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CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

Pre-service educators, whether they are college supervisors or cooperating teachers in local schools, play an important role in helping student teachers cope with reality and evolve into effective teachers (Price, 1961; Seperson & Joyce, 1973; Kepler, 1979). In a study of the responsibilities of cooperating teachers, the most critical ones were perceived to be: (1) to promote the student teacher's role development, (2) to provide the student with personal support, and (3) to assist the student teacher with gaining professional skills (Karmos & Jacko, 1977).

Studies have been conducted of graduates of teacher education programs in various universities to determine the adequacy of preparation for the teaching profession. In one study conducted at Iowa State University, thirty-three areas of preparation were examined for adequacy and importance among ISU's teacher education graduates (Warren, Lagomarcino, Kemis, & Sweeney, 1987).

Some areas of concern stem from the relationship between student teachers and the cooperating teachers to whom they are assigned. In one study, lack of communication between the cooperating teacher and the student teacher was the most frequent problem encountered (Southall & King, 1979). When such problems are encountered, certain questions arise concerning not only the cause of the problem but also the way in which it should be resolved.

An important thing to consider is the ability of supervising teachers to cultivate mutually beneficial relationships between themselves and their student teachers while maintaining the profile of a supervisor. This means that they must have good inter-personal skills and adequate proficiency in supervision.
How are these skills acquired? What standards are required for practicing professionals to serve as cooperating or supervising teachers?

As late as 1984, only two of the fifty states required any certification for cooperating teachers (Thies-Sprinthall, 1984). Historically, a cooperating teacher has been one who had at least a few years of teaching experience and a willingness to serve in the role. Fortunately, teacher educators have begun to realize the significance of the supervising teacher in a mentoring role with the student teacher, and more qualifications are being required for the job.

How are the certification requirements for cooperating teachers being measured? Some universities are now requiring that prospective cooperating teachers receive specific supervision training before being approved to receive student teachers. Those who participate in the training are instructed and tested in various instructional models, planning skills, elements of clinical supervision, methods of recording observations, conference skills, and the writing of professional growth plans. Another approach to satisfying these requirements is the use of an assessment center.

An assessment center is not a place – it is a process in which individuals have an opportunity to participate in a series of situations which resemble what they might be called upon to do in the real world. They are put to the test in situational or simulated exercises, and then trained assessors process the information in a fair and impartial manner (Jaffe & Sefcik, 1980). The purposes of assessment centers are first to assess the abilities of employees on job-related tasks, and second, to provide career development of a constructive nature for the individual as well as for the organization (Niehoff, 1983).
Because of their success, assessment centers have proliferated in the private sector and spread into the public sector (Sweeney, 1980). Examples of successful utilization of assessment centers in education are those conducted in Iowa and Missouri under the auspices of their respective state education departments to determine the supervisory capabilities of both principals and superintendents. These are facsimiles of the centers developed by the National Association of Secondary School Principals and the American Association of School Administrators. If the assessment center approach can be used successfully to measure supervisory proficiencies for school administrators, why not for supervising teachers, since many of the same skills are necessary? According to Jaffee and Sefcik (1980), a strong positive correlation exists between assessment center ratings and future job performance.

**Statement of the Problem**

Some colleges of education require that teachers from cooperating school districts who will be supervising student teachers be given specific training in supervision prior to receiving student teachers. The College of Education at California Polytechnic State University (CPSU) has had a similar requirement for its prospective student teacher supervisors. This two-day training costs the college hundreds of dollars per teacher for stipends, workshop materials, and other expenses. In an effort to cut back on these costs the professors of education at CPSU were seeking an alternative to the training, and in 1987, contracted the School Improvement Model (SIM) team at Iowa State University to develop and test a training alternative.
It is likely that many potential supervising teachers may already have the necessary knowledge and supervision skills, which may have been acquired through in-service education programs in their school districts or as a result of participating in other professional training activities. It would then be valuable, considering the elements of time and money that may be saved, if an alternative to the supervisory training required by California Polytechnic State University were to be developed.

The problem for the current investigation was to develop and test an assessment center model for California Polytechnic State University to use as an alternative to its supervision workshops for certifying supervising teachers. The study would determine if groups of prospective supervising teachers differ in their knowledge of elements of instruction and supervision or their skills in observing and evaluating a teaching episode.

The problem may be more specifically defined by considering the following questions:

1. Is there a difference in knowledge of instructional supervision and evaluation skills between a group of teachers having taken specific training in supervision at California Polytechnic State University and those who acquired similar knowledge and skills through other means?

2. Are there differences in knowledge or supervision skills that may be associated with certain characteristics such as gender or the teaching levels of prospective supervising teachers?

3. Is an assessment center method a feasible way of determining the readiness of prospective supervising teachers in lieu of specific supervision training by the university?
Definitions of Terms

The following definitions of terms shall be used for the purposes of the present investigation:

Assessment center is a process that examines and evaluates the knowledge and skills of persons in order to help determine their potential ability and success in an area of service.

Cooperating teacher refers to a teacher representative from a school district who has responsibility for supervising and mentoring a student teacher. The term is used synonymously with supervising teacher for the purposes of the present investigation.

Dimension is a category or description under which specific, verifiable behaviors can be logically and reliably classified (Byham, 1980).

Instructional Plans and Materials Assessment Scale is an instrument developed in the School Improvement Model at Iowa State University to analyze and evaluate instructional plans and materials (Wicks, 1988).

In-service activities refers to professional development activities in which teachers participate for training or enrichment during their employment.

Jury of professionals is a group of educators who have received advanced training and acquired appreciable experience as practitioners in instructional supervision. It is the group whose ratings serve as standards for assessment for the purposes of the present investigation.

Presage variables include all the knowledge, attitudes, values and personal characteristics that teachers bring to an instructional setting (Dzyacky, 1987).

Process variables are observable classroom activities related to teacher performance and pupil learning experiences.
**Reliability** refers to the ability of an instrument or process to produce consistent results. More specifically, for the purposes of the present study, it means that a teacher's performance, as judged according to a specific criterion, is rated similarly by different assessors.

**Student teacher** is a college or university student who is in the process of completing the requirements of the teacher education curriculum by participating in a teaching internship in a school district.

**Summative Evaluation Report (SER)** is an instrument, developed by the School Improvement Model research team at Iowa State University, containing criteria and descriptors for evaluating teacher performance and used to record the ratings of the observer (Manatt & Stow, 1986).

**Supervising teacher** refers to a teacher from a school district who has responsibility for supervising and mentoring a student teacher. The term is used synonymously with cooperating teacher in this study.

**Supervisor assessment** is a multiple-choice examination containing items designed to assess general knowledge of instructional supervision.

**Treatment Group A** refers to the subjects who received specific training in instructional supervision through the Student Teacher Supervision Workshop at California Polytechnic State University.

**Treatment Group B** refers to the group of subjects, other than those specifically associated with California Polytechnic State University, who participated in the assessment center during the course of the present investigation.

**Validity** refers to the ability of an instrument or a process to actually measure what they are intended to measure.
Purpose of the Study

It is reasonable to assume that student teachers will be better served and more objectively evaluated if they are assigned to supervising teachers who have demonstrated their knowledge and skills in supervision and evaluation. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to:

1. Develop a feasible and reliable method for assessing the knowledge and competencies of prospective student teacher supervisors;

2. Generate a list of competencies for student teacher supervisors which can be observed and evaluated;

3. Develop materials, experiences, and instruments to measure the competencies for student teacher supervisors;

4. Determine if there is a significant difference in proficiencies of subjects having received training in supervision through local in-service programs and those having completed the Student Teacher Supervision Workshops at California Polytechnic State University.

Objectives of the Study

In order to accomplish the purposes of this study, it was necessary to:

1. obtain funding for the project;

2. identify the knowledge and competencies necessary for a person to serve as a supervising teacher for California Polytechnic State University;

3. develop the necessary components for an assessment center for student teacher supervisors;

4. create protocol materials for simulations and evaluations;
5. select subjects who have completed supervision training through California Polytechnic State University and those who have received training only through other in-service programs;

6. measure the effectiveness of supervision training attained at California Polytechnic State University versus similar types of training from other in-service programs; and

7. test the effectiveness of the assessment center components and procedures and refine them for subsequent use.

**Hypotheses to be Tested**

In order to fulfill the purposes of this study, the following hypotheses were developed and tested:

1. There is no significant difference in the knowledge of instructional supervision between teachers who have completed the Student Teacher Supervision Workshop at California Polytechnic State University and those who have been trained in other in-service programs.

2. There is no significant difference in teacher performance evaluation skills between teachers who have completed the Student Teacher Supervision Workshop at California Polytechnic State University and those who have been trained in other in-service programs.

3. There is no significant difference between males and females in the knowledge of instructional supervision and the evaluation of a teacher's performance.

4. There is no significant difference between elementary teachers and secondary teachers in the knowledge of instructional supervision and the evaluation of a teacher's performance.
Basic Assumptions

This study was based upon the following assumptions:

1. that subjects being assessed had at least minimal training in instructional supervision and evaluation;

2. that participants would evaluate a teacher's performance in a videotaped lesson the same as one actually observed in a classroom;

3. that participants would evaluate an unknown teacher depicted in a videotaped vignette the same as they would evaluate a student teacher in a real-life situation;

4. that protocol materials used in the simulations would be tested for reliability by a panel of professional instructional evaluators; and

5. that data provided by the various testing sites are accurate.

Delimitations

Only individuals who received supervision training during the 1988-1989 school year were used as subjects for this study.

A total of 97 subjects were included in the study. Forty-nine subjects formed Treatment Group A and were among a larger group who were participating in a two-day supervision workshop sponsored by California Polytechnic State University in December, 1988. Of the forty-eight subjects who formed Treatment Group B, sixteen were participating in a graduate class being conducted at Iowa State University during the spring of 1989, and were assessed in February of that year. The remaining thirty-two subjects in Treatment Group B were participants in a workshop conducted by Dr. Richard P. Manatt in North Carolina in February, 1989.
The same knowledge assessment instrument, in-basket activity, and video simulation exercise were administered to all subjects.

To obtain approval of the Human Subjects Research Committee to conduct this study, subjects were permitted to refrain from returning the materials if they chose not to participate in the study.
CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of literature presented in this chapter encompasses educational reform, the need for better qualified teachers for America's schools and the preparation of those teachers for professional service. A major part of the review includes studies about those who supervise student teachers at the school site, since they are the focus of the present investigation. Also included are related studies about assessment centers and their use in various settings for determining the capabilities and potential of prospective supervisors.

Many categories of information were reviewed, including broad-based articles in various professional journals, as well as writings with a more narrow focus from specific studies, such as dissertations and position papers. Among initial sources of information were library indexes, Educational Administration Abstracts, Dissertation Abstracts International, and other collections of educational research studies. Further sources were identified from citations in books and journals and from personal interviews with human resources.

Several limitations of the research procedures should be noted:

a. no systematic studies of sources outside of the United States were included;

b. some of the studies are from published sources, which tend to report only those with significant results; and

c. many other contributions have been made to the existing body of research, which may be related to but are not included in the present study.
Background

Student performance on standardized tests, as well as feedback from employers about the lack of basic skills of entry-level employees, suggest that changes are needed in America's educational systems. Many of the studies in education during the last several years generally have emphasized the need to reform American public education, and specifically to examine and improve the programs for professional preparation (Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, 1986; Darling-Hammond & Goodwin, 1993; Goodlad, 1990; The Holmes Group, 1986; Manatt, 1992a; Toch, 1993).

Daggett (1992), has said that Americans keep "recreating the schools of their youth" by redoing schedules, renaming but continuing old practices, and implementing other surface changes, but real educational reform should be implemented by changing the content, as well as the scope and sequence of the curriculum. Others assert that American education can best be improved by attracting the best, brightest, and most intellectually curious undergraduates into teaching, and by recruiting, employing, and keeping better teachers (Glickman, 1993; Manatt, 1992a; Tollefson & Kleinsasser, 1992).

Educational reform and restructuring

The literature reveals that efforts for school reform during the last decade came in two or three distinct waves (Boyd, 1992; Foster, 1992; Glickman, 1993; Manatt, 1993; Payzant, 1992). The first wave of reform in the early 1980's was focused on the pursuit of excellence, which was characterized by higher standards for students and the curriculum (Boyd, 1992; Manatt, 1993; McLaughlin, 1992). Embedded in the philosophy of the first wave were more graduation requirements, more subjects, more testing, and more attendance.
The second wave began after the release, in 1983, of *A Nation At Risk* by the National Commission on Excellence in Education, and emphasized a need for better teachers and better pay for better performance (Manatt, 1993). More rigorous teacher certification standards were introduced, and performance-based teacher evaluation programs were implemented across the country (Payzant, 1992). This caused much unhappiness among teachers and a great deal of concern among teacher organizations (Manatt, 1993). Another result of this second wave was that good teachers were rewarded by being chosen to be mentors for new teachers to help them become better teachers.

The third wave of reform is not only a change in methodology, but also it is a change in philosophy (Manatt, 1993). Called *restructuring*, the new wave attempts to address student differences, as well as higher expectations for teaching and learning for all students (Payzant, 1992). In restructuring, decision-making is more site-based than centralized. Restructuring looks at desired student outcomes determined by collaborative processes; it gives schools options as to how the outcomes will be achieved; and it provides for a variety of accountability measures (Manatt, 1993).

Foster (1992) asserted that restructuring affects the schooling process in four fundamental ways: 1) the school principal is perceived more as a facilitator than as a manager or director; 2) the role of the teacher is changed; 3) parents and community are more actively involved in the schooling process; and 4) the central office assumes the role of an agency designed to give aid to individual efforts rather than to control them.
Need for improved teachers

School reform and restructuring calls for changes and improvements in the teaching role. Teacher empowerment is a hot topic in current literature about school restructuring. Teachers are taking on, or at least sharing, a variety of responsibilities, which are new to them. Included among these are making decisions about curriculum, governance, planning, accountability, management, and other responsibilities traditionally left to administrators (Darling-Hammond & Wise, 1992; Foster, 1992; Payzant, 1992). Goodlad (1990) set forth four broad expectations for teachers, including: 1) understanding the roots of citizenship and owning a foundation of knowledge about government and its expectations for citizens; 2) being well and liberally educated; 3) having pedagogical knowledge and skills; and 4) understanding the common-places of schooling and being able to participate in educational decision making.

Any profession requires continuous learning and honing of skills, and teaching is certainly no different. At the current rate, the amount of available knowledge doubles about every thirty months, and as technology continues to improve, that time frame will only decrease (Daggett, 1992). It is not possible for anyone to keep up with the volume of information that emerges at those rates, thus teachers must become better decision makers with regard to the curriculum and how it is to be delivered. Instead of relying on adopted texts and personal knowledge as the primary sources of information, teachers must become the facilitators of learning for their students. The important things to teach now include methods for finding and using information, skills for using modern technologies, and techniques for higher order thinking and problem solving. This demands that teachers not only improve some of their current
knowledge and teaching techniques, but they must also learn and implement new skills and strategies in teaching their students.

**Teacher shortages**

The shortage of qualified, effective teachers has become apparent in recent years. Estimates place the total demand for new teachers at about 2.5 million between 1990 and the year 2000 (National Center for Educational Statistics, 1991). By 1985, the annual supply of newly trained teachers had dwindled to under 100,000 — less than half the number who graduated in the early 1970's (Darling-Hammond, 1988). About a third of the nation's teaching force is expected to retire during the 1990s, and at the current graduation rate, colleges of education will provide only about two-thirds of the number needed to replace them (Darling-Hammond & Goodwin, 1993).

**Teacher professionalism**

The teacher shortage is a concern that presses hard upon the standards for professionalism. Forty-six states maintain emergency licensure procedures, and twenty-three states have adopted alternative certification provisions to ensure an adequate supply of teachers (Darling-Hammond & Wise, 1992). Darling-Hammond & Goodwin (1993) suggest that teaching remains the only licensed occupation — including many not considered to be professions, such as cosmetology or plumbing — in which licensing standards are routinely waived to fill employment vacancies. The researchers further assert:

> Licensing and certification standards for teachers must become both educationally meaningful and inviolable, and they must be defined and enforced by the profession itself. (p. 47)
The Holmes Group (1986) stated that the hallmark of a profession is its responsibility for the quality and competence of its members. According to Wise (1990), the existence of emergency, temporary, and alternate licensing prevents the development of strong teacher education programs and hampers development of a "profession" of teaching. Darling-Hammond and Goodwin (1993) suggested that progress toward professionalism can be recognized by 1) the requirements for training and entry into an occupation, 2) the nature of the work and structure of the job, 3) the authority relationships which govern the work, and 4) the bases for accountability. The recommendation of the Holmes Group, that untrained and non-licensed personnel be hired only as instructors who practice under the supervision of certified teachers, is a positive stroke for the professionalization of teaching (Holmes Group, 1986).

