INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University Microfilms International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

7917677

BORNSTEIN, TINA J.
A FOLLOW-UP STUDY, COMPARING GRADUATES' AND SUPERVISORS' RATINGS OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS (1969-1976).

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, PH.D., 1978

University Microfilms International 300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

© 1978

TINA J. BORNSTEIN

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark ✓.

1. Glossy photographs _____
2. Colored illustrations _____
3. Photographs with dark background _____
4. Illustrations are poor copy _____
5. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page _____
6. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages ✓ throughout _____
7. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine _____
8. Computer printout pages with indistinct print _____
9. Page(s) _____ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author _____
10. Page(s) _____ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows _____
11. Poor carbon copy _____
12. Not original copy, several pages with blurred type _____
13. Appendix pages are poor copy _____
14. Original copy with light type _____
15. Curling and wrinkled pages _____
16. Other _____

University Microfilms International

300 N. ZEEB RD., ANN ARBOR, MI 48106 (313) 761-4700

A FOLLOW-UP STUDY, COMPARING GRADUATES' AND SUPERVISORS' RATINGS OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS (1969-1976)

By

Tina Bornstein

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Division of Student Teaching and Professional Development

1978

ABSTRACT

A FOLLOW-UP STUDY, COMPARING GRADUATES' AND SUPERVISORS' RATINGS OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS (1969-1976)

By

Tina Bornstein

Purpose

The major purpose of this study was to determine the degree to which data gained from supervisors' judgments of graduates contribute to the assessment of Michigan State University's teacher education programs.

Methodology

Comparisons were made between graduate and supervisor ratings of graduates' ability to apply selected teaching skills and of their level of commitment to the teaching profession. Supervisors' knowledge and ratings of teacher education programs were also examined.

The instruments used to collect data included the "Survey of Michigan State University College of Education Graduates," "Follow-Up Study of Michigan State University Graduates--Supervisor Survey," and the "Success Rating Chart," used to determine graduates' scores for the student teaching experience.

The graduates in the study were selected using a stratified random sampling procedure. Sixty individuals were selected for each group, which represented the intersection among the five programs and four graduation intervals. The sample of supervisors was generated by the respondents in the graduate sample. Each graduate was strongly encouraged but not required to name his/her immediate supervisor. Of the 269 supervisors in the sample, 236 returned questionnaires, for a return rate of 88 percent.

Supervisors' and graduates' ratings were compared to determine relationships and significant differences among programs and years of graduation. Whenever feasible, ratings of individual items were combined to form subscale ratings. In some of the analyses, supervisors ratings were treated independently, whereas in others they were compared to the graduates' self-ratings.

Major Findings

1. Supervisors and graduates generally agreed on the importance of the 11 specified teaching skills.

2. The results of the graduates' and supervisors' ratings of graduates' performance of specified teaching skills indicated they did not agree about the graduates' level of performance.

3. Supervisors' ratings of the graduates' performance of specified teaching skills did not differentiate among graduates from different programs.

4. There were no differences among programs, as measured by supervisors' ratings of the graduates' commitment to teaching.

5. The E.I.P. was ranked highest (a) on supervisors' accurate identification of the program from which the teacher had graduated, (b) as a factor for hiring potential, and (c) for better preparing graduates for classroom teaching. The Regular Program ranked lowest for (a) hiring potential and (b) for preparing graduates for classroom teaching, with Overseas and Cluster programs drawing neutral responses on these items.

6. The graduates' student teaching reports by their cooperating teachers had a very low correlation with the supervisors' ratings of the graduates' performance of specified teaching skills.

7. The graduates' student teaching reports by their cooperating teachers also had a very low correlation with the supervisors' ratings of the graduates' commitment to teaching.

8. No statistically significant differences were found between the general patterns of graduates' self-ratings and the supervisors' ratings of performance skills among programs and years.

9. It was recommended that supervisors' ratings should be included in future follow-up studies to evaluate teacher education programs. More research should be conducted to discover why supervisors' and graduates' ratings of graduates' performance skills differed so dramatically from one another.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am extremely thankful to the chairman of my committee, Dr. Henry Kennedy, whose interest, support, and flexibility have helped me to realize my goals.

In addition, I would like to thank Dr. Robert Scrivens, Dr. Paul Slocum, and Dr. James Tolliver for serving on my committee.

I am especially thankful to Dr. Jacqueline Caul, who originally inspired me to take this direction, and to Dr. Donald Freeman, who kept me moving along the right path.

I am also grateful to Francine Tompkins, Sherry Ralston, and Jeewaratnam Moses, who donated their time to help me collect data and have been encouraging and supportive friends.

Finally, this dissertation is dedicated to my husband, Fred, who has always challenged me to see the other side.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Teachers have a tremendous impact on the quality of elementary and secondary education and must be well prepared to meet the responsibilities of a classroom. Realizing the effect a teacher can have, it is imperative that educators design unique, high-quality teacher education programs. Many institutions train teachers, and most of these institutions offer a variety of training programs, but chances are not all of these programs, or the institutions themselves, are equally effective. Therefore, it is imperative that these institutions gather data on the quality of their programs with the intention of improving them. Because the success of an education institution can best be measured by the success of its graduates, it would seem that a first step in conducting a program evaluation would be to assess the performance of that program's graduates.

"A major and continuing problem of teacher education is the evaluation of its product--namely the teacher."[1] Sandefur suggested that program evaluation can be based partially on the evaluation of teachers who are graduates of these programs. Presently, institutions are not conducting enough program evaluation research, as will be documented later. Colleges of education must put greater effort into program evaluation. Needed is a systematic, valid procedure

to test how well teachers perform the tasks they have been trained to perform. Teacher educators must evaluate their graduates and adjust their teacher preparation programs on the basis of that evaluation information. To develop effective programs we need continuing follow-up studies of graduates' and their employers' (supervisors') evaluations of the institution's pre-service programs, combined with input from faculty, administrators, local school districts, and teacher organizations.

In reporting on the nursing preparation program at Amarillo College in Texas, Peterson concluded, "The employer follow-up has the potential capacity for determining justification of increased expenditures, progressive program development and accountability."[2] Supervisors have a first-hand understanding of the graduates and can provide useful evaluations because of their unique relationship with the teachers in their schools. Some distinctive outcomes that might be gained from a supervisor follow-up are:

- Rating graduates' professional and generic skills
- Assessing the competence of specific teacher education programs
- Comparing the professional qualities of program graduates with those of the general population of teachers
- Providing supervisors the opportunity to recommend areas of improvement or programs to be developed
- Developing employer contacts and assisting the institution with its public relations efforts

Statement of the Problem

In an effort to evaluate and improve existing programs, the Division of Student Teaching and Professional Development at Michigan State University conducted an extensive follow-up study of a sample of College of Education graduates from selected programs. The current dissertation was designed to work in conjunction with the Graduate Follow-Up Study--to focus on supervisors' judgments of the graduates in the study and to compare these judgments with the graduates' own judgments. (See page 14 for definitions of terms.) The research supported the assumption that both graduates and their supervisors can contribute valuable postgraduation information, providing a more global view of the impact Michigan State University teacher education programs have had on teacher performance and professionalism.

Purposes

The major purpose of this study was to determine the degree to which data gained from supervisors' judgments of graduates contribute to the assessment of Michigan State University's teacher education programs. More specifically, the study sought to determine the relationship between graduates' and supervisors' ratings of graduates' performance of specific teaching skills and the importance of these teaching skills. Eleven generic teaching skills were identified and relevant questions were asked of both the graduates and their supervisors. Relationships were drawn between supervisors' perceptions of the graduates' ability to apply these skills in the

classroom, and the graduates' perceptions of their own ability to apply these skills.

The second purpose of the study was to identify similarities and differences in the relative effectiveness of various undergraduate teacher preparation programs, as suggested by data provided by graduates and supervisors.

The third purpose was to analyze ratings provided by teachers and supervisors on the five teacher education programs being evaluated to identify similarities and differences among these five programs. The five programs under consideration were the Regular Student Teaching Program, Elementary Intern Program, Cluster Program, Overseas Program, and the Competency-Based Teacher Education Program.

The fourth purpose of the current research was to determine the relative effectiveness of various undergraduate teacher preparatory programs, as measured by supervisors' ratings of graduates' commitment to teaching and performance of specified teaching skills, and the supervisors' knowledge and rating of the value of specific teacher preparation programs at Michigan State University.

Finally, the fifth purpose was to determine the consistency among the ratings of the graduates and their supervisors and the evaluations of the graduates written by their cooperating teachers during the student teaching experience.

Importance of Study

This study is important for the following three reasons. First, it is customary to obtain follow-up information from graduates,

but it is worthwhile to investigate whether data provided by supervisors' perceptions of graduates' commitment to the profession, performance of specific teaching skills, and assessment of the teacher education programs are congruent with conclusions suggested by similar data from the graduates. Second, the results of this study of supervisors' ratings of Michigan State University graduates could assist in determining how much time, effort, and money should be directed to gathering and reviewing supervisors' opinions in future follow-up studies. Third, to insure the continuing improvement of teacher education programs, it is necessary consistently to evaluate existing programs. Adding supervisors' ratings to graduates' self-ratings in follow-up studies is possibly a more comprehensive method of evaluating teacher education programs than is examining graduates' ratings alone.

Generalizations

The findings of this study may have an impact beyond the limits of the study itself. Any serious effort to maintain quality undergraduate programs must include the experience and opinions of their graduates, so researchers should be open to any kind of data that could contribute to this undertaking. Will follow-up studies be more powerful if they include data from supervisors? The results of the present study indicate this method could be a model for others doing similar follow-up studies. This study might provide important information to Michigan State University's College of Education about its teacher education programs. The study might

also provide useful data for National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and other forthcoming evaluations of teacher education programs. In addition, the data could provide relevant information about which programs students should be advised to pursue. Results could also suggest which programs universities should continue to support.

Background

The College of Education provides professional programs for teachers at all levels of education. The five programs being evaluated in this study are teacher education programs offered through that College's Department of Teaching and Professional Development. A brief description of these five programs follows.

Regular Student Teaching Program

The Regular Program is a four-year plan and includes an assignment to a student teacher center for 11 weeks of student teaching. This instructional activity provides for actual classroom teaching experience and is an extension of the campus-based portion of the preparation program.

> Every student earning a Michigan elementary or secondary provisional teaching certificate through Michigan State University spends one academic quarter (in the case of Special Education candidates, two quarters) in this supervised laboratory experience in a cooperating school in one of the fourteen student teaching centers maintained by the College of Education.[3]*

*Correction: There are now eight student teaching centers.

Students wanting to teach in any of the majors offered at M.S.U. may meet graduation requirements through the Regular Student Teaching Program. Depending upon the student's major, specific coursework, including general, major, minor, and professional education is required, culminating in the student teaching experience, and usually followed by a social foundations course to complete the requirements for graduation.

The student teacher is placed in a school and is assigned to a supervising teacher; they cooperatively make plans to provide the student with meaningful experiences during the 11-week period. Depending in part on his/her readiness for teaching, the student first observes, increasingly assumes classroom responsibilities, and for a portion of the time teaches a full load. A university coordinator frequently visits the student in the school to provide guidance, instruction, and evaluation.

Cluster Program

The requirements for the Cluster Program are the same as for the Regular Student Teaching Program. The differences occur during the student teaching experience, where, in the Cluster Program, a group of 10 to 12 student teachers is assigned to one school building. A school faculty member is released one-half time to develop and direct a program for these student teachers; the half-time salary is reimbursed to the school district by the university. Having a cluster of students teaching in the same building provides increased opportunities for supervision, communication, seminars, and evaluation.

> This program was devised at Michigan State University as a model that would broaden the learning experiences of the student teachers. Planned student contact with several teaching models, a highly individualized experience, contact with a variety of school community activities, and greater involvement of the public school cooperating staff are primary elements of this program.[4]

Overseas Program

The Overseas Student Teaching Program has substantially the same pre-student-teaching requirements as the Regular Program. The University arranges for groups of students (15 to 25) to be assigned to overseas American schools for their term of student teaching. The experience is full time, following the regular university time requirements. "A regular Michigan State University faculty member from the Department of Student Teaching is assigned as coordinator of the program to work with the host school administration and faculty in planning, supervising and implementing a program of experiences for each student teacher."[5] Programs have been conducted in Madrid, Rome, Guadalajara, The Hague, Brussels, Lankenheath, and Belize. Teacher candidates are expected to engage in the usual activities of student teaching, observation, special program work, and student activities in addition to participating in available cross-cultural experiences.

Elementary Intern Program

As an alternative to the Regular Program in elementary education, students may elect the Elementary Intern Program (E.I.P.) during the first or second term of their sophomore year. In this program the

student spends two terms in a cooperating center during the junior year, and does supervised intern teaching the fourth year. While intern teaching, the student earns a salary of approximately $6,000. The E.I.P. "also includes the following two main deviations from the Regular Teacher Preparation Program. Methods classes are taught in a block in the off-campus centers and in conjunction with some observation on the part of the student; and the Elementary Intern spends two summers on campus,"[6] so as to graduate within a four-calendar-year period. Benefits of the E.I.P. include increased classroom exposure and the intern teaching experience, including extensive guidance and supervision by a master teacher (an intern consultant).

Competency-Based Teacher Education

The program includes a two-term sequence of 20 term hours of credit, one term of which is student teaching. During the first term, students spend one-half day weekly in a school and two hours weekly in a teacher education laboratory on campus. The second term provides for a full-time school experience.

> Clinical consultants supervise both terms of field experience. The clinical consultant is a classroom teacher relieved for a portion of his/her teaching load to provide this supervision. The university reimburses the school for the released time, providing an opportunity for the consultant to work together with the university staff on in-service training and program development.[7]

During this time students in the program complete the study and are evaluated on 14 selected major competencies within 5 major areas of teaching responsibility. Benefits of the program include increased school exposure and direct application of learned skills and theory

in micro-teaching and in the actual classroom. Final evaluation is based on the student teachers' performance of the specified skills.

Pre-student-teaching experiences are the same in the Regular, Cluster, and Overseas programs, depending on the individual's major and minor. The E.I.P. is different, in that the student spends two terms of the junior year in the cooperating center, taking methods classes and student teaching, followed by intern teaching the senior year. In the C.B.T.E. program, the entire experience comprises a two-term, 20-credit course that includes the social foundations material.

Procedure

In 1977-78, the Division of Student Teaching and Professional Development conducted the Graduate Follow-Up Study to assess graduates' opinions about the existing teacher education programs and their suggestions for improvement. There were two significant treatment variables in the study: (1) date of graduation and (2) student teaching program in which the individual was enrolled. The following academic years were selected for study: 1969-70, 1971-72, 1974-75, and 1975-76. These graduation intervals were selected to provide a base for plotting trends in selected aspects of professional development. These particular years were also chosen because of the availability of a sample for 1969-70 from the statewide study, "The Impact of Student Teaching Programs Upon the Cooperating Public Schools in Michigan."[8] The 1974-75 and 1975-76 school years were selected so as to include the C.B.T.E. program, and 1971-72 was selected

to insure realistic intervals to span the seven years of the study.

The five student teaching programs selected for study were: Regular, Cluster, Overseas, Elementary Intern Program (E.I.P.), and Competency-Based Teacher Education (C.B.T.E.). The 5x4 matrix resulting from the cross between teacher preparation programs and years of graduation had a total of 20 cells. Because it is a comparatively new program, there were no graduates of the C.B.T.E. program for the years 1969-70 and 1971-72. Thus, these two cells were empty. A random sample of 60 individuals from each of the other 18 cells participated in the graduate study. The total graduate sample size was 18 x 60 = 1,080 individuals. (See Appendix A.)

The primary focus of the current study was to examine the contributions that graduates' supervisors can make to a more thorough evaluation of the five teacher education programs. This study was based upon the data collected from the immediate supervisors of the graduates included in the Graduate Follow-Up Study. The supervisor data were compared specifically to the graduate data concerning the (1) perceived importance of specified teaching competencies, (2) perceived performance of specified teaching skills, and (3) perceived level of commitment to the teaching profession. Supervisors were also asked to report their knowledge of the five teacher education programs. This study also compared the supervisors' ratings to the rating of the graduates' final evaluation by their cooperating teachers during the student teaching experience.

Questions

The study was designed to answer the following specific questions as to whether or not supervisors' ratings should be included in graduate follow-up studies evaluating teacher education programs:

I. To what extent will ratings provided by supervisors differ from those provided by graduates?

   a. Will ratings of the "importance" of specific teaching skills provided by Michigan State University graduates differ from those provided by their supervisors?

   b. To what extent will ratings of "performance" of specific teaching skills provided by Michigan State University graduates differ from those provided by their supervisors?

II. Will judgments provided exclusively by supervisors assist in determining differences among teacher education programs?

   a. Will supervisors' ratings of the graduates' performance of specified teaching skills differ among the five teacher education programs?

   b. Will supervisors' ratings of the professional commitment of graduates to teaching differ among the specified teacher education programs?

III. Does a supervisor's knowledge of specific teacher education programs differ from one program to another?

IV. Will there be a significant relationship between the supervisors' ratings of the graduates and the ratings of graduates by their cooperating teachers during the student teaching experience?

   a. Will supervisors' ratings of the graduates' commitment to teaching differ from similar ratings provided by their cooperating teachers?

   b. Will supervisors' ratings of graduates' performance of specified teaching skills differ from like ratings provided by their cooperating teachers?

V. Are the variations among programs suggested by data provided by graduates the same as variations among programs suggested by data provided by supervisors?

Hypotheses

The study was based on the premise that supervisors' judgments should be included in graduate follow-up studies, to evaluate teacher education programs more accurately. To validate this belief, the following hypotheses were tested:

H_1: Ratings provided by supervisors will be significantly different from those provided by graduates.

This hypothesis will be regarded as true if there is a significant difference between supervisor and graduate judgments of the importance of specific teaching skills and of the graduates' performance of these specific teaching skills.

H_2: Information provided by supervisors will be valuable in determining differences among the specified teacher education programs.

This hypothesis will be regarded as true if there is a significant difference among teacher education programs, as measured by supervisors' ratings of graduates' professional commitment to teaching and their performance of specified teaching skills.

H_3: Supervisors' knowledge of teacher education programs will differ among programs.

This hypothesis will be regarded as true if there is a significant difference among programs as measured by the supervisors' ability to identify the specific teacher education programs from which the teachers graduated.

H_4: There will be a significant correlation between the supervisors' ratings of graduates and the ratings of graduates by their cooperating teachers during the student teaching experience.

This hypothesis will be regarded as true if a significant statistical relationship is found between cooperating teachers' ratings and supervisors' ratings of graduates' commitment to teaching and performance of specified teaching skills.

