INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. 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 original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns 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 thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

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

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from “photographs” if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of “photographs” may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106
ADAMS, Leola, 1948-
TEACHER PREPARATION AS A FACTOR OF TEACHER PERFORMANCE.

Iowa State University, Ph.D., 1975
Education, home economics

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED
Teacher preparation as a factor of teacher performance

by

Leola Adams

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of The Requirements for the Degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Major: Home Economics Education

Approved:

Signature was redacted for privacy.

In Charge of Major Work

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Major Department

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Graduate College

Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

1975
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of the Study</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background of the Study</td>
<td>3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVIEW OF LITERATURE</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching as a Predictor of Teaching Performance</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of First-Year Teachers</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Year Teachers' Problems and Concerns</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHOD OF PROCEDURE</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection of the Data</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Data</td>
<td>41a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usability of the Revised Student Teacher Evaluation</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Between Student Teaching and First Year Teaching</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Performance</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactions to First Year of Teaching</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITERATURE CITED</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A:</td>
<td>Student Teacher Evaluation and Evaluator's Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX B:</td>
<td>Revised Student Teacher Evaluation and Evaluator's Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX C:</td>
<td>Item Relationship Between RSTE and STE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX D:</td>
<td>Correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter to Principals - A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Letter - 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Letter - 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Letter - 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX E:</td>
<td>Graphic Presentation of Selected Competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 1</td>
<td>Expected values of mean squares in the analysis of variance design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 2</td>
<td>Expected values of mean squares in the analysis of variance design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3</td>
<td>F ratios for analysis of variance, intraclass correlations, and reliabilities for the Revised Student Teacher Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4</td>
<td>Means, standard deviations and correlation coefficients between first year teaching and student teaching performance, Part I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 5</td>
<td>Means, standard deviations and correlation coefficients between first year teaching and student teaching performance, Part II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 6</td>
<td>Category means for student teaching and first year teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 7</td>
<td>Graphic presentation of professional competencies on Part I of RSTE of a teacher judged of lesser performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 8</td>
<td>Graphic presentation of professional competencies on Part I of RSTE of a teacher judged of better performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

Current educational literature supports evaluation of teacher education programs. Professional educators at all levels are requesting that teacher preparation programs in colleges and universities be continually evaluated and pertinent research be conducted to ensure improvement in teacher competency. The literature emphasizes the need for good teachers if the nation is to have good public schools; therefore, institutions involved in the preparation of teachers need to be increasingly concerned about the teacher preparation program.

As criticisms of public schools focus attention on the need for high quality teaching, teacher education receives increasing amounts of the criticism. Questions are being asked that will require the teacher education institutions to assess their product, the teacher. The Recommended Standards for Teacher Education (A.A.C.T.E., 1970, p. 12) have emphasized teacher evaluation. Smith (1971) also contended that the chief purpose of research on the education of teachers is to improve the programs of teacher preparation in these institutions.

Researchers suggest that studies of the effectiveness of teacher education programs should involve follow-up and evaluation of the graduates of such programs. The Recommended Standards for Teacher Education (1970) also stated that each institution should conduct well-defined research for evaluating the teachers it prepares. However, Rosenshine and Furst (1971) contend that there have been few well-designed correlational or experimental studies to determine the effectiveness of a teacher.
preparation program. This observation on the need for well-defined re-
search was also made by Overing (1970). Leimkuhler (1966) indicated that
if colleges and universities follow up their teacher education graduates,
these institutions could have a valuable source of evaluative and diag-
nostic data. Such data would be available for further study and provide
answers for such questions as the relationship between the pre-teaching
program and the actual teaching situation.

The Home Economics Education Department at Iowa State University is
currently involved in a research project to validate an evaluative device
for assessing teacher performance. As part of the departmental project,
this study investigated the usability of the observation device for
assessing first-year teacher performance to attempt to discover if teacher
performance differed between student teaching and first year teaching.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the degree to which the
Home Economics Education Departments at Iowa State University (ISU) and
South Dakota State University (SDSU) met selected professional objectives
in preparing home economics teachers. Specifically, the focus of the
study was to determine if performance during the student teaching experi-
ence was indicative of future teaching performance. Another purpose of
the study was to investigate the usability of the observation device, the
Student Teacher Evaluation: Assessing the Teaching-Learning Process (STE)
in assessing the teaching performance of first-year ISU and SDSU home
economics education graduates teaching in the States of Iowa and South
Dakota, respectively.
Background of the Study

Subjects were selected from the 77 who participated as student teachers in a 1974 study by Gilbert. Participants in the Gilbert study were student teachers from the home economics education programs at ISU and SDSU. The sample consisted of 40 first-year graduates of the home economics teacher education programs at ISU and SDSU; 24 first-year home economics teachers from ISU; 16 first-year home economics teachers from SDSU. Data existed on two to three observations during the student teaching experience and allowed for an analysis of variance across studies. Gilbert (1974) and the present study.