**The Student Teaching Experience**

There is a general consensus among teacher educators, teachers, pre-service teachers, and critics that learning to teach must be at least partially accomplished through practice teaching (Cruickshank & Armaline, 1986; K. Peterson, 1988). The student teaching experience, which includes a complex set of interactions among program features, settings, and people (Zeichner, 1986), has a profound influence in determining the kind of teacher the student becomes (Spears, 1989; Thies-Sprinthall, 1984).

Students' grades in pre-service teacher education courses do not predict chances for employment, job satisfaction, or longevity (Villeme & Hall, 1980). Moran (1990) asserted that beginning teachers are unprepared for the degree of expertise expected of them when they sign their first contracts.
On the other hand, those entering into the teaching profession today are, in many ways, much better prepared than were their predecessors, because of the application of educational research to teacher training courses. Among other elements in their teacher education programs, students are educated in curriculum, models of instruction, lesson planning, evaluation of student progress, and classroom management (Edwards, 1993; Knicker 1987b; Palmer, 1987).

Moran (1990) related these perceptions of teacher pre-service preparation:

Pre-service education, even at its most intense and pragmatic, can only begin the process of scientific discovery and artistic creativity that is teaching ... The most effective pre-service preparation stimulates more questions than it answers and erodes the simplistic educational philosophies with which most student teachers gird themselves. (p. 211)

Goodlad (1990) has suggested that the necessary conditions for vigorous, coherent, self-renewing programs of teacher preparation are not yet in place. This can be accomplished, however, by linking teacher education internships, student teaching, classes, and seminars with schools that are striving to be truly exemplary (Glickman, 1993). Groups of political, corporate, and educational leaders have proposed the establishment of networks of "clinical" or "professional development" schools, analogous to teaching hospitals in the medical profession, to train public school teachers (Darling-Hammond & Goodwin, 1993; Manatt, 1992a; Goodlad, 1990; Wise, 1990).

Cooperating Teachers

Many studies examining the supervision of student teaching have been published during the past three decades and have been reported in other
summary works (Kagan, 1988; Lanier & Little, 1986; Tabachnick & Zeichner, 1984; Thies-Sprinthall, 1984). The selection of quality cooperating teachers is a task faced every semester by colleges of education. It is a task that has become more difficult, in light of today's expectations for cooperating teachers to serve not only as supervisors, but also to serve as mentors. It has also become more imperative that colleges employ cooperating teachers who have the knowledge base and necessary skills to fulfill these expectations.

Influence of cooperating teachers

Student teachers view their cooperating teachers as the ones having the most significant influence on their student teaching experience (Karmos and Jacko, 1977; Price, 1961). The literature reveals that cooperating teachers not only have a great influence upon the student teachers under their supervision, but also it suggests that the cooperating teacher is actually the key variable as to whether or not the student teacher has a successful experience (Blair, David, & Bacharach, 1984; Brodbelt, 1980; Kepler, 1979). Other studies have indicated that the attitudes of student teachers tend to merge toward those of their cooperating teacher as the semester progresses, and their skill development is also influenced greatly by the practices of the cooperating teacher (Hattie, Olphert, & Cole, 1982; Price, 1961; Seperson & Joyce, 1973).

It has recently been reported that cooperating teachers also exert greater influence on the attitudes and classroom behaviors of beginning teachers than do university supervisors (Tollefson & Kleinsasser, 1992). Goodlad (1990) noted that when student teachers were confronted by the significant differences between, for example, methods of teaching reading learned in their campus
based classes and the methods formally specified by the district, and modeled by the cooperating teacher, to which they had been assigned, they opted for the latter. Over seventy per cent of the student teachers surveyed in an earlier study felt their cooperating teachers were of greater help than their college supervisors, because they were accessible for observation and discussion (Yates, 1981).

However, not all of the influences of the cooperating teachers have been regarded as positive. Two decades ago, Yee (1969) reported that few stable relationships existed, in terms of attitudes, between student teachers and their cooperating teachers, and most of the attitude shifts were negative in nature. Farley (1973) found differences of opinion between cooperating teachers and student teachers on the importance of instructional time, discipline policies, and educational innovations, as well as the specific duties of the student teacher. Brodbelt (1980) reported that more than twenty per cent of all unsuccessful student teaching experiences was due to the role played by the supervising (cooperating) teacher.

Even with as much impact as the cooperating teachers have upon their student teachers, sometimes their influence is not recognized by the university supervisor. Goodlad (1990) found a lack of collaboration between university and school-based supervisors of student teachers:

In only a few settings in our sample were supervisors from the university and cooperating teachers in the schools brought together somewhat regularly and systematically to plan the total teacher education curriculum. And when this was done, the cooperating teachers served only in an advisory capacity; they had no vote. (p. 190)
A recommendation that often follows research of how cooperating teachers affect student teachers is that care should be exercised in the placement of students with supervisors (Hattie, Olphert, & Cole, 1982).

Criteria for selection

According to Shaver (1989), the cooperating teachers who supervise future teachers should meet a uniform basic level of attainment, but there appears to be no uniformity among the requirements for them. Haberman and Harris (1982) surveyed the states for requirements for cooperating teachers and found that twenty-four of the fifty states reported that they have no legal requirements for serving as a cooperating teacher. Of the remaining twenty-six states, two require only that a teacher be certified. Sixteen states require that the teacher have some experience. Three states require the teacher to have a masters degree. And only nine states required that a program or course related to the supervision of students must be completed prior to serving as a cooperating teacher. Among the states surveyed by Haberman and Harris, West Virginia had the most extensive requirements for cooperating teachers including five years of experience, a master's degree with nineteen hours within or beyond the degree to include courses on the principles supervision and the supervision of student teachers, fifteen hours in the area of specialization, and finally, the recommendation of a district official.

Only two states required actual certification for cooperating teachers in the early 1980's (Thies-Sprinthall, 1984). It was reported, however, that several states during that period were in the process of certifying cooperating teachers
on the basis of years of service, advanced degrees, or completion of a supervision course (Blair, David, & Bacharach, 1984).

In another national survey of state requirements for cooperating teachers conducted later in the 1980's, it was reported that twenty-six states had a requisite of teacher certification; only four states required a course specifically designed for cooperating teachers; four states required training and evaluation of cooperating teacher in "state" programs; one state required supervision training, with no specifications regarding student teachers; one state required endorsement in supervision of student teaching; one state moved from state licensure to NCATE standards enforced by the individual universities; two states required a graduate degree; and approximately one-fifth of the states cited changes in cooperating teacher requirements during the five years prior to the survey (Zerr, 1987).

Cruickshank and Armaline (1986) suggested one very specific criteria for the selection of cooperating teachers:

Field-based teacher educators should be selected for no other reason than that they are masterful teachers themselves and/or because they have aptitude to foster the development of students of teaching. Their most desirable quality should be the ability to raise pre-service teachers' level of cognition about teaching and learning. (p. 38)

Selection process for cooperating teachers

For decades, the identification and selection of cooperating teachers has been one of the most crucial problems in the student teaching program. Brodbelt (1980) regarded the process of selecting the supervising (cooperating) teacher as one of the most neglected aspects of the student teaching program, and stated that too often, college and university training programs readily
accepted any teacher as a supervisor. Goodlad (1990) found the selection of cooperating teachers often to be solely in the hands of school principals, though sometimes final approval required the action of a district administrator. Proximity and availability, more than recognized teaching competence, were frequently the criteria governing the selection of cooperating teachers.

Goodlad (1990) also reported on the seriousness of the cooperating teacher dilemma in his landmark Study of the Education of Educators:

Clearly, the most important clinical component of most of the programs we studied suffered seriously from a shortage of well-qualified cooperating teachers, from casual placements made according to questionable criteria, from some benign neglect, and from a lack of connection to foundational studies. (p. 190)

Responding to Goodlad, Wise (1990) commented on the standards relating to the teacher education faculty:

Standards of faculty members expect [assume] that those who teach professional education courses, including teachers who supervise student teachers and provide support for them, are qualified for those roles. (p. 200)

Roles and responsibilities

The literature reflects a variety of roles and responsibilities for cooperating teachers. These responsibilities include being a supervisor, an assessor of teaching performance, and a mentor.

The cooperating teacher as a supervisor assumes the responsibility of guiding the growth of a student teacher and seeing that there is successful development throughout the semester. However, the process of supervision itself, although designed to promote growth, may produce the opposite effect (Thies-Sprinthall, 1980). Mosher and Purpel (1972) called supervision a
"reluctant profession" because of earlier researchers' findings that student teachers generally became more authoritarian, less flexible, less responsive to students, and more rigid in their classroom behavior during their student teaching experiences. The teacher who can accommodate progressive educational ideas and balance those with traditional educational ideas is seen as the most effective supervising teacher (Loadman & Mahan, 1987).

The role of the cooperating teacher, as one who assesses the teaching performance of the student teacher, is similar to the role of a principal who assesses the performance of a professional teacher. Usually following some version of a clinical supervision model (Acheson & Gall, 1980; Cogan, 1973; Goldhammer, Anderson, & Krajewski, 1980), the cooperating teacher typically observes, analyzes, and conducts follow-up conferences with the student teacher during the semester, and ultimately recommends a summary grade to the student's college or university supervisor.

The grade recommended by the cooperating teacher is often based upon a combination of factors, which may or may not be related to actual teaching performance (Hattie, Olphert, & Cole, 1982; McIntyre & Killian, 1987; Phelps, Schmitz, & Boatright, 1986; Tollefson & Kleinsasser, 1992; Wheeler & Knoop, 1982). Much of the "data" serving as the basis for the student teacher's rating are collected in an informal manner and lack specificity, making the final assessment of the student teacher's capability potentially open to subjective judgment, personal bias, and a high degree of influence (Allison, 1978; Melnick, 1989; Phelps, Schmitz, & Boatright, 1986). Some of the studies note differences existing in the assessment of student teachers between teaching levels, with elementary teachers rating student teachers more leniently than
their secondary counterparts (Hattie, Olphert, & Cole, 1982; Phelps, Schmitz, & Boatright, 1986). Commenting on the importance of their role as evaluators, Hattie, Olphert, and Cole (1982) stated:

Cooperating teachers are expected to help, guide, and eventually evaluate the student teacher, and these evaluations are often influential in deciding the student's immediate future. (p. 778)

The role of the cooperating teacher has also changed during the past several years from that of being an overseer and evaluator to one of being a mentor (Zelazik & Garten, 1990). Considering the aforementioned influence that cooperating teachers have upon the student teachers assigned to them, the mentoring role they play is conceivably the most important. Zelazik and Garten (1990) commented on the need for cooperating teachers to have mentoring skills:

... the supervising teacher needs to have a working knowledge base as to what it means to be a mentor, what skills are required in the mentoring process, and how to actualize mentoring behavior during the relationship with a student teacher. (p. 7)

Karmos and Jacko (1977) reported that the cooperating teacher's most critical functions were perceived to be: 1) to promote the student teacher's role development, 2) to provide the student teacher with personal support, and 3) to assist the student teacher with gaining professional skills. These functions are also consistently listed among in the literature as traditional roles for mentors (Gray & Gray, 1985; Odell, 1990; Zelazik & Garten, 1990). Moran (1990) equated the student teacher's view of the mentor to that of a student to the classroom teacher — as a model, an inspiration, and guide, and sometimes, as the direct source of a skill or an understanding.
Stipends for cooperating teachers

Unfortunately, the stipends that cooperating teachers are usually paid are not commensurate with the roles they are expected to fulfill. In California, for example, the student teaching experience is divided into two quarters. The first quarter is a half-time field experience and half-time classroom training for the student teacher. The cooperating teacher is paid one hundred dollars for supervision during this period. During the second quarter, when the student teacher participates in a full-time field experience, the cooperating teacher is paid two hundred dollars (Palmer, 1993).

In Missouri, it is a common practice for colleges and universities to provide certain benefits for those serving as cooperating teachers during a student's junior experience, in which the student is in the classroom for only one hour per day. These "perks" might include fee waivers for a course at the college, library privileges, and free admission to campus events. During the student's senior experience, a full-time student teaching semester, the cooperating teacher is typically paid one hundred dollars, and in school districts where career ladder programs exist, cooperating teachers may earn points in addition to their stipend (Edwards, 1993).

Training for cooperating teachers

The first yearbook of the Association for Student Teachers to give detailed attention to the in-service education of supervising teachers appeared in 1954, and therein was indicated a need for both formal and informal preparation of supervising teachers for their new responsibilities (Shaver, 1989). The need for specific training for professionals serving as supervisors is indicated by recent
studies on teacher education (Daniels, 1989; Gray & Gray, 1985; McIntyre & Killian, 1987; Melnick, 1989; Phelps, Schmitz, & Boatright, 1986; Thies-Sprinthall, 1987). Although most of these recent citations address the concept of supervision training for administrators who supervise practicing teachers, the nature of supervision remains the same for those who supervise student teachers, thus the research is applicable for them as well.

Some believe that mentoring under experienced teachers is sufficient preparation by itself for the preparation of teaching professionals. Goodlad (1990) refuted the notion:

...they have overlooked the research on prevailing school and classroom procedures and have ignored the tyrannical control that these ingrained procedures exercise over novice teachers, who lack both the intellectual tools for critiquing them and an adequate awareness of better alternatives. (p. 190)

Melnick (1989) asserted that if student teachers are to improve significantly during the student teaching experience, it is essential to provide appropriate training for cooperating teachers. McIntyre and Killian (1987) recommended that training programs for cooperating teachers be developed and included as integral components of teacher education programs.

Daniels (1989) very succinctly stated the need for a certain level of expertise in specific skills among teacher supervisors:

If the effectiveness of teachers is to be improved, it is important for those who supervise teachers to be able to identify teacher behaviors which are related to improved student outcomes. (p. 1)
Training in supervision and assessment

Appropriate training is necessary if cooperating teachers are to be effective in their roles as supervisors. Problems which deter effective instructional supervision, and which generate unnecessary apprehensions that usually accompany the process, include a lack of proper training in observation and supervisory techniques (Johnston & Holt, 1983).

It was mentioned earlier that cooperating teachers may use some form of clinical supervision in their assessment of student teachers, but they may have received little, if any, training in the clinical supervision process. The ratings of student teachers based on cooperating teachers’ use of this process then becomes questionable. Good and Mulryan (1989) stated that ratings must be perceived as descriptive, evaluative information that can be used to examine instruction. The validity of Likert-type rating instruments used frequently by supervising teachers in assessing the performance of student teachers is highly suspect without appropriate training (Phelps, Schmitz, & Boatright, 1986).

Medley, Coker, & Soar (1984) discussed the inadequacy of teacher evaluation methods existing before and during the 1980’s which utilized paper-and-pencil teacher knowledge tests, or student achievement test scores, or observations of teacher performance without making clear distinctions between competence, effectiveness, and performance. Blackborn (1986) placed a great deal of importance on classroom observation:

While the ... supervisor may use a variety of supervisory skills in attempting to facilitate instructional improvement, probably none can yield the kind of information gained through direct classroom observation. (p. 4)
Blackborn (1986) also asserted that using exemplary observation procedures can alleviate negative perceptions about classroom observation and can aid supervisory efforts. Several observations in a variety of situations are needed before an accurate assessment of teachers' skills can be determined (Stodolsky, 1984).

Medley and Coker (1987) wrote of principals' failure to properly observe and evaluate teacher performance, and reported that the correlations between the average principal's ratings of teacher performance and teacher effectiveness were near zero. Greabell and Anderson (1988) reported that both beginning and experienced teachers received higher scores on their evaluations when teaching simple lessons as compared to the scores they received when they taught complex lessons. These studies point out the unreliability of older forms of teacher evaluation practices.

However, research conducted in the School Improvement Model (SIM) at Iowa State University indicates that, with appropriate training, principals and other supervisors can be more effective in their roles as evaluators. Evaluators became more effective when they were taught specific components of clinical supervision and were trained in teacher performance evaluation procedures (Faast, 1982; Manatt, 1983). Some studies have indicated that without the proper training, the possibility of rater bias exists among teacher evaluators (D. Peterson, 1988; Newsum, 1990). Manatt and Daniels (1990) reported that when appropriate instruments and methods are utilized, and when extensive training is given, principals are good judges of teacher performance.

