved it for Compliance with Human Subject Research Guidelines for the Project: "The Relationship Between the Student Teacher's Self-reflection and the Cooperating Teacher's Evaluations".

Attached is the signed permission form. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (423)974-4112.

c: Ms. Brenda Lawson

APPENDIX B
(Page 1 of Form)

The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
College of Education and Applied Professional Studies

Student Teaching Final Evaluation

STUDENT TEACHER (LAST, FIRST, MIDDLE)		SOCIAL SECURITY #	DATE
SCHOOL		CITY, STATE	
GRADE LEVEL(S)	SUBJECT(S)	UTC PROFESSOR-IN-RESIDENCE	

SUMMARY RECORDING: Mark the proficiency level from the Instructional Development Scale for each area listed. Level 1 or Level 2 should be selected if, according to the guidelines for using the Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth, the Area/Measurement Statement would be identified as an area to strengthen. Level 3 should be selected if the student's ability conforms to Rubric Level A and is not designated as an area to strengthen. Level 4 should be selected if the student's ability conforms to Rubric Level B. The descriptors below are drawn from the measurement statements found in the Framework but are slightly abbreviated. For the full statements, consult the Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth.

Level 1 = Student teacher has not yet developed or used this skill.
Level 2 = Student teacher is beginning to incorporate this skill in his/her instructional repertoire.
Level 3 = Student teacher uses this skill appropriately and competently.
Level 4 = Student teacher uses this skill consistently with a high degree of competence and confidence.

AREA	1	2	3	4
Planning				
1. Establishes long-term goals reflecting a student-centered curriculum.				
2. Establishes goals and objectives which address student needs at the appropriate level.				
3. Establishes goals and objectives which address the thinking process.				
4. Evaluates goal achievement/plans.				
5. Matches instruction to goals and objectives, strategies, assessments and student needs.				
6. Provides instruction integrating knowledge, skills, and methods from related subject areas.				
7. Provides instruction integrating materials, human resources, and technology.				
8. Understands and identifies different student approaches to learning and performance.				
9. Meets instructional needs of students from diverse cultures with different learning needs.				
Teaching Strategies				
1. Understands concepts, assumptions, and processes of inquiry central to discipline.				
2. Varies instructional role re content, purposes of instruction, and student needs.				
3. Uses multiple explanations of concepts, captures key ideas, links student understanding.				
4. Paces the lesson appropriately.				
5. Clarifies directions and explanations when students misunderstand.				
6. Engages students in active learning to promote critical thinking and problem-solving.				
7. Helps students assume responsibility for identifying and using varied learning resources.				
8. Provides practice activities which support the achievement of instructional goals.				
9. Engages students in generating knowledge.				
10. Links learning to students' prior knowledge, experiences, and cultural backgrounds.				
11. Elicits examples of student thinking that simulate reflection on own and others' ideas.				
12. Facilitates internalization of learning and development of employability skills.				
13. Organizes, prepares, monitors independent and group work allowing for full participation.				

APPENDIX B
(Page 2 of Form)