Student teachers from both universities were selected because of basic similarities in the programs and the potential for a larger sample. Both programs are administered as separate departments within colleges of home economics and both programs are based upon the objectives and generalizations designated by a representative group of home economics teacher educators as common to all home economics teacher education programs (Kreutz and Anthony, 1966).

A revised form of the STE was used to collect data. The STE, a 50-item device, was developed by Home Economics Education faculty and graduate students at ISU during 1973-74 and was used by Gilbert (1974). The results of the study by Gilbert served as a basis for instrument revision.

An assumption was made that since student teachers from both Iowa State University and South Dakota State University were assessed by the same criterion measures of the STE, the first-year teachers from both
universities could be assessed by the Revised Student Teacher Evaluation. The study was limited geographically to first-year teachers in Iowa and South Dakota.
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The effect of preprofessional teacher preparation on teacher performance is a major concern of educators. Preparation of teachers for the nation's classrooms requires continuous evaluation and appraisal of teacher preparation programs in furthering understanding of the teaching-learning process. Smith (1971) maintained that the chief purpose of research on the education of teachers is to improve the programs of teacher preparation in these institutions. One major purpose of teacher education institutions is to make available opportunities to provide prospective teachers with sufficient knowledge, skills, and behaviors to enable them to function effectively in future teaching experiences.

Vittetoe (1972) stated that the assumption of many years that the appropriate degree from an institution of higher learning qualified the holder to teach is now being rejected by many who regard the undergraduate degree as only a start toward a professional education. A way must be found in the near future to provide data to answer the question of how successful prospective teachers will be when they actually assume the roles of student teacher and classroom teacher. Leimkuhler (1966) theorized that in a study of the effectiveness of teacher education programs it would seem that the follow-up and evaluation of the graduates of such programs would be essential.

A review of the literature reveals that systematic follow-up programs of teacher education graduates are limited. Leimkuhler (1966) maintained that if colleges and universities follow up their teacher education
graduates, these institutions might have a valuable source of evaluative and diagnostic data. Such data would permit study of the relationship between the preservice program and the actual teaching situation, the appraisal of possible changes in the college curriculum, and the professional growth of the teacher.

The present study was designed to focus on the proficiency of two teacher education programs in meeting selected objectives in preparing home economics teachers. Few preservice teacher education programs have attempted to measure the character and longevity of teacher behavior beyond the terminal period of preservice preparation. The literature revealed that the subjective evaluations made of students by supervising teachers and college supervisors, though limited and of different levels of refinement, seem to provide the best single available yardstick for measuring the predicted performance of a beginning teacher. This review will be limited to the student teaching experience as a predictor of teaching performance and to selected studies concerned with on-the-job performance of recent graduates of teacher education programs.

**Student Teaching as a Predictor of Teaching Performance**

Determining what constitutes success in teaching has been the concern of researchers for decades. Few factors have been useful in predicting performance in student teaching and subsequent performance in the classroom. However, studies of variables relative to student teaching success in a specific academic setting can be useful in confirming the applicability of past efforts to a specific institutional context (Mathis and
Park, 1965). Variables found to relate to success in student teaching include student teaching grade, pre-student teaching interview, participation in extra-curricular activities, personality, attitudes, and academic achievement.

Results of studies concerned with the correlation of ratings of persons as student teachers and as full time teachers suggest that a high relationship exists between student teaching performance and performance on-the-job. Studies by Vittetoe (1972), Chrisp, Walter, and Aven (1969), Adams (1967), and Hall (1964) report that a person's rating as a student teacher will indicate that person's performance as a full time teacher and furthermore, the teachers who had completed student teaching were more effective than teachers who had not completed the prescribed education courses at least in the first year of teaching experience. Evaluations of the first-year teachers' performance were made by first year teacher supervisors, principals, and/or superintendents using different rating scales. Cautious interpretation of the results of these studies is suggested. Studies which reported more sophisticated research procedures in the study of the relationship between student teaching and first year teaching were selected to be reported in detail.