Good teacher evaluation also depends upon good criteria. Redfem (1980) asserted that an understanding of what is expected of one is a prerequisite to
the formulation of performance objectives, and that criteria are the yardsticks against which are measured the extent to which the objectives are achieved. Manatt, Palmer, and Hidlebaugh (1976), found ninety-four valid, reliable, and discriminating teacher performance criteria. The researchers reported thirty of the items to be representative of the pool of ninety-four, and that the thirty items were adequate to discriminate between teachers of high, medium, and low performance. It is reasonable that the preparation of supervisors for their role as evaluators should include training in the application of these criteria.

If cooperating teachers are required to assess student teacher performance in much the same way that principals or other supervisors assess professional teachers, then the research and training pertaining to principals and other supervisors should be applicable to cooperating teachers in their role as supervisors.

Significant among the accomplishments of the School Improvement Model was the development of several video-based instructional modules from actual teaching episodes (Manatt & Stow, 1988). The SIM team utilized these modules to simulate classroom situations in training nationwide. The research-based evaluator training and the video-based instruction modules developed by SIM became the model for the components of the assessment center developed for the present investigation.

Assessment Centers

There is ample literature detailing the use of the assessment center in determining the potential success of those entering supervisory and management positions (Bray & Grant, 1966; Byham, 1986; Deluzain & Cohen, 1976;
Definition and purpose

Various terms and phrases are used to describe or define an assessment center (Byham, 1986; Milstein & Fiedler, 1989; Shulman, 1987; Wendel, 1986), but the defining term used most is *process* (Deluzain & Cohen, 1976; Hersey, 1986; Jaffe & Sefcik, 1980; Olshfski & Cunningham, 1986; Sweeney, 1980).

Regardless of the terms used to define it, the purposes of an assessment center are consistent. It is a process in which individuals have an opportunity to participate in a series of situations or simulations which resemble what they might be called upon to do in real-life situations (Jaffe & Sefcik, 1980), and it is used to identify job-related behavior proficiencies (Milstein & Fiedler, 1989; Neihoff, 1983; Wendel, 1986). According to Deluzain and Cohen (1976), the assessment center is designed to increase objectivity and add relevancy to manpower planning and selection. Byham (1986) describes the assessment center as a diagnostic tool:

... it separates an individual's abilities into specific dimensions and then examines specific examples of good and poor behavior within each dimension. This helps determine more precisely what training and development activities are required. (p. 43)

Background and early applications

The basic assessment center model grew out of efforts made by German psychologists to establish a systematic way of identifying potential officers during World War I, and the model was later used by English psychologists to
select candidates for promotion in the British Civil Service System (Deluzain & Cohen, 1976; Milstein & Fiedler, 1989). The first large-scale use in America came about during the 1950's in American Telephone & Telegraph company's Management Program Study, which was a landmark longitudinal study of the career progress of young managers in six telephone companies (Bray & Grant, 1966). The MPS is considered to be the foremost study in the predictive validity of assessment centers (Gomez & Stephenson, 1987). The assessment center process has now been adopted for use by hundreds of companies and agencies including the Internal Revenue Service, J. C. Penney, Sears, General Electric, U. S. Department of Agriculture, American Airlines, Prudential Insurance, Standard Oil, and Xerox Corporation (Byham, 1970; Sweeney, 1980).

Components and procedures

The assessment center is developed through a series of procedures that establish the validity and reliability of the exercises embedded in the process. At least three essential elements of the assessment center process have been identified: 1) job-related behavioral dimensions, 2) exercises to elicit behaviors, and 3) trained assessors (Kelly, 1986; Olshfski & Cunningham, 1986; Wendel & Uerling, 1989).

According to Niehoff (1983), for a center to be considered an assessment center, the following minimal requirements must be met:

1. Multiple assessment techniques must be used.
2. Multiple assessors must be used.
3. Judgments must be based on data collected.
4. An overall evaluation of behavior must be made by the assessors at a time separate from the observation.
5. Simulations should be used. These exercises are developed to tap a variety of predetermined behaviors and have tested prior to use to ensure that techniques provide reliable, objective, and relevant behavioral information.

6. The dimensions, attributes, characteristics, or qualities evaluated by the assessment center are determined by an analysis of relevant job behaviors.

7. The techniques used in the assessment center are designed to provide information used in evaluating the dimensions, attributes, or qualities previously determined. (pp. 354-355)

The first step in the development procedure is to specify the objectives or behavioral dimensions to be assessed (Byham, 1980; Deluzain & Cohen, 1976; Milstein & Fiedler, 1989; Niehoff, 1983; Quick, Fisher, Schkade, & Ayers, 1980; Sweeney, 1980). In order to do this adequately, input is needed from several sources. For example, when developing the assessment center for American Airlines, input was received from American Airlines management and training personnel, job analyses, existing literature on assessment centers, and behavioral science professionals (Quick, Fisher, Schkade, & Ayers, 1980). The Panhandle Area Educational Cooperative in Florida received input from professional literature, school superintendents, school board members, principals, and teachers in establishing the dimensions for its principals' assessment center (Deluzain & Cohen, 1976). The assessment center is then a reflection of the degree to which the participants already exhibit the desired behaviors and skills set forth in the dimensions or objectives.

Next in the development procedures is to select the components for the assessment center process. The designated exercises must represent the types, complexities, and difficulty level of activities that are actually required
on the job (Byham, 1980) and that are relevant to the established dimensions (Deluzain & Cohen, 1976). Included among the components may be knowledge tests, interviews, management exercises, discussions, writing assignments, and simulations, that are designed to highlight the presence or absence of certain behaviors that have been determined to be necessary or desirable (Cooper, Benz, & Thompson, 1988; Deluzain & Cohen, 1976; Hersey, 1977; Moses, 1977b; Quick, Fisher, Schkade, & Ayers, 1980).

Some assessment center components are more desirable than others in terms of validity, objectivity, and efficiency. Knowledge tests, for example, are more cost-efficient and objective than are some other components, but the validity of these paper-and-pencil type tests has been questioned (Bray & Grant, 1966; Byham, 1986). Haertel (1987) asserted that the difficulty of establishing appropriate and defensible performance standards on paper-and-pencil tests is among the weaknesses of this form of assessment. Byham (1986), indicated that a complicated criterion-related validity study must be done to establish the appropriateness of paper-and-pencil tests.

Some studies, however, indicate that paper-and-pencil knowledge tests have a legitimate place in the assessment center (Bray & Grant, 1966; Cooper, Benz, & Thompson, 1988). Data from research on assessment centers show that the combination of knowledge data and behavioral observations provides a significantly better means of evaluating people than either method used alone (Thornton & Byham, 1982). In one study of the use of the assessment center in the measurement of potential for business management, Bray and Grant (1966) reported that situational methods were most predictive of success, followed by paper-and-pencil ability tests, and last were personality questionnaires.
Most organizations having adopted the assessment center methodology followed AT&T's lead, concentrating on behavioral exercises or simulations rather than paper-and-pencil tests (Byham, 1986; Milstein & Fiedler, 1989; Moses, 1977b). Drath and Kaplan (1986) explained the effect of behavioral simulations:

Realistic behavioral simulations recreate the experience of daily in organizations. Participants become powerfully drawn into their roles and the larger organizational environment. Within half an hour after the simulation begins, participants almost always lose themselves in their roles, and tend to behave or respond naturally, thereby producing a representation and reasonably accurate sample of how they normally perform. (p. 48)

Jaffe & Sefcik (1980) commented about what makes a good situational or simulation exercise:

The more the test situation reflects the job demands and calls for the exhibition of skills that will be required on the job, the better the ability of the tests to predict later job behavior. (p. 41)

Much of the literature on assessment centers emphasizes the need for appropriately trained assessors (Burleson, 1986; Deluzain & Cohen, 1976; Gomez & Stephenson, 1987; Hersey, 1986; Lemley, 1986; Milstein & Fiedler, 1989; Sweeney, 1980). Of the requirements for assessors, field experience is usually listed at the top (Deluzain & Cohen, 1976; Lemley, 1986; Milstein & Fiedler, 1989). Participation in the assessment experience itself may be part of the training program for the assessors (Lemley, 1986; Sweeney, 1980). Next, building upon their experience and participation in the center, assessors are trained in the use and scoring of assessment exercises, behavioral observation techniques, data capturing methods, interviewing techniques, and the writing
of evaluation summaries. Finally the trainees participate in guided practice with seasoned assessors (Bray & Grant, 1966; Deluzain & Cohen, 1976; Lemley, 1986; Quick, Fisher, Schkade, & Ayers, 1980). The training of the assessors supports the overall assessment center design.

Applications in education

The development and implementation of an assessment center model in the field of education came about in 1975, through the cooperative efforts of the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) and the American Psychological Association (APA). The purpose of this pilot project was to demonstrate another approach to selecting potentially successful school administrators. Greater concern for defining the roles and responsibilities for principals and other administrators became an important educational spin-off (Hersey, 1977). The NASSP Assessment Center Project has seen tremendous growth since its inception, with more than fifty NASSP sanctioned centers in operation in 1989, and it represents the most extensive use of the assessment center in public education to date (Burleson, 1986; Gomez & Stephenson, 1987; Milstein & Fiedler, 1989).

The assessment center process has been applied in projects in several states to assess basic pedagogical knowledge and teaching skills (Cooper, Benz, & Thompson, 1988; Olson, 1987). Some assessment center components are being utilized in undergraduate teacher education programs for training in teaching methods, such as the video-based simulations used in Iowa State University's Teacher Assessment Modules (TAMs) (Volker, Gehler, Howlett, & Twetten, 1986). Other institutions of higher education, such as Colorado
State University, Loyola University, The University of Utah, and Western Michigan University are following in the footsteps of Alverno College (Wisconsin), the forerunner in applying assessment center methods to program development for its students (Milstein & Fiedler, 1989).

Professor Lee Shulman and his colleagues from Stanford University, sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation, used the assessment center method in the *Teacher Assessment Project*, a study of teaching practices of elementary and high school teachers (Haertel, 1987; Olson, 1988; Shulman, 1987). It was particularly interesting, for the purposes of the present investigation, to note that this project made extensive use of video-based simulations. According to Shulman (1987), structured teacher performance assessments, based upon the assessment center model, are being developed primarily to assist the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, but there may be other applications for education such as teacher licensure, career ladder, merit pay, and mentor teacher programs.

**Validity and fairness**

There is an abundance of information which attests to the validity of the assessment center. In the Management Progress Study (MPS) of 355 young managers who participated in AT&T's assessment center process, Bray and Grant (1966) found that the relationships between assessor judgments and subsequent progress in management indicated that the assessors' predictions were very accurate. The MPS is considered to be the foremost study in the predictive validity of assessment centers (Gomez & Stephenson, 1987). In a longitudinal study of 254 managers who attended an assessment center,
Mitchell (1975) found a general increasing trend in validity coefficients over time. Thornton and Byham (1982) reviewed 29 studies of the validity of assessment center methods and found more support for the assessment center than for other selection methods. Over 50 research studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of the assessment center technique in a variety of environments including schools, universities, and businesses (Huck, 1973; Moses, 1977b; Gomez & Stephenson, 1987).

A formal three-year validation study of NASSP's Assessment Center Project was completed in 1981 by a team from Michigan State University (Schmitt, Noe, Meritt, Fitzgerald, & Jorgenson, 1983). The team found the assessment center to be a content valid procedure for the selection of school administrators, and evidence concerning the assessment center's predictive validity was also found to be positive (Hersey, 1986; Milstein & Fiedler, 1989). The validity study of the Dade County (Florida) Management Assessment Center yielded statistically significant, positive validity correlation coefficients of the relationship between the predictor (skill rating) and the criterion (job performance rating) of the participants (Gomez & Stephenson, 1987). The study also reflected high inter-rater reliability, which is considered to be a prerequisite to validity.

It is important to mention that there has been research showing that assessment centers are unbiased in predicting of future performance. The studies considered candidates' age, race, and gender, and they have shown that predictions by the assessment center process are equally valid for all candidates (Thornton & Byham, 1982).
Advantages and disadvantages

In addition to validity, assessment center advantages and disadvantages can be discussed in terms of effectiveness, impact, practicality, and benefits to participants. Sweeney (1980) noted that organizations in the private sector using the assessment center continually observed greater behavior changes among employees resulting from that process than from other management training programs. Byham (1986) concluded that assessment centers demonstrated the effectiveness of simulations in enhancing interpersonal and administrative skills, and the training increased performance in a variety of skill areas. According to Milstein and Fiedler (1989) research indicates that assessment centers generate a significant amount of valuable information about candidates, have an acceptable level of validity, and are cost-effective. Research in industrial settings has also found that assessment centers do not have the adverse impact on minority candidates that is associated with many paper-and-pencil tests (Olson, 1987).

Olson (1987) reported comments made by Bruce Ashton, a senior consultant with Development Dimensions International, about distinguishing characteristics of the assessment center process:

The major distinction between the assessment center and the paper-and-pencil tests is that the center allows one to look at relatively realistic job-performance behaviors. (p. 5)

Assessment centers are designed to avoid the disadvantages of the two extreme approaches to measurement (Byham, 1986). At one extreme, some paper-and-pencil tests require only limited, and often trivial, behaviors and measure narrowly defined traits. At the other extreme, some personality
assessment programs have been concerned with such broad characteristics as "general adjustment" or "effectiveness."

Practicality has implications for both cost-effectiveness and time savings. The cost of operating assessment centers has been quite high in business and industry — typically providing one evaluator for every two examinees and costing as much as $2,000 per person (Byham, 1986; Olson, 1987). Wendel and Uerling (1989) also cited the high cost of personnel in both time and money as the most prevalent problem in assessment center implementation in education, with per-assessee cost of $1,500 to $2,500 having been reported for some of the centers using the NASSP model. In contrast, however, Pennsylvania's Pre-Teacher Assessment Center was designed to evaluate twenty-four college students at once at a cost of only fifty to seventy dollars per participant. Other other studies have also shown the cost effectiveness of assessment centers (Byham, 1986; Milstein & Fiedler, 1989)

Another advantage to the assessment center is the savings in time that a one or two-day assessment center may afford as compared to traditional methods such as internships, which usually take weeks, or trial periods of employment. Gomez & Stephenson (1987) commented on the time and cost savings advantages of the assessment center:

It has been suggested that the best selection method (for selecting school-level administrators) is an internship or trial period of employment. However, since such methods are often precluded by high cost, time constraints, administrative problems and so forth, a logical alternative is the job simulation provided by an assessment center. An assessment center can thus be viewed as a simulated trial employment. (p. 6)

In one of the telephone company studies, predictions of management potential in a two-day assessment center were used as criteria against which
to validate a one-day center. Significant correlations were obtained, which indicated that the shorter assessment center could be effectively used as a substitute for the longer, more expensive center (Moses, 1973). In a study of the application of experience from the American Airlines assessment center process to the development of administrative personnel in government, Quick and associates also found that one-day assessment centers may be sufficient for screening employees (Quick, Fisher, Schkade, & Ayers, 1980).

Participant reaction is a good measure of the benefits of the assessment center process. Hersey (1986) cites a number of positive participant reactions resulting from the implementation of the NASSP Assessment Center projects across the United States. These include the acquisition of knowledge, feedback, the honing of skills, socialization factors, and training potential.

Perhaps the one most beneficial aspect of the assessment center process is the feedback provided in both written and oral form (Deluzain & Cohen, 1976; Howe, 1986; Landholm, 1986). The potential for staff development programs based on this feedback may be superseded only by the potential for use of the assessment center itself as the vehicle for research and staff development (Byham, 1986; Hersey, 1986; Ogawa, 1986; Sweeney, 1980; Wendel, 1989).

There may be certain disadvantages to the assessment center process. The high cost, mentioned in conjunction with some projects, could be a negative factor. Reporting on South Carolina's assessment center pilot project for the NASSP, Burleson (1986) noted that because of the emphasis for the assessors to be objective, detached, and analytical, the assessment center experience is sometimes perceived by participants as cold and impersonal. Efforts should be put forth to make the assessment experience more humane.
Related Research

A summary of related research relative to assessment centers and their use is included in Table 1. Recommendations pertaining to the dimensions and components of assessment centers are included.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Byham</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Assessment centers for evaluating teachers</td>
<td>Include leaderless group discussions, management games, in-baskets, simulations, paper-and-pencil tests, interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deluzain &amp; Cohen</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Assessment center dimensions</td>
<td>Identified 16 dimensions for Florida's administrator assessment center project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemley</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Assessor training</td>
<td>Training components should include observation, data-gathering, interviewing, analysis, and report writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milstein &amp; Fiedler</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>NASSP assessment center activities</td>
<td>NASSP exercises include in-baskets, leaderless group discussions, interviews, simulations, schedule making, case studies, mgt. games, paper-and-pencil tests, fact finding, staged staff meetings, public speaking, and negotiations, depending on situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick, Fisher, Schkade, &amp; Ayers</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Developing administrative personnel through assessment centers</td>
<td>One-day centers with 1-3 exercises are sufficient for screening employees for supervisory &amp; managerial positions; utilized in-basket, leaderless group discussion, conflict resolution, fact finding, and financial analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweeney</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Assessment center concept</td>
<td>Typical exercises include in-baskets, leaderless group discussions, role-playing, and interviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendel &amp; Uerling</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>AC as prep programs for principals</td>
<td>Exercises that elicit job oriented behaviors include in-baskets, fact-finding, and interviews.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This chapter first describes the source of funding for this study and the subsequent development of an assessment center for California Polytechnic State University. Second, the critical competencies required by CPSU for supervising teachers are enumerated followed by a discussion as to how they were ascertained. Next, the assessment center components are described, including the specific instruments and procedures used to collect data, followed by a description of the populations sampled in the study. Finally, the statistical treatments used in the analysis of the data are discussed.