H_5: Variations among programs suggested by graduates' judgments will be significantly different from variations among programs suggested by supervisors' judgments.

This hypothesis will be regarded as true if data provided by graduates and those provided by supervisors suggest significant differences among programs.

Definition of Terms

Competence--Ability to apply the essential principles and techniques of teaching to practical situations.

Cooperating Teacher--The classroom teacher who supervised the graduate during his/her student teaching experience.

Graduates--Those who completed a specified teacher education program and received a degree from Michigan State University.

Performance--Actual accomplishment as distinguished from potential ability, capacity, or aptitude.

Professional Commitment--The degree to which a teacher has attained the specialized attitudes and dedication that characterize commitment to teaching, as judged by the supervisor.

Rating--An estimate, made according to some systematic procedure, of the degree to which a person or thing possesses a given characteristic.

Teaching Skills--Specific actions that the teacher has learned to perform with ease and precision; may be either cognitive, psychomotor, or affective performance (e.g., the ability to relate to students).

Supervisors--Persons identified by the graduates in the sample as the immediate supervisors to whom they are responsible. This could include principals, assistant principals, department heads, or any other supervisory person designated in that particular school system.

Organization of the Study

In the first chapter an introduction to and statement of the problem were presented, along with a brief description of the procedures employed in the study. The major questions to be tested were stated, and significance of the research, generalizations, and definitions pertinent to the study were discussed.

Chapter II, the review of related literature, contains three sections: a review of trends in evaluation of teacher education programs, a review of research on supervisors' ratings of teachers and teachers' self-ratings, and a review of follow-up studies using evaluations from graduates and their supervisors.

The design of the study is detailed in Chapter III. Included are a description of the sample, information on the measuring instruments, and an explanation of the procedures used in collecting and analyzing the data. The hypotheses to be tested are stated and the statistical analysis is described.

The findings of the study are reported in Chapter IV.

Conclusions and recommendations, as well as implications for further studies, are presented in the final chapter.

Footnotes--Chapter I

[1]J. T. Sandefur, Illustrated Model for Evaluation of Teacher Education Graduates (Washington, D.C.: AACTE, 1970), p. 1.

[2]Larry K. Patterson, Graduate Employee Follow-Up (Amarillo, Texas: Amarillo College, 1977), p. 9.

[3]Hugo David, ed., Toward Excellence in Student Teaching (Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co., 1973), p. 1.

[4]Charles Jackson, "A Study of Selected Student Teaching Experiences Reported by Michigan State University Cluster Program and Conventional Program Student Teachers" (Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971), pp. 16-17.

[5]Banks Bradley, "Overseas Student Teaching: A Follow-Up Study Report as an Assessment of Intercultural Experiences in Student Teaching" (East Lansing: Michigan State University Department of Student Teaching, 1975), p. 1.

[6]Robert Arends, "A Comparative Study of the Graduates of the Michigan State University Elementary Intern Program and the Regular Teacher Education Program" (Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1969), p. 7.

[7]Michigan State University and participating school districts, "P.O.I.N.T.E." (East Lansing: Division of Student Teaching and Professional Development, 1978), p. 3.

[8]Deans and Directors of Teacher Education in Michigan, Student Teaching Programs: Questions and Answers, "The Impact of Student Teaching Programs Upon the Cooperating Public Schools in Michigan" (June 1970).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

An exhaustive examination, including a thorough library search and direct correspondence with the individuals and institutions presently involved in research pertaining to teacher education, revealed several studies focusing on evaluations of programs that were somewhat related to the current study. However, none of those studies included the diversities of procedures and designs necessary to give a basis for answering the specific questions posed in Chapter I. This chapter contains three sections designed to provide the reader with the background necessary for understanding the conceptual framework of this study. The three sections include a review of trends in evaluation of teacher education programs, a review of research concerning supervisors' ratings of teachers and teachers' self-ratings, and a review of follow-up studies using evaluations from graduates and their supervisors.

A Review of Trends in Evaluation of Teacher Education Programs

The review of trends in evaluation of teacher education programs includes a look at the guidelines and recommended standards for accreditation of basic and advanced teacher preparation programs. Using these standards as a broad base from which to develop actual evaluation models, a review of experts' opinions outlines the direction that evaluation of teacher education programs should take.

Also presented in this section are two models that suggest actual procedures for the effective evaluation of teacher education programs.

Educators on the national level are continuously striving to improve the quality of teaching in this nation. For example, a major goal of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) is to set up procedures that will assure the public that accredited programs "meet national standards of quality," that "children and youth are served by well prepared personnel," and that the teaching profession is advanced "through the improvement of preparation programs."[1] The new standards of the AACTE establish a relationship between "the nature of programs, and the teaching ability of their graduates, and the values which should inform [sic] efforts toward improving programs."[2]

The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) has set certain standards for educators. The following statement prefaces standards 6.1 and 6.2 on evaluation:

> The ultimate criterion for judging a teacher education program is whether it produces competent graduates who enter the profession and perform effectively. An institution committed to the preparation of teachers keeps abreast of new developments in the evaluation of teacher education personnel and engages in systematic efforts to evaluate the quality of its graduates . . . when they complete their programs of study, and after they enter the teaching profession.[3]

Standard 6.2 reads: "The institution regularly evaluates its teacher education programs and uses the results of its evaluation in the modification and improvements of those programs."[4]

Teacher educators agree that evaluation of teacher education programs and their curricula is essential to ensure quality preparation

of teachers. Heath claimed, "Whether as a developmental function, as an aid to the practicing educator, or as fundamental research, evaluation of the interaction between a curriculum and its environment seems essential."[5] Mayhew agreed that "the establishment, operation, and evaluation of the curriculum ought to be one of the central responsibilities of college faculties and academic administration. It is the vehicle through which the institution seeks to make its most significant impact on the lives of students."[6] Woodring concurred: "In spite of the fact that projects in teacher education are, by their very nature, difficult to evaluate, the problem of evaluation must be accepted as a major responsibility of all experimental projects if we are to know the extent of their success."[7] Piyush implied the importance of program evaluation when he wrote, "The quality of education in schools hinges primarily on the quality of teachers. High levels of professional competence of teachers are crucial for the successful dissemination of human knowledge from one generation to the next."[8]

The necessity of evaluation has been established and confirmed, but extensive program evaluations are not being undertaken. There are many reasons for this. Woodring claimed,

> Never before in history has a major nation provided so much education for so many for so long. Unfortunately the emphasis on quantity has not been accompanied by a similar emphasis on quality; we provide more education but it is not all that clear that we provide better education than other nations, or an education that is nearly as good as we can provide, with our vast resources.[9]

Besides emphasizing quantity rather than quality in education, educators are confused about the methodology to follow for successful

evaluation. Evaluation is more than a mere compilation of factual data; "it implies a system of values and decisions about values involving human judgment."[10] Evaluation requires decisions about accepted practices and their possible improvement.

Sandefur claimed that since reliable evaluation tools have been developed there is no excuse for not proceeding to evaluate teacher education programs.

> It is evident that teacher education institutions have largely ignored the evaluation of their graduates. This failure has been due primarily to the profession's inability to determine what constitutes effective teaching. Fortunately both of these conditions which have prohibited evaluation have been removed and that teacher education institutions must now move ahead with systematic approaches to evaluating their products.[11]

He offered two premises:

1. A sufficient body of research now exists from which inferences may be drawn, and substantiated, on the characteristics of good teaching and good teachers. The findings of research on teaching and learning form a configuration that is subject to order and can be incorporated into instructional schemata.

2. Classroom observational systems and other evaluative tools have been developed which enable educators to assess teaching behavior in a systematic fashion.

The next issue of methodology to contend with is: Who should evaluate the graduates? The current study utilized supervisors' evaluations and graduates' self-evaluations, but the researcher cannot ignore the worth of input from other sources. A controversial argument for accountability is that teacher ratings should be based

on student performance. This argument could very well be applied to the evaluation of teacher education programs based on the performance of pupils in the graduate's classroom. Herbert stated:

> It has often been argued that the validity of the evaluation of a teacher preparation program increases if the evidence is collected as close as possible to the final product --the changes in the pupil.
>
> Though indisputable in theory, this argument does not work in practice. While we should do more and better research on which teacher behaviors result in changes in pupil behavior, it is not expedient to evaluate teacher preparation programs, by such changes in the schools where the teachers find employment. Pupil changes occur to a great number of different individuals, each of unknown personality, unpredictable cultural conditioning and idiosyncratic response. The reaction to any teacher cannot necessarily be attributed to the teacher much less the teacher's preparation.[12]

Evaluators of teacher education programs suggest using contributions from the pupils, peers, supervisors, and the self-ratings of graduates. Another method of evaluation is the evaluation of graduate teaching performance by trained observers. The major focus of Michigan State University's graduate follow-up study was self-evaluation. Kaufman supported this approach: "The most common approach to the evaluation of instruction now is through student evaluation of their learning experiences."[13] He also justified soliciting supervisor ratings, citing specifically a study evaluating South Alabama University's teacher training program:

> Two instruments, severally addressed to two groups of respondents, in the ultimate analysis, converge on an appraisal of the work of the University in the skills, insights, knowledge essential to effective teaching. The selection of the two sources of feedback (graduates and their supervisors) on South Alabama's teacher training program is apt and judicious.[14]

An extensive discussion of the validity of supervisor ratings and teacher self-ratings is included in the second section of this literature review.

The process of evaluation in education is a measure of the achievement of objectives and of the possible need for redefinition or modification of these objectives. There is a need for the evaluation process as an aid in identifying and abandoning outmoded and obsolete practices while promoting relevant and useful programs.

Baer endorsed the need for evaluation of teacher education programs. He wrote:

> Increasingly those individuals and institutions working with teachers-to-be are feeling and assuming responsibility for the performance of their graduates. Recognizing that teaching success is directly proportional to the quality of teacher preparation, institutions are seeking to measure the effectiveness of their programs.[15]

Grommon conducted a survey of 392 colleges of education to discover the extent, nature, and value of follow-up programs for program evaluation, and concluded that not enough evaluation is being done. He revealed that one-fifth of the universities studied had conducted follow-up studies of secondary programs, and one-half had conducted studies of elementary programs. He identified two types of studies--formal and informal. Informal studies, he said, are extremely unreliable; "fewer than 10% performed formal follow-up studies of the 392 colleges surveyed."[16] Based on his research, Grommon made the following suggestions for follow-up improvements: (1) people in charge of follow-up studies are now assigned the task as extra duty, whereas full time should be devoted to such research;

(2) researchers must substantiate their findings and make the appropriate changes based on these results; and (3) follow-up studies should be conducted for more than first-year teachers.

A more recent survey, by Peques, revealed that 42 percent of NCATE-accredited institutions are not conducting follow-up evaluations. She contended that "Parent institutions appear to be exerting only minimal pressure on training programs to conduct follow-up evaluations. The external pressure provided by NCATE, NASDTEC and Regional Accrediting Associations may not be potent enough factors in influencing the extent of follow-up evaluation practices."[17] It becomes evident that despite the increase in information supporting the value of follow-up studies, the actual practice of conducting such studies has increased little in the past decade.

Sandefur recommended a practical model for conducting follow-up studies for the evaluation of teacher education programs. Depending on the availability of time, money, and human resources, an institution can adapt and fit this model to its own particular needs. Sandefur cautioned that "any model for evaluating the product of teacher education will be inadequate and incomplete. The problems are too great and the knowledge about evaluation too limited to allow the presentation of a model which is not subject to criticism."[18] He suggested, "The proposed evaluative data can be derived from four categories: (A) career line data; (B) direct classroom observation; (C) pupil, peer, and supervisor evaluations; and (D) standardized measures."[19] He defined these four categories as follows:

Career Line Data: Demographic information, program success (GPA), continued professional preparation, and perception of the quality of their teacher preparation programs are examples of the data that constitute career line data. All these data, collected from the participating teachers, are concerned with their personal background, professional development, and perceptions of the preparatory program.

Direct Classroom Observation: A category of data that has been shown to be most important in the study of teacher effectiveness is direct observation of the teacher and students in the classroom. This observation should be systematic and provide data suitable for assessing a teacher's competence.

Pupil, Peer, and Supervisor Evaluations: It seems reasonable to collect data from the sources most closely associated with the teacher--students, peers, and supervisors. "Rating scales have the advantage of allowing the researcher to use a human observer to describe characteristics of another person."[20] Sandefur found a definite relationship between these sources, lending credence to the thesis that "supervisors as well as pupils can consistently identify these important teaching behaviors."[21]

Standardized Measures: Sandefur discussed the drawbacks of using standardized achievement tests to measure student gain, and did not recommend using such tests as product measures in evaluating teacher education programs. However, more research is needed in this area to determine those teaching competencies and characteristics that can and should be evaluated. Sandefur suggested that

standardized measures, especially the authoritarianism measure, be used to assess certain personality characteristics that seem desirable in teachers. However, he pointed out the inconclusiveness of research in this area.

Sandefur summarized the development of his model:

> The effort to design a model for the evaluation of teacher education graduates was based on two major premises: that a sufficient body of research was now in existence from which generalizations on good teaching and good teachers can be drawn, and that classroom observational systems and other evaluative tools had been developed which enabled educators to evaluate systematically the product of teacher education programs in the light of research findings. The overriding premise was, of course, the position that institutions of teacher education had historically ignored the whole area of evaluation but were now required to face this issue because of the new standards implemented by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.[22]

In an attempt to help Pennsylvania State University keep better track of its teacher education graduates, Peshkopia developed a model to be used in conducting follow-up research.[23] He suggested that such research should be conducted in the following stages:

Stage A: Secure a list of prospective teacher education graduates--prior to graduation--to insure correct addresses.

Stage B: Generate a sample of prospective teacher education graduates.

Stage C: Orient the sample of prospective teacher education graduates--student involvement will increase response.

Stage D: Collect data from the sample and evaluations from their supervisors.

> Generally the purpose of [submitting] the evaluation scale to employers was to obtain feedback about graduates that would assist faculty with program improvement. The questionnaire

for the graduates and the teacher evaluation scale for their employers were designed to discover:

1. Names and addresses of the persons directly responsible for the supervision of former graduates who are teaching.
2. The percentage of graduates who actually enter teaching in September immediately after graduation.
3. The percentage who reject teaching completely and who decide to seek more attractive opportunities.
4. The effect which geographic constraints, student teaching or other factors have on job placement.
5. Evaluations of first year teachers by their employers.
6. Opinions from graduates concerning their teacher education programs.[24]

Stage E: Analyze information from the Teacher Questionnaire and supervisors' evaluations.

Stage F: Improve the plan for next repetition.

Stage G: Conduct a cost analysis of the plan.

Realizing that the cost factor is often the major deterrent to education institutions' conducting follow-up studies, Peshkopia devised a flexible, reasonably economic model. He concluded,

> Educators agree that follow-up of graduates is important but have found that operating a system of regular follow-up of graduates is not only costly but administratively cumbersome. The quality of return for the total effort expended usually is disappointing. This field test should be important to NCATE and teacher education institutions in general for it demonstrates a cost effective follow-up system for gathering information about teacher graduates which can be described in NCATE literature and adapted for use by any college or university.[25]

Universities must not lose sight of the purpose of follow-up research. The actual process of conducting such studies is very demanding in terms of human resources, and is also very expensive. The goal, again, is to make necessary improvements in existing teacher education programs. Johnson substantiated this statement:

> It must be stated that a study of this type is meant to provide feedback regarding the educational experiences of undergraduates in the college of education. Evaluation of the results of this feedback must result in modification, both qualitative and quantitative, of the experiences provided students. If this feedback is not examined and used as a criterion for curriculum change and teaching emphasis, the purposes for performing this investigation have not been met.[26]

If the results of a given study provide definite information for the alteration of a program, the results must be heeded, or the study was for naught.

A Review of Research Concerning Supervisors' Ratings of Teachers and Teachers' Self-Ratings

A significant number of researchers have analyzed the validity of supervisors' ratings of teachers and teachers' self-ratings. The purpose of this section is to review the literature concerned with using supervisors' and graduates' ratings in evaluating teacher education programs. There are also other reasons for using graduate and supervisor ratings. Swartz reported, "A proclaimed justification of the evaluation procedure is to serve administrative purposes (i.e., promotion, tenure, salary adjustment) and to help teachers to improve the instructional process."[27] Also reviewed in this section is research conducted on the validity of supervisors' and teachers' perceptions of the teacher's performance. This review is important because the current study was intended to analyze supervisors' ratings and graduates' self-ratings in relation to their contribution to the improvement of teacher education programs.

In his article on teacher evaluation, McAfee posed the following questions:

> If you were to take a group of teachers and their immediate supervisors and ask them the same questions about the job being done by the teachers, how closely would they agree? Would they agree as to the importance of the objectives, and how well the objectives are attained? Would they agree as to how well and how effectively the teacher works with different types of students, his supervisor, other teachers, parents, and the community in general (add professionalism and training)? Would they agree as to the effectiveness of the teacher's ability to communicate with students, motivate them, and help them to improve their self-image?[28]

McAfee attempted to answer these questions through a study he conducted for Southern Illinois University. He asked 1969-70 and 1970-71 teaching graduates to evaluate themselves and their performance in relation to an inventory of 41 items designed to measure teacher performance and personal characteristics. The graduates furnished their supervisors' names, and the supervisors were asked to evaluate the graduates using the same instrument.

The results of the survey were varied. Teachers and supervisors did not agree about who (the teacher or the supervisor) set the objectives for the course being taught by the teacher. In regard to meeting their objectives, supervisors gave the teachers a higher rating (88 percent) than the teachers gave themselves (68 percent). Both parties agreed that the teachers had an above-average understanding of students. They also concurred on the following teacher performance and personality characteristics: an above-average relationship with their supervisors; an average relationship with parents of students; and above-average ratings on personal characteristics, teachers' ability to rate themselves, and planning skills. Of the 51 items in the survey, teachers and supervisors agreed on 35 percent, or 17 items. McAfee stated,

> It is apparent from the response to the items on the questionnaire by both teachers and supervisors that they do not often agree on their estimates of the teachers' abilities, professional skills, attitudes, public relations and knowledge, and use of various methods and techniques of teaching.[29]

The lack of agreement between supervisors and teachers in McAfee's study damaged the validity of both responses. He concluded, "with such a wide variation between teachers' and supervisors' responses it seems possible that either the teachers or the supervisors or both are incapable of correctly evaluating the teachers' performance, background, and abilities."[30]

Crisp conducted a study to determine how experienced secondary school English teachers evaluated themselves in knowledge of English and in English teaching abilities. He found,

> On the basis of the data obtained in this survey, teachers with more years of teaching experience do in fact tend to rate themselves higher in given areas of knowledge in English and knowledge and skill in the teaching of English than do teachers with less experience.[31]

Cook and Richards identified "one of the most difficult problems facing supervisors of teachers and principals of schools where beginning teachers are performing in actual classroom situations, is that of determining the success of teacher behavior."[32] In their study to reveal the dimensions of principal and supervisor ratings of teacher behavior, they interpreted the results to mean that the rating scales generated data that were more a reflection of the rater's point of view than of a teacher's actual classroom behavior. They found that

> the teachers' ratings may reflect the expectations of the evaluator more than the actions of the teacher. Regardless of how these results are interpreted, however, it is clear

> that information about a teacher's performance based on rating scales should be interpreted with caution.[33]

The purpose of Carey's study was to examine the validity of the practice of interpreting teachers' perceptions of their performance as an indication of their actual performance on specified teaching skills. Many state departments of education, universities, and teacher centers use this procedure to assess students and teachers on identified skills, to evaluate existing training programs, and make decisions about forthcoming teacher training.