Starting with the assumption that there might be a positive correlation between attitudes, personality, predicted success, and college achievement with success as student teacher and as a first-year teacher, Ort (1964) studied 443 seniors in the College of Education at Bowling Green State University during the school years of 1960-62. The 443 seniors were studied during pre-student teaching and during student teaching in an
attempt to determine how successful teacher aspirants will be when they actually assume the role of student teacher and later as classroom teacher.

Data from the 443 seniors were obtained by the use of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (Group Form) (MMPI) and the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI). Cumulative point averages were also calculated; the Trigg Reading Test Survey Section (Form B) and the American Council of Education Psychological Examination, (1952) (ACE) scores were tabulated for correlations. Each student was given a predicted evaluation as to his probable success as a student teacher by the director of student teaching based on a 15-minute pre-student teaching interview. A five-point scale was used to make this evaluation. Following the student teaching experience, the student was evaluated by his campus supervisor and his supervising teacher.

At the end of the first year of teaching, the immediate supervisors of 273 first-year teachers used the same student teacher evaluation form to evaluate the first year's teaching experience. Evaluations were also made by supervisors, principals, and/or superintendents (depending upon the size of the school) and when appropriate, a composite evaluation was made by all who were in contact with the teacher. The total score of the MTAI was used for the correlations. With the MMPI, the scale scores of the following were used for correlations: depression, paranoia, schizophrenia, hypomonia, and social Introvert/Extrovert. Correlations of these scores were run with each score obtained during the college years. Evaluation procedures employed by the evaluators of student teachers and first-year teachers were not reported.
Ort (1964) reported no significant correlation between the factors selected on the MMPI and the evaluations made by the supervising teachers and the campus supervisors. Likewise, there was no significant correlation of scores on the evaluations of the first year teaching experience and the social factor of the personality inventory. The highest correlation, .63, was between the campus supervisor and the supervising teacher. The second highest correlation, .56, was between the rating of the director of student teaching and the point average. The correlations for the campus supervisor, the supervising teacher, and the first-year teacher evaluations were .21, .20, and .16, respectively. The researcher suggested that the further the teacher gets away from his or her college record the less relationship there is with success as a teacher and grade point average.

The correlations of the scores of the campus supervisor, supervising teacher, and the director of student teaching with the scores of the evaluators of the first-year teachers were .33, .29, and .24, respectively. The highest correlation of the first-year teachers was that between the supervising teacher and the evaluators of the first-year teachers, but these correlations were not high enough to be substantially significant.

Ort (1964) concluded that many variables such as drive, motivation, love of children, philosophy, experimental background, and health are difficult to control when evaluating teachers. Anyone, or any combination of these may become an important determiner of personality, of attitude, of the success of an individual. However, the results from personality and teacher attitude inventories in this study did not have any predictive
value as to how successful a person would be as a teacher. Furthermore, academic achievement in college did not seem to have any predictive value as to the success of a student as student teacher or first-year teacher. Even though limited, the best predictions of the future success of a student teacher were made by the supervising teacher and the college supervisors.

In a study by Bailey (1974) to determine whether interaction patterns demonstrated during student teaching changed or were modified significantly after two years of independent classroom experience, data were collected on nine randomly selected secondary social studies teachers graduated from the University of Nebraska. The nine teachers selected taught during the two years following graduation.

The Interaction Analysis System and the Nebraska Skill Analysis System were used to record observable verbal and selected non-verbal classroom interaction patterns. Since two observational systems were used to code classroom interaction, data collection via videotape was employed. Interaction Analysis System data were gathered live during the classroom teaching sessions while the Nebraska Skill Analysis data were coded at a later date by replaying the videotapes. Data on student teaching interaction patterns were collected in the middle and near the end of the semester including two 40-minute class periods for a total of four observations for each teacher. The same procedure was employed to collect data on independent classroom teaching interaction patterns.

Two measures of reliability were computed for the Interaction Analysis System and the Nebraska Skill Analysis System major categories and
sub-categories. Reliability for both observational tools was set at .90 for major categories and .80 for sub-categories. The inter-observer reliability coefficients, computed with a formula suggested by Scott (1955), ranged from 91.4 to 95.8 for the major categories and 88.3 to 94.2 for the sub-categories.