Funding

Seeking a money-saving alternative for certifying cooperating teachers in school districts, Professor Kenneth Palmer, Director of The University Center for Teacher Education at California Polytechnic State University, awarded a grant to the School Improvement Model (SIM) at Iowa State University for the development of an assessment center. With funding obtained, a prototype assessment center was designed utilizing teacher evaluation materials already developed by SIM. This study was then conducted to determine the validity and reliability of the center for the selection of qualified student teacher evaluators and to determine the feasibility for its practical use at California Polytechnic State University.
Competencies for Supervisors of Student Teachers

In the first phase of the study, it was necessary to determine the critical competencies required by the university for supervisors of student teachers in order to develop appropriate components for the assessment center. Several sources were used to develop a list of potential competencies. These included student teacher handbooks from California Polytechnic State University (Palmer, 1987) and Iowa State University (Knicker, 1987a), a manual of research-validated criteria for teacher performance evaluation (Manatt & Stow, 1984), a survey of practicing teachers who were former Iowa State University students (Warren, Lagomarcino, Kemis, & Sweeney, 1987), the syllabus for the student teacher supervision workshops conducted at CPSU, and interviews with practitioners. These competencies were written into a matrix, which was later used as a basis for reference and discussion.

In a meeting with a committee of professors at CPSU, critical competencies for supervising teachers were determined, with the help of the matrix, and include the following:

1. knowledge of essential elements of effective instruction;
2. knowledge of classroom management strategies;
3. knowledge of student teacher evaluation criteria;
4. knowledge of clinical supervision elements and procedures;
5. skill in gathering, documenting, and analyzing data for evaluation purposes;
6. skill in writing performance improvement plans;
7. knowledge of types of teacher-supervisor conferences and skills in conducting them;
8. peer coaching skills.
These competencies are included among the learning outcomes and skills taught in the student teacher supervision workshops conducted at CPSU.

At the conclusion of the meeting with the CPSU staff, it was decided that the assessment center components to be developed by the School Improvement Model should focus only on testing the participants' knowledge of instructional supervision and assessing their skills in observing and evaluating teacher performance. The CPSU staff would add simulated teacher-supervisor conferences, coaching techniques, and other components to the assessment center at a later time.

**Components of the Assessment Center**

In the next phase of the study, three major components were developed or adapted for the assessment center, which included (1) a written, multiple-choice examination to assess knowledge of instructional supervision and evaluation, (2) an instrument to evaluate instructional plans, and (3) a videotaped teaching episode with instruments for recording observations and evaluating the teacher's performance. A facilitator's manual for administering the assessment center components was also developed.

**Development of the Assessment Center Items**

Several sources were used to develop the Student Teacher Supervisor Assessment, including instruments developed by the School Improvement Model (SIM) team at Iowa State University for a consortium of California school districts and instruments developed for the Iowa LEAD Project at Iowa State University. The items were selected to assess subjects' knowledge of lesson analysis, teaching strategies, clinical supervision, and performance
evaluation. After an initial field test of the assessment instrument with groups of subjects at California Polytechnic State University and Iowa State University, the test items were subjected to a computerized item analysis (Menne & Tolsma, 1971). Based upon item analysis results, some items were modified or deleted. The final form of the Student Teacher Supervisor Assessment included forty multiple-choice items (Appendix A).

The *Instructional Plan and Materials Assessment Scale* was adapted for use from a set of materials developed for use with *The Teacher Performance Evaluation Cycle*, a series of videotapes produced for the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) by the School Improvement Model (SIM) team at Iowa State University (Manatt & Stow, 1988). With some modifications, this instrument was used to evaluate the sample lesson plans and instructional materials against seven research-based criteria using a three-point scale (Appendix B).

The videotaped teaching episode and accompanying instruments were also adapted from the *Teacher Performance Evaluation Cycle* series. This series utilized a teaching episode of a mathematics teacher in the West Des Moines (Iowa) School District. Although the videotaped teaching episode was used intact, its accompanying evaluation instruments were modified to match the criteria used in California Polytechnic State University's student teaching handbook (Palmer, 1987). In addition, an observation form used in California Polytechnic's supervising teacher workshops was included in the assessment center package (Appendix B).

The final component was a facilitator's manual to provide instructions for the administration of each of the assessment center components (Appendix C).
Included in the manual are descriptions of the components, directions for facilitators to administer the components, including helpful facilitator "tips", and instructions for completing the answer sheets used with each component.

Also included in the facilitator's manual are ratings for both the lesson plan and the teacher's performance in the videotaped lesson, determined by a jury of professionals in instructional supervision. The members of the jury individually evaluated the lesson plan and the teacher's performance in the videotaped teaching episode according to the criteria, and then agreed by group consensus upon what the appropriate rating should be for each criterion. Included in the jury of professionals were: Mary Davis, elementary principal in a Department of Defense Dependents School in Turkey; Dr. James Ferrare, an associate superintendent in Iowa; Dr. Sally Frudden, a professor of education at the University of Northern Iowa; Dr. Glenn Holzman, an assistant superintendent in Montana; Dr. Donna Merkley, an assistant professor of education at Iowa State University; Linda K. Miller, an intermediate school principal in Pennsylvania; Don Nelson, a superintendent in Arizona; Dr. David Peterson, a high school principal in Minnesota; Scarlett Rehrig, middle school principal in a Department of Defense Dependents School in Japan; Joan Wilcox, principal in a Department of Defense Dependents School in Germany; and Karen Willis, a research associate with the School Improvement Model at Iowa State University. The group's ratings were used as standards for comparison for determining the proficiency of assessment center participants in assessing the teacher's instructional plans and performance. Similar methodologies for ratings comparisons have been used in other studies (Volker, Gehler Howlett, & Twetten, 1986; Haertel, 1987).
Selection of Samples

A total of ninety-seven subjects in two groups were included in the study. Treatment Group A included forty-nine subjects who were participants in a student teacher supervision workshop at California Polytechnic State University in December, 1988. Treatment Group B was formed by combining sixteen subjects participating in a graduate class taught by Professor Richard P. Manatt at Iowa State University with another group of thirty-two subjects from North Carolina during the spring of 1989. Treatment Group B did not receive CPSU’s specific student teacher supervision training. However, the subjects in this group had received some supervision training as part of their requirements for the graduate course, or through their participation in a workshop conducted by Professor Manatt in North Carolina in 1989.

All subjects participated in the study voluntarily. Administration of the assessment center components followed procedures which guaranteed the anonymity of individuals within each group. Codes were used to distinguish between sexes and teaching levels (elementary teachers, secondary teachers, and administrators), and they assured proper grouping of the answer sheets from individual participants within each test group. Assessment center activities were administered to Treatment Group A in California by Kenneth Palmer, Professor of Education at California Polytechnic State University, and to Treatment Group B in Iowa and North Carolina by Richard P. Manatt, Professor of Educational Administration at Iowa State University.
Human Subjects Release

The Iowa State University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research reviewed this project and concluded that the rights and welfare of the human subjects were adequately protected, that risks were outweighed by the potential benefits and expected value of the knowledge sought, that confidentiality of data was assured, and that informed consent was obtained by appropriate procedures.

Data Collection Procedures

The assessment center materials were administered to the groups of teachers and administrators from California, Iowa and South Carolina. Data were collected between December, 1988, and February, 1989.

The subjects were first given the Student Teacher Supervisor Assessment forms and an accompanying answer sheet. After receiving instructions for completing the demographic information on the answer sheet, the subjects were allowed thirty minutes to complete the assessment.

Each of the subjects was then given the packet of materials to be used in the teacher evaluation simulation. The simulation materials included: (1) a description of the class to be observed on the videotape, (2) a copy of the teacher's lesson plan, including worksheets to be used in the course of the lesson, (3) a list of the criteria and descriptors to be used in evaluating the lesson plans, (4) an answer sheet for recording the subjects' ratings of the lesson plans, (5) a form for recording information to be used by the subjects while observing the teacher's classroom performance, (6) a summative evaluation report form which included the criteria and descriptors for
evaluating teacher performance, and (7) an answer sheet for recording
subjects ratings of the teacher's performance.

Using the *Instructional Plans and Materials Assessment Scale*, subjects
were given fifteen minutes to evaluate the lesson plans and worksheets in the
packet and record their ratings on the answer sheet according to the seven
criteria listed in the instrument.

The subjects then viewed the videotape of the teaching episode, and using
the *Student Teacher Observation Report* provided in the packet, made notes in
conjunction with their observations. Finally, using the criteria and descriptors
from the *Summative Evaluation Report* and their observation records, the
subjects recorded their ratings for the teacher's classroom performance on the
answer sheets provided.

The results of the subjects' assessments were based upon the three scores
from the previously described components. Supervisor assessment scores
were based upon the number of correct responses out of the total. Subjects'
ratings of both the lesson plans and the teacher's performance were compared
to the corresponding ratings of the jury of professionals, and their scores were
then determined by agreement with or deviation from the jury's scores.

**Treatment of Data**

The study incorporated a posttest-only control group design (Borg & Gall,
1983). This design determined the type of statistical analysis most appropriate
for addressing the questions presented in Chapter I. Treatment Group A from
CPSU was compared against Treatment Group B formed by combining the two
other groups from Iowa and North Carolina.
The first question in the study was: Is there a difference in the level of knowledge of supervision theory and skills between a group of teachers having taken specific training to prepare them for supervising student teachers and those who acquired knowledge and skills through other avenues?

The methodology employed in the study to address this question was to compare mean scores of the two groups on the three assessment center components. This was accomplished through $t$ test comparison procedures for grouped samples. In effect, the $t$ test determines whether or not the means of the two groups differ significantly, and the probability of any differences between the groups occurring by chance alone.

The second question was: Are there differences in knowledge or supervision skills that may be associated with certain characteristics such as gender or teaching level of prospective supervising teachers?

The methodology employed in the study to address this question was to compare the scores of both groups categorized by gender and employment level to determine the $a$ priori equivalence in each category. If the scores of the groups in either category showed no significant difference, then there is a strong indication that the categorical groups are roughly equivalent in content knowledge and are not biased in their evaluation of teacher performance with respect to the grade level at which they teach.

To test this aspect of the study, the statistical treatment employed was a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). The ANOVA is somewhat parallel to the $t$ test, in that it is used to determine whether mean scores on one or more factors differ significantly, but it is more appropriate for use when comparing several factors or variables at the same time. It also determines whether
sample variances differ significantly from each other. The independent variables tested in the present investigation were:

1. gender

2. level of employment (primary teacher, secondary teacher, or administrator)

Scores on the assessment center components were the dependent variables. In addition to the ANOVA, an orthogonal contrast statistical treatment was employed to test for differences by gender and level of employment for each of the criteria in the lesson plan assessment and the teacher's performance assessment.

The third and final question was: Is the assessment center method a feasible way of determining the readiness of prospective supervising teachers in lieu of specific supervision training by California Polytechnic State University? The answer to this question was best determined by implementing the assessment center, and comparing the performance records of the two groups of participants. If those participating in the assessment center were actually selected to be supervising teachers and were as successful in the role as those who participated in the university's training program, then the question could be answered positively. Follow-up interviews with the CPSU staff would provide the needed information.
CHAPTER IV: FINDINGS

This chapter reports the analyses of data gathered from administering the assessment center components to different groups of educators. First to be presented are demographics for both of the treatment groups. Next, an analysis of the Supervisor Assessment component of the assessment center is presented. Finally, statistics relative to the subjects' performance on each of the assessment center components are reported.

Subject Demographics

Tables 2 and 3 present descriptive data about the subjects in each of the groups in the study. The respective groups are disaggregated by gender and level of employment.

An examination of Table 2 shows the similarity in size of the two groups. However, the groups were different in their proportion of men to women. Group A had nearly twice as many women as men, but Group B had more than three times as many men as women. Considering all of the subjects together, men outnumbered women by approximately 39 per cent.

Table 2. Populations Tested

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Several differences between the two groups appeared when the data were disaggregated according to levels of employment. An examination of Table 3 shows that all of the subjects in Group A were teachers, and there were about as many elementary teachers as there were secondary teachers. About fifty per cent more females than males were represented in this group.

**Table 3. Levels of employment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Teachers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Teachers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Teachers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group B was comprised almost entirely of school administrators — i.e., principals at either the elementary or secondary levels — and the males in the group outnumbered the females more than three to one. Only three subjects in this group were teachers. Two of the subjects were elementary teachers, and one was a secondary teacher. Among the administrators represented, it is not known how many were elementary or secondary.
**Supervisor Assessment Analyses**

Utilizing a standard examination analysis program developed at the Durham Computation Center at Iowa State University, an item analysis was performed on the assessment center's *Supervisor Assessment* component for the purpose of improving the instrument for use at California Polytechnic State University.

The item discrimination index indicates how well an item is able to separate scores based on the respondents' knowledge of subject material. For example, a high discrimination value for an item indicates that subjects who scored well on an examination tended to answer that particular item correctly, and the subjects who scored poorly on the examination tended to answer the item incorrectly. Generally, values less than .20 do not discriminate well among respondents, and contribute little to the reliability of the examination.

Administrations of the same examination to different groups usually yields dissimilar item analysis results, and such is the case for these two groups. Data from the item analysis are presented in Table 4.

The table indicates that the discrimination values for the assessment ranged from .09 to .99 for Group A, and from -.23 to .43 for Group B. Some of the assessment items for each group are valued below the .20 level of acceptability. A few of the items are valued low in both groups, which is a sure indication that those particular items should be rewritten. Several items, however, are valued low for one group but high, or at least in an acceptable range, for the other group.
Table 4. Summary of item analysis results for supervisor assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Group A Discrimination</th>
<th>Group A Difficulty</th>
<th>Group B Discrimination</th>
<th>Group B Difficulty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avg = 67.6

Avg = 71.2
A few items in the Group B analysis have negative discrimination values, which indicate an inverse relationship between total scores and scores on an item, i.e., respondents scoring high on the test answer the item incorrectly, and students scoring low on the test answer the item correctly. Items with negative discrimination values should also be examined to determine if any problems exist in the respective questions.

The assessment items with low discrimination values were examined to find a possible reason for their low ratings. It was determined for most of the items in question that either the stem was poorly worded or at least one of the distractors was too plausible or ambiguous. The poor items were corrected and rewritten, and then the new version of the assessment was included among the materials delivered to California Polytechnic State University.

The table also indicates that the average difficulty ratings of the assessment items were 67.6 for Group A and 71.2 for Group B. The difference in the ratings is attributed to variations in respondents' answers but not in the test items themselves.

The KR-20 reliability estimates for the supervisor assessment were found to be .74 and .50 respectively for the two groups. Publishers of tests are generally satisfied if the reliabilities of their published tests are around the .90 mark, but examinations developed by instructors and others rarely approach that level. The reliability estimates for this component were respectable for Group A and at least acceptable for Group B, considering that subjects in Group B represent populations in different settings having knowledge acquired from a variety of experiences.
The reliability of the supervisor assessment was evidently improved with the corrections made in the final version. This supposition is supported by the fact that in three separate educational administration classes in which the assessment was administered by Professor Richard P. Manatt at Iowa State University in 1992, the KR-20 reliability estimates were .69, .80, and .80 respectively (Manatt, 1992).

Subjects' Performance on the Assessment Center Components

All subjects were tested with the same assessment center components, which included the Supervisor Assessment, the Instructional Plan and Materials Assessment, and the Summative Evaluation Report.

The research design of the study necessitated the use of two groups. The subjects in Group A were tested with the assessment center components immediately following their participation in the student teacher supervision workshop at California Polytechnic State University (Treatment A). Subjects in Group B did not receive the specific CPSU training, although they were involved in a different form of supervision training (Treatment B) and were tested with the assessment center components at their respective sites in Iowa and North Carolina. The tables that follow reflect the results of both groups on each of these components.