Carey compared teachers' self-ratings to trained observers' ratings. He stated,

> Using teachers' perception scores to predict actual performance scores on teaching skills appears to be an invalid practice. This finding held true for three different types of questions, namely, recall of verbal information, concept identification, and problem solving questions.[34]

He warned,

> . . . Basing inservice on teachers' said need does not appear to be valid. The acquisition of accurate data concerning teachers' competence on specified teaching skills is not the only ingredient that should be used to identify inservice training priorities.[35]

The evidence presented by the four researchers discussed above demonstrates the human factor of misperception in evaluating teaching performance. Herbert summarized the limitations of supervisor ratings:

> Information of this kind is relatively accessible since it can be gathered directly or by interview, or by other techniques, not as direct. Such information, however, is subject to a number of limitations. Procedures and criteria for evaluating teachers vary from district to district, and frequently the evidence on which ratings are based is very meager or second hand. The personality of the principal also seems to

> have a substantial effect on the ratings of a teacher's ability and social competence. In addition, school districts and college supervisors do not agree in their ratings of teachers. Perhaps the attempts to divide teachers into types based on profiles of attributes they have in the principals' judgment may be more valid, but the evidence is not strong.[36]

Hardebeck's study was designed to determine the degree to which teachers mastered individualized instruction by comparing trained education observers' evaluations and teachers' self-evaluations. According to that researcher,

> Both observations and surveys are acceptable methods to assess and describe characteristics or situations. Observations by trained observers have the advantage of potentially high inter-observer reliability. Surveys have the advantage of relative low cost and lack of geographical restraints.[37]

Hardebeck further claimed,

> Researchers often gather data by sending questionnaires, opinionnaires, or other self reporting forms to the population being studied. Is it reasonable to expect reliability from responses which come from individuals untrained in the use of the particular instrument and possibly uninformed as to the intended meaning of terminology used in the instrument?[38]

A partial answer to Hardebeck's question was presented by Worle, who studied the effects of training on the variance in teachers' ratings. He found that variance was influenced by two factors. First, greater variance existed when raters used unscaled items than when they used scaled items. This supported Harris, Bessent, and McIntyre's claim that when a rater had specific behavioral items upon which to focus his attention the ratings tended to become more uniform than when only general terms were offered. Second, training did alter variance.[39]

Swartz conducted a mail survey to study the differences among group ratings of the same instructor. A population of 72 teachers of different backgrounds, teaching in the field of trade and industrial education, was selected. Each instructor rated himself and was rated by one school administrator, a supervisor, two teaching colleagues, and pupils. The results revealed that the school administrators, supervisors, and colleagues had similar views, whereas students' ratings and teachers' self-ratings did not reveal many similarities. Swartz concluded, "It implies that the emphasis of teaching effectiveness is placed differently by different groups, and thus ratings from a single group of raters would not reveal a total picture of the teaching effectiveness of an instructor."[40]

Swartz cited some of the related research supporting his study: A 1969 study by Johnson and Radebaugh found that administrators could effectively evaluate and identify superior teachers. Owens, in 1971, concluded that administrators, teachers, and college supervisors perceived most areas of teacher competence similarly.[41]

Results of the research on teacher evaluation are extremely conflicting. For the purposes of the current study, it would have been negligent to avoid the findings citing the limitations of supervisors' ratings and teachers' self-ratings. The two major limitations appear to be nonsystematized ratings and human misperceptions. In the current study, both the supervisor and the graduate rated teaching performance with the same instrument. The researcher understands the possible dynamics of perceptions and partially compensated by comparing the evaluations with the student

teaching evaluations. The research supporting the use of supervisors' and teachers' evaluations of teaching performance lends credence to the current study.

The next section includes a review of follow-up studies using evaluations from graduates and their supervisors, and their implications for the present research.

A Review of Follow-Up Studies Using Evaluations From Graduates and Their Supervisors

This section of the literature review cites recent follow-up studies soliciting evaluation data from both graduates and their supervisors. Kaufman supported this approach to the evaluation of teacher education programs:

> A variation that seems to us most appropriate is the use of dual samples. In this case you are interested in comparing the responses of one or more samples from one or more populations. We recommend to the reader that your survey design be set up to accommodate both graduates and their immediate supervisors. If you query both samples, you can compare their responses to see if there is agreement or disagreement. In this particular case of dual sampling we are really using the sample from one population to generate the sample from another population. This is perfectly acceptable and in this case necessary if you are to match the responses of the graduates to the responses of their immediate supervisors.[42]

The purpose of Piyush's study was to follow up graduates of a preservice field-based program after they had taught one to five years. The sample was composed of 86 graduates employed as full-time science teachers in Ohio during 1974 and 1975. They had been teaching for a period ranging from one to five years, at different levels (elementary, junior high, and senior high school), and in different settings (urban and suburban). The solicited responses came from

administrators, students, and the teachers themselves. Preservice data included each subject's score on the Science Classroom Activities Checklist and his/her grade point average.

The data analysis revealed there were no significant differences in changes of teachers' views regarding the appropriate types of classroom activities, or in the types of activities implemented by the teachers with one to five years of teaching experience. The graduates' views toward inquiry-oriented teaching and the use of such activities in the classroom remained stable after five years of teaching. The administrators' views regarding science teaching and the support given science teachers were a strong independent predictor variable.

It is important to take into account the independent variables in teacher education, especially when attempting to evaluate a teacher education program by the performance of its graduates. Piyush stated,

> Teaching-learning is a complex process. The participants in this process, a teacher and a learner, bring to a classroom their own personality characteristics, unique motivations, and expectations. It is easy to decide on rational statements about what a learner and a teacher should do in the classroom. It is exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, to block their unique personality characteristics from playing their role in it. In addition, availability of materials and physical facilities influence the performance of the teacher as well as the learner.[43]

Although these independent variables cannot be controlled for in the research evaluating teacher education programs, they must be considered in the final analysis.

Adams conducted a pilot study to field test a theoretical model for the evaluation of a teacher education program, using

Sandefur's model (described earlier in this chapter). Forty individuals were observed during their student teaching, toward the end of their first year of teaching, after three years, and finally after five years of teaching. The results indicated that studies using Sandefur's model can be successful. Adams concluded:

1. Elementary teachers became less authoritarian after one year of teaching.

2. There was no significant difference between the cooperating teachers' ratings of student teaching behavior and peer and supervisor ratings after one year of teaching.

3. The secondary supervisors' ratings were lower than the cooperating teachers' ratings for the teaching dimension "relations with students."

4. Pupil ratings during student teaching and after the first year of teaching did not differ significantly from one another.

5. Classroom interactions for elementary and secondary school teachers did not change significantly after one year of teaching experience.[44]

Coyne reported the results of a study comparing the conventional teacher education program and the new Missouri Western Continuum Program. The new program comprised 54 weeks of classroom experience starting with the sophomore year, and replaced traditional education courses with seminars with faculty and school personnel.

The information collected included scores on proficiency examinations, student questionnaires, and school administrators'

evaluations of students' performance as observed on video tapes. The T-test for paired groups was used to analyze the data. The findings of the study were:

1. The supervisors' evaluations of the students in the new program were significantly superior to those of the comparison group.

2. The students in the new program had significantly superior attitudes toward the concurrent education courses than did the comparison group.

3. Perceptions (visual and written) of the students in the new program concerning the analysis of the teaching situations included in a questionnaire were significantly superior to those of the students in the conventional programs.[45]

In a closely related field, Patterson solicited employer data to analyze a nursing preparation program at Amarillo College in Texas. He employed a two-phase follow-up method; the first phase was a personal interview, and the second phase a questionnaire mailed to supervisors. Patterson praised the employer response: "Not only were there no objections, but without exception the employers thought it was an excellent opportunity to provide relevant information for performance evaluation."[46]

Further, Patterson recommended the questionnaire over the interview method:

> This study has utilized the personal interview and the mail out questionnaire as a data gathering device, and it is our recommendation to implement the mail out questionnaire designed for computer analysis. The personal interview has

> proven very costly, time consuming, and has not given the significant personal dimension initially anticipated. Most employers [supervisors] find it inconvenient to arrange a 15-20 minute personal interview to provide the necessary data; on the other hand, most will take time to complete a short questionnaire and return it by mail.[47]

Rande Smedley concurred:

> The mail survey has the advantage of being able to collect large amounts of data from large segments of the population inexpensively and for this reason enjoys wide popularity in areas where large sums of money are not available for research.[48]

Patterson concluded,

> The employer follow-up report appears to be a very valuable tool for developing an accountability model for individual major departments and school divisions. In addition some other important areas for which employer follow-up data may provide significant documentation are (A) State and Federal reports, (B) Educational Association accreditation evaluators, (C) Grant Proposals (Federal, State, and Private), (D) Public Relations Improvement (newspapers), (E) increase enrollments (impressive employment data).[49]

Copley conducted evaluative research comparing three types of teachers: those who were trained as teachers, those who were trained as teachers without student teaching, and those with no formal training. The sample comprised (1) 22 liberal arts graduates with no formal education classes, (2) 38 liberal arts graduates with some education courses and no student teaching, and (3) 40 education graduates. Copley justified the study by saying:

> This study was not conducted to prove a point. It was conducted to gather evidence to evaluate professional education courses. The study was not conducted to silence academician criticism. The results hopefully will be enlightening to both academicians and the educationist.[50]

Principals rated the subjects on the following six dimensions: (1) exhibits understanding of people, (2) uses effective communication

skills, (3) possesses classroom management skills, (4) secures effective teaching results, (5) is considerate of pupils, and (6) is fair in relations with pupils.

Significant differences among the three groups on these items separated group three from groups one and two, demonstrating that the principals rated the education graduates significantly higher than the teachers in groups one and two. There was a significant difference among principals' ratings of beginning teachers in terms of their professional education preparation, but there was no significant difference in other types of academic preparation in terms of personality characteristics or physical and emotional health.

Goldenberg prefaced his study of the relationships between principals' and teachers' perceptions of the quality of college preparation for teaching competence by stating, "Since evaluation is a necessary ingredient of any program preparing teachers, it is increasingly appropriate that studies of this nature be designed and executed in order to determine program effectiveness and future goals."[51] His study was designed to determine: (1) how elementary school principals perceive the undergraduate preparation of their teachers, (2) how graduates perceive their undergraduate education, and (3) whether principals' and graduates' perceptions are congruent. The sample included 136 first-year teachers and 134 principals. The researcher evaluated two programs--a regular teacher education program and a competency-based teacher education program.

Goldenberg's conclusions indicated "principals and their teachers view the preparation of teaching in a different manner."[52]

Principals took a more global view of teacher preparation and were prone to view the product of an undergraduate teacher education program, rather than the program itself. Principals did not perceive the various components of preparing teachers, but rather viewed teacher education in its totality.

On the other hand, teachers viewed preparation as being composed of several major elements, because they were directly involved in the process. One major difference between the two groups was that teachers viewed the programs as being somewhat more effective in preparing them to teach than did their principals. This study revealed that graduates' responses were much more helpful than principals' replies. Goldberg identified a flaw in his questionnaire as not rating teaching performance, but rather asking teachers and principals for their views concerning undergraduate preparation for teaching.

Johnson conducted a study of graduates of the University of South Alabama to assess their reactions to their jobs and how they felt about their preparation, and to estimate the university's adequacy in developing their skills and insights. Johnson sent questionnaires to all of the Spring 1969 graduates, and received a 31 percent return. Some of the results were:

1. Seventy-four percent of the alumni were very satisfied with their education, 28 percent were satisfied with their education, and 5 percent were somewhat dissatisfied with their education.

2. A majority claimed they had learned teaching skills in the preservice preparation.

3. Graduates felt they needed the following skills but had not learned them during preservice education: lecturing, advising students, interpreting and using results from standardized tests, and working effectively with groups of students in extra-class relationships.

4. Teachers identified classroom discipline as their biggest problem.[53]

In the same study, Johnson elicited principals' evaluations to ascertain the strengths and weaknesses of the graduates surveyed. He determined the reliability of the rating scale "by comparing the relationship between principals' ratings of the teachers and the ratings of those teachers by their supervisors in practice teaching."[54] Johnson found a significant difference between these two ratings, which he attributed to the fact that the two tracking experiences were inconsistent. He also speculated that the two parties defined teaching differently, and that principals observed less than supervising teachers.

Jarvis's study was intended to measure the effectiveness of a vocational education program. The study included two groups--one trained in a four-week summer program and the other untrained. Questionnaires were administered to the two control groups; a questionnaire was also given to the administrators in direct supervision of the subjects. The purposes of the study were to determine if the course content actually met the needs of the first-year vocational-technical education teachers and to make recommendations for program improvement.

Jarvis concluded, "It is the opinion of the investigator that for the most part the administrators felt that this was a very beneficial program for new staff members."[55] The administrators helped strengthen the program with their overwhelming support. They further suggested that the training program be mandatory. Jarvis's study revealed weaknesses in first-year teachers and made recommendations for program improvement.

The studies reviewed in this section suggested recent trends in the evaluation of teacher education programs. A majority of the follow-up studies were conducted after 1970. Realizing the importance of and need to emphasize the evaluation of teacher education programs, the 1978 AACTE meeting's main focus was on the methodology for the development of program evaluation. The feedback received from such studies can be used to improve preservice programs. As the results become more reliable, through thorough investigation and replication, colleges of education will have more and more direct indications of where to improve or change their programs.

Summary

In summary, a number of researchers have attested to the importance of follow-up studies in evaluating teacher education programs. This literature review has defined the role major national organizations have taken, in firm support of program evaluation. Two flexible follow-up models, developed by Sandefur and Peshkopia, designed to apply to any college of education's evaluation project, were outlined. The researcher also focused on the validity of

graduates' self-ratings of teaching performance and supervisors' ratings of graduates' teaching performance. The research concerned with developing follow-up studies to evaluate teacher education programs or actual studies implementing the suggested models advocated using supervisors' opinions. In contrast, other researchers have questioned the validity of graduates' and supervisors' ratings of teaching performance. The majority of studies warned against placing too much credence in either supervisors' or graduates' judgments. The consensus of this research is that neither group is capable of judging performance accurately. The results of these two types of studies are inconsistent, and therefore serve as a caution in interpreting the current study's findings. Finally, this chapter surveyed recent research that solicited graduate and supervisor responses to evaluate teacher education programs. The methodology of that research lent credence to the current study.

In his Handbook for Evaluations of Academic Programs, Roth summarized the essence of the current study:

> In order to effectively evaluate a program, it is necessary to collect feedback information from the graduates of that partifular program. Gathering this information through follow-up studies thus forms an essential part of program evaluation. The importance of the utilization of follow-up studies is based on the fact that these data are derived from individuals who have already completed the program. These individuals thus have a different perspective than those in the program, since they have completed the entire sequence and may have teaching experience. Follow-up studies, however, need not only be in terms of the viewpoints of graduates. Evaluation by supervisors . . . can also be part of this follow-up.
>
> In general, resources dictate that the first type [viewpoints of graduates and supervisors] is more feasible and thus more commonly utilized in evaluations of teacher education programs.[56]

A thorough description of research procedures used in collecting and analyzing the data is presented in Chapter III. Following this, the findings of the study are reported in Chapters IV and V.

Footnotes--Chapter II

[1]AACTE, Recommended Standards for Teacher Accreditation of Basic and Advanced Preparation Programs for Professional School Personnel (March 1970). ERIC ED 037 423.

[2]John Herbert, "A Research Base for the Accreditation of Teacher Preparation Programs" (paper presented at the AERA, Minneapolis, 1970), p. 82.

[3]NCATE, Standards for Accreditation of Teacher Education (Washington, D.C.: NCATE, 1977), p. 10.

[4]Ibid., p. 11.

[5]Dan Kaufman and others, "Assessment of Teacher Preparation Programs" (unpublished paper, June 1974), p. 280. ERIC ED 095 176.

[6]Ibid., p. 188.

[7]P. Woodring, New Directions in Teacher Education (New York: Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1957), p. 62.

[8]Swami Piyush, "A Follow-Up Study for Evaluation of Preservice Secondary Science Teacher Education Program at Ohio State University" (unpublished paper, February 1975), p. 20. ERIC ED 113 200.

[9]Woodring, p. 62.

[10]Kaufman and others, p. 2.

[11]J. T. Sandefur, Illustrated Model for the Evaluation of Teacher Education Graduates (Washington, D.C.: AACTE, 1970), p. 2. ERIC ED 080 485.

[12]Herbert, p. 8.

[13]Kaufman and others, p. 16.

[14]Ibid., p. 38.

[15]Thomas Baer, "Teacher Preparation--What Graduates Tell Us" (unpublished paper, July 1975), p. 3. ERIC ED 103 402.

[16]Alfred Grommon, ed., The Education of Teachers of English for American Schools and Colleges, Vol. V, NCTE Curriculum Series (April 1969), p. 43. ERIC ED 024 687.

[17]Wennette Peques, "A National Survey of Teacher Education Follow-Up Practices" (AACTE convention paper, 1978), p. 1.

[18]Sandefur, p. 11.

[19]Ibid., p. 17.

[20]Ibid.

[21]Ibid., p. 56.

[22]Ibid., pp. 5-6.

[23]Theodore Peshkopia, "How to Keep Better Track of Our Teaching Education Graduates?" Journal of College Placement (Spring 1976): 61-63.

[24]Ibid., pp. 62-63.

[25]Ibid., p. 63.

[26]Granville Johnson, "Evaluation of the University of South Alabama College of Education Teacher Training Program by Analysis of Its Alumni, 1971 (unpublished paper, University of South Alabama, Mobile, June 1972), p. 42. ERIC ED 060 050.