Data derived from the two observational instruments included major category matrices, sub-category matrices, and behavioral key data for both student teaching and independent classroom teaching. Descriptive and comparative data concerning interaction patterns were reported for the nine teachers. The hypothesis, "interaction patterns observed during independent classroom teaching will not differ significantly from those observed during student teaching with regard to Interaction Analysis System and Nebraska Skill Analysis categories, sub-categories, and selected matrix data", was tested statistically with the correlated t-test (Ferguson, 1969).

Bailey (1974) reported that significant differences were found for eight out of the 19 Interaction Analysis System and Nebraska Skill Analysis major categories when interaction patterns from independent classroom teaching were compared with student teaching interaction patterns. Results indicated that after two years of classroom experience, the teachers showed significant increases in positive reinforcement, accepting and using student ideas, questioning, and direction giving. Teacher lecture or information giving (direct influence behavior) exhibited a significant decrease in frequency.

Behavioral differences as measured by Interaction Analysis System and Nebraska Skill Analysis sub-categories showed 22 out of 79 verbal and
non-verbal behaviors to be significantly different beyond the .05 or .01 level. Independent classroom teachers used more reinforcement, humor and questions while individual student questions and series of questions were used less frequently. Additionally, these teachers used more pictorial visualization to introduce new material. More direct influence behavior such as directions to individuals and directions to class were used. The teacher's non-verbal control of student participation increased significantly. Students of independent classroom teachers asked more questions about teacher expectation and exhibited more unison response to teacher questions; however, fewer unison responses were exhibited if unsolicited by the teacher.

Even though the sample was small, the researcher was confident in the findings because of strict research procedures employed. Since a transition of interaction patterns from student teaching to independent teaching was evidenced, Bailey (1974) suggested that teacher education programs provide comprehensive experiences for students which will help inform and prepare them for this eventual shift or change in teaching style.

One part of a study by Preil (1968) was to determine the differences in teaching effectiveness between 82 first-year elementary teachers with student teaching backgrounds as compared with 19 first-year elementary teachers without student teaching backgrounds during the 1966-67 school year. The investigator constructed a rating instrument which consisted of 23 major teaching functions of the classroom teacher as identified by the literature. Five criteria were delineated for each of the 23 teaching functions and these formed the basis of a rating instrument designed to
elicit the evaluations of classroom teachers by principals and by two trained classroom observers. The validity of the rating instrument was established by a jury of five educational experts. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were used in a pilot study to determine the reliability of principals' ratings as well as the inter-observer reliability of ratings. The reliability coefficients were not reported.

Principals evaluated the teachers on all 23 functions. Classroom observers were able, theoretically, to evaluate the teachers on the first 14 functions, but the observers generally were able to evaluate all of the first eight functions plus one or two of Functions 9-14 during the course of an actual classroom visit. The investigator accompanied the main observer on 31 classroom visits for the purpose of confirming the level of inter-observer reliability. These r's for the twelve possible functions evaluated by both observers simultaneously ranged from .43 to .90.

Data were analyzed around the 23 teaching functions. Analysis of variance and t-ratios were determined for each of the 23 functions based on principals' evaluations. Analyses of variance for eight possible functions and t-ratios for 10 possible functions were based on the main observer's evaluations.

Preil found that principals' evaluations indicated that beginning teachers with student teaching backgrounds were more effective teachers than beginning teachers without student teaching backgrounds. This indication is especially true for those aspects of the teacher's responsibility which involves classroom performance: teaching content areas of the curriculum such as reading, other language arts, mathematics, and also such
teacher classroom responsibilities as general discipline, unit of study approach, and providing for individual differences in the classroom. The presence or absence of student teaching has little or no impact on such functions as level of participation as member of school faculty, skill in evaluating individual pupil progress and level of teacher-pupil relationships. The observer evaluations confirmed the principals' evaluations that beginning teachers with student teaching backgrounds were more effective than beginning teachers without student teaching backgrounds.

Thorup (1968) studied certain attitudes and characteristics of 82 home economics students enrolled at three California State Colleges who had completed a student teaching assignment in home economics during the 1965-66 school year. The purpose of the study was to determine the relationship of these characteristics to evaluations of student teaching and first year teaching.