Table 5 reflects the scores of the groups on the Supervisor Assessment component of the assessment center. Scores are reported as the number of correct responses among the 40 items on the multiple-choice instrument. The scores of the 49 subjects in Treatment Group A ranged from 15 to 35. The mean of the scores was 27.14, and the standard deviation was 3.93. The scores of the
Table 5. Comparison of scores on the supervisor assessment component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Ranges</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>15-35</td>
<td>27.14</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>-1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18-35</td>
<td>28.52</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48 subjects in Treatment Group B ranged from 18 to 35. The mean of the scores in this group was 28.52, and the standard deviation was 3.64.

In comparing the performance of the two groups on this assessment center component, a $t$ test was used to determine if the mean scores of the two groups differed significantly at the .05 level. The resulting $t$ value was -1.79, which indicated that there was no significant difference between the two groups.

Scores on the instructional plan evaluation component were derived by comparing the subjects' ratings of the sample instructional plan to ratings of the same plan, deemed to be "correct" by a consensus of a jury of professionals, based upon the criteria listed in the *Instructional Plans and Materials Assessment Scale*. Subjects' responses were either correct or incorrect, based upon this comparison. Scores reported were the actual number of correct ratings among the seven criteria listed.

Table 6 reflects the scores of the two groups on their assessment of the instructional plan and materials. Scores of the subjects in Group A ranged from 0 to 6. The mean of the scores was 3.51, and the standard deviation was 1.19. Scores in Group B ranged from 2 to 6. The mean of the scores in this group was 3.85, and the standard deviation was 1.05.
Table 6. Comparison of scores on the instructional plan and materials assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Ranges</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0-6</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>-1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2-6</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the $t$ test, mean scores of the two groups were tested for significant difference at the .05 level. The resulting $t$ value was -1.51, indicating that the two groups were not significantly different in their evaluation of the instructional plan.

Results of the subjects' evaluation of the teacher's performance in the teaching episode are reported in Table 7. Scores for this comparison are taken from the assessment center's *Summative Evaluation Report* (SER). As before, the subjects' ratings on each of the 18 performance evaluation criteria were compared to ratings deemed to be "correct" by a consensus of the jury. Scores reported from the groups were the actual number of correct ratings among the 18 criteria.

An examination of Table 7 reveals that the scores of Treatment Group A ranged from 0 to 15. The mean of these scores was 8.80, and the standard deviation was 3.19. The scores from Treatment Group B ranged from 6 to 13. The mean of the scores from this group was 9.50, and the standard deviation was 2.12.
Table 7. Comparison of scores on the Summative Evaluation Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Ranges</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>-1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6-13</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the t test, mean scores of the two groups were tested for significant difference at the .05 level. The resulting t value was -1.21, indicating that the two groups were not significantly different in their evaluation of the teacher's performance in the classroom teaching episode.

A comparison of the scores of males and females from the combined groups was performed to determine whether or not there were differences in their knowledge of supervision or if any difference existed in their evaluations when disaggregated by gender. Tables 8 through 10 reflect the results of those comparisons.

An examination of Table 8 reveals the scores of males and females on the Supervisor Assessment component of the assessment center. The scores for the 56 males represented ranged from 15 to 35. The mean of the scores for the males was 28.05, and the standard deviation was 3.91. For the 41 females represented, scores ranged from 18 to 35, the mean of the scores was 27.51 and the standard deviation was 3.75.
Table 8. Comparison of male/female scores on the supervisor assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Ranges</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>15-35</td>
<td>28.05</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18-35</td>
<td>27.51</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean scores between males and females were compared using a t test to determine if there was a significant difference between the groups at the .05 level. The resulting t value was 0.69, indicating that no significant difference in supervisory knowledge existed between the gender groups.

Table 9 reveals the scores of males and females on the Instructional Plans and Materials Assessment component of the assessment center. The mean of the scores for males was 3.73, and the standard deviation was 1.05. For the females, the mean of the scores was 3.61 and the standard deviation was 1.24.

Table 9. Comparison of males/females on instructional plan assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mean scores between males and females were compared using a \( t \) test to determine if there was a significant difference between the groups at the .05 level. The resulting \( t \) value was 0.51, indicating that no significant difference existed between the sexes in their assessment of the sample instructional plan.

An examination of Table 10 reveals the scores of males and females on the evaluation of the teacher in the classroom teaching episode as reported on the *Summative Evaluation Report* (SER). The mean of the scores for males was 9.52, and the standard deviation was 2.06. For females, the mean of the scores was 8.59, and the standard deviation was 3.38.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>( t ) value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using a \( t \) test, mean scores between males and females on the SER were compared to determine if there was a significant difference between the groups at the .05 level. The resulting \( t \) value was 1.57, indicating that no significant difference existed between the gender groups in their evaluation of the teacher's performance.

Comparisons were made among the subjects of the combined groups to determine if differences existed in knowledge of instructional supervision, in
evaluation of instructional plans, or in evaluation of a teacher's performance relative to the subjects' level of employment as elementary teachers, secondary teachers, or administrators. These comparisons are reflected in Tables 11-15.

Of the total 97 subjects, 28 were elementary teachers, 24 were secondary teachers, and 45 were school administrators. The statistical treatment used for these comparisons was a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), a more appropriate procedure to use when comparing several groups simultaneously.

Table 11 reflects the results of the comparison of the subjects by levels of employment using their mean scores on the Supervisor Assessment. An examination of the data reveals the means ranged from 27.39 to 28.64. The F-value of 0.13 indicates that no significant differences existed in the knowledge of supervision among the groups when disaggregated by level of employment.

Table 11. Comparison of scores by level of employment on the Supervisor Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Teachers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27.39</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Teachers</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26.79</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28.64</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The comparison of subjects by levels of employment using their scores from the Instructional Plans and Materials Assessment component of the assessment center is reflected in Table 12. An examination of these data reveals a range of mean scores from 3.32 to 3.87. The F-value of 0.13 indicates that with
regard to the subjects' level of employment, no significant differences existed in the subjects ratings of the sample lesson plan when evaluated according to the criteria and descriptors listed on the *Instructional Plans and Materials Assessment Scale*.

Table 12. **Comparison of scores by level on instructional plan assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Teachers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Teachers</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though no significant differences in the lesson plan ratings among the groups were apparent from the overall mean scores, it was assumed that significant differences may have existed between teachers' ratings and administrators' ratings of the lesson plan on individual criteria in the *Instructional Plans and Materials Assessment*. Therefore, an item-by-item comparison was made, employing the orthogonal contrast statistical treatment, to find if differences existed among the subjects with respect to their level of employment at the .05 level of significance. The scores of the subjects for each item were derived by calculating the deviation from the scores of the jury of experts, resulting in a calculated deviation score mean for each level, which was used as the basis for the comparisons.
It was found that significant differences did indeed exist among the groups for two of the items in the assessment. An examination of Table 13 discloses $t$ values indicating that significant differences existed between the calculated deviation score means of the elementary teachers and administrators, and a highly significant difference between the deviation score means of secondary teachers and administrators for Item 4 (*The lesson plan accommodates appropriate cognitive levels.*) at the .05 level. The lower deviation score mean indicated that the administrator group was more consistent with the jury rating for this item than were the other two groups.

### Table 13. Contrasts of deviation scores between groups for item 4 in the *Instructional Plans and Materials Assessment.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>$t$ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Teachers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Teachers</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An examination of Table 14 reveals a significant difference between the deviation score means of elementary teachers and administrators for Item 5, (*Differences in student capabilities are evident in planning of instruction.*). As before, the lower deviation score mean indicates that the administrators' ratings were more consistent with those of the jury than were the ratings of both the elementary and secondary teachers.
Table 14. **Contrasts of deviation scores between groups for item 5 in the Instructional Plans and Materials Assessment.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ElementaryTeachers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Teachers</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An examination of Table 15 reflects the results of the comparison of the subjects by levels of employment using their mean scores on the *Summative Evaluation Report*. An examination of the data shows that the mean scores ranged from 8.67 to 9.38 on a scale of 18. The F-value of 0.59 indicated that there were no significant differences in the evaluation of the teacher's performance among the groups when disaggregated by employment level.

Table 15. **Comparison of scores by level on the Summative Evaluation Report**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ElementaryTeachers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Teachers</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As in the Instructional Plan and Materials Assessment situation, it was suspected that significant differences might exist between the teachers and administrators on individual criteria in the Summative Evaluation Report (SER), even though no significant differences were indicated by comparing the overall mean scores. As before, an item-by-item comparison of calculated deviation scores was made, using the orthogonal contrast treatment, to find if differences existed among the subjects with respect to their level of employment at the .05 level of significance.

Tables 16 through 21 show the results of the item-by-item contrasts of the level-of-employment groups where significant differences appeared among the groups on their evaluation of the teaching episode according to the criteria. Items showing significant differences in the groups' scores included Criterion 2 (Implements the lesson plan), Criteria 9 (Ensures student time on task), Criterion 11 (Plans for and makes effective use of time, materials, and resources), Criterion 15 (Demonstrates effective interpersonal relationships), Criterion 16 (Demonstrates awareness of students' needs), and Criterion 18 (Demonstrates sensitivity in relating to students).

An examination of Table 16 reveals a significant difference between the deviation score means of the elementary teachers and administrators on their ratings of the teacher's performance of Criterion 2 (Implements the lesson plan). Mean deviation scores ranged from .38 for the administrators to .86 for the elementary teachers, indicating that the administrators' ratings were more consistent with those of the jury of professionals than were the ratings of either the elementary or secondary teachers.
Table 16. Contrasts of deviation scores between groups for criterion 2 in the Summative Evaluation Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Teachers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.012*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Teachers</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An examination of Table 17 reveals a significant difference between the deviation score means of the elementary teachers and administrators on their ratings of the teacher's performance of Criterion 9 (Ensures student time on task). The statistics for this criterion are identical to those for the previous criterion for the respective groups, with deviation score means ranging from .38 for the administrators to .86 for the elementary teachers, again indicating that the administrators' ratings were more consistent with those of the jury.

Table 17. Contrasts of deviation scores between groups for criterion 9 in the Summative Evaluation Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Teachers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.012*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Teachers</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data revealed in Table 18 indicate that highly significant differences existed between the administrators and both of the teacher groups on their ratings of the teacher's performance according to Criterion 11 (*Plans for and makes effective use of time, materials, and resources*). The calculated deviation score means ranged from .13 for the administrators to 1.0 for the elementary teachers. The *t* value is .001, which indicates that there was very little agreement on the ratings of the teacher's performance on this criterion between elementary teachers and administrators. There was also a highly significant difference between the ratings of secondary teachers and administrators on this criterion. The *t* value for this comparison is .002.

Table 18. **Contrasts of deviation scores between groups for criterion 11 in the Summative Evaluation Report.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th><em>t</em> value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Teachers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td><strong>0.001</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td><strong>0.002</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Teachers</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another significant difference between ratings of elementary teachers and administrators is revealed in an examination of Table 19. This time the difference is reflected in Criterion 15 (*Demonstrates effective interpersonal relationships*). The calculated deviation score means for the groups were .93 for the elementary teachers, .50 for administrators, and .42 for the secondary teachers. The *t* values are .04 for the contrast between the elementary teachers
and administrators and .62 for the contrast between administrators and secondary teachers. The table also shows that the secondary teachers' ratings were in closer agreement with the jury of professionals than were the scores of the other two groups on this particular criterion.

Table 19. Contrasts of deviation scores between groups for criterion 15 in the Summative Evaluation Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Teachers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Teachers</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20 reflects a significant difference between the ratings of elementary teachers and administrators on Criterion 16 (Demonstrates awareness of the needs of students). The calculated deviation score means were .50 for the elementary teachers, .88 for secondary teachers, and .84 for administrators.

Table 20. Contrasts of deviation scores between groups for criterion 16 in the Summative Evaluation Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Teachers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Teachers</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The t values are .013 for the contrast between elementary teachers and administrators and .80 for the contrast between administrators and secondary teachers. On this criterion, the elementary teachers were more consistent with jury ratings than were either secondary teachers or administrators.

The final contrast is reported in Table 21, which indicates that highly significant differences existed between each of the teacher groups and the administrators on criterion 18 (Demonstrates sensitivity in relating to students). The deviation score means were .13 for the administrators, .71 for secondary teachers and 1.00 for elementary teachers. The t values are .001 for the contrast between elementary teachers and administrators, and .002 for the contrast between administrators and secondary teachers. Once again the ratings from the administrator group were far more consistent with the jury ratings than were either of the teacher groups.

Table 21. Contrasts of deviation scores between groups for criterion 18 in the Summative Evaluation Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Teachers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.002**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Teachers</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The problem for this study was to develop and test an assessment center for cooperating teachers, which was to be employed in lieu of the Student Teacher Supervision Workshop conducted at The University Center for Teacher Education at California Polytechnic State University, for the purpose of certifying field-based student teacher supervisors (cooperating teachers).

Summary

The School Improvement Model (SIM), under the direction of Professor Richard P. Manatt, was awarded a grant from California Polytechnic State University to develop the prototype assessment center, drawing from research and from training materials developed by SIM. Subsequently, three exercises (components) were developed or adapted for use in the assessment center model for the present investigation. The testing was to determine if the center was a feasible alternative to CPSU's Student Teacher Supervision Workshop, and if participants, not having had CPSU's specific supervision training, would score the same as the workshop-trained participants on the assessment center exercises.

Initial research was conducted to determine the critical competencies that would be tested in the center. Included in the research were professional journals, teacher education syllabuses, and studies of competencies and needs assessments of beginning teachers. In addition, meetings were held with the faculty at California Polytechnic State University to ascertain the outcomes expected of those who successfully completed CPSU's Supervising Teachers
Workshops. Information from these sources was placed into a matrix from which it was determined that the dimensions to be tested in the assessment center would include 1) knowledge of instructional supervision, 2) analysis of lesson plans and materials, and 3) assessment of teaching performance. Exercises were subsequently developed to assess prospective cooperating teachers' competencies in each of the three dimensions.

The following questions were raised pertaining to the problem which were to be answered by the present investigation:

1. Is there a difference in knowledge of instructional supervision and assessment skills between a group of teachers having taken specific training in supervision at California Polytechnic State University and those who acquired similar knowledge and skills through other means?

2. Are there differences in knowledge of supervision or assessment skills that may be associated with certain characteristics such as gender or the teaching levels of prospective supervising teachers?

3. Is an assessment center method a feasible way of determining the readiness of prospective supervising teachers in lieu of specific supervision training by the university?

In order to address these questions, the following operational research hypotheses were posed:

1. There is no significant difference in the knowledge of instructional supervision between teachers who have completed the Student Teacher Supervision Workshop at California Polytechnic State University and those who have been trained in other in-service programs.

2. There is no significant difference in teacher performance evaluation skills between teachers who have completed the Student Teacher Supervision Workshop at California Polytechnic State University and those who have been trained in other in-service programs.

3. There is no significant difference between males and females in the knowledge of instructional supervision and the evaluation of a teacher's performance.
4. There is no significant difference between elementary teachers and secondary teachers in the knowledge of instructional supervision and the evaluation of a teacher's performance.

In testing the first hypothesis, the mean scores recorded by the treatment groups on the knowledge assessment were compared using the \( t \) test statistical treatment. The findings revealed no significant difference between the two groups. Based on the findings, the hypothesis was retained.

The testing of the second hypothesis compared the treatment groups' scores on their analysis of the lesson plan and their evaluation of the teacher's performance in the videotaped episode. Again, the \( t \) test was utilized for the comparison. No significant difference was revealed for either of these assessment components between Treatment Group A and Treatment Group B. Based on these findings, the hypothesis could not be rejected.

Testing the third hypothesis involved combining the scores of the treatment groups for each of the assessment center components and disaggregating the data by gender. The \( t \) test comparison revealed no significant differences for any of the components. Based on the findings, the third hypothesis could not be rejected.

In order to test the fourth hypothesis, the scores of the treatment groups were again combined, and the data were disaggregated by level of employment. Since three employment levels emerged from the process, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to compare the participants' scores on each of the assessment center components. The results of the comparisons revealed no significant difference on any of the components taken as a whole. Based on the findings, the fourth hypothesis was retained.
It was interesting to discover that although there were no significant differences found between Treatment Group A and Treatment Group B on the various assessment center components, the subjects in Group B scored slightly higher on the knowledge assessment and had fewer deviations from the teacher performance rating standards than did the subjects in Group A, who had just completed California Polytechnic State University's supervision training workshop.