[27]Ned Swartz, "Divergent Perceptions of Teaching Effectiveness by Different Groups of Raters" (unpublished paper, NCME, April 1975), p. 3. ERIC ED 104 959.

[28]David McAfee, "Evaluation of the Teacher: Do Teachers and Supervisors Agree?" High School Journal 58 (May 1975): 336.

[29]Ibid., p. 339.

[30]Ibid.

[31]Raymond Crisp, "The Professional Competency of Illinois Secondary School English Teachers: A Report of the Self-Evaluation of Experienced Illinois Secondary School English Teachers" (Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, December 1968), p. 44. ERIC ED 029 889.

[32]Martha Cook and Herbert Richards, "Dimensions of Principal and Supervisor Ratings of Teacher Behavior," Journal of Experimental Education 41 (Winter 1972): 11.

[33]Ibid., p. 13.

[34]Lou Carey, "An Investigation of the Validity of Using Self-Evaluation Instruments to Identify Instructional Needs" (unpublished paper, December 1977), p. 6. ERIC ED 142 579.

[35]Ibid.

[36]Herbert, p. 14.

[37]Richard J. Hardebeck and others, "Individualization of Instruction by Vocational and Nonvocational Teachers and Self-Reports Compared With Observations" (unpublished paper, Texas Education Agency, 1974), p. 21. ERIC ED 131 202.

[38]Ibid., p. 28.

[39]Ibid., pp. 24-25.

[40]Swartz, p. 6.

[41]Ibid., pp. 4-6.

[42]Kaufman and others, p. 68.

[43]Piyush, p. 42.

[44]Ronald Adams, Follow-Up and Evaluations of Teacher Education Graduates, Final Report (Bowling Green, Kentucky: Western Kentucky University, 1974), p. 68.

[45]Charles Coyne, Comparative Analysis of Teacher Education (St. Joseph, Missouri: Missouri Western State College, 1970), p. 75.

[46]Larry Patterson, Graduate Employer Follow-Up Studies (Amarillo, Texas: Amarillo College, 1977), p. 20.

[47]Ibid.

[48]Rande H. Smedley and George H. Olson, "Graduate Follow-Up Studies: How Useful Are They?" (Washington, D.C.: ARA, 1975). ERIC ED 109 431.

[49]Patterson, p. 20.

[50]Patrick Copley, "A Study of the Effect of Professional Education Courses on Beginning Teachers" (unpublished paper, Southwest Missouri State, 1975), p. 1. ERIC ED 098 147.

[51]Ronald Goldenberg, "The Relationships Between Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions of the Quality of College Preparation for Teaching Competency " (unpublished paper, ATE, March 1975), p. 3. ERIC ED 131 075.

[52]Ibid., p. 14.

[53]Johnson.

[54]Ibid., p. 33.

[55]Bob Jarvis and William Stevenson, "The Effects of the 1971 UO-Tech New Teacher Training Program on the Teaching Activities of Nineteen Beginning Vocational Teachers in Oklahoma" (unpublished paper, July 1972), p. 25. ERIC ED 069 907.

[56]Robert Roth, Handbook for Evaluation of Academic Programs (Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1978), pp. 235-36.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This study was designed to test the degree to which data gained from supervisors could contribute to the assessment of five specified Michigan State University teacher education programs.

In the fall of 1977, the Division of Student Teaching and Professional Development initiated a Graduate Follow-Up Study to evaluate teacher education programs. During the planning of that study, the question was raised whether a second follow-up study soliciting responses from the graduates' immediate supervisors would provide enough valuable information to justify the additional cost. The current study is that extension of the Graduate Follow-Up Study.

This chapter discusses the design of that investigation. The population from which the sample was drawn is described and the nature of the sample is specified. Procedures for gathering the data are detailed. Both research and statistical hypotheses are stated, and the models chosen to test them are described.

Description of Sample

Two hundred sixty-nine supervisors were involved in this study. Respondents in the Michigan State University Graduate Follow-Up Study generated the supervisor sample. Each graduate in that study

was asked to name his/her immediate supervisor, but was given the option to fill out and return the questionnaire omitting the supervisor's name.

The graduates in the follow-up study were randomly selected by groups, divided by the particular program and year in which they participated in student teaching. Five teacher education programs were compared over the following academic years: 1969-70, 1971-72, 1974-75, and 1975-76.

The original graduate follow-up sample comprised 1,080 subjects, 60 in each of the 18 cells. The tally of the final sample was 994 subjects, not 1,080 as originally designed. If questionnaires were returned as nonforwardable from the second mailing, those subjects were eliminated from the total sample. An effort was made, however, to maintain the original sample size by randomly selecting new subjects to replace those who could not be reached in the second mailing. Of these, 86 were nonforwardable, making the final sample size 994 subjects. (The 18 cells resulted from a 5x4 matrix from the cross between teacher preparation programs and years of graduation, minus two cells from the CBTE program for the years 1969-70 and 1971-72.)

Fifty-four percent of the graduate sample (536 respondents) responded to the questionnaire. Forty percent of the 536 graduate respondents never had taught or were no longer teaching and were not able to submit a supervisor name. Only 10 percent of the graduates who were still teaching chose not to submit their supervisor's name, but did return the questionnaire. Fifty percent, exactly one half,

of the graduate respondents submitted supervisor names and addresses. Of the 269 subjects in the supervisor sample, 236 returned questionnaires for a return rate of 88 percent.

Measuring Instruments

Two questionnaires were developed, one for the graduate follow-up study and the other for the supervisor follow-up study. Both instruments were constructed during spring term, 1977, and have undergone minor revisions. As stated above, the first questionnaire was administered to a random sample of graduates and provided data regarding: (1) employment histories; (2) perceptions of the influence of selected individuals and characteristic features of the student teaching programs on subsequent classroom performance; and (3) perceptions of the graduates' ability to apply selected teaching skills, their rating of the importance of these selected teaching skills, and their rating of the influence the student teaching program had on the development of each skill.

The supervisor questionnaire was administered to supervisors of those graduates who supplied their names in the first questionnaire. The instrument was designed to provide evidence of (1) the graduates' ability to apply selected teaching skills, (2) the graduates' level of commitment to the teaching profession, and (3) supervisors' knowledge and ratings of the teacher education programs.

A reliability analysis test was applied to the questionnaires, computing an inter-item matrix of performance skills that

correlated items into subscales that empirically and logically fit together.

A third instrument, the "Success Rating Chart" (developed by West[1]), was used to compare the supervisors' ratings of graduates' professional commitment to teaching and performance of specified teaching competencies, to evaluations of graduates by their cooperating teachers during the student teaching experience. The graduates' student teaching evaluation was assigned a success rating number. Seven was the lowest tally in a cell in which both the graduates and their supervisors responded to the questionnaires. The cells with more than seven respondents were reduced by a random selection procedure, using a table of random numbers. The student teaching recommendations were obtained by the researcher with the cooperation of the Student Placement Services. A panel of three evaluators, who had extensive experience in teaching and in supervising student teachers, separately assigned each graduate a success rating number. Each panel member was given the self-explanatory "Success Rating Chart" (see Appendix J) and a list of guidelines. Some of the guidelines for the raters were to: (1) assign the graduate a rating based on the cooperating teacher's comments, (2) take the cooperating teacher's comments at face value, and (3) give the graduate the lower score if undecided between two scores. The three panel members' ratings were averaged to the closest integer, resulting in one fixed number per graduate. These numbers were then compared to the supervisors' rating scores of graduate competence and commitment to teaching.

The reliability of the "Success Rating Chart" appears to be very high. (See Appendix K.) In the sample of 126 subjects, the three raters unanimously agreed on the graduates' success rating numbers 54 percent of the time. In all the other cases, there was agreement by two raters, with the third rater scoring either one point above or one point below the consensus rating. In no case did all three raters differ on a particular rating.

Validity

The two main instruments of this study were designed by a panel of professionals in the teacher education field. This team carefully screened each item to insure that the instruments did provide a reasonable measurement of what they purported to measure. This procedure should insure that the instruments have a reasonable level of content validity. The panel included Dr. Donald Freeman, Dr. Henry Kennedy, and Dr. Banks Bradley, faculty members at Michigan State University, and Grace Iverson, research consultant from the Lansing School District.

Reliability

Internal consistency was determined through the split-halfs correlation coefficient for two separate subscales of the survey, namely commitment to teaching and performance of specified teaching skills.

Data Collection

The procedures for collecting and handling the data are illustrated by the following calendar outline:

August 1977--The graduate sample was selected.

September-December 1977--Four months were spent retrieving graduates' addresses from student teaching files, the MSU Alumni Association, and outdated MSU phone books.

December 1977--The first graduate surveys were mailed on December 10. The answer sheets were coded, so that when they were returned the researcher could readily identify the cell to which data belonged.

January 1978--Graduates' names were checked off as the answer sheets were returned.

- Those graduates submitting supervisors' names were identified, coded, and catalogued in a separate file box.
- Approximately 100 questionnaires were returned by the post office as bearing incorrect, nonforwardable addresses.
- New subjects were randomly selected to replace those 100 subjects whose questionnaires had been returned by the post office.
- The new subjects were sent questionnaires on January 15.
- The researcher mailed an entire second package on January 16, with a new cover letter (specifically identifying their programs and individually signed by the director of the specific program) to the graduates who had not responded to the first mailing. (See Appendix F.)

February 1978--The supervisor surveys were mailed on February 1; the answer sheets were catalogued and coded to identify individuals who did not respond.

March 1978--On March 7, a second questionnaire was sent to each of the second group of graduates who had not returned questionnaires.

- The supervisors who had not yet responded were sent a reminder letter on March 18.
- The reminder letters to the supervisors were followed two weeks later by an entire second questionnaire packet.

April 1978--The collection of data continued until the cut-off date of April 30.

May-June 1978--The data were programmed on the computer using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences.

Treatment and Analysis of Data

The following null hypotheses were formulated in an attempt to answer the main question of this study: Should supervisors' ratings be included in graduate follow-up studies evaluating teacher education programs?

Question 1

To what extent will ratings provided by supervisors differ from those provided by graduates?

This question was tested by the following null hypotheses:

Ho_{1a}: The correlation between graduates' and supervisors' ratings of the importance of specified teaching skills does not differ significantly from zero.

Ho_{1b}: The correlation between graduates' and supervisors' ratings of graduates' performance of specified teaching skills does not differ significantly from zero.

Analysis: Data regarding the first research question were analyzed by computing a correlation coefficient between supervisor and graduate subscale scores. Eleven items on the supervisor questionnaire dealt with importance of specified teaching skills and graduates' performance of these teaching skills. Subscale scores were determined to correlate the same items appearing on both the graduate and supervisor surveys.

Question 2

Will judgments provided exclusively by supervisors assist in determining differences among teacher education programs?

This question was tested by the following null hypotheses:

Ho_{2a}: There is no significant difference among programs as judged by supervisors' ratings of graduates' performance of specified teaching skills.

Ho_{2b}: There is no significant difference among programs as judged by supervisors' ratings of graduates' commitment to teaching.

Analysis: Data regarding the second research question were subjected to an analysis of variance to compute the significance of differences among ratings of programs, years, and the interaction of the two. The total scores of supervisors' subscale ratings were computed for each pertinent item on the questionnaire. That is, supervisors' responses to commitment questions became one subscale score for graduates' commitment to teaching, and so on for performance.

Question 3

Does a supervisor's knowledge of specific teacher education programs differ from one program to another?

This question was tested by the following null hypothesis:

Ho_3: There is no significant difference among programs as judged by supervisors' ability to identify the specific teacher education programs from which the teachers graduated.

Analysis: The data were analyzed by using a chi-square test to determine significant differences in knowledge of programs, as judged by the supervisors.

Question 4

Will there be a significant relationship between the supervisors' ratings of the graduates and the ratings of graduates by their cooperating teachers during the student teaching experience?

This question was tested by the following null hypotheses:

Ho_{4a}: The correlation between supervisors' ratings of the graduates' professional commitment to teaching and the general ratings of the graduates by their cooperating teachers during the student teaching experience does not differ significantly from zero.

Ho_{4b}: The correlation between supervisors' ratings of the graduates' performance of specified teaching skills and the general ratings of the graduates by their cooperating teachers during the student teaching experience does not differ significantly from zero.

Analysis: Data regarding the fourth research question were analyzed by computing a correlation coefficient for a performance subscale and a commitment to teaching subscale of supervisors' ratings, and comparing the rating on each subscale to the success rating of the graduates' student teaching performance.

Question 5

Are the variations among programs suggested by data provided by graduates the same as variations among programs suggested by data provided by supervisors?

In addition to testing the preceding hypotheses, an effort was made to identify differences among programs that were suggested by data provided by graduates and supervisors. Data were analyzed by comparing the pattern of results; the analysis was limited to the results of the performance subscales. The analysis was conducted by subtracting the graduate performance subscale scores from the supervisor subscale scores for performance skills. These scores were subjected to an analysis of variance test to compute the significance of differences between ratings of programs, years, and the interaction between the two.

Assumptions

This study was developed with certain basic assumptions. They are listed below:

1. The supervisors had observed the graduates and knew their performances wellenough to rate them.
2. Graduates and supervisors were careful and honest in filling out the forms.
3. The questionnaires accurately tested the hypotheses.

Limitations

The following factors were considered to be limitations of the study:

1. The results of the study were based on supervisors' ratings and graduates' self-ratings rather than on observations. Although the cited research indicated these ratings are not the best method of evaluating teacher education programs, such ratings were the only viable source of information for this project, considering cost, human resources, time, and geographic constraints.

2. The validity of supervisors' ratings and graduates' self-ratings has not been established, and is a limitation of this study because of the possible question of the accuracy of such ratings.

3. The study was limited by at least two unavoidable contaminating variables, which could not be controlled: (a) Current addresses for some of the original random sample of graduates were unavailable; (b) Some graduate respondents did not provide supervisors' names. Those graduates who did not submit supervisors' names may have had relationship difficulties with their supervisors, problems with self-confidence, or felt their supervisors had nothing substantial to offer to the study. There was no way to determine whether this limitation affected total scores.

4. The findings of the study can be generalized only to those five programs and years specified in the study. Any efforts to generalize beyond the study are questionable.

5. Inferences cannot be drawn regarding comparative quality of the programs studied, because of the differences in students entering the various programs. Program differences may also have

resulted from students being attracted to specific programs. There was no way to control for differences in academic qualifications, personal characteristics, motivations, or reasons for entering various programs.

Summary

Five hundred thirty-six graduates and 236 supervisors participated in this study.

The instruments used to collect data were the "Survey of Michigan State University College of Education Graduates," "Follow-Up Study of Michigan State University Graduates--Supervisor Survey," and the "Success Rating Chart," which was used to determine graduates' scores for the student teaching experience.

The graduate questionnaire was sent to a random sample of MSU graduates, followed by the supervisors' questionnaire sent to the supervisors whose names the graduates had provided. Analysis of variance and correlation coefficients were used to analyze responses to the research questions.

Chapter IV contains the results of the statistical analysis of the data.

Footnotes--Chapter III

[1]Bradley West, "A Study of Computer-Scored Group Holtzman Inkblot Variables as Related to Student Teaching Success, Major Teaching Fields, and Sex" (Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1969), p. 36.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS

The results of the statistical analysis of the data are presented in this chapter. The procedures followed were in accordance with the research design outlined in Chapter III. Each research question is stated as a null hypothesis, followed by a narrative account of the research findings. Tables summarizing the findings for each research question accompany the discussion.

Findings

Question 1

> To what extent will ratings provided by supervisors differ from those provided by graduates?

This question was translated into two null hypotheses; the first was:

> Ho_{1a}: The correlation between graduates' and supervisors' ratings of the importance of specified teaching skills does not differ significantly from zero.

Table 1 shows that there was a correlation of >.883 between graduates' ratings and supervisors' ratings of the importance of specified teaching skills. This correlation was significantly different from zero ($\alpha = .01$). A series of tests was applied to test the significance of differences between item means. Significant differences were found for the following items: knowledge of educational theory

Table 1.--Mean ratings: graduate and supervisor ratings of the importance of specified teaching skills.[a]

Teaching Skills	Graduates $\bar{X}$	Graduates N	Supervisors $\bar{X}$	Supervisors N	T-test	Alpha
Knowledge of educational theory and practice	1.20	401	.82	224	7.54	.01
Knowledge of subject matter	.33	339	.46	225	2.82	.01
Ability to establish rapport with students	.20	400	.22	225	.58	N.S.
Ability to communicate with parents and other teachers	.53	401	.52	226	.22	N.S.
Ability to formulate instructional goals and objectives	.79	339	.66	223	2.48	.02
Ability to provide a wide variety of instructional strategies and materials	.57	339	.53	226	...	N.S.
Ability to collect and interpret data regarding student needs and achievement	.71	400	.72	224	...	N.S.
Ability to maintain active student participation in classroom tasks	.46	403	.50	226	.42	N.S.
Ability to recognize and deal effectively with problems in student discipline	.31	402	.46	224	1.65	N.S.
Ability to use effective questioning and interaction techniques in the classroom	.63	401	.71	225	.79	N.S.
Ability to evaluate one's own classroom and general professional performance	.49	395	.61	219	1.31	N.S.

Note: Relationship between graduates' and supervisors' ratings of importance of specified teaching skills: $R_{xy} = .883$[b]

[a]0 = crucial, 1 = important, 2 = limited relevance, 3 = non-essential.

[b]Correlation score of total mean ratings between graduates and supervisors.

and practice, knowledge of subject matter, and ability to formulate instructional goals and objectives (see Table 1). Although only 3 of the 11 items showed significance, based on t-tests of mean differences, the correlation of total mean ratings was very high. Based on the high relationship between supervisors' and graduates' ratings of the importance of specified teaching skills, the null hypothesis was rejected.

The second null hypothesis stated:

Ho_{1b}: The correlation between graduates' and supervisors' ratings of graduates' performance of specified teaching skills does not differ significantly from zero.

Two correlations were of special interest in testing the hypothesis. First, are supervisors' ratings of graduates' performance consistent in and of themselves? As can be seen in Table 2, the high correlation (>.747) between the supervisors' ratings of graduate performance and graduate commitment to teaching suggested that supervisors' ratings were consistent per se. The second and main question pertaining to this null hypothesis asked whether supervisors' ratings were highly related to graduates' self-ratings of performance. The relationship between graduates' self-ratings of their performance of specified teaching skills and supervisors' ratings of that same performance resulted in a correlation of > -.004. (See Table 2.) Since this correlation was extremely low, the null hypothesis was accepted.