The student teachers' attitudes toward children and families were assessed by the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI) and the Teacher and the Community Inventory (TCI). The Rokeach Dogmatism Scale was used to measure open-mindedness and rigidity. Biographical information was obtained through a questionnaire and college records supplied scholastic data. Evaluation of student teaching performance was made by the college supervisors and the master teacher, based on assigned ratings on six characteristics which constituted a composite student teacher rating score. A 9-point scale was used by each evaluator to make an over-all prediction of future teaching success for the student. Ratings for each student were averaged as a composite score. Reliability coefficients between the college
supervisors and master teacher on the two evaluations of student teaching were .86 and .84.

The second phase of the study by Thorup (1968) involved a follow-up of the 68 participants who were completing their first year of teaching during the spring of 1972. Sixty-seven teachers completed the 48-item Teaching Situation Reaction Test. The Teacher Evaluation Scale, developed for the study, was used by the principal and whenever possible, the subject area supervisor, to evaluate the teachers. The scale delineates nine areas of teaching competency with statements defining three separate aspects of each one. Teachers were rated in comparison to other beginning teachers on each of the 27 items by a check designating whether they ranked with the top 10%, top 25%, middle 50%, bottom 25%, or bottom 10%. Ratings were converted to numerical values from nine for "top 10%" to one for "bottom 10%" allowing all mid-point ratings to receive adequate consideration. Total rating scores could range from 27 to 243. An over-all evaluation of teaching performance was also submitted. The same scale was used, with 9 points signifying the highest possible rating. The reliability of the two raters was found to be .89 on 27 qualities and .82 on the over-all performance rating. The researcher considered these coefficients high enough to justify the use of average scores in analyzing and reporting the data.

Analysis of variance was used to determine the significance of the relation of each of the independent variables to ratings of student teaching and first year teaching. Correlations and inter-correlations were computed between test scores and certain sub-scales, academic achievement, and
ratings of teaching performance in an attempt to determine the predictive value of various personal, academic and professional factors. Multiple regression equations were set up to determine the best combination of such variables.

Thorup (1968) reported that first-year teachers who were more likely to be rated by their principals or supervisors as "friendly, well-liked, accepting of all students, able to motivate and inspire pupils, and able to maintain a cooperative classroom atmosphere" (p. 210) were those who scored high on the Teacher and Community sub-scales, Slum Families and Problem School and ranked below the 50th percentile on college entrance examinations.

Student teaching ratings on planning, motivating pupils, classroom control, and accepting criticism were significantly related to over-all performance ratings of first-year teachers. The ability to get along with others and proficiency in subject matter were not significantly related to first year ratings. The best predictors of the over-all ratings that would be assigned by principals and supervisors were student teacher rating, including rating on the ability to plan, prediction for success by master teacher, response on the Teaching Situation Reaction Test and rank on college entrance examinations.

The researcher concluded that the Teaching Situation Reaction Test had greater potential as a teaching instrument rather than an instrument to make individual predictions. The Teacher Evaluation Scale was considered to provide for optimal objectivity.
Summary

Reviews of studies by Bailey (1974), Vittetoe (1972), Chrisp, Walter, Aven (1969), Adams (1967), and Hall (1964) suggest that ratings received during student teaching by cooperating teacher and college supervisor give the best single prediction of future teaching performance. In other studies reported by Preil (1968), Thorup (1968), and Ort (1964), student teaching ratings by cooperating teacher and college supervisor correlated highly with first-year performance ratings by trained observers and principals.

Evaluation of First-Year Teachers

Accountability is a concern of all institutions of education which shape and support formal education in the United States. For example, Leimkuhler (1966) observed that criticism of weaknesses in the public schools often focuses the blame on the poor preparation of teachers and that the critics are not limited only to lay individuals and spokesmen for lay organizations, but also teacher educators, school administrators and teachers. Criticisms of education and of teachers have a long history in the United States since the early establishment of schools. Woodring (1957) stressed the importance of criticisms of education, and specifically in teacher education, for improving the preparation of teachers.

One way to improve programs for the preparation of teachers is by use of results of program evaluation. Elias (1974) theorized that the only true measure of a program is a measure of its products, the program graduates. It is theoretically possible for a program to meet most or even
all of the criteria of a process evaluation but still not be generating satisfactory products, competent graduates. The authors of Recommended Standards (A.A.C.T.E., 1970) state, "The ultimate criterion for judging a teacher education program is whether it produces competent graduates who enter the profession and perform effectively (p. 12). They further state, "Any effort to assess the quality of the graduates requires that evaluation be made in relation to the objectives sought. Therefore, institutions should use the stated objectives of the teacher education programs as a basis for evaluating the teachers they prepare" (p. 12).