Student Teaching Final Evaluation

AREA	1	2	3	4
Assessment and Evaluation				
1. Uses assessment strategies and instruments appropriate to learning expectations.				
2. Uses information from a variety of sources to make instructional decisions.				
3. Interprets assessment data appropriately and uses it for diagnosis and instruction.				
4. Organizes and maintains useful records; communicates effectively with parents/students.				
5. Provides prompt and immediate feedback to students to move them to the next level.				
6. Uses a variety of assessment techniques to evaluate curriculum and instruction.				
7. Monitors and modifies teaching strategies in relation to student success.				
8. Uses student performance data to improve instruction.				
9. Assesses, analyzes, and communicates accurately the effectiveness of instruction.				
10. Evaluates student achievement and determines amount of progress.				
11. Evaluates student attitudes toward learning and determines amount of positive change.				
Learning Environment				
1. Uses strategies in which students work collaboratively, independently, and purposefully.				
2. Assists students in developing shared expectations for interactions and responsibilities.				
3. Establishes and maintains standards of mutually respectful interaction.				
4. Uses management techniques which foster self-control and self-discipline.				
5. Communicates and challenges students in a positive, purposeful manner.				
6. Organizes, allocates, and manages resources to engage students in productive learning.				
7. Maximizes the amount of class time spent in learning.				
8. Demonstrates flexibility and modifies procedures as situations demand.				
Professional Growth				
1. Demonstrates productive leadership or team membership skills.				
2. Participates in collegial activities to make the school a productive learning environment.				
3. Provides evidence of performance levels and articulates strengths and areas for growth.				
4. Articulates a professional development plan to improve performance and repertoire.				
5. Performs professional responsibilities efficiently:				
Maintains accurate and up-to-date records				
Completes assigned tasks on schedule.				
Maintains a satisfactory record of punctuality and attendance.				
Follows applicable policies and procedures.				
Maintains confidentiality and fulfills legal responsibilities.				
Communication				
1. Demonstrates an understanding of effective verbal and non-verbal communication.				
2. Models effective communication strategies in all interactions with students.				
3. Uses appropriate grammar and word choice for clear, concise exchange of information.				
4. Writes clearly and effectively:				
Uses correct grammar.				
Organizes information logically.				
Designs communication appropriate to the audience.				

APPENDIX C

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

Recommended Doctoral Committee Appointment

00 FEB 21 AM 11:30

[redacted]
(Social Security Number)

Bonnie B. Eder
(Name)

727 Tee Top Drive
(Address)

Cohutta GA 30710
(City) (State) (Zip)

Department Head (Approval) 2/18/2000 Date

The Graduate School (Approval) 2-22-00 Date

Committee Recommended: Type or print name and department. Signature indicates both acknowledgment of request and willingness to serve.

Name	Department	Signature
Dr. Glennon Rowell (Chairperson)	Education	
Dr. Mary Jane Connelly	Educ in Sci-Math-Res & Tech	
Dr. Lloyd Davis	Leadership Studies	
Dr. Cynthia Gettys	Teacher Prep Academy (UTC)	
Dr. Dan Quarles	Leadership Studies	
Dr. Mary Tanner		

Change in Previously Appointed Committee: Indicate above the recommended membership of the Committee. Signatures are needed for new members and those being removed.* A statement indicating the reason for the proposed change must be provided below by the department head.

Add to the Committee:

Dr. Mary Tanner	Education (UTC)	Mary Tanner

Remove from the Committee:

Dr. Mary Jane Connelly	Educ in Math-Sci-Res & Tech	Mary Jane Connelly

Reason for Changes:

To relieve the dissertation load for Dr. Connelly.

* Signatures are not required to remove persons whose UT faculty appointments have been terminated or who are absent from the campus for an extended period.

VITA

Bonnie Peterson Eder was born in Hutchinson, Minnesota, the youngest of eight children. She attended parochial schools through 12th grade. She graduated from the University of Wyoming in 1979 with a Bachelor of Science in Social Science and received her teacher's training from Jamestown College in Jamestown, North Dakota.

She began teaching in the Pierre (South Dakota) Public Schools in August, 1982. After a family move to Georgia in 1985, she taught for eight years in the Gordon County Public Schools. During that time, she completed a Master's degree in middle grades from Berry College, Mt. Berry, Georgia, and a Specialist degree in middle grades from West Georgia College in Carrollton, Georgia in 1993.

She entered the doctoral program at the University of Tennessee/Knoxville in the fall of 1997. The doctoral degree was received in August, 2000.

While enrolled in the doctoral program, she was teaching 7th grade at A. W. Spalding Elementary School in Collegedale, Tennessee, a position which she held for seven years. As of July 1, 2000, she was employed by the Texas Conference of Seventh-day Adventist as an Associate Educational Superintendent.