The final analysis that had a direct bearing on Question 1 was a factor analysis of the correlation matrix of the five subscales used in this study. Three subscales were based on graduates' ratings:

Table 2.--Relationships between subscales of graduate and supervisor ratings and graduates' student teaching success ratings by their cooperating teachers.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
(1) Graduates' ratings of satisfaction with student teaching	1.000	.237	.608	.018	.038	.186
(2) Graduates' self-ratings of skill performance		1.000	.304	-.004	-.043	.038
(3) Graduates' ratings of skill competence: contributions from student teaching			1.000	.064	.003	.167
(4) Supervisors' ratings of graduates' skill performance				1.000	.747	.128
(5) Supervisors' ratings of graduates' commitment to teaching					1.000	.151
(6) Graduates' cooperating teachers' student teaching general ratings						1.000

(1) graduates' ratings of satisfaction with student teaching, (2) graduates' self-ratings of skill performance, and (3) graduates' ratings of skill competence gained from student teaching. Two subscales were based on the supervisors' ratings: (1) supervisors' ratings of graduates' skill performance and (2) supervisors' ratings of graduates' commitment to teaching. If there were clear differences in graduates' and supervisors' ratings, one would anticipate that a factor analysis with a two-factor solution would differentiate between these two sources. As shown in Table 3, the graduate subscales were most highly loaded on factor 2, and the two supervisor subscales were most highly loaded on factor 1. This analysis provided substantive evidence that the graduates' and supervisors' ratings were distinct. If the five subscales were to be condensed into two subscales, one of these would involve only graduates' ratings and the other would involve only supervisors' ratings.

Question 2

> Will judgments provided exclusively by supervisors assist in determining differences among teacher education programs?

This question was tested by two null hypotheses, the first of which stated,

> Ho_{2a}: There is no significant difference among programs as judged by supervisors' ratings of graduates' performance of specified teaching skills.

Table 4 presents supervisors' mean ratings of skill performance among graduates of the five teacher preparation programs included in the study. An examination of these mean ratings suggested that they were

quite similar; thus it is not surprising that the corresponding F-ratio (>.344) was not statistically significant (α = .85). Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted.

Table 3.--Factor analysis with varimax rotation of subscale ratings.

Subscales	Factor Analysis	
	Factor 1	Factor 2
Graduates' ratings of satisfaction with student teaching	.031	.693
Graduates' self-rating of skill performance	-.028	.347
Graduates' ratings of skill competence: contributions from student teaching	.036	.875
Supervisors' ratings of graduates' skill performance	.856	.022
Supervisors' ratings of graduates' commitment to teaching	.874	-.018

Table 4.--Differences among programs based upon supervisors' ratings of graduates' performance skills.

Program	Supervisors' Scores	
	$\bar{X}$	N
Regular	1.16	45
E.I.P.	.82	55
Cluster	1.08	54
Overseas	1.06	54
C.B.T.E.	1.00	16

Grand mean = 1.02
F (4, 195) = .334 alpha = .85 (N.S.)

The second null hypothesis stated:

Ho_{2b}: There is no significant difference among programs as judged by supervisors' ratings of graduates' commitment to teaching.

Table 5 presents the supervisors' mean ratings of commitment to teaching among graduates of the five teacher education programs. As can be seen from the table, no statistically significant differences were found among programs, based on supervisors' ratings of graduates' commitment to teaching (α = .37). The null hypothesis was accepted.

Table 5.--Differences among programs based upon supervisors' ratings of graduates' commitment to teaching.

Program	Supervisors' Scores	
	$\bar{X}$	N
Regular	.66	45
E.I.P.	.60	45
Cluster	.71	48
Overseas	.49	54
C.B.T.E.	.71	16

Grand mean = .63
F (4, 195) = 1.065 alpha = .37 (N.S.)

As a complement to this analysis of the subscales, the supervisors were asked to give a single overall rating--on competence and commitment to teaching--of the graduates whom they supervised. Table 6 shows that the chi-square test was applied to see if frequencies could be distributed by chance. No statistically significant difference among programs was found for competence (α = .828)

or for commitment to teaching (α = .921). The low significance levels shown in Table 6 agree with the data shown in Tables 4 and 5, in that both support the decision to accept the null hypothesis.

Table 6.--Supervisors' overall ratings of graduate competence and commitment to teaching.[a]

Program	Supervisors' Ratings of			
	Competence		Commitment	
	$\bar{X}$	N	$\bar{X}$	N
Regular	1.49	48	1.00	46
E.I.P.	.94	49	.78	49
Cluster	1.06	52	.91	53
Overseas	.81	57	.78	58
C.B.T.E.	1.28	18	.97	18
Grand Mean =	1.12		.89	
Chi-square (12) =	7.423		5.907	
alpha =	.828	(N.S.)	.921	(N.S.)

[a]0 = outstanding (top 10 percent of all teachers), 1 = strong (top 25 percent of all teachers), 2 = above average, 3 = below average.

Question 3

Does a supervisors' knowledge of specific teacher education programs differ from one program to another?

This question was translated into the following null hypothesis:

Ho_3: There is no significant difference among programs as judged by supervisors' ability to identify the specific teacher education programs from which the teachers graduated.

Table 7 presents the data concerning supervisors' knowledge of Michigan State University teacher education programs. The table

Table 7.--Supervisors' knowledge of Michigan State University teacher education programs.

Question		Answer	Supervisor Response N	%
Did this teacher begin his/her professional career under your supervision?				
		Yes	96	43.8
		No	123	56.2
Prior to this survey, were you aware that this teacher had graduated from Michigan State University?				
	Program			
	Regular	Yes	41	93.2
		No	3	5.8
	E.I.P.	Yes	39	84.8
		No	7	15.2
	Cluster	Yes	48	87.3
		No	7	12.7
	Overseas	Yes	48	87.3
		No	7	12.7
	C.B.T.E.	Yes	18	100.0
		No	0	0.0
	Total	Yes	194	89.0
		No	24	11.0
	Chi-square (4) = 4.18		alpha = .38 (N.S.)	

shows that less than half of the graduates (43.8 percent) began their teaching under that supervisor's direction. More than 89 percent of the supervisor respondents knew their teacher had graduated from Michigan State University, regardless of the program in which the teacher had been enrolled. The corresponding chi-square value (4.18) revealed no significant differences among programs ($\alpha = .38$). In other words, most supervisors knew their teachers had graduated from Michigan State University, but there were no distinguishable differences among programs.

Table 8, column A, shows that the supervisors were most aware of teachers' having graduated from the Regular and E.I.P. programs; 61 percent were unable to identify the program from which the teacher had graduated. To check the accuracy of these tallies, a cross-tabulation was computed on this item. Table 8, column B, reveals that most of the supervisors of teachers from the E.I.P., Overseas, and Cluster programs correctly identified the program from which their teachers graduated. Over one-half, or 19 of 33, incorrectly identified the Regular Program. (That is, the supervisor marked the Regular Program, which was not the one from which the teacher had graduated.) Table 8, column C, shows that the greatest number of teachers whose supervisors did not know from which program they had graduated had been in the Cluster Program (75 percent) or the C.B.T.E. Program (72 percent). The percentage for the Cluster Program was based on 41 responses and was therefore comparatively stable; however, the corresponding percentage for the C.B.T.E. Program was based on only 15 responses and therefore may have questionable stability.

Table 8.--Supervisors' perceived and actual knowledge of Michigan State University teacher education programs.

Program	(A) Supervisors Responding to the Identification of the Specific Program in Which the Graduate Participated		(B1) Supervisors Who Correctly Identified the Graduate's Program[a]		(B2) Supervisors Who Incorrectly Identified the Graduate's Program[a]		(C) Supervisors, by Program, Who Said They Did Not Know From Which Program the Teacher Graduated[b]	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Regular	33	75	14	32	19	43	26	59
E.I.P.	25	54	22	48	3	6	21	46
Cluster	10	18	10	18	..	..	41	55
Overseas	11	20	9	16	2	4	31	75
C.B.T.E.	2	11	..	..	2	11	13	72
Don't know[b]	132	61	..	..	..	..	..	..

[a] B1 + B2 = A.

[b] Column C distributes the 132 "don't know" responses over the five programs.

Table 9 shows that the chi-square value of 18.84 was significant at > .01 for supervisors' judgments of specific programs contributing to the chances of graduates' being hired in that district. It appears that, in the supervisors' opinion, graduates from the E.I.P. were more apt to be hired in a particular district than were graduates from other programs. The table also shows that a teacher's having graduated from the Regular Program was not a major factor in the supervisor's decision to hire that teacher. Because only two supervisors chose the C.B.T.E. program, the expected frequencies in that category were extremely unstable.

As shown also in Table 9, the chi-square value of 35.62 was significant at .0000 for differences among programs, based on supervisors' judgments about which program better prepared the graduate for classroom teaching. Once again, supervisors rated the E.I.P. as preparing teachers for the classroom better than the other programs. Supervisors indicated that the Regular Program did not better prepare students to be classroom teachers, whereas they were not sure of the training provided in the Cluster and Overseas programs. The C.B.T.E. program was not included in this analysis because of the low number of respondents in that category. Because significance levels were achieved for the supervisors' identification of programs, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Question 4

> Will there be a significant relationship between the supervisors' ratings of the graduates and the ratings of graduates by their cooperating teachers during the student teaching experience?

Table 9.--Supervisors' ratings of graduates for the hiring and preparation of classroom teachers, by program.

Question	Program	Supervisor Response: Yes N	Yes %	Not Sure N	Not Sure %	No N	No %
Do you feel that graduates from this program have a greater chance of being hired in your district than graduates of other programs at Michigan State University?	Regular	3 -	15	7	35	10 +	50
	E.I.P.	12 +	50	7 -	29	5 -	21
	Cluster	7	33	10	48	4 -	19
	Overseas	.. -	..	10 +	63	6 +	38
	C.B.T.E.	1	50	..	..	1	50
	% totals		27		41		31
	Chi square (8) = 18.84			Sig. = .01			
Do you feel that graduates from this program are better prepared as classroom teachers than graduates of other programs at Michigan State University?	Regular	1 -	5	12	60	7 +	35
	E.I.P.	13 +	54	8 -	33	3	13
	Cluster	3	15	15 +	75	2 -	10
	Overseas	1 -	6	12 +	75	3	19
	C.B.T.E.	.. -	..	.. -	..	2 +	100
	% totals		22		57		21
	Chi-square (8) = 35.62			Sig. = .0000			

Note: A "+" sign reflects a disproportionately high frequency (where expected frequencies are based on column totals for the entire sample) and a "-" sign reflects a disproportionately low frequency. If the percentage for a specific program is within 10 percent of the row average, there is no further designation.

This question was translated into two null hypotheses. The first stated:

> Ho_{4a}: The correlation between supervisors' ratings of the graduates' professional commitment to teaching and the general ratings of the graduates by their cooperating teachers during the student teaching experience does not differ significantly from zero.

Table 10 shows that there was a low correlation between the supervisors' and cooperating teachers' general ratings of the graduates' commitment to teaching (>.15) and between supervisors' and cooperating teachers' overall ratings of graduates' commitment to teaching (>.01). Hence the null hypothesis was accepted.

The second null hypothesis stated:

> Ho_{4b}: The correlation between supervisors' ratings of the graduates' performance of specified teaching skills and the general ratings of the graduates by their cooperating teachers during the student teaching experience does not differ significantly from zero.

The correlation coefficients for Null Hypothesis 4b can also be found in Table 10. There is no evidence that the null hypothesis can be rejected, as Table 10 shows that the correlation between supervisors' and cooperating teachers' general ratings of graduates' skill performance was >.03 and the correlation between supervisors' and cooperating teachers' overall rankings of graduates' competence in teaching was >.09. The null hypothesis was therefore accepted.

Table 10.--The relationship between the success ratings given by the graduates' cooperating teachers during student teaching and graduates' and supervisors' ratings.

Rating	Correlation Between Graduates' and Supervisors' Ratings and Success Ratings Given by the Graduates' Cooperating Teachers
Graduates' ratings of satisfaction with student teaching	.19
Graduates' self-rating of skill performance	.38
Supervisors' ratings of graduates' skill performance	.13
Supervisors' ratings of graduates' commitment to teaching	.15
Graduates' ratings of skill competence contributed by student teaching	.17
Supervisors' overall competence ranking	.09
Supervisors' overall commitment ranking	.01

Question 5

Are the variations among programs suggested by data provided by graduates the same as variations among programs suggested by data provided by supervisors?

To determine if the general patterns of graduates' self-ratings were significantly different from supervisors' corresponding ratings of skill performance, the graduates' self-ratings of skill performance were subtracted from the supervisors' ratings on that measure. The different scores were then analyzed using an analysis

of variance test, with years and programs serving as the independent variables. This analysis exhausted another avenue to determine if there were any significant differences among programs, as judged by graduates and their supervisors. Table 11 reveals no differences in the patterns of graduates' and supervisors' ratings across either programs or years.

Table 11.--General patterns of differences between supervisors' ratings and graduates' self-ratings of performance skills.

Significance of:	Scores	
	Significance	Alpha
Main effects	F (7) = .796	.592
Year	F (3) = 1.251	.293
Program	F (4) = .454	.769
Two-way interactions for year and program	F (10) = .686	.737

Summary

General Hypothesis 1

A. A statistically significant correlation was found between graduates' and supervisors' ratings of the importance of specified teaching competencies. The null hypothesis was rejected.

B. No statistically significant correlation was found between graduates' self-ratings of teaching performance and supervisors' ratings of graduates' teaching performance. The null hypothesis was accepted.

General Hypothesis 2

A. No statistically significant differences were found among programs, as measured by supervisors' ratings of graduates' performance of specified teaching skills. The null hypothesis was accepted.

B. No statistically significant differences were found among programs, as measured by supervisors' ratings of graduates' commitment to teaching. The null hypothesis was accepted.

General Hypothesis 3

A. Statistically significant differences were found among programs, as measured by supervisors' ability to identify the specific teacher education programs from which the teachers had graduated. The null hypothesis was rejected.

General Hypothesis 4

A. No statistically significant correlation was found between supervisors' ratings of the graduates' professional commitment to teaching and the general ratings of the graduates by their cooperating teachers during the student teaching experience. The null hypothesis was accepted.

B. No statistically significant correlation was found between supervisors' ratings of graduates' performance of specified teaching skills and the general ratings of the graduates by their cooperating teachers during the student teaching experience. The null hypothesis was accepted.

Chapter V contains a general summary of the study, a discussion of the research findings, conclusions, and recommendations for further study.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Presented in this chapter are a review of the problem, a summary of the procedures employed to collect the data, a summary and discussion of the research findings, conclusions drawn from the findings, and recommendations for further study.

Summary

The problem of the study was to determine whether supervisors' ratings should be included in graduate follow-up studies evaluating teacher education programs.

Five research questions were considered:

1. To what extent will ratings provided by supervisors differ from those provided by graduates?
2. Will judgments provided exclusively by supervisors assist in determining differences among teacher education programs?
3. Does a supervisor's knowledge of specific teacher education programs differ from one program to another?
4. Will there be a significant relationship between the supervisors' ratings of the graduates and the ratings of graduates by their cooperating teachers during the student teaching experience?
5. Are the variations among programs suggested by data provided by graduates the same as variations among programs suggested by data provided by supervisors?

Design of the Study

The study was designed to test the degree to which data gained from supervisors' judgments contribute to the assessment of five specified Michigan State University teacher education programs. Comparisons were made between graduates' and supervisors' ratings of the graduates' ability to apply selected teaching skills and their level of commitment to the teaching profession. In addition, information concerning the supervisors' knowledge and ratings of teacher education programs was solicited.

The instruments used to collect data included the "Survey of Michigan State University College of Education Graduates," "Follow-Up Study of Michigan State University Graduates--Supervisor Study," and the "Success Rating Chart," used to determine graduates' scores on the student teaching experience.

The graduates in the study were selected using a stratified random sampling procedure. Sixty individuals were selected for each group, where groups represented the intersection between the five programs and four graduation intervals. Respondents in the graduate sample generated the supervisors' names. Each graduate was asked to name his/her immediate supervisor. Although this response was strongly encouraged, it was not mandatory. Of the 269 subjects in the supervisor sample, 236 returned questionnaires, for a return rate of 88 percent.

Supervisors' and graduates' ratings were compared to determine relationships and significant differences among programs and years of graduation. Whenever feasible, ratings of individual items

were combined to form subscale ratings. In some of the analyses, supervisors' ratings were treated independently, whereas in others they were compared to the graduates' self-ratings.

Summary and Discussion of the Research Findings

Graduates' and Supervisors' Ratings of Importance of Teaching Skills

A strong correlation was found between graduates' and supervisors' ratings of importance of specified teaching skills. Both groups agreed that the 11 skills were important to teaching. Every mean score (except graduates' ratings of knowledge of educational theory and practice) fell between "important" and "crucial." Both groups viewed the ability to establish rapport with students as most crucial to success in teaching, and knowledge of educational theory and practice as least crucial.

Graduates' and Supervisors' Ratings of Graduates' Performance of Teaching Skills

An extremely low correlation was found between graduates' self-ratings on the performance of specified teaching skills and the supervisors' ratings of the graduates on this same measure. Whereas both groups agreed that these skills were important, they were inconsistent in their judgments of how well the graduates performed the skills. Because there was no way to predict performance ratings for the graduates solely on the basis of their self-ratings or the supervisors' ratings, it was necessary to collect data from both groups. Without direct observations, it is impossible to

determine which group was more accurate in judging graduates' skill performance. Therefore, it must be concluded that, because the two sets of ratings were inconsistent, program decisions based solely on the ratings of one of the groups would be incomplete. McAfee's research, cited in Chapter II, supported this position: "With such a wide variation between teachers' and supervisors' responses it seems possible that either the teachers or the supervisors or both are incapable of correctly evaluating the teachers' performance, background, and abilities."[1]

In fact, there is some basis for questioning the validity of either source. Do supervisors observe a teacher's performance often enough to render valid judgments? Do teachers observe the performance of their colleagues often enough to have a solid basis for comparing their own performance with that of others? On the other hand, there is reason to believe each source is uniquely valid. Supervisors' ratings would probably be more objective than teachers', being based on a wider norm group, i.e., all the teachers in the building. The teachers, however, know clearly what they can or cannot do. Their judgments are based on a total picture of their personal strengths, weaknesses, and actual classroom performance.

Supervisors' Ratings of Graduate Skill Performance to Determine Differences Among Programs

Supervisors' ratings of the graduates' performance of specified teaching skills tended to be comparatively high, with mean ratings ranging from "outstanding" to "strong." The mean ratings

also tended to be consistent across programs. Those modest differences in program means that did occur were not statistically significant. These data suggest that if there were large and meaningful differences among programs, as measured by graduates' performance levels, it should have been possible to refute the null hypothesis. Therefore, if there were differences among programs, they were probably comparatively small and insignificant.