Graduates of teacher education programs

Several studies are reported in the literature as follow-up studies of graduates of teacher education programs in an attempt to determine the proficiency of the teacher education programs in preparing graduates for on-the-job performance. Studies by Holtzen (1974), Lauriana (1965), Hollis (1964), Regier (1963) and Beery (1962) revealed that a relationship existed between teacher preparation and first-year teacher performance. Data were gathered by untrained observers, usually principals and/or first year supervisors. The observers used questionnaires of varying degrees of refinement. Systematic procedures for data collection and analysis were limited.

Data from these studies suggest that first-year teachers who completed the prescribed courses in education (including student teaching) were rated to be more effective than teachers who lacked all or part of the sequence in education courses. Additionally, the data suggest that the majority of first-year teachers were considered to be average to above average in
teacher performance, with competencies in knowledge of subject matter content and human relations skills. These studies may be useful in providing teacher preparation programs with information for the improvement of preservice and inservice education programs.

Two follow-up studies employing experimental designs were found in the literature. Catalano (1974) and Colella (1975) studied first-year teachers to test curriculum models. Colella found significant differences between first-year teachers who were graduates of an experimental model, whereas, one possible significant correlation between student teaching and first year teaching was indicated by Catalano. Detailed discussions of these studies are reported.

Catalano (1974) sought to determine if there were any significant differences between the type of student teaching experience (particularly as related to the socio-economic status of the school in which it was held) and the supervisory evaluation of the teacher's first year of employment. Hypotheses were that no significant differences existed between any of the elementary or secondary teacher subgroups on any of the 22 criteria as ranked by the teacher's immediate supervisor after the first year of employment in either a disadvantaged or non-disadvantaged school, and that there were no significant differences between any of the elementary or secondary subgroups by location of the student teaching experiences and the location of first employment.

The 485 subjects, graduates of the Arizona State University's College of Education in 1970 and 1971, were placed into two Problem areas. Problem I--Elementary involved those of the population who had enrolled in the
undergraduate Department of Elementary Education curriculum offerings. Within this Problem there were six subgroups based on specific program and socio-economic status of the schools in which student teaching and first year of employment occurred. The undergraduate programs were Multiple Opportunities in Student Teaching (MOST) and the Regular Student Teaching Program. These programs were not described in this report.

Problem II—Secondary involved those of the population who had enrolled in the undergraduate Department of Secondary Education curriculum. The four subgroups of this Problem were defined by undergraduate student teaching program (Regular), site of student teaching and location by socio-economic character of first year of employment. Descriptions of these subgroups were not reported.

The Teacher Evaluation Form (TEF), which required ratings on 22 criteria describing professional behaviors, was used to collect data on the graduates. Validity and reliability statistics were not reported. The data analysis techniques included the one-way factorial analysis of variance and Scheffe multiple comparison of means procedure. Chi-square and percentage calculations were used to report results of data relevant to the third hypothesis. The investigator reported that evidence was offered to substantiate the choice of these techniques and procedures in the research.

Possible significance was suggested on one criterion from the TEF (out of the possible 22) for each Problem. Within Problem I—Elementary the criterion Health and Energy and within Problem II—Secondary the criterion Professional Attitude evidenced possible significance. To
determine where the significance existed on specific scales within the
devices, the Scheffe test was employed. The results failed to detect any
significance at the predetermined level of confidence (.05) for the com-
parisons of interest. The conclusion was drawn that the location of
student teaching in relation to socio-economic character of the school of
first employment had no significant bearing on first year professional
behaviors for graduates of Arizona State University's College of Education.
It was suggested that the elementary graduates had a better than chance
rate of return to disadvantaged school settings if student teaching
occurred in such a site. A percentage report by school and district of
student teaching activity and first employment contract revealed the MOST
subgroups (Problem I--Elementary) displayed 100% placement in one of the
schools of student teaching.

Colella (1975) studied 35 first-year teachers graduated from the
Experimental Model and 35 first-year teachers graduated from the Traditional
Model of Seton Hall University in order to determine the extent to which
the common goals of the programs had been accomplished. The six common
goals involved the development of an attitude of affection and sympathetic
understanding toward children, the development of positive attitudes
toward oneself and one's children, the development of effective classroom
teaching behaviors, the development of personal qualities, the development
of professional relationships, and the development of effective classroom
verbal behaviors. The study also attempted to determine whether signifi-
cant interrelationships existed among the teachers' self-ratings, princi-
pals' ratings, and trained observers' ratings of the attitudes and
behaviors of the recent graduates.