Conclusions

The primary conclusion for the present investigation is that the assessment center worked as well as the training for instructional supervision conducted in the Student Teacher Supervision Workshop at California Polytechnic State University for the preparation of potential cooperating teachers. Considering the information gathered from the research and the findings derived from the data collected, the following conclusions are also warranted:

1. No significant difference exists in the knowledge of instructional supervision and assessment skills between teachers having completed the Student Teacher Supervision Workshop at California Polytechnic State University and those who participated in the assessment center.

2. There are no differences in knowledge of supervision or assessment skills that may be associated with gender or the teaching levels of prospective supervising teachers.

3. The assessment center process is a feasible alternative and, with consideration to monetary and time factors, a relatively low-cost substitute for training personnel in instructional supervision in a conventional program. Furthermore, an assessment center with as few as three components may be sufficient to predict the ability of prospective cooperating teachers to provide adequate instructional supervision to student teachers in the field.

4. Use of the assessment is appropriate for training purposes, considering the results obtained in this investigation.
Limitations

Because of the design of the present investigation and the circumstances under which some of the data were collected, certain limitations must be noted.

1. The investigation did not control presage variables such as entering knowledge, or the subject areas in which the teachers taught, or the experience accumulated by the subjects.

2. The population sample was decidedly too small and did not allow for the preponderance of non-teacher subjects which emerged from the sample. Several of the subjects were rejected because they did not turn in scores on all of the assessment center components. Also, the small sample only allowed for tentative conclusions to be made with reference to certain demographic considerations.

3. The subjects comprising Treatment Group B were chosen from a limited number of sites and training experiences, none of which were in California.

Discussion

This assessment center was developed to assess the preparedness of potential cooperating teachers, and thus it was anticipated that the research sample would be comprised of teachers. Only practicing teachers were included in Treatment Group A. However, it was discovered while recording the demographic data that a large number of administrators were included in Treatment Group B. This situation might have skewed the results of the present investigation, as related to the original hypotheses, but it also provided an opportunity to compare the knowledge of instruction and supervision, as well as the evaluation skills, of the administrators with the knowledge and skills of the teachers.
The scores on the Supervisor's Assessment were low for all participants, and it was surprising that there was very little difference between the scores of administrators and teachers on this component. The low scores recorded by the administrator group were particularly disappointing. It was anticipated that their scores would be significantly higher than the teachers' scores on this test of knowledge.

Although not among the original hypotheses, the decision was made to compare, by level of employment, subjects' ratings for each of the instructional plan assessment criteria and for each of the criteria in the assessment of the teacher's performance, to determine if there were any significant differences. The findings revealed that some differences did exist between the ratings of teachers and administrators on two of the criteria in the Instructional Plans and Materials Assessment and on six of the teacher evaluation criteria in the Summative Evaluation Report.

The two items among the lesson plans and materials assessment criteria, on which the teachers and administrators differed, included Item 4 (Lesson plan accommodates different cognitive levels.) and Item 5 (Differences in student capabilities are evident in the planning of instruction). Administrators' ratings on both items were more consistent with the ratings of the jury of professionals than were the teachers' ratings. The difference in the ratings on Item 4 might have been due to the fact that the administrators, like the jury of professionals, could have had more extensive training than the teachers in the application of Bloom's Taxonomy of the Cognitive Domain. The difference in the ratings on Item 5 might be explained simply by the fact that the jury of
professionals was comprised of practicing school administrators, accounting for the closer agreement of the administrator group's scores.

The six summative evaluation criteria on which the ratings of teachers and administrators differed included Criterion 2 (Implements the lesson plan), Criteria 9 (Ensures student time on task), Criterion 11 (Plans for and makes effective use of time, materials, and resources), Criterion 15 (Demonstrates effective interpersonal relationships), Criterion 16 (Demonstrates awareness of students' needs), and Criterion 18 (Demonstrates sensitivity in relating to students). It is believed that more extensive training and/or experience in instructional supervision, especially in observing teaching behaviors and comparing them to performance standards, might account for the closer agreement of the administrators' ratings to those of the jury of professionals for Criteria 2, 9, 11, and 18.

The comparison of teacher and administrator ratings on Criterion 15 (Demonstrates effective interpersonal relationships) revealed a significant difference between elementary teachers and administrators. It also showed the ratings of secondary teachers and administrators to be somewhat close to each other, with secondary teachers actually being the closest in agreement with the jury of professionals on this criterion. The difference in the ratings between the elementary group and the other two groups may lie in the nature of the subject matter, the grade level, and the presentation medium depicted in the video simulation. The subject is mathematics in a middle school setting, and there is not much movement in the classroom, because the teacher uses an overhead projector extensively in the delivery of instruction. Feedback on the use of the video in other training venues has indicated that elementary
teachers in particular regard this teaching episode as somewhat boring. Also
to be noted is the fact that the teacher in the video simulation is depicted as
attending only to students needing help during the guided activity phase of the
lesson, which is more typical of secondary-level instruction. Teachers at the
elementary levels are more prone to attend to all of the students regardless of
whether or not help is requested.

The comparison of ratings on Criterion 16 (Demonstrates awareness of
students' needs) revealed another significant difference between elementary
teachers and administrators. All the ratings were somewhat higher than the
jury of professionals, but this time the elementary group was in closer agree­
ment with the jury than were the other two groups. In contrast, the ratings of
the administrators and the secondary teachers were in very close agreement.
These findings seemed to contradict the findings for the previous criterion. On
the other hand, the elementary teachers simply might have been better at
recognizing the teacher in the classroom simulation responding to the raised
hands of the students when help was needed.

The length of training for both treatment groups was very short. Subjects
in Treatment Group A were trained in a two-day workshop and then were
subjected to the assessment center. Although participating in more lengthy
training, Treatment Group B subjects were also tested following the second
day of their training. The brief period of training, without practical application
and practice, would probably not have allowed the participants to fully
internalize their training. It would be interesting to assess the two groups
again, after they had a reasonable period to practice what they learned in their
respective trainings, to see what, if any, differences existed between them.
Much of the related research in chapter two of the present investigation recommended a number of exercises or components to be included in an assessment center lasting several days. Many of the applications were geared for management in business and industry (Byham, 1986), although the same types of exercises were included in NASSP's assessment center model for school principals, which also spans several days (Milstein & Fiedler, 1989). However, it has been asserted that a one-day assessment center with one to three exercises was sufficient for some purposes (Byham, 1986; Quick, Fisher, Schkade, & Ayers, 1980). The few components utilized in the assessment center model developed for the present study was sufficient to measure the knowledge of instructional supervision and the performance evaluation skills of current and potential instructional supervisors. The predictive value of this assessment center for the success of student teacher supervisors remains to be seen. With a few additional elements, the center should serve well to assess and certify prospective cooperating teachers.

The assessment center process as a training medium is a concept that has tremendous potential and support (Byham, 1986; Hersey, 1986; Ogawa, 1986; Sweeney, 1980; Wendel, 1989). An assessment center approach for instruction is currently being tested by Richard P. Manatt in educational administration courses at Iowa State University. Using the activities and materials developed for the present study (Manatt & Stow, 1988), Professor Manatt implemented video-based training modules for independent study in Ed Ad 657 (Advanced Supervision), a graduate course in the Department of Professional Studies at ISU during the spring semester of 1993. Plans are being made for the summer of 1993, to develop similar video-based modules for the basic instructional
supervision course (Ed Ad 557), which will be delivered as a televised course via fiber-optics starting in the fall.

Several other applications of the assessment center process in education were mentioned in chapter two of the present study (Burleson, 1986; Cooper, Benz, & Thompson, 1988; Gomez & Stephenson, 1987; Hersey, 1977; Milstein & Fiedler, 1989; Shulman, 1987; Volker, Gehler, Howlett, & Twetten, 1986). Potential applications of assessment center methodology included teacher licensure, career ladder, merit pay, and mentor teacher programs. Brookhart and Loadman (1992) mentioned that steps are being taken by the Educational Testing Service to replace the NTE with a three-phase assessment addressing academic knowledge at entry to teacher education, pedagogical knowledge at exit from teacher education, and practical abilities after a year or so of teaching experience.

The supervision of instruction remains a most important function for cooperating teachers, because their role in facilitating the emergence of those who would be capable teaching professionals depends on it. Tollefson and Kleinsasser (1992) asserted from their research that classroom skills was the only factor that differentiated clearly between interns rated as outstanding and those receiving less favorable ratings. Daniels (1989) succinctly stated the need for a certain level of expertise among teacher supervisors:

If the effectiveness of teachers is to be improved, it is important for those who supervise teachers to be able to identify teacher behaviors which are related to improved student outcomes. (p. 1)

If the effectiveness of those entering the teaching profession is to be improved, the same rationale can be applied to cooperating teachers who supervise
student teachers and have the responsibility of identifying and assessing their teaching behaviors. The assessment center process provides the opportunity for cooperating teachers to demonstrate the requisite knowledge and skills.

The stipends for cooperating teachers mentioned in chapter two of the present investigation are typical for cooperating teachers across the country. Aside from the traditional obligation for teachers to give something back to the profession, it seems that cooperating teachers ought to reap better rewards for their efforts. In school districts where career ladder programs exist, cooperating teachers may earn points in addition to their stipend (Edwards, 1993), and this is certainly a step in the right direction. However, based upon the adage, "You get what you pay for," appropriate stipends should be paid to those helping to prepare students for their future roles as professional educators.

**Recommendations for Practice**

If the assessment center process is to be used with potential cooperating teachers, the following recommendations are put forth:

1. In addition to the Supervisor's Assessment and the Student Teacher Evaluation Simulation, include at least two more components in the assessment center. First, add an assessment interview component, which is an information-gathering exercise that generates relevant information from the participants in conjunction with the dimensions to be assessed (Byham, 1986). Also add a case study exercise. In this type of exercise, participants are given data about a situation and are asked to recommend appropriate action or generate plausible solutions.

2. Use the assessment center in one of the following ways. First, use it to assess the supervisory knowledge and skills of practicing teachers for the purpose of certifying them to serve as cooperating teachers. Those
who meet minimum performance standards should be awarded certification in lieu of specific supervision training. Those who do not meet minimum performance standards will participate in a student teacher supervision workshop, such as the one at California Polytechnic State University, and receive further training. Second, use the center itself as the vehicle for training. As the participants proceed through the various components, they would acquire the knowledge and the skills needed for supervising student teachers and receive certification upon the completion of the assessment process.

3. Have those who are to serve as assessors participate in the assessment center themselves to become familiar with the administration of the various components and the scoring procedures. They should then be trained to develop and refine skills that emphasize observation, data gathering, analysis of results, interviewing, and report writing before actually serving as assessors.

Recommendations for Further Research

Based on the limitations of this study and an examination of the results of this study, the following recommendations are made for further research:

1. Employ a larger and more representative research sample. The original hypotheses called for comparisons between teachers, but when the demographic information was analyzed, it was found that many administrators were included among Treatment Group B. A larger sample would allow subsequent researchers to eliminate subjects but still retain a sufficient number to maintain statistical reliability.

2. Employ treatment group subjects from the same area. The subjects in Treatment Group B were from different areas of the United States, whereas the subjects in Treatment Group A were from California. It may be more beneficial, in terms of validity and reliability, to compare groups from the same geographic area.
3. Include years of experience among the variables when disaggregating the data from the various components. The present investigation did not include this variable, and it would have been beneficial to know if any differences existed among the participants relative to their experience.

4. Include mentoring with the other dimensions to be assessed in the center. Include items to address mentoring knowledge in the supervisor's assessment, and develop components to measure skills, such as peer coaching, in the dimension.

5. Conduct a longitudinal follow-up study to compare the effectiveness of cooperating teachers who received certification as a result of their successful participation in the assessment center with those who were certified as a result of their successful completion of the student teacher supervision workshop at California Polytechnic State University.

6. It is possible that all of the subjects possessed significant knowledge and skills prior to the assessment center experience. In future research, a pretest should be used for initial assessment, followed by a posttest at least six months later to assess the knowledge and skill levels of the participants after putting the training into practice.
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Student Teacher
Supervisor Assessment
SUPERVISOR ASSESSMENT

Directions: The items below are designed to assess your knowledge of student teacher supervision. For each item, choose the most appropriate response and fully blacken the "bubble" under the corresponding letter on the answer sheet. Use only a No.2 pencil.

1. In the student teacher evaluation cycle, which of the following comes first?
   a. formative components
   b. summative components
   c. observations
   d. synthesizing data

2. Legal problem areas in written evaluations include
   a. absence of hearsay.
   b. congruency of comments and ratings.
   c. lack of documentation.
   d. all of the above.

3. Points to discuss during the preobservation conference should include
   a. evaluation of learner outcomes.
   b. teaching methods and procedures to be monitored.
   c. instructional objective(s) for the lesson.
   d. all of the above.

4. The primary purpose of lesson observation and analysis is
   a. to inspect the teacher's classroom.
   b. to critique the teacher's technique.
   c. to be able to give specific feedback about the lesson.
   d. to give the teacher general information about student behavior.

5. The most important accomplishment to be gained from a preobservation conference is
   a. obtaining answers to a series of questions.
   b. establishing a framework for the classroom observation.
   c. making the teacher feel secure in the observation.
   d. obtaining feedback for the teacher's concerns.
6. "Task analysis" is a term most closely associated with
   a. selecting an objective at the appropriate level of difficulty.
   b. teaching to an objective.
   c. monitoring and adjusting instruction.
   d. using the principles of learning.

7. Teachers are providing opportunities for individual differences when they select a student to answer on the basis of
   a. who will give the correct answer.
   b. the order in which the hands are raised.
   c. proximity to the student.
   d. the question being asked.

8. The element of a conference most crucial for enhancing professional growth is
   a. a summary of observations.
   b. discussion of problems.
   c. providing specific feedback.
   d. admitting weaknesses.

9. Which of the following lists presents Bloom's taxonomy of cognitive thinking skills in the correct order from the lowest to highest levels?
   a. evaluation, synthesis, analysis, application, comprehension, knowledge
   b. knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, evaluation, synthesis
   c. comprehension, knowledge, application, analysis, synthesis, evaluation
   d. knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, evaluation

10. Instructional objectives should be written in terms of
    a. teacher actions.
    b. learner outcomes.
    c. teacher/student interactions.
    d. how much time is needed for instruction.
11. Which of the following statements is least accurate concerning clinical supervision?

a. It focuses on events which take place in the classroom.
b. It is the product of summative evaluation.
c. It focuses on helping the teacher improve instruction.
d. It calls for a one-to-one, face-to-face interaction between teacher and supervisor.

12. During the preobservation conference, the supervisor would not

a. review observation data.
b. clarify how things will work.
c. discuss the previous evaluation.
d. discuss criteria and expectations.

13. When recording data during classroom observations, one should always

a. avoid making judgments.
b. focus only on the behavior(s) the teacher wants monitored.
c. use only shorthand.
d. do all of the above.

14. A data gathering technique which focuses on at-task behavior and movement patterns in the classroom is

a. the anecdotal record.
b. the selective-verbatim record.
c. the seating chart observation record.
d. the timeline.

15. Research tells us that the best approach to use in a conference is

a. directive.
b. non-directive.
c. tell and listen.
d. dependent on many factors.
16. The most correct statement concerning **formative** and **summative** conferences is

a. The formative conference occurs after the summative.
b. The formative conference focuses on specific feedback about a teaching episode whereas the summative conference encompasses the total sphere of teaching effectiveness.
c. Teachers normally have a more active role in the summative conference than in the formative conference.
d. The summative conference occurs prior to the formative.

17. When manipulating variables of motivation, the student teacher should

a. give specific feedback.
b. communicate limited expectations.
c. encourage passive involvement from the students.
d. all of the above.

18. Positive reinforcement is best used

a. to make the student feel comfortable
b. when the teacher wants to project a certain "feeling tone".
c. to connect the present learning with things that are familiar.
d. to strengthen the response it follows.

19. The purpose of checking for understanding is

a. to give the teacher an opportunity to ask short-answer questions.
b. to involve the students in sponge activities.
c. to provide feedback to the teacher about the students’ learning.
d. to allow the students to assess their own knowledge.

20. The most important accomplishment in a classroom observation is

a. the consideration of the lesson plan.
b. the gathering of specific descriptive data.
c. the identification of ineffective teaching techniques.
d. involvement in the lesson.
21. A student teacher who is low in abstract thinking and high in commitment would probably be classified as
   a. a professional.
   b. an analytical observer.
   c. an unfocused worker.
   d. a dropout.

22. A data gathering technique which focuses on a broad flow of events in the classroom is
   a. the anecdotal record.
   b. the selective verbatim record.
   c. the seating chart observation record.
   d. scripting.

23. Following the classroom observation, the supervisor should analyze the data in order to
   a. provide the teacher with a general sense of direction.
   b. categorize the behaviors according to the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains.
   c. develop a list of teacher directed activities.
   d. make decisions about specific things to be discussed during the post-observation conference.