Supervisors' Ratings of Graduates' Commitment to Teaching to Determine Differences Among Programs

Statistically significant differences were not found among programs for supervisors' ratings of graduates' commitment to teaching. The results indicated that the mean differences among programs, based on supervisors' ratings of graduates' commitment to teaching, were so small that the supervisors' ratings of graduates' commitment to teaching did not distinguish among programs. This conclusion was reinforced by the supervisors' separate ratings of graduates' overall competence and commitment to teaching.

Supervisors' Ability to Identify Programs

Some statistically significant differences were found among programs, based on supervisors' judgments. Although 56 percent of the graduates did not begin their professional careers under their present supervisors, more than 85 percent of the supervisors knew their teachers had graduated from Michigan State University. Although most of the supervisors were aware that their teachers were Michigan

State graduates, only 39 percent of these supervisors attempted to identify the specific teacher education program in which the teacher had participated. The supervisors accurately identified graduates from the E.I.P., Overseas, and Cluster programs. The two supervisors who said their teachers were C.B.T.E. graduates were incorrect, as were more than half of the supervisors who believed their teachers had graduated from the Regular program. Nineteen supervisors thought their teachers had participated in the Regular program, when in fact they had not.

It is difficult to make judgments about the Regular program based on these data. One possibility is that because the Regular program is the oldest and most common, the supervisors in question felt safe in guessing this answer. The Regular program had enough appeal for the supervisors to identify, yet the frequency of misjudgments was much higher for this than for the other programs. The abnormally and inconsistently high proportion of correct and incorrect judgments made it virtually impossible to compare the Regular program with the other programs on this dimension.

For the Regular, E.I.P., and Cluster programs, slightly more than half of the supervisors could not identify the specific program, whereas two-thirds of the supervisors of Overseas and C.B.T.E. program graduates did not know the specific program from which the teacher had graduated. Of the remaining programs, supervisors correctly identified graduates from the E.I.P. most frequently. The other three programs (Overseas, Cluster, C.B.T.E.) were roughly equal on this dimension.

Supervisors' opinions regarding hiring potential and quality of classroom preparation also pointed to a significant difference among programs. Supervisors who identified their teachers as being from the C.B.T.E. program were not included in the analysis because they had incorrectly identified the program. Supervisors felt that graduates from the E.I.P., as compared to the other three programs, were the best prepared and had the greatest potential for being hired. Supervisors' opinions of graduates from the Cluster and Overseas programs were somewhat lower; this seemed to imply that supervisors were not certain whether graduating from these programs influenced employment potential or evidenced better classroom preparation. Supervisors' opinions of the Regular program were the least favorable and seemed to suggest that graduating from this program might result in a lower potential for job opportunities and lower levels of classroom preparation.

Relationships Between Supervisors' Ratings and the Cooperating Teachers' Success Ratings of the Graduates' Student Teaching Experience

No statistically significant correlations were found between the supervisors' ratings of graduates' commitment to teaching and the cooperating teachers' ratings of graduates' student teaching experience. The correlation between supervisors' ratings of graduates' performance of specified teaching skills and the cooperating teachers' ratings of the graduates' student teaching experience was also very low. These results indicated that predictions of how a supervisor

will evaluate a teacher's performance or commitment to teaching, based on student teaching reports, are suspect.

The researcher could not uncover any other research to support or refute these findings. Given that this conclusion is not supported by additional research evidence, there are two ways in which the low correlations may be interpreted: (1) Graduates change between student teaching and classroom experience and (2) Student teaching reports, or supervisors' ratings, or both, are not valid measures of teaching performance. If it can be assumed that both of these ratings are fairly accurate measures or true scores, it can also be assumed that graduates' actual performance and commitment levels immediately after student teaching cannot be used to predict their level of performance and commitment after graduation. In other words, a highly committed young teacher may not be as committed five years after graduation, and vice versa.

General Patterns of Graduates' and Supervisors' Ratings of Performance Skills

No statistical significance was found for graduates' and supervisors' ratings of performance skills among years or programs. These findings concurred with the other findings, which revealed that neither group's ratings determined differences among programs. These data were analyzed to investigate whether there was an interaction between the differences in patterns of ratings. The results indicated that the patterns were very closely aligned, revealing no interactions among programs and/or years.

General Findings

Two additional findings, which were not suggested by the questions posed in this study, may be of interest to the reader. The first related to supervisors' ratings of graduates' performance skills, broken down by years. A statistically significant difference was found among these ratings, as can be seen in Table 12 (Appendix M). It appears that the supervisors favored the more experienced teachers over the less experienced teachers.

The second finding concerned graduates' and supervisors' ratings of factors contributing to classroom performance. Six sources of influence were identified on the questionnaire, and both groups were asked to rate the extent to which each source contributed to the graduates' present teaching performance. The correlation among the mean ratings for these six sources was comparatively high, as can be seen in Table 13 (Appendix N). Although supervisors' ratings of all six sources tended to be somewhat lower than graduates' ratings, both groups tended to agree that "interactions with colleagues" had moderate influence, and that "undergraduate education courses," "inservice programs," and "graduate education courses" had limited influence. The difference between groups in mean ratings of the influence of student teaching was comparatively large. Graduates seemed to feel that student teaching had contributed more to their present teaching performance than supervisors felt it had contributed.

Including Supervisors' Ratings in Evaluations of Teacher Education Programs

The major question addressed by this study asked: "Should supervisors' ratings be included in graduate follow-up studies evaluating teacher education programs?" This study provided substantive evidence that the answer to this question is yes. There was a negligible correlation between graduates' and supervisors' ratings of the graduates' performance of specified teaching skills. This study did not determine which group's ratings were more accurate, but it did demonstrate that the ratings were different. A researcher could also use peer and student ratings of graduates to strengthen the foundation of evaluating teacher education programs. Another important finding of this study revealed that graduates' student teaching reports did not predict how the graduates employed as teachers would be rated by their supervisors.

The questions on the supervisors survey, which asked them to identify and rate programs, indicated that the supervisors, as participants in the teacher education process, should have the right and opportunity to express their views on teacher preparation to the colleges and universities that control that process. Supervisors' extremely high questionnaire return rate (88 percent) also indicated their interest in teacher preparation.

Conclusions

On the basis of the data gleaned from this study, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1a. Supervisors and graduates generally agreed on the importance of the 11 specified teaching skills.

1b. The results of graduates' and supervisors' ratings of graduates' performance of specified teaching skills indicated they did not agree about the graduates' performance.

2a. Supervisors' ratings of the graduates' performance of specified teaching skills did not differentiate among graduates from different programs.

2b. There were no differences among programs, as measured by supervisors' ratings of graduates' commitment to teaching.

3. The E.I.P. was ranked highest (a) on supervisors' accurate identification of the program from which the teacher had graduated, (b) as a factor for hiring potential, and (c) for better preparing graduates for classroom teaching. The Regular Program ranked lowest for (a) hiring potential and (b) for preparing graduates in classroom teaching, with the Overseas and Cluster programs drawing neutral responses.

4a. The graduates' student teaching reports by their cooperating teachers had a very low correlation with supervisors' ratings of the graduates' performance of specified teaching skills.

4b. The graduates' student teaching reports by their cooperating teachers also had a very low correlation with supervisors' ratings of the graduates' commitment to teaching.

5. No statistically significant differences were found between the general patterns of graduates' self-ratings and supervisors' ratings of graduates' skill performance among years or programs.

6a. The first general finding was that there was a relationship between the number of years a teacher had been teaching and supervisors' ratings of graduates' performance; this demonstrated that supervisors rated more experienced teachers higher than new teachers on the performance measure.

6b. The second general finding was that there was a high correlation between supervisors' and graduates' ratings of contributions to teaching; the graduates rated the student teaching experience as somewhat more influential than did the supervisors.

7. Based on the preceding conclusions, supervisors' ratings of graduates should be included in follow-up studies evaluating teacher education programs.

Recommendations

On the basis of the foregoing research findings, the following recommendations are made:

1. Further research replicating this study over a longer period of time would help to corroborate the findings of this study, and offer more conclusive information regarding the C.B.T.E. program.

2. Further research is recommended to focus on observations of graduate performance by trained observers, as a more accurate measure of the graduates' actual teaching performance. This method would require the selection of a realistic economic subsample.

3. Further research, soliciting data from graduates and their pupils and colleagues, would provide additional information to assist teacher educators in evaluating teacher education programs.

4. A more complete follow-up study should be undertaken incorporating all of the preceding recommendations, as well as a sample of graduates who are prepared before leaving college, to participate in a longitudinal follow-up study to evaluate the teacher education program.

5. Research should be conducted that closely examines the relationships between graduates' student teaching evaluations and their present supervisors' ratings. In addition, relationships could be drawn between graduates' self-ratings of performance and their student teaching evaluations.

6. Further research is recommended to develop a more valid measure for determining graduates' teaching performance and commitment to the profession.

7. It is also recommended that the questionnaires used in this study be redesigned to be programmed more easily for computer analysis.

Implications

In addition to the specific recommendations stated above, the study has three important implications for graduates, their supervisors, and teacher educators in general.

First, it is customary for graduates' student teaching evaluations to remain with their credentials throughout their teaching careers. According to the findings of this study, these student teaching reports did not relate to graduates' performance after they had had some teaching experience. Perhaps the graduates were

improving, becoming better teachers as they gained more experience, although this probably is not always the case. Therefore, the student teaching evaluation probably does not remain a meaningful evaluation tool after a graduate has had teaching experience. Hiring officials should heed the results of this study and carefully weigh both cooperating teachers' and supervisors' recommendations before hiring a new teacher. Because of the lack of research in this area, it is impossible to determine if one rating is more accurate than the other.

The second important implication of the study is an obvious need for all individuals involved in education to be trained in evaluation procedures. The research cited has numerous examples of the failure of teachers accurately to evaluate their own performance, and the inability of supervisors to evaluate teachers' performance. If educators continue to base important decisions such as tenure, promotion, hiring, and firing, or, as in this study, assessments of teacher education programs, on evaluations, more accurate measures must be developed and procedures standardized for the evaluation process.

The third implication of this study was derived from the supervisors' overwhelming response to the study. Eighty-eight percent of the supervisors returned their questionnaires by the deadline, and another 7 percent returned questionnaires late. That amounted to a 95 percent return rate. The supervisors' comments and general feelings indicated (a) pleasure in having had the opportunity to participate in such a study; (b) general lack of knowledge about the

specific teacher preparation programs, but a definite interest in learning; and (c) appreciation that Michigan State University had communicated with them and asked for their contributions to the improvement of teacher education programs. Twenty percent of the supervisors took the initiative to write a short note in addition to the questionnaire, expressing their feelings about Michigan State, the graduates' teacher education programs, and the opportunity to express themselves. (A representative sample of comments can be found in Appendix L.) The general feeling of the supervisors was expressed simply in one comment: "Thanks for the opportunity of rating _____."

At the very least, this study opened doors with the supervisors of Michigan State University graduates throughout the United States and the world, including Canada, South America, Australia, and Europe. The education of people should be a community effort, each facet (government, universities, and school districts) contributing its expertise to the others. This study has opened the doors of communication, and they must remain open.

Footnotes--Chapter V

[1]David McAfee, "Evaluation of the Teacher: Do Teachers and Supervisors Agree?" High School Journal 58 (May 1975): 336.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

INITIAL SAMPLE SIZE

APPENDIX A

INITIAL SAMPLE SIZE

Program	1969-70	1971-72	1974-75	1976-76	Totals
Regular	60	60	60	60	240
Cluster	60	60	60	60	240
Overseas	60	60	60	60	240
E.I.P.	60	60	60	60	240
C.B.T.E.	0	0	60	60	120
Totals	240	240	300	300	1,080

APPENDIX B

GRADUATES AND SUPERVISORS: TOTAL SAMPLE RETURNS BY YEARS AND PROGRAMS

APPENDIX B

GRADUATES AND SUPERVISORS: TOTAL SAMPLE RETURNS BY YEARS AND PROGRAMS

Year	Regular	E.I.P.	Cluster	Overseas	C.B.T.E.
1969-70	30/7[a]	26/15	29/12	25/17	...
1971-72	24/12	24/11	30/18	33/18	...
1974-75	26/13	34/10	36/14	24/8	33/11
1975-76	28/13	25/12	36/13	46/15	27/7

Total graduate returns = 536.
Total supervisor returns = 226.

[a]Graduate returns/supervisor returns.

APPENDIX C

GRADUATE QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX C

GRADUATE QUESTIONNAIRE

SURVEY OF M.S.U. COLLEGE OF EDUCATION GRADUATES

Name_____ Student Number_____

Term(s) in which you student taught_____ Year Graduated ____ _____

INSTRUCTIONS: PLEASE RECORD YOUR RESPONSE TO EACH ITEM IN THE APPROPRIATE SPACE ON THE ANSWER SHEET WHICH HAS BEEN PROVIDED.

1-4 How would you characterize your STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE?

1. Level:
   1. Special Education
   2. Lower Elementary
   3. Upper Elementary
   4. Middle or Jr. High
   5. Senior High
2. Type of School:
   1. Public
   2. Private
   3. Parochial
3. School Setting:
   1. Urban
   2. Suburban
   3. Rural
4. Number of Students in the School:
   1. Small
   2. Medium
   3. Large

---

5. In which of the following student teaching programs did you participate?
   1. Regular
   2. Overseas
   3. Cluster
   4. EIP
   5. CBTE
   6. Other (please specify)_____
6. Did you secure a teaching position following graduation?
   1. Yes (please answer items 7-14 below)
   2. No (please skip to items 15 and 16 below)

DO NOT ANSWER ITEMS 7 THROUGH 14 IF YOU DID NOT SECURE A TEACHING POSITION FOLLOWING GRADUATION (SKIP TO ITEM 15 BELOW).

7. What type of position did you initially secure?

1. Substitute teaching
2. Paraprofessional Role
3. Support Position (e.g. librarian, consultant, etc.)
4. Part-Time Classroom Teaching
5. Full-Time Classroom Teaching
6. Administration
7. Other (please specify) _____

8-10 How would you characterize your INITIAL TEACHING EXPERIENCE? (Check all which apply)

8. Type of School:
1. Public
2. Private
3. Parochial

9. School Setting:
1. Urban
2. Suburban
3. Rural

10. Number of Students in the School:
1. Small
2. Moderate
3. Large

11. How similar was your initial teaching position and your student teaching experience in regard to grade level and subject matter taught?

1. Very Similar
2. Similar
3. Dissimilar
4. Very Dissimilar

12. Do you still hold a teaching position?

1. YES (Please answer item 13 below)
2. NO (Please skip to item 14 below)

13. (For those who still hold a teaching position) In how many schools have you worked?

1. One
2. Two
3. Three
4. Four or more

SKIP TO ITEM 18

14. (For those who do not still hold a teaching position) Please check the statement which best describes your reasons for leaving the teaching profession.

1. Did not provide sufficient personal/professional challenge or satisfaction.
2. Left to raise a family.
3. Found a more rewarding job outside the profession.
4. Could not obtain a teaching position in area to which I subsequently moved.
5. Other (Please specify) _____

SKIP TO ITEM 18

DO NOT ANSWER ITEMS 15, 16, AND 17 IF YOU SECURED A TEACHING POSITION FOLLOWING GRADUATION (SKIP TO ITEM 18 BELOW).

15. Please check the statement which best describes your reason for not entering the teaching position.....

1. Decided against teaching as a career.
2. Entered graduate school.
3. A teaching position was not available in geographical area in which I hoped to reside.
4. A teaching position was not available anywhere.
5. Offered a job outside of education which promised greater rewards.
6. Other (Please specify) _____

16. Which of the following best describes the position you held during the year following college graduation?

1. Not employed in a paid position - SKIP TO ITEM 18
2. Held a social services position other than teaching.
3. Employed in professional and/or administrative role.
4. Employed in clerical and/or technical role.
5. Self-employed.
6. Unskilled or semi-skilled labor.
7. Other (Please specify)_____

17. To what extent was the college education you received essential to success in this position?

1. Advancement in this position required even more college education than I had received.
2. Advancement did not require any further college education.
3. I did not need as much college education as I had already received to secure and advance in this position.

→ 18. How many graduate credits have you earned?

1. 0 - 12 credit hours
2. 13 - 24
3. 25 - 36
4. 37 - 48
5. More than 48 credit hours.

19. What proportion of your graduate credits have you earned at MSU?

1. 0 - 25%
2. 26 - 50%
3. 51 - 75%
4. 76 - 100%

THE STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE

20 - 30 Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements by marking the corresponding response on your answer sheet.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
20. Student teaching was an enjoyable education experience.	1	2	3	4
21. My student teaching experience provided a practical and useful preparation for teaching.	1	2	3	4
22. I would recommend my student teaching experience to any undergraduate preparing to enter the teaching profession.	1	2	3	4
23. My student teaching program was responsive to recommendations of participating classroom teachers and students.	1	2	3	4
24. I was encouraged throughout student teaching to develop my own unique style of teaching.	1	2	3	4
25. I believe my presence as a student teacher contributed to the development of a better educational experience for the students enrolled in my supervising teacher's classroom.	1	2	3	4
26. My supervising teacher(s) provided frequent and/or valuable feedback regarding my lesson plans and classroom performance.	1	2	3	4
27. I felt free to discuss my progress and problems with my supervising teacher(s).	1	2	3	4
28. My (clinical consultant/college coordinator) provided frequent, and/or valuable feedback regarding my lesson plans and classroom performance.	1	2	3	4
29. I felt free to discuss my progress and problems with my (clinical consultant/college coordinator).	1	2	3	4

30. How would you characterize your rapport with students during student teaching?

1. Excellent
2. Good
3. Fair
4. Poor

How valuable were each of the following aspects of the student teaching experience?

	Great Value	Moderate Value	Limited Value	Little or No Value	Did not occur in my program
31. Scheduled seminars or meetings with other student teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
32. Observations in other classrooms.	1	2	3	4	5
33. Opportunity to teach at more than one grade level or subject area	1	2	3	4	5
34. Student teaching handbook.	1	2	3	4	5
35. Written midterm evaluation of your teaching performance.	1	2	3	4	5

EXPERIENCE AS A PRACTICING CLASSROOM TEACHER

PLEASE DO NOT RESPOND TO ANY MORE ITEMS ON THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IF YOU HAVE NEVER HELD A CLASSROOM TEACHING POSITION. IF YOU WISH TO ADD ANY COMMENTS, PLEASE DO SO IN ITEM 84 ON THE FINAL PAGE.

36. When did you make a firm decision to actively seek a teaching position?

1. Prior to student teaching.
2. During student teaching.
3. Following student teaching.

37. To what extent is your classroom organization and style of teaching similar to that of the teacher(s) who supervised your student teaching experience?