The extent to which the goals of the Models were accomplished was determined through: (1) teachers' attitudes toward children and the learning process, (2) teachers' self-ratings of their behaviors concerning classroom teaching, personal qualities, and professional relationships, (3) principals' ratings of teachers' behaviors concerning classroom teaching, personal qualities, and professional relationships, and (4) trained observers' ratings of teachers' classroom verbal behaviors. The Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI) was employed to measure the attitudes of the Experimental and Traditional graduates; the Appraisal of Teacher Service (ATS) and the Flanders System of Interaction Analysis were used to measure the behaviors of the graduates. The ATS, a 36-item rating scale, was completed by the first-year teachers and their principals. The ATS was divided into three areas: classroom teaching, personal qualities, and professional relationships. The Flanders System of Interaction Analysis was used to record the verbal interaction of teachers and pupils within the classroom. The quality of the ATS and reliability coefficients of observers were not reported.

One-way analysis of variance was employed to test for significant differences between the means of the responses of the Experimental and Traditional graduates and between principals and trained observers with respect to selected attitudes and behaviors. To determine the interrelationship among the attitudes and behaviors of the Experimental and Traditional graduates, Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were calculated.
Analyses of the data revealed that the majority of Experimental graduates reflected uncritical positive attitudes toward teaching, and the majority of Traditional graduates reflected critical, authoritarian attitudes. Comparisons between the means of the scores of the Experimental and Traditional graduates' attitudes, self-ratings of their behaviors, and principals' ratings of their behaviors revealed significant differences with the Experimental graduates receiving the higher mean scores. Comparisons between the means of the instances of indirect teacher talk, direct teacher talk, total teacher talk, and student talk of Experimental and Traditional graduates revealed significant differences. The means of the instances of indirect teacher talk and student talk were higher for Experimental graduates, and the mean of the instances of direct teacher talk was higher for Traditional graduates. Significant positive and substantial relationships existed between Experimental graduates' attitudes and self-rated classroom teaching behaviors. It was concluded that the Experimental model attained a higher degree of success among its graduates than the Traditional model in developing the common goals of the programs.

The effectiveness of programs for the preparation of science teachers was considered by Newton (1971) and Perkes (1971). Newton (1971) reported that follow-up efforts are essential to determine the ways in which individuals change as a result of teacher preparation programs and the extent to which such programs achieve their stated objectives. To determine the effectiveness of preparing teachers of elementary science, Perkes (1971) put to test a proposition; namely, if teachers are "required to behave" in ways consistent with a new program, they will continue to teach in a
similar manner. The focus of the study was to assess whether the Elementary Science Study (ESS) teaching style continues once teachers were in charge of their own classes of elementary children.

Prior to student teaching, the sample of 38 teachers took a required course in elementary science "methods", and were assigned to one of two "student teaching treatments". One treatment required teachers to select and teach a unit from the ESS collection. The "control" group followed a typical pattern in which the classroom supervising teacher and his student teacher agreed on what was to be taught, how it was to be taught, and which commercial materials and equipment were to be used. Both groups of student teachers were supervised twice a week by University supervisors and videotapes made of their teaching. Supervisory advisement focused on teaching analysis of what transpired, contrasting that to what was intended.

After the first year of teaching, the 38 teachers were observed teaching science for two 30-minute intervals during a designated month. Trained observers recorded each teacher's behaviors using the Science Teaching Observational Instrument (STOI). Quality of the instrument for this study was not indicated. The predominant teaching behavior was recorded each five seconds; the frequency of each kind of question, when asked; and the characteristics of a lesson, at five minute intervals. The significance of the difference between the mean behavior frequency scores of the treatment and control groups were determined for each of the selected behavioral categories. Fisher's "t" formula for testing the significant difference between two means for samples of equal size was used.
Analysis of observational records of the 38 teachers' involvement in science education make glaringly dubious the value of instruction on "how to teach" science upon subsequent teaching behavior. The data suggest marked significance can be attached to the student teaching experience. A distinction was shown in the behavior of teachers who evolved plans individually with their supervising teachers and those required to follow a pedagogical format of a unit drawn from the ESS. The latter group talked less, engaged more frequently in verbal interchanges with students, asked more questions requiring students