24. The best way to begin a post-observation conference is
   a. to discuss the supervision cycle.
   b. to clarify the purpose of the conference.
   c. to revisit the lesson.
   d. to discuss growth goals.

25. If the supervisor wants to establish a non-threatening but professional atmosphere in the post-observation conference, he/she should sit
   a. behind a desk.
   b. in a comfortable, well-padded chair.
   c. at a table next to the teacher.
   d. none of the above.
26. During the post-observation conference, the supervisor should not
   a. rate the teacher.
   b. discuss areas for growth.
   c. try to enhance the professional relationship.
   d. reinforce specific positive practices.

27. When planning a feedback conference, the appropriate number of growth
goals to discuss in detail is
   a. as many as you wish.
   b. one to three.
   c. three to five.
   d. at least six.

28. The best data gathering technique to provide a written record of what the
teacher says during a lesson is
   a. anecdotal record.
   b. selective verbatim.
   c. seating chart observation record.
   d. none of the above.

29. A post-observation conference closure should include
   a. positive strokes.
   b. a chance for rebuttal.
   c. a summary of the discussion.
   d. written goals.

30. The professional growth goal (PGG) should contain all of the following
elements except
   a. a designated timeline for completion and implementation.
   b. a plan designed solely by the supervisor.
   c. an objective stated in specific, measurable terms.
   d. a statement which summarizes the goal.
31. Supporting data for the _summative evaluation_ should include
   a. analysis of observations.
   b. summaries of conferences.
   c. work samples.
   d. all of the above.

32. The best type of supervisory behavior to use with a student teacher who seems to be detached or not involved is
   a. directive.
   b. non-directive.
   c. punitive.
   d. supportive.

33. A professional growth objective which reads, "The teacher will regularly demonstrate sensitivity in relationships with students," is an objective in the _______ domain.
   a. cognitive
   b. affective
   c. psychomotor
   d. motivational

34. The most significant areas for student teacher growth which should be focused upon are
   a. behaviors that influence effective teaching the most.
   b. the most ineffective teaching behaviors.
   c. refining strengths
   d. timelines for improvement.

35. In the clinical supervision process, the student teacher's performance rating for each criterion should be discussed during the
   a. pre-cycle conference.
   b. preobservation conference.
   c. post-observation conference.
   d. summative evaluation conference.
36. The primary purpose of the **summative evaluation** conference is
   a. to prepare the summative evaluation report for the student teacher's file.
   b. to let both the student teacher and the supervisor add to the summative evaluation report.
   c. to discuss the summative evaluation report.
   d. to defend the student teacher's performance ratings.

37. When preparing to rate the student teacher according to criteria on the summative evaluation report, data are
   a. reviewed.
   b. labeled.
   c. analyzed and judged.
   d. all the above.

38. The most effective summative evaluation conference will include
   a. the evaluatee reading the report and responding to it.
   b. the evaluatee accepting more responsibility for his/her professional behavior.
   c. exploring the evaluatee's perceptions and feelings.
   d. none of these.

39. The degree of commitment to accomplishing a professional growth goal increases when it is written
   a. by the student teacher.
   b. by the supervisor.
   c. by the student teacher and the supervisor.
   d. by an impartial third party.

40. A teacher who is high in both abstract thinking and commitment is considered to be
   a. a professional.
   b. an analytical observer.
   c. an unfocused worker.
   d. a dropout.
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Student Teacher Evaluation Simulation
STUDENT TEACHER EVALUATION SIMULATION

for

Gerry Page*

* Excerpts taken from The Teacher Performance Evaluation Cycle: Effectively Implementing a Lesson Plan, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1988 (Video Series)
Group Description for Eighth Grade Mathematics

Teacher: Gerry Page

Number of students: 21 (11 boys and 10 girls).

Age range: The students are 13 and 14 years of age.

Ability range: The students are average and above. This is an accelerated math class in an academic magnet junior high school.

Typical interest and involvement: The students are very motivated, good communicators, display a lot of interest in their work, and volunteer during oral discussion.

Prior relevant material: The class has studied how to identify and classify angles as well as how to specify measurement of angles on intersecting lines when the measurement of one or more angles is given.
Lesson Plan

Formal (Announced) Visit—Observation 2

Teacher: Gerry Page
Grade: Eighth grade math
Unit topic: Geometry

Period: 10:00-10:45 a.m.
Room: 302
Topic for this lesson: Kinds of angles and transversals

Date: 4/29/19

1. Set: "Let's shift our attention to something new."

2. Statement of objective: Following the lecture/demonstration, the student will list and label the five kinds of angles on parallel lines when given the label of at least one and define a transversal.

3. Instructional procedures: Lecture and demonstration

4. Learning activities: Question-and-answer and worksheet

5. Evaluation of learner outcomes: Worksheet on which students demonstrate their understanding of the objective
Exercises 1-8 refer to the following figure. Line m is parallel to line n.

1. What is the $\angle d$? _________________________

2. Briefly explain two ways you can prove your answer.
   a. 
   b. 

3. What is the $\angle a$? _________________________

4. Briefly explain two ways you can prove this answer.
   a. 
   b. 

5. What is the $\angle g$? _________________________

6. Offer two proofs for your answer.
   a. 
   b. 

7. What is the $\angle f$? _________________________
   Briefly explain why you are confident that your answer is correct.

8. What is a transversal?

Questions 9-18 refer to the following diagram.

9. Name two pairs of alternate exterior angles.
   a. 
   b. 

   How do you know for sure that these two pairs are alternate exterior angles?

10. Name two pairs of alternate interior angles.
    a. 
    b. 

11. Angle a is congruent to which two angles?
    a. 
    b. 

12. Using angles a, b, g, and h only, list the supplementary angles to $\angle b$.

Questions 19-23 refer to the following diagram.

What is the corresponding angle for each of the following angles?

13. b 
14. f 
15. d 

What is the vertical angle for each of the following angles?

16. g 
17. c 
18. d 

Note: The answer that you obtain for each question does not carry over to the following question(s):

19. If $m \angle e = 110^\circ$, what is $m \angle c$?
20. If $m \angle b = 75^\circ$, what is $m \angle g$?
21. If $m \angle d = 50^\circ$, what is $m \angle f$?
22. If $m \angle a = 125^\circ$, what is $m \angle g$?
23. If $m \angle h = 55^\circ$, what is $m \angle f$?
### Instructional Plans and Materials Assessment Scale

**Directions:**
For each of the items, select the number above the statement that best describes the teacher's lesson planning and/or materials. Record your choice by circling the number on the answer sheet.

1. The learning is stated in terms of what the student will be able to do after mastery of the educational objective(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No objectives are stated; are in general terms; are teacher behaviors; are inappropriate.</td>
<td>Objectives are appropriate to topic and student; are specifically stated; are generally measurable.</td>
<td>All objectives are appropriate, are specifically stated, and measurable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Content, materials, and media selected are appropriate vehicles for teaching the objectives of the lesson.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content, materials, and media are not appropriate.</td>
<td>Content, materials, and media are appropriate; selection of resources is adequate.</td>
<td>Content, materials, and media are all appropriate and objective-specific; selection is wide and imaginative.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The designated instructional procedures are appropriate to accomplish lesson objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedures are not specified or are inappropriate for students.</td>
<td>Procedures are generally stated and appropriate for students.</td>
<td>Procedures are specific, varied, and appropriate for students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The lesson plan(s) accommodate(s) appropriate cognitive levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students are required to acquire factual information, explain, or summarize.</td>
<td>Students are required to apply information, analyze complex ideas, or synthesize information.</td>
<td>Students are required to evaluate, judge, or value ideas and information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Differences in student capabilities are evidenced in the planning of instruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No provision for individual student capabilities is planned.</td>
<td>Plans intermittently provide for individual student capabilities.</td>
<td>Plans consistently provide for student capabilities, i.e., remedial, maintenance, and enrichment activities are specified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Evaluation of student progress on the objectives is indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No evaluation of student progress is indicated.</td>
<td>Only general, summative evaluation of student progress is indicated.</td>
<td>Specific, measurable student progress is indicated on each objective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. The lesson plan(s) incorporate(s) elements of effective instruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The lesson design does not reflect elements of effective instruction.</td>
<td>Some elements of effective instruction are included.</td>
<td>All elements are represented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREOBSERVATION REPORT</td>
<td>POSTOBSERVATION REPORT</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. What lesson will be taught? Is this new, practice, review, or a diagnostic lesson?</strong>&lt;br&gt;How does it fit in with the unit of study?</td>
<td><strong>1. Indicate topic and type of lesson.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of angles; transversals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 10, Page 195 in textbook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. What are the objectives for this lesson?</strong></td>
<td><strong>2. Were the objectives observed during the lesson?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student will list and label five kinds of angles on parallel lines when given the label of at least one angle.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student will define a transversal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. What teaching/learning activities will be used to accomplish the objective?</strong></td>
<td><strong>3. Were the teaching activities implemented?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question &amp; Answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worksheet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question &amp; Answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worksheet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question &amp; Answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worksheet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question &amp; Answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worksheet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREOBSERVATION REPORT</td>
<td>POSTOBSERVATION REPORT</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMARY TEACHER EVALUATION: PERFORMANCE AREAS &amp; CRITERIA</td>
<td>4. Indicate pertinent data gathered relevant to the criterion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Area I: Productive Teaching Techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion A: Demonstrates effective lesson planning skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion B: Implements the lesson plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion C: Motivates students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion D: Communicates effectively with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion E: Provides students with specific evaluative feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion F: Prepares appropriate diagnostic evaluation activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion G: Displays a thorough knowledge of subject matter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion H: Selects &amp; teaches learning content congruent with prescribed curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion I: Provides opportunities for individual abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion J: Ensures student time on task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion K: Sets high expectations for student achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Area II: Organized Structured Class Mgt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion A: Plans for and makes effective use of time, materials and resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion B: Demonstrates evidence of personal organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion C: Sets high standards for student behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion D: Organizes students for effective instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Area III: Positive Interpersonal Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion A: Demonstrates effective personal relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion B: Demonstrates awareness of needs of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion C: Promotes positive self concept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion D: Demonstrates sensitivity to relating to students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion E: Promotes self-discipline and responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Area IV: Professional Responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion A: Demonstrates employee responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion B: Supports school regulations and policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion C: Assumes responsibilities outside the classroom as they relate to school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion D: Engages in professional self-evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion E: Responds positively to suggested improvements and/or criticism in a timely manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREOBSERVATION REPORT</td>
<td>POSTOBSERVATION REPORT</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How will you know students have achieved the lesson objectives?</td>
<td>5. Was the students' mastery of the objectives evaluated? Did the students' master the objectives?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy of completed worksheets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Are there any group or individual characteristics which the observer needs to know about?</td>
<td>6. Was there responsiveness to the characteristics identified?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. General comments or additional information</td>
<td>7. General observations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMATIVE EVALUATION REPORT
PERFORMANCE AREA I. Productive Teaching Techniques

CRITERION 1. Demonstrates Effective Lesson Planning Skills
   a. Selects appropriate long-range goals consistent with district curriculum.
   b. Writes instructional objectives that are relevant to long-range goals.
   c. Selects objectives at the correct level of difficulty to assure successful learning experience for each student.
   d. Includes teaching methods and procedures relevant to the objective.
   e. Includes relevant student activities.
   f. Utilizes both formative and summative evaluation procedures.
   g. Plans appropriate time allotment.
   h. Selects a variety of teaching methods and procedures along with a variety of relevant student activities to use.

CRITERION 2. Implements the Lesson Plan
   a. Reviews and previews; provides the structure for learning.
   b. Communicates instructional objectives.
   c. Models activities congruent with topic being taught and provides guided practice to reinforce concepts.
   d. Utilizes lesson summary and closure techniques.
   e. Provides relevant independent practice activities.
   f. Provides effective transition.
   g. Checks for understanding.
   h. Monitors and adjusts lesson and is flexible.
   i. Evaluates lesson after presentation.

CRITERION 3. Motivates Students
   a. Communicates challenging scholastic expectations to students.
   b. Responds positively to students.
   c. Stimulates students by choosing materials and techniques at the appropriate level of difficulty.
   d. Gives feedback to students.
   e. Uses methods to stimulate creative expression.
   f. Stimulates creative thinking.
   g. Promotes active participation during the lessons.
   h. Provides opportunities for students to experience success.
STUDENT TEACHER SUMMATIVE EVALUATION REPORT

TEACHER: _________________________ DATE: ______________

DIRECTIONS: Beside each criterion, determine the descriptor which best describes the teacher's performance on that item. Record your rating for each item by darkening the appropriate bubble on the accompanying answer sheet. DO NOT MARK ON THIS FORM.

| LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE |
|-------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| CRITERIA                | NOT OBSERVED | DOES NOT MEET STANDARD | NEEDS IMPROVEMENT | MEETS STANDARD |

AREA I. Productive Teaching Techniques

1. Demonstrates Effective Lesson Planning Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Observed</td>
<td>The teacher does not demonstrate effective lesson planning skills.</td>
<td>The teacher inconsistently demonstrates effective lesson planning skills.</td>
<td>The teacher demonstrates effective lesson planning skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>The teacher consistently demonstrates effective lesson planning skills.</td>
<td>The teacher inconsistently demonstrates effective lesson planning skills.</td>
<td>The teacher demonstrates effective lesson planning skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Appropriate</td>
<td>The teacher inconsistently demonstrates effective lesson planning skills.</td>
<td>The teacher demonstrates effective lesson planning skills.</td>
<td>The teacher demonstrates effective lesson planning skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS:

2. Implements the Lesson Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Observed</td>
<td>The teacher does not implement the lesson plan effectively.</td>
<td>The teacher inconsistently implements the lesson plan effectively.</td>
<td>The teacher implements the lesson plan effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>The teacher implements the lesson plan effectively.</td>
<td>The teacher implements the lesson plan effectively.</td>
<td>The teacher implements the lesson plan effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Appropriate</td>
<td>The teacher inconsistently implements the lesson plan effectively.</td>
<td>The teacher implements the lesson plan effectively.</td>
<td>The teacher implements the lesson plan effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS:

3. Motivates Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Observed</td>
<td>The teacher dissuades students from performing according to their abilities.</td>
<td>The teacher inconsistently requires students to perform according to their abilities.</td>
<td>The teacher clearly motivates students to perform assigned tasks according to their abilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>The teacher motivates students to perform assigned tasks according to their abilities.</td>
<td>The teacher motivates students to perform assigned tasks according to their abilities.</td>
<td>The teacher motivates students to perform assigned tasks according to their abilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Appropriate</td>
<td>The teacher motivates students to perform assigned tasks according to their abilities.</td>
<td>The teacher motivates students to perform assigned tasks according to their abilities.</td>
<td>The teacher motivates students to perform assigned tasks according to their abilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS:
CRITERION 4. Communicates Effectively with Students
   a. Speaks clearly.
   b. Puts ideas across logically.
   c. Uses a variety of verbal and nonverbal techniques.
   d. Praises, elicits, and responds to student questions before proceeding.
   e. Gives clear, explicit directions.
   f. Utilizes effective questioning techniques.
   g. Provides structuring comments which clarify the tasks and help the lesson proceed smoothly.
   h. Uses appropriate demonstration techniques.
   i. Is a good listener.

CRITERION 5. Provides Students with Specific Evaluative Feedback
   a. Gives written comments, as well as points or scores.
   b. Returns student work as quickly as possible.
   c. Makes opportunities for one-to-one conferences.
   d. Administers district-constructed, criterion-referenced tests, and/or standardized tests.
   e. Interprets test results to students and parents.
   f. Verbally gives specific ongoing feedback throughout the lesson.

CRITERION 6. Prepares Appropriate Diagnostic Evaluation Activities
   a. Makes methods of evaluation clear and purposeful.
   b. Assesses prerequisite skills.
   c. Monitors student progress through a series of formative and summative evaluation techniques.
   d. Prepares tests which reflect course content.
   e. Regularly evaluates activities.