1. Very similar
2. Somewhat similar
3. Somewhat dissimilar
4. Little or no similarity

38. Imagine that MSU has an active student teaching program in your district. How many student teachers would you be willing to supervise each year?

1. None
2. One
3. Two
4. Three or more

To what extent have interactions during student teaching with each of the following individuals influenced your performance as a practicing classroom teacher?

	Stong Influence	Moderate Influence	Limited Influence	Little or No Influence
39. Supervising teacher	1	2	3	4
40. Cluster consultant/college supervisor	1	2	3	4
41. Other teachers in the school in which I student taught	1	2	3	4
42. Other student teachers in the program	1	2	3	4
43. Principal of the school in which I student taught	1	2	3	4

44-49 How much have each of the following contributed to your performance as a classroom teacher?

	Strong Influence	Moderate Influence	Limited Influence	Little or No Influence
44. Undergraduate methods courses	1	2	3	4
45. Student teaching	1	2	3	4
46. Other undergraduate education courses	1	2	3	4
47. In-service programs in the schools	1	2	3	4
48. Interactions with colleagues	1	2	3	4
49. Graduate education courses	1	2	3	4

50-82 Instructions: Please answer the three questions which follow each knowledge or skill area listed below. (Mark the response which best expresses your view on the answer sheet.	A. To what extent is this skill essential to success in teaching?					B. How would you rate your ability to apply this knowledge or skill in your classroom?					C. To what extent did your student teaching experience promote the development of this skill?				
		Crucial	Important	Limited Relevance	Nonessential		Outstanding*	Strong*	Above Average	Below Average		Strong Influence	Moderate Influence	Limited Influence	Little or No Influence
Knowledge of educational theory and practice	50	1	2	3	4	51	1	2	3	4	52	1	2	3	4
Knowledge of subject matter	53	1	2	3	4	54	1	2	3	4	55	1	2	3	4
Ability to establish rapport with students	56	1	2	3	4	57	1	2	3	4	58	1	2	3	4
Ability to communicate with parents and other teachers	59	1	2	3	4	60	1	2	3	4	61	1	2	3	4
Ability to formulate instructional goals and objectives	62	1	2	3	4	63	1	2	3	4	64	1	2	3	4
Ability to provide a wide variety of instructional strategies and materials	65	1	2	3	4	66	1	2	3	4	67	1	2	3	4
Ability to collect and interpret data regarding student needs and achievement	68	1	2	3	4	69	1	2	3	4	70	1	2	3	4
Ability to maintain active student participation in classroom tasks	71	1	2	3	4	72	1	2	3	4	73	1	2	3	4
Ability to recognize and deal effectively with problems in student discipline	74	1	2	3	4	75	1	2	3	4	76	1	2	3	4
Ability to use effective questioning and interaction techniques in the classroom	77	1	2	3	4	78	1	2	3	4	79	1	2	3	4
Ability to evaluate one's own classroom and general professional performance	80	1	2	3	4	81	1	2	3	4	82	1	2	3	4

* Outstanding = top 10% of all teachers
Strong = top 25% of all teachers

83. Please provide the name and address of the principal or supervisor in the school in which you are currently working.

Name:_____

Address _____

_____

_____

84. GENERAL COMMENTS:

APPENDIX D

SUPERVISOR QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX D

SUPERVISOR QUESTIONNAIRE

FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF M.S.U. GRADUATES - SUPERVISOR SURVEY

Name_____ Date_____

Address_____

As a part of a follow-up study of graduates of the College of Education at Michigan State, we would appreciate your cooperation in evaluating the performance of _____.
Your responses to this survey will be confidential. Results will be reported collectively rather than by schools or individuals.

1-8 Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements which refer to professional activities of this teacher. (Please mark the corresponding spaces on the answer sheet which has been provided.)

THE TEACHER WHOSE NAME APPEARS ABOVE...	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Seeks active involvement with students outside the classroom setting	1	2	3	4
2. Establishes cooperative relations with colleagues and various support personnel in the building	1	2	3	4
3. Is receptive to "promising" new ideas or approaches to teaching	1	2	3	4
4. Maintains appropriate professional conduct and appearance	1	2	3	4
5. Actively participates in various in-service activities such as workshops and teacher committees	1	2	3	4
6. Assumes a leadership role within the informal social structure of the school	1	2	3	4
7. Is resourceful in creating and using available instructional materials	1	2	3	4
8. Completes professional assignments and responsibilities in a competent and dependable manner	1	2	3	4

Items 9 and 10 ask you to compare this teacher with other teachers in his/her field

9. Where would this teacher rank in overall competence as a teacher?

    1. Outstanding (top 10% of all teachers)
    2. Strong (top 25% of all teachers)
    3. Above average
    4. Below average

10. Where would this teacher rank in level of commitment to the teaching profession?

    1. Outstanding (top 10% of all teachers)
    2. Strong (top 25% of all teachers)
    3. Above average
    4. Below average

Instructions: Please answer the two questions which follow each knowledge or skill area listed below. (Mark the number on your answer sheet which best expresses your view.)

Knowledge/Skill		A. To what extent is this skill essential to success in teaching?					B. How would you rate this teacher's ability to apply this knowledge or skill in the classroom?			
		Crucial	Important	Limited Relevance	Nonessential		Outstanding (top 10% of all teachers)	Strong (top 25% of all teachers)	Above Average	Below average
Knowledge of educational theory and practice	11.	1	2	3	4	12.	1	2	3	4
Knowledge of subject matter	13.	1	2	3	4	14.	1	2	3	4
Ability to establish rapport with students	15.	1	2	3	4	16.	1	2	3	4
Ability to communicate with parents and other teachers	17.	1	2	3	4	18.	1	2	3	4
Ability to formulate instructional goals and objectives	19.	1	2	3	4	20.	1	2	3	4
Ability to provide a wide variety of instructional strategies and materials	21.	1	2	3	4	22.	1	2	3	4
Ability to collect and interpret data regarding student needs and achievement.	23.	1	2	3	4	24.	1	2	3	4
Ability to maintain active student participation in classroom tasks	25.	1	2	3	4	26.	1	2	3	4
Ability to recognize and deal effectively with problems in student discipline	27.	1	2	3	4	28.	1	2	3	4
Ability to use effective questioning and interaction techniques in the classroom.	29.	1	2	3	4	30.	1	2	3	4
Ability to evaluate one's own classroom and general professional performance	31.	1	2	3	4	32.	1	2	3	4

Items 33-37: In your judgment, how much have each of the following contributed to this individual's performance as a classroom teacher?

	Strong Influence	Moderate Influence	Limited Influence	Little or None	No basis for eval.
33. Student teaching	1	2	3	4	5
34. Undergraduate education courses	1	2	3	4	5
35. In-service programs in the schools	1	2	3	4	5
36. Interactions with colleagues	1	2	3	4	5
37. Graduate education courses	1	2	3	4	5

38. Did this teacher begin his/her professional career under your supervision?
    1. yes
    2. no

39. Prior to this survey, were you aware that this teacher graduated from Michigan State University?
    1. yes
    2. no

40. This teacher graduated from one of the following teacher preparation programs at Michigan State University. If you are aware of which program, please check the appropriate box. If you have no knowledge of the program she/he graduated from, please check the "don't know" category.
    1. Elementary Intern Program (E.I.P.)
    2. Competency-Based Teacher Education Program (C.B.T.E.)
    3. Overseas Student Teaching Program
    4. Cluster Student Teaching Program
    5. Regular (Conventional) Program
    6. Don't Know (Skip to item 43)

DO NOT ANSWER QUESTIONS 41 and 42 if you checked "Don't Know" in Item 35 (skip to Item 43)

41. Do you feel that graduates from this program have a greater chance of being hired in your district than graduates of other programs at M.S.U.?
    1. yes
    2. not sure
    3. no

42. Do you feel that graduates from this program are better prepared as classroom teachers than graduates of other programs at M.S.U.?
    1. yes
    2. not sure
    3. no

43. GENERAL COMMENTS:

APPENDIX E

FIRST COVER LETTER TO GRADUATES

APPENDIX E

FIRST COVER LETTER TO GRADUATES

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION • DIVISION OF
STUDENT TEACHING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
ERICKSON HALL

EAST LANSING • MICHIGAN • 48824

Dear Participant,

As a part of our continuing effort to improve teacher education programs at Michigan State University, we are conducting a follow-up study of past student teachers. You are a part of a randomly selected sample from this group. From your responses to the enclosed questionnaire, we can identify strengths and weaknesses of our teacher education program. In this way graduates will have a significant input in our efforts to improve the ongoing program. We therefore urge you to take 15 to 20 minutes of your time to complete the questionnaire.

The final question on the survey asks you to name your principal or supervisor. A shorter questionnaire will be sent to him/her. Although this survey will ask your supervisor to rate certain aspects of your performance, the purpose is clearly to evaluate the success of our student teaching program as seen by administrators. We will therefore never analyze or report data for individual teachers! If for any reason you would rather not cooperate in this phase of the study, please complete the questionnaire, omitting only item #83.

All data from both the teacher and supervisor surveys will be published in group form only. A specific respondent will never be identified by name by the research team. Thus all personal information will be kept strictly confidential. We sincerely appreciate your cooperation in this important study.

Respectfully,

W. Henry Kennedy
Director

INSTRUCTIONS

PLEASE:

1. Carefully record your response to each item in the appropriate space on the IBM answer sheet.
2. Use a soft (#2) lead pencil.
3. Write your name at the top of the IBM answer sheet and questionnaire.
4. Detach page 8 of the questionnaire (which includes additional comments you wish to make) and enclose it and the IBM answer sheet in the return addressed envelope. Discard or keep the first seven pages of the questionnaire!
5. Enclose a self-addressed stamped envelope if you wish a copy of the final report.

APPENDIX F

SECOND COVER LETTERS TO GRADUATES: BY PROGRAM

APPENDIX F

SECOND COVER LETTERS TO GRADUATES: BY PROGRAM

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION • DIVISION OF
STUDENT TEACHING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
ERICKSON HALL

EAST LANSING • MICHIGAN • 48824

January 16, 1978

Dear Participant,

In December, you should have received a letter requesting your participation in a major study of the undergraduate teacher preparation programs at Michigan State University. Although many individuals have returned the questionnaires, we have not yet received your response.

Because the number of returns from former participants in the CBTE student teaching program is comparatively small, we fear that you and other graduates of this program may not be adequately represented in our efforts to improve undergraduate programs. We therefore urge you to take 15 to 20 minutes of your time to complete this important survey. *

The earlier letter also described our desire for you to supply the name of your supervisor so that we may evaluate the success of our undergraduate programs as seen by administrators. Data from both the enclosed questionnaire and the supervisor survey will be kept strictly confidential and will be published in group form only. If for any reason you would rather not include your supervisor's name, please complete the questionnaire, omitting only item #83.

If you have already returned the questionnaire, please disregard this letter. We sincerely appreciate your cooperation in this important study.

Respectfully,

Robert Hatfield

Robert Hatfield
Professor

* On the chance that you may have inadvertantly misplaced the original letter, we have enclosed another copy of the questionnaire as well as a stamped envelope.

INSTRUCTIONS

Please:

1. Carefully record your response to each item in the appropriate space on the IBM answer sheet.
2. Use a soft (#2) lead pencil.
3. Write your name at the top of the IBM answer sheet and questionnaire.
4. Insert the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope and return.
5. Enclose a self-addressed envelope if you wish a copy of the final report.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION • DIVISION OF
STUDENT TEACHING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
ERICKSON HALL

EAST LANSING • MICHIGAN • 48824

January 16, 1978

Dear Participant,

In December, you should have received a letter requesting your participation in a major study of the undergraduate teacher preparation programs at Michigan State University. Although many individuals have returned the questionnaires, we have not yet received your response.

Because the number of returns from former participants in the overseas student teaching program is comparatively small, we fear that you and other graduates of this program may not be adequately represented in our efforts to improve undergraduate programs. We therefore urge you to take 15 to 20 minutes of your time to complete this important survey. *

The earlier letter also described our desire for you to supply the name of your supervisor so that we may evaluate the success of our undergraduate programs as seen by administrators. Data from both the enclosed questionnaire and the supervisor survey will be kept strictly confidential and will be published in group form only. If for any reason you would rather not include your supervisor's name, please complete the questionnaire, omitting only item #83.

If you have already returned the questionnaire, please disregard this letter. We sincerely appreciate your cooperation in this important study.

Respectfully,

Banks Bradley

Banks Bradley
Associate Professor

BB/cg

* On the chance that you may have inadvertantly misplaced the original letter, we have enclosed another copy of the questionnaire as well as a stamped envelope.

INSTRUCTIONS

Please:

1. Carefully record your response to each item in the appropriate space on the IBM answer sheet.
2. Use a soft (#2) lead pencil.
3. Write your name at the top of the IBM answer sheet and questionnaire.
4. Insert the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope and return.
5. Enclose a self-addressed envelope if you wish a copy of the final report.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY EAST LANSING • MICHIGAN 48823

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION • OFFICE OF THE DEAN • ERICKSON HALL

January 16, 1978

Dear Participant,

In December, you should have received a letter requesting your participation in a major study of the undergraduate teacher preparation programs at Michigan State University. Although many individuals have returned the questionnaires, we have not yet received your response.

Because the number of returns from former participants in the cluster student teaching program is comparatively small, we fear that you and other graduates of this program may not be adequately represented in our efforts to improve undergraduate programs. We therefore urge you to take 15 to 20 minutes of your time to complete this important survey. *

The earlier letter also described our desire for you to supply the name of your supervisor so that we may evaluate the success of our undergraduate programs as seen by administrators. Data from both the enclosed questionnaire and the supervisor survey will be kept strictly confidential and will be published in group form only. If for any reason you would rather not include your supervisor's name, please complete the questionnaire, omitting only item #83.

If you have already returned the questionnaire, please disregard this letter. We sincerely appreciate your cooperation in this important study.

Sincerely,

Keith Goldhammer
Dean

* On the chance that you may have inadvertantly misplaced the original letter, we have enclosed another copy of the questionnaire as well as a stamped envelope.

INSTRUCTIONS

Please:

1. Carefully record your response to each item in the appropriate space on the IBM answer sheet.
2. Use a soft (#2) lead pencil.
3. Write your name at the top of the IBM answer sheet and questionnaire.
4. Insert the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope and return.
5. Enclose a self-addressed envelope if you wish a copy of the final report.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY EAST LANSING • MICHIGAN 48823

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION • OFFICE OF THE DEAN • ERICKSON HALL

January 16, 1978

Dear Participant,

In December, you should have received a letter requesting your participation in a major study of the undergraduate teacher preparation programs at Michigan State University. Although many individuals have returned the questionnaires, we have not yet received your response.

Because the number of returns from former participants in the regular student teaching program is comparatively small, we fear that you and other graduates of this program may not be adequately represented in our efforts to improve undergraduate programs. We therefore urge you to take 15 to 20 minutes of your time to complete this important survey. *

The earlier letter also described our desire for you to supply the name of your supervisor so that we may evaluate the success of our undergraduate programs as seen by administrators. Data from both the enclosed questionnaire and the supervisor survey will be kept strictly confidential and will be published in group form only. If for any reason you would rather not include your supervisor's name, please complete the questionnaire, omitting only item #83.

If you have already returned the questionnaire, please disregard this letter. We sincerely appreciate your cooperation in this important study.

Sincerely,

Keith Goldhammer
Dean

* On the chance that you may have inadvertantly misplaced the original letter, we have enclosed another copy of the questionnaire as well as a stamped envelope.

INSTRUCTIONS

Please:

1. Carefully record your response to each item in the appropriate space on the IBM answer sheet.
2. Use a soft (#2) lead pencil.
3. Write your name at the top of the IBM answer sheet and questionnaire.
4. Insert the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope and return.
5. Enclose a self-addressed envelope if you wish a copy of the final report.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SPECIAL EDUCATION

EAST LANSING • MICHIGAN • 48824

January 16, 1978

Dear Participant,

In December, you should have received a letter requesting your participation in a major study of the undergraduate teacher preparation programs at Michigan State University. Although many individuals have returned the questionnaires, we have not yet received your response.

Because the number of returns from former participants in the Elementary Intern Program is comparatively small, we fear that you and other graduates of this program may not be adequately represented in our efforts to improve undergraduate programs. We therefore urge you to take 15 to 20 minutes of your time to complete this important survey. *

The earlier letter also described our desire for you to supply the name of your supervisor so that we may evaluate the success of our undergraduate programs as seen by administrators. Data from both the enclosed questionnaire and the supervisor survey will be kept strictly confidential and will be published in group form only. If for any reason you would rather not include your supervisor's name, please complete the questionnaire, omitting only item #83.

If you have already returned the questionnaire, please disregard this letter. We sincerely appreciate your cooperation in this important study.

Respectfully,

James E. Snoddy, Chairman
Elementary and Special Education

* On the chance that you may have inadvertantly misplaced the original letter, we have enclosed another copy of the questionnaire as well as a stamped envelope.

INSTRUCTIONS

Please:

1. Carefully record your response to each item in the appropriate space on the IBM answer sheet.
2. Use a soft (#2) lead pencil.
3. Write your name at the top of the IBM answer sheet and questionnaire.
4. Insert the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope and return.
5. Enclose a self-addressed envelope if you wish a copy of the final report.

APPENDIX G

FIRST COVER LETTER TO SUPERVISORS

APPENDIX G

FIRST COVER LETTER TO SUPERVISORS

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION • DIVISION OF
STUDENT TEACHING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
ERICKSON HALL

EAST LANSING • MICHIGAN • 48824

January 16, 1978

Dear Supervisor,

As a part of our continuing effort to improve teacher education programs at Michigan State University, we are conducting a follow-up study of former students. An important phase of this study will be to evaluate the success of our undergraduate programs as seen by those who currently supervise our graduates. The teacher who is identified on the enclosed questionnaire voluntarily provided your name and address as their direct supervisor.

From your responses we can gain some insight into the activities and teaching performance of our former students. In this way, graduates and their supervisors can have a significant input in our efforts to improve ongoing programs. We therefore urge you to take approximately 10 minutes of your time to complete the questionnaire.

Your response to the questionnaire will be analyzed and reported by undergraduate programs only. Thus all personal information will be kept strictly confidential and will never be analyzed or reported for individual teachers, supervisors, or school systems. We sincerely appreciate your cooperation in this important study.

Respectfully,

W. Henry Kennedy
Director of Student Teaching

INSTRUCTIONS

Please:

1. Carefully record your response to each item in the appropriate space on the IBM answer sheet.
2. Use a soft (#2) lead pencil.
3. Write your name at the top of the IBM answer sheet and questionnaire.
4. Insert the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope and return.
5. Enclose a self-addressed stamped envelope if you wish a copy of the final report.

APPENDIX H

REMINDER COVER LETTER TO SUPERVISORS

APPENDIX H

REMINDER COVER LETTER TO SUPERVISORS

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION · DIVISION OF
STUDENT TEACHING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
ERICKSON HALL

EAST LANSING • MICHIGAN • 48824

March 8, 1978

Dear Supervisor,

Recently, you should have received a letter requesting your participation in a major study of the undergraduate teacher preparation programs at Michigan State University. Your name was provided by one of the graduates in our study. Although most have returned the questionnaire, we have not yet received your response.

Because the total number of supervisors in our study is comparatively small, we are anxious to maximize the number of returned questionnaires. This will insure that supervisor evaluations of the success of our undergraduate programs is based upon a representative sample. Such a sample will provide critical information regarding the activities and teaching performance of our former students.

If you have already returned the questionnaire, please disregard this letter. We sincerely appreciate your cooperation in this important study. On the chance that you may have inadvertantly misplaced the original letter, we will send you another copy of the questionnaire in approximately two weeks.

Sincerely,

Dr. Henry Kennedy
Director

HK:dme

APPENDIX I

THIRD COVER LETTER TO SUPERVISORS

APPENDIX I

THIRD COVER LETTER TO SUPERVISORS

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION · DIVISION OF
STUDENT TEACHING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
ERICKSON HALL

EAST LANSING · MICHIGAN · 48824

March 22, 1978

Dear Supervisor,

Recently you should have received a reminder that we seek your cooperation in completing a questionnaire which is part of a follow-up study of M.S.U. graduates. Because we have not heard from you, we assume you have misplaced the questionnaire. As our earlier letters have indicated, participation by you and others will ensure an adequate representation of supervisors in our study. Another copy of the questionnaire is therefore enclosed as well as a stamped addressed envelope. The directions below should assist you in completing this form.

If you have already returned the answer sheet, please disregard this letter. We sincerely appreciate your cooperation in this important study.

Respectfully,

W. Henry Kennedy
Director

Instructions

Please:

1. Carefully record your response on each item in the appropriate space on the IBM Answer Sheet.
2. Use a soft (#2) lead pencil.
3. Write your name at the top of the IBM Answer Sheet.
4. Insert the answer sheet in the enclosed envelope and return.
5. Enclose a self-addressed stamped envelope if you wish a copy of the final report.

APPENDIX J

SUCCESS RATING CHART

APPENDIX J

SUCCESS RATING CHART

	Success Rating Number	Interpretation	Percentage of Students Likely to Receive This Number
CRITERIA OF SUCCESS A. Working With People B. Establishing Classroom Climate C. Planning Instruction D. Managing Instruction E. Command of Subject and Teaching Materials F. Personal Qualities G. Professional Qualities H. General Effectiveness as a Teacher	1	ONE OF THE VERY BEST STUDENT TEACHERS I HAVE EVER SEEN. Assign rating 1 to the MOST EXCEPTIONAL and OUTSTANDING student teacher of all. If you judge that a student is of ABSOLUTELY OUTSTANDING ACCOMPLISTMENT and will make a potentially GREAT and PROFOUND effect on students, assign rating 1.	2% or about 15 out of 850
	2	HIGHLY SUCCESSFUL. Assign rating 2 to those of somewhat lesser overall ability than rating 1 but nevertheless represent ACCOMPLISHED and OUTSTANDING student teaching performance. The highly successful student would rate close to rating 1 but is not one of the best student teachers you have ever seen.	13% or about 110 out of 850
	3	SUCCESSFUL. Assign rating 3 to COMPETENT student teachers. Most should receive this rating and do not show the outstanding qualities of ratings 1 and 2.	About 70% or most or about 595 out of 850
	4	LESS SUCCESSFUL. Assign rating 4 to those student teachers who have some problems and rate below the middle, that is, competent and successful, group in your center.	13% or about 110 out of 850
	5	PASSED BUT SHOULD NOT BE IN TEACHING. Assign rating 5 to those students who you feel OUGHT to fail--they really are not inclined to teaching--but because of various reasons should not receive a failing grade.	2% or about 1f out of 850

APPENDIX K

SUCCESS RATING SCORES OF GRADUATES' STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE: BY PROGRAM

APPENDIX K

SUCCESS RATING SCORES OF GRADUATES' STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE: BY PROGRAM

I.D. #	Rater			Final Score
	A	B	C	
Regular 1969/70				
2	2	3	3	3
4	4	4	4	4
7	3	3	3	3
11	3	3	3	3
13	3	3	3	3
19	2	3	3	3
26	2	3	2	2
E.I.P. 1969/70				
34	2	3	3	3
35	2	3	3	3
36	4	3	3	3
45	3	3	3	3
50	2	3	3	3
51	4	3	4	4
52	3	3	3	3
Cluster 1969/70				
59	3	3	3	3
61	3	3	3	3
66	2	3	3	3
73	3	3	3	3
75	1	2	2	2
76	2	2	3	2
82	1	2	1	1
Overseas 1969/70				
87	3	3	3	3
90	4	3	3	3
95	2	2	2	2
98	3	3	4	3
100	3	4	3	3
101	3	2	3	3
105	3	3	2	3

I.D. #	Rater A	Rater B	Rater C	Final Score
Regular 1971/72				
116	3	3	3	3
120	2	3	2	2
122	3	3	3	3
125	3	3	3	3
126	3	3	3	3
132	2	3	3	3
133	4	3	3	3
E.I.P. 1971/72				
138	2	3	3	3
139	3	3	3	3
142	3	3	2	2
144	1	2	2	2
148	3	3	3	3
150	3	3	3	3
158	3	3	2	3
Cluster 1971/72				
162	3	3	2	3
165	4	4	4	4
173	3	3	3	3
175	3	3	3	3
176	3	3	3	3
179	2	3	2	2
188	2	2	2	2
Overseas 1971/72				
199	2	2	2	2
201	3	3	3	3
202	2	2	2	2
207	2	3	3	3
208	2	3	3	3
211	3	3	3	3
219	3	3	3	3
Regular 1974/75				
228	3	3	3	3
232	1	2	2	2
233	2	3	3	3
236	2	3	3	3
243	2	3	2	2
244	3	3	3	3
247	3	3	3	3

I.D. #	Rater A	Rater B	Rater C	Final Score
E.I.P. 1974/75				
252	2	2	3	2
257	3	3	3	3
262	2	2	3	2
272	2	2	2	2
275	3	3	3	3
281	2	2	2	2
Cluster 1974/75				
288	3	3	3	3
293	3	3	3	3
303	2	3	3	3
306	2	3	3	3
307	3	3	3	3
308	2	3	3	3
310	1	2	2	2
Overseas 1974/75				
320	2	1	2	2
322	3	3	3	3
323	2	3	2	2
328	2	3	3	3
329	3	2	2	2
335	2	2	3	2
340	2	2	2	2
C.B.T.E. 1974/75				
343	3	3	2	3
346	5	5	5	5
348	3	3	3	3
356	3	3	3	3
358	2	3	2	2
369	2	2	3	2
372	3	3	3	3
Regular 1975/76				
385	3	3	3	3
389	2	3	3	3
393	3	3	4	3
397	4	3	4	4
399	2	2	3	2
402	2	2	2	2
403	2	2	2	2

I.D. #	Rater A	Rater B	Rater C	Final Score
E.I.P. 1975/76				
413	2	3	3	3
414	2	2	2	2
415	2	3	3	3
417	2	2	2	2
418	3	3	3	3
420	2	2	3	2
426	3	3	3	3
Cluster 1975/76				
433	3	3	3	3
435	3	3	2	3
436	3	3	2	3
444	3	3	3	3
452	2	2	3	2
455	3	3	3	3
456	1	2	2	2
Overseas 1975/76				
466	1	1	1	1
469	2	2	2	2
488	2	2	2	2
489	2	2	2	2
490	3	3	3	3
494	3	3	3	3
502	3	3	3	3
C.B.T.E. 1975/76				
514	3	3	3	3
518	2	2	2	2
519	3	3	3	3
522	2	2	2	2
523	3	3	3	3
526	2	2	2	2
528	2	3	3	3

APPENDIX L

SUPERVISORS' GENERAL COMMENTS: BY PROGRAM

APPENDIX L

SUPERVISORS' GENERAL COMMENTS: BY PROGRAM

Regular Program: The Regular Teacher Education Program received 11 positive comments concerning the graduates, as judged by their supervisors. Below is a sample of these comments:

> "_____ is a fine teacher, most cooperative, and works well with students and staff."
>
> "I find M.S.U. does well in Teacher Education--period."
>
> "This has been the most difficult form I have ever completed. _____ is a very good teacher, I feel MSU may have contributed to this but I think he would be a good teacher coming from any teacher education school."
>
> ". . . In the short time she has been with us, _____ is doing an excellent job teaching."

Two less positive comments were received from supervisors judging graduates from the Regular Student Teaching Program:

> "This teacher was prepared in a subject area and does not have a very good knowledge of dealing with students or developing sequential skills within her content area."
>
> "_____ does not 'measure up' to other M.S.U. grads we've employed and consequently would not be issued a contract for '78-79. However, due to his late start and the 19 days we've had to miss school, we're going to make an attempt to correct deficiencies and see if he could fit in here."

Elementary Intern Program: The E.I.P. received eight positive comments concerning the graduates, as judged by their supervisors. Below is a sample of these comments:

> "_____ was one of the most outstanding teachers I have ever worked with. She is a credit to her profession and to M.S.U."
>
> "E.I.P. is one of the better teacher training approaches in the country. I feel that the methods classes still have a long way to go."

"_____ is an outstanding young teacher. She is well grounded in theory as well as in practice. Herclassroom performance is much better than any teacher of her limited experience should be expected to perform."

Cluster Program: The Clusterteacher education program received five positive comments concerning the graduates, as judged by their supervisors. Below is a sample of these comments:

"Thanks for the opportunity of 'rating' _____. I honestly considered her to be one of my best teachers ever. (I have sixteen years experience as a principal.) _____ probably had more innate talent than most of us put together in our building. Her art room was the best example of a work center that I have experienced. Thus, I have rated her quite high. However, besides being very talented she could get kids involved. Perhaps, she learned the latter at Michigan State."

"_____ is a totally dedicated, excellent teacher. She has applied for an elementary administrator position in our district and I am highly recommending her for the position."

The following are three of four comments that were less positive than the preceding two.

"_____ would be a superior college professor. He has some difficulty in high school."

"_____ has had a bad year. Techniques used in the classroom were poor. He has been receptive to constructive criticism and is improving."

"I am very much in favor of the C.B.T.E. approach or intern program approach for the training of future teachers."

Overseas Program: The Overseas teacher education program received 18 positive comments concerning the graduates and other teacher education programs, by supervisors. Below is a representative sample of these comments:

"_____ is what he is primarily because of the person _____ is. If he reflects M.S.U. then M.S.U. is #1; if he simply reflects himself, then he is #1."

"In all respects, this individual has been a positive contributing member of the staff. Experience and creativity have developed constantly."

"Excellent teacher. Professional and dedicated."

"I have nothing but the highest, most enthusiastic regard for the E.I.P. program. My experience has convinced me that, given a choice, I would be highly biased to choose a teacher for my building that had been trained in this program. Their grasp of the realities of the profession is practical, their background of experience is broad and their acceptance of guidance and cooperative sharing is very high. Friday night, or I'd say more."

Competency-Based Teacher Education Program: The C.B.T.E. Program received one comment from a responding supervisor:

"General education courses generally are of little consequence in helping out new teachers; theory has very limited application without a practical base as a control."

APPENDIX M

GRADUATES' SELF-RATINGS AND SUPERVISORS' RATINGS OF GRADUATES' PERFORMANCE OF SPECIFIED TEACHING SKILLS, BY YEAR OF GRADUATION

APPENDIX M

GRADUATES' SELF-RATINGS AND SUPERVISORS' RATINGS OF GRADUATES' PERFORMANCE OF SPECIFIED TEACHING SKILLS, BY YEAR OF GRADUATION

Table 12.--Graduates' self-ratings and supervisors' ratings of graduates' performance of specified teaching skills, by year of graduation.

Year	Graduate Self-Ratings		Supervisor Ratings	
	$\bar{X}$	N	$\bar{X}$	N
1969-70	1.04	47	.94	47
1971-72	1.06	55	1.05	55
1974-75	1.11	54	.98	54
1975-76	1.13	57	1.28	57
Grand mean =	1.09		1.06	
F (3, 195) =	.453		2.97	
alpha =	.71		.03	

APPENDIX N

MEAN RATINGS: SIX SOURCES OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE GRADUATES' PRESENT TEACHING PERFORMANCE

APPENDIX N

MEAN RATINGS: SIX SOURCES OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE GRADUATES' PRESENT TEACHING PERFORMANCE

Table 13.--Mean ratings: six sources of contributions to the graduates' present teaching performance.

	Mean Rating[a]			
	Graduates		Supervisors	
	$\bar{X}$	N	$\bar{X}$	N
Student teaching	.68	405	1.73	215
Undergraduate education courses	1.61	404	1.87	2.5
Inservice programs in the schools	1.58	400	1.71	214
Interactions with colleagues	.85	405	1.05	213
Graduate education courses	1.56	379	2.22	212
Other undergraduate education courses	1.72	404	...	...

Correlation between graduates and supervisors' ratings of contributions to teaching: $R_{xy} = .560$

[a]0 = strong influence, 1 = moderate influence, 2 = limited influence, 3 = little or no influence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AACTE. Recommended Standards for Teacher Accreditation of Basic and Advanced Preparation Programs for Professional School Personnel. March 1970. ERIC ED 037 423.

Adams, Ronald. Follow-Up and Evaluation of Teacher Education Graduates, Final Report. Bowling Green, Kentucky: Western Kentucky University, 1974.

Arends, Robert. "A Comparative Study of the Graduates of the Michigan State University Elementary Intern Program and the Regular Teacher Education Program." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1969.

Baer, Thomas. "Teacher Preparation--What Graduates Tell Us." Unpublished paper, July 1975. ERIC ED 103 402.

Bradley, Banks. "Overseas Student Teaching: A Follow-Up Study Report as an Assessment of Intercultural Experiences in Student Teaching." East Lansing: Michigan State University Department of Student Teaching, 1975.

Carey, Lou. "An Investigation of the Validity of Using Self-Evaluation Instruments to Identify Instructional Needs." Unpublished paper, December 1977. ERIC ED 142 579.

Cook, Martha, and Richards, Herbert. "Dimensions of Principal and Supervisor Ratings of Teacher Behavior." Journal of Experimental Education 41 (Winter 1972).

Copley, Patrick. "A Study of the Effect of Professional Education Courses on Beginning Teachers." Unpublished paper, Southwest Missouri State, 1975. ERIC ED 098 147.

Coyne, Charles E. Comparative Analysis of Teacher Education. St. Joseph, Missouri: Missouri Western State College, 1970.

Crisp, Raymond. "The Professional Competency of Illinois Secondary School English Teachers: A Report of the Self-Evaluation of Experienced Illinois Secondary School English Teachers." Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, December 1968. ERIC ED 029 889.

David, Hugo, ed. Toward Excellence in Student Teaching. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co., 1973.

Deans and Directors of Teacher Education in Michigan. Student Teaching Programs: Questions and Answers. "The Impact of Student Teaching Programs Upon the Cooperating Public Schools in Michigan." June 1970.

Goldenberg, Ronald. "The Relationships Between Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions of the Quality of College Preparation for Teaching Competency." Unpublished paper, ATE, March 1975. ERIC ED 131 075.

Grommon, Alfred H., ed. The Education of Teachers of English for American Schools and Colleges, Vol. V. NCTE Curriculum Series. April 1969. ERIC ED 024 687.

Hardebeck, Richard J., and others. "Individualization of Instruction by Vocational and Nonvocational Teachers and Self-Reports Compared With Observations." Unpublished paper, Texas Education Agency, 1974. ERIC ED 131 202.

Herbert, John. "A Research Base for the Accreditation of Teacher Preparation Programs." Paper presented at the AERA, Minneapolis, 1970. ERIC ED 040 124.

Jackson, Charles. "A Study of Selected Student Teaching Experiences Reported by Michigan State University Cluster Program and Conventional Program Student Teachers." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971.

Jarvis, Bob, and Stevenson, William. "The Effects of the 1971 UO-Tech New Teacher Training Program on the Teaching Activities of Nineteen Beginning Vocational Teachers in Oklahoma." Unpublished paper, July 1972. ERIC ED 069 907.

Johnson, Granville. "Evaluation of the University of South Alabama College of Education Teacher Training Program by Analysis of Its Alumni, 1971." Unpublished paper, University of South Alabama, Mobile, June 1972. ERIC ED 060 050.

Kaufman, Dan, and others. "Assessment of Teacher Preparation Programs." Unpublished paper, June 1974. ERIC ED 095 176.

McAfee, David T. "Evaluation of the Teacher: Do Teachers and Supervisors Agree?" High School Journal 58 (May 1975): 336-42.

Michigan State University and participating school districts. "P.O.I.N.T.E." East Lansing: Division of Student Teaching and Professional Development, 1978.

NCATE. Standards for Accreditation of Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: NCATE, 1977.

Patterson, Larry. Graduate Employer Follow-Up Studies. Amarillo, Texas: Amarillo College, 1977.

Peques, Wennette. "A National Survey of Teacher Education Follow-Up Practices. AACTE convention paper, 1978.

Peshkopia, Theodore. "How to Keep Better Track of Our Teaching Education Graduates?" Journal of College Placement (Spring 1976): 61-63.

Piyush, Swami. "A Follow-Up Study for Evaluation of Preservice Secondary Science Teacher Education Program at Ohio State University." Unpublished paper, February 1975. ERIC ED 113 200.

Roth, Robert. Handbook for Evaluation of Academic Programs. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1978.

Sandefur, J. T. Illustrated Model for Evaluation of Teacher Education Graduates. Washington, D.C.: AACTE, 1970.

Smedley, Rande H., and Olson, George H. "Graduate Follow-Up Studies: How Useful Are They?" Washington, D.C.: ARA, 1975. ERIC ED 109 431.

Swartz, Ned K. "Divergent Perceptions of Teaching Effectiveness by Different Groups of Raters." Unpublished paper, NCME, April 1975. ERIC ED 104 959.

West, Bradley. "A Study of Computer-Scored Group Holtzman Inkblot Variables as Related to Student Teaching Success, Major Teaching Fields, and Sex." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1969.

Woodring, P. New Directions in Teacher Education. New York: Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1957.