CRITERION 7. Displays a Thorough Knowledge of Subject Matter
   a. Relates specific topics or activities to content area.
   b. Explains topics or activities in context of content area.
   c. Uses appropriate examples and illustrations.
   d. Teaches accurate and up-to-date information.
   e. Identifies the subset of skills that are essential for accomplishing the instructional objective(s) of the lesson.
   f. Demonstrates possession of knowledge related to information sources relevant to the subject taught.
   g. Models skills associated with the subject taught.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Communicates Effectively with Students</td>
<td>Not Observed</td>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>Communications from the teacher are frequently unclear.</td>
<td>Communications from the teacher are usually clear, but student input is not encouraged.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Provides Students with Specific Evaluation Feedback</td>
<td>Not Observed</td>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>The teacher gives no evaluative feedback.</td>
<td>The teacher consistently gives evaluative feedback.</td>
<td>The teacher gives specific evaluative feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Prepares Appropriate Diagnostic Evaluation Activities</td>
<td>Not Observed</td>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>The teacher prepares diagnostic evaluation activities which are irrelevant to the instructional objective(s).</td>
<td>The teacher prepares diagnostic evaluation activities which are marginally related to the instructional objective(s).</td>
<td>The teacher prepares evaluation activities which are related to the instructional objective(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Displays a Thorough Knowledge of Subject Matter</td>
<td>Not Observed</td>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>The teacher does not display a thorough knowledge of subject matter.</td>
<td>The teacher inconsistently displays a thorough knowledge of subject matter.</td>
<td>The teacher displays a thorough knowledge of subject matter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITERION 8. Provides Opportunities for Individual Abilities
   a. Uses knowledge of individual students to design educational experience.
   b. Paces learning according to students' mastery of content.
   c. Provides extra help and enrichment activities.
   d. Presents subject matter which is appropriate for abilities and interests of students.
   e. Provides multimodel instruction to accommodate a variety of learning styles.
   f. Uses school and community resources to gain knowledge and understanding of students.
   g. Implements IEPs as required.

CRITERION 9. Ensures Student Time on Task
   a. Schedules learning time according to policy for the subject area(s).
   b. Begins class work promptly.
   c. Reinforces students who are spending time on task.
   d. Minimizes management time.
   e. Minimizes transition time.
   f. Maximizes time spent on learning objective for the lesson.

CRITERION 10. Sets High Expectations for Student Achievement
   a. Establishes expectations for students based on a level of skills acquisition appropriate to their ability level.
   b. Promotes personal goal setting.
   c. Uses appropriate sources of information to determine student ability level.
   d. Establishes student expectations based on student ability level.

PERFORMANCE AREA II. Organized, Structured Class Management

CRITERION 11. Plans for and Makes Effective Use of Time, Material, and Resources
   a. Organizes instructional materials effectively.
   b. Blends materials and resources smoothly into a lesson.
   c. Creates materials to use.
   d. Identifies available resources to use.
   e. Efficiently uses available time.
8. Provides Opportunities for Individual Abilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Observed</td>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>The teacher does not provide for individual abilities.</td>
<td>The teacher intermittently provides for individual abilities.</td>
<td>The teacher provides for individual abilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS:

9. Ensures Student Time on Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Observed</td>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>The teacher does not use techniques which ensure student time on task.</td>
<td>The teacher intermittently uses techniques that ensure student time on task.</td>
<td>The teacher uses techniques that ensure student time on task.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS:

10. Sets High Expectations for Student Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Observed</td>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>The teacher does not set high expectations for student achievement.</td>
<td>The teacher inconsistently sets high expectations for student achievement.</td>
<td>The teacher sets high expectations for student achievement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS:

AREA II. Organized, Structured Class Management

11. Plans for and Makes Effective Use of Time, Material, and Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Observed</td>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>The teacher does not use time, material, and resources effectively.</td>
<td>The teacher intermittently uses time, material, and resources effectively.</td>
<td>The teacher uses time, materials, and resources effectively.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS:
CRITERION 12. Demonstrates Evidence of Personal Organization
   a. Maintains classroom organization for efficient distribution of learning materials.
   b. Incorporates into daily planning content from previous levels for reinforcement and anticipates content from future grade levels to ensure continuity and sequence.
   c. Shows evidence of adequate lesson preparation and organization of work with objectives clearly in mind.
   d. Makes materials readily available to the students.
   e. Has all necessary materials and equipment ready for the lesson being taught.
   f. Provides adequate plans and procedures for substitute teachers.
   g. Presents materials in a well-organized fashion.
   h. Sets priority for planning.

CRITERION 13. Sets High Standards for Student Behavior
   a. Is familiar with administrative regulations, school board policies, and legal requirements, and implements them.
   b. Establishes and clearly communicates parameters for student classroom behavior.
   c. Promotes self-discipline.
   d. Manages disruptive behavior constructively.
   e. Demonstrates fairness and consistency in the handling of student problems.
   f. Demonstrates assertiveness when appropriate and necessary.
   g. Monitors student attention during the lesson.
   h. Behaves in ways that make students attentive at all times.

CRITERION 14. Organizes Students for Effective Instruction
   a. Uses grouping to encourage peer group interaction when appropriate.
   b. Makes use of the physical school environment to support current learning activities.
   c. Makes certain that procedures avoid or reduce wasted time for students.
   d. Groups students according to their instructional needs.
   e. Varies size of groups according to instructional objective.
   f. Creates a set of guidelines for students to follow when in small groups.
   g. Provides orientation for new students.
   h. Creates a safe learning environment.

PERFORMANCE AREA III. Positive Interpersonal Relations

CRITERION 15. Demonstrates Effective Interpersonal Relationships
   a. Makes use of support services as needed.
   b. Shares ideas, materials, and methods with other teachers.
   c. Informs appropriate personnel of school-related matters.
   d. Supports community involvement with the school as appropriate.
   e. Supports and participates in parent-teacher activities.
   f. Works well with other teachers and the administration.
   g. Provides a climate which opens up communications between the teacher and the parent.
   h. Has positive relationships with students individually and in groups.
12. Demonstrates Evidence of Personal Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not Observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The teacher is disorganized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The teacher intermittently displays evidence of personal organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The teacher displays evidence of personal organization, i.e., materials are available; the instructional sequence progresses logically.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:**

---

13. Sets High Standards for Student Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not Observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The teacher does not set high standards for student behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The teacher sets high standards for student behavior consistently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The teacher sets high standards for student behavior.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:**

---

14. Organizes Students for Effective Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not Observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The teacher does not use techniques which organize students for effective instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The teacher inconsistently uses techniques which organize students for effective instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The teacher uses techniques which organize students for effective instruction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:**

---

**AREA III. Positive Interpersonal Relations**

15. Demonstrates Effective Interpersonal Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not Observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The teacher does not display effective interpersonal relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The teacher inconsistently demonstrates effective interpersonal relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The teacher demonstrates effective interpersonal relationships.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:**
CRITERION 16. Demonstrates Awareness of the Needs of Students
   a. Shows awareness of needs and ability to deal with exceptional students.
   b. Shows sensitivity to mental, physical, and emotional development of students.
   c. Is aware of special health needs of students.
   d. Recognizes and deals properly with substance abuse by students.

CRITERION 17. Promotes Positive Self-concept
   a. Provides opportunities for all students to achieve recognition for constructive behavior.
   b. Provides opportunity for each student to meet success regularly.
   c. Promotes student self-control.
   d. Promotes positive self-image in students.

CRITERION 18. Demonstrates Sensitivity in Relating to Students
   a. Is readily available to all students.
   b. Acknowledges the rights of others to hold differing views or values.
   c. Is sensitive to student differences related to ethnicity, culture, and religion.
   d. Gives criticism which is constructive; praise which is generous.
   e. Makes an effort to know each student as an individual.
   f. Uses discretion in handling confidential information and difficult situations.
   g. Is a willing listener.
   h. Communicates with students sympathetically, accurately, and with understanding.
## 16. Demonstrates Awareness of Needs of Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not Observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The teacher is aware of the needs of students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The teacher inconsistently demonstrates awareness of the needs of students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The teacher is aware of the needs of students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:**

Not Observed

Appropriate

Not Appropriate

## 17. Promotes Positive Self-concept

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not Observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The teacher does not promote positive self-concept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The teacher inconsistently promotes self-concept for all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The teacher promotes positive self-concept for all students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:**

Not Observed

Appropriate

Not Appropriate

## 18. Demonstrates Sensitivity in Relating to Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not Observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The teacher does not show sensitivity in relating to students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The teacher inconsistently shows sensitivity in relating to students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The teacher demonstrates sensitivity in relating to students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:**

Not Observed

Appropriate

Not Appropriate
Classroom visit #
(Check one)  1  2  3  4  5  6

SS Number ______________________

Answer Sheet for Instructional Plans and Materials Assessment Scale

Circle the number that is your best answer. A "1" indicates a low rating and a "3" is the highest rating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### COMPUTER ASSISTED
#### TEACHER EVALUATION/SUPERVISION
#### CATE/S
#### SUMMATIVE EVALUATION REPORT
#### ANSWER SHEET

- Do not fold this form.
- Write comments only where indicated.
- Erase cleanly any marks you wish to change.

- Be sure to fill the bubbles completely.
- Use a No. 2 pencil to complete this form.

---

If a criterion is not observed, but appropriately so, MAKE NO MARK.

**The teacher...**

1. Demonstrates effective lesson planning skills.
2. Implements the lesson plan.
3. Motivates students.
4. Communicates effectively with students.
5. Provides students with specific evaluative feedback.
6. Prepares appropriate diagnostic evaluation activities.
7. Displays a thorough knowledge of subject matter.
8. Provides opportunities for individual abilities.
9. Ensures student time on task.
10. Sets high expectations for student achievement.
11. Makes effective use of time, materials, and resources.
12. Demonstrates evidence of personal organization.
13. Sets high standards for student behavior.
14. Organizes students for effective instruction.
15. Demonstrates effective interpersonal relationships.
16. Demonstrates awareness of needs of students.
17. Promotes positive self-concept.
18. Demonstrates sensitivity in relating to students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME:</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLDG. CODE</th>
<th>TEACHER ID. NO.</th>
<th>EVALUATOR NO.</th>
<th>DATE MO</th>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>YR.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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FACILITATOR'S MANUAL

Prologue
This album has been prepared for the Student Teacher Supervisor Assessment Center at California Polytechnic State University for the purpose of assessing the knowledge and supervisory skills of prospective student teacher supervisors. The album includes a Student Teacher Supervisor Assessment Instrument, a video recording, and a packet of forms to be used in an evaluation simulation. The materials contained in the album were developed by Dr. Richard P. Manatt and members of the School Improvement Model (SIM) research team at Iowa State University.

Technical advisor for this album was Dr. Kenneth Palmer, professor of education and director of the Student Teacher Supervisor Assessment Center at California Polytechnic State University. The album components were assembled and edited by J. Mike Lucas, research associate for the School Improvement Model. Serving on the jury of experts for performance ratings were Mary Davis, Glenn Holzman, Scarlett Rehrig, Joan Wilcox, and Karen Willis.

Sequence for Assessment
Although any sequence may be used in administering the components in the assessment album, it is recommended that the Supervisor's Assessment be completed first, followed by the Student Teacher Evaluation Simulation.

Section A of the album contains the Student Teacher Supervisor Assessment instrument, a sample universal scan-form answer sheet, and a similar scan-form with the appropriate "bubbles" filled in to serve as an answer key. The items in the assessment instrument are research-based and were designed to assess the prospective student teacher supervisor's knowledge of elements of effective instruction, classroom management, clinical supervision, and evaluation.
The instrument was subjected to a computerized item analysis and field tested in various sites across the United States to establish validity and reliability.

**Directions for administering the Student Teacher Supervisor's Assessment:**

1. Distribute the general purpose NCS® answer sheets for the *Student Teacher Supervisor Assessment* to the subjects.

2. Have the subjects complete the information section on the answer sheets. Remind them as they write in the boxes that the corresponding "bubbles" below each box are darkened as well. Be sure that all bubbles are sufficiently darkened so that the optical mark scanner will read them accurately.
   
   a. Under the "Grade or Educ" column on the answer sheet, have the subjects darken the bubble that corresponds with the grade level that they teach.
   
   b. Subject's Social Security number should be used for the "Identification Number" in that section.

3. Distribute the *Student Teacher Supervisor's Assessment* forms to the subjects, and begin. This part of the assessment should be completed in forty minutes.

4. When the subjects have completed the assessment, collect the forms and answer sheets for scoring.

Section B of the album is contains a packet of materials to be used in conjunction with the videotaped lesson to observe and evaluate the teacher's performance. The videotape and its accompanying materials were originally prepared for "The Teacher Performance Evaluation Cycle", a video-based training series produced for the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).

The videotape depicts Gerry Page teaching a lesson on transversals to an eighth grade advanced mathematics class. While the students were in Mr. Page's class during the time frame depicted and the lesson actually taught, the introduction of television crews and the opportunity to edit obviously changes reality in that classroom. It is recommended that the facilitator ask the subjects to make the assumption that it is a normal classroom setting and that all comments such as "Was this staged?" and "Did the students really behave in that manner?" be deferred until the assessment sequence is completed.
 Previewing the Videotape

The videotape may be divided into seven segments. It is suggested that the facilitator preview the videotape and record the video player's counter number for each of the segments listed in order to easily locate the correct starting place each time the tape is used. After an appropriate introduction, viewing for assessment purposes should begin at Segment 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment Title</th>
<th>Counter No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Segment 1</td>
<td>Prologue and credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 2</td>
<td>Manatt sets the stage (voiceover)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 3</td>
<td>Close of formative conference (Gerry Page &amp; Tom Drake)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 4</td>
<td>Manatt reviews classroom observation procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 5</td>
<td>Classroom visit -- Page teaches lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 6</td>
<td>Feedback conference (Page &amp; Drake)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 7</td>
<td>Manatt reviews formative evaluation elements and developmental supervision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibits contained in the Student Teacher Evaluation Simulation packet are referred to by their circled numbers. The description of teacher Jerry Page's mathematics class, for example, is referred to as Exhibit 1. The materials packet is arranged so that the answer sheets can be detached from the back without having to separate the rest of the materials.

Directions for administering the Evaluation Simulation:

1. Distribute the Student Teacher Evaluation Simulation packet to subjects.

2. Direct the subjects to read the materials associated with the videotaped lesson. These materials include the class description (Exhibit 1), the lesson plan (Exhibit 2), and the worksheet samples used by Mr. Page (Exhibit 3).
3. Ask the subjects to use the *Instructional Plans and Materials Assessment Scale* (Exhibit 4) to rate the lesson plan (Exhibit 2) and the student worksheet samples (Exhibit 3). Ratings should be marked on the Answer Sheet (Exhibit 7) included in the packet. **Be sure that subjects record their identification number in the space provided on the answer sheet.**

4. Have subjects view the videotaped classroom visit (Segment 5). Direct them to use a suitable method of data capture (i.e. scripting, timelining, anecdotal, etc.) to record their observations. A digital clock will appear in the lower right portion of the television monitor at 30-second intervals to facilitate timelining.

**Tip for facilitators** -- Suggest to the subjects that when gathering data during the lesson observation, they should follow this maxim: "It didn't happen if you didn't see it, and you didn't see it if you didn't write it down."

5. Following the lesson observation, the participants should analyze and label their notes and respond to the postobservation and comments sections in the *Student Teacher Lesson Observation Report* (Exhibit 5).

6. Direct the subjects to complete the information section on the CATE/S Summative Evaluation Report Answer Sheet (Exhibit 8). Be sure that their identification number corresponds to the numbers they used on the answer sheet for the *Supervisor's Assessment* and the answer sheet for the *Instructional Plans and Materials Assessment*.

7. Using the *Summative Evaluation Report* (Exhibit 6) and notes from their *Student Teacher Lesson Observation Report* (Exhibit 5), have the subjects evaluate Gerry Page's performance in the videotaped lesson and record their ratings for each of the criteria on the SER answer sheet (Exhibit 8).

**Tip for facilitators** -- Point out that the *Summative Evaluation Report* has been modified for training purposes and would normally have more items (including some centered on non-instructional criteria).
8. When the subjects have completed the simulation activities, direct them to turn in their answer sheets for both the *Instructional Plans and Materials Assessment* (Exhibit ⑦) and the *Summative Evaluation Report* (Exhibit ⑧).

Using the instruments in this album, an expert jury of five clinical supervisors in the School Improvement Model (SIM) research team at Iowa State University rated Mr. Page's instructional plans and materials, as well as his classroom performance, with the following results:

**Instructional Plans and Materials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rating:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Classroom Observation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rating:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion:</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rating:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The expert jury ratings on both the instructional plans and the performance of Mr. Page should be used as standards for comparison to score the evaluations of the assessment center participants. Deviations of ratings on either side of the expert jury ratings would count against the participant's score.

The final determination of successful completion of the student teacher supervisor assessment should be based upon a certain percentage of correct answers on the *Supervisor's Assessment*, and the appropriate ratings on both parts of the *Student Teacher Evaluation Simulation*. Eighty percent accuracy is recommended for a minimum "passing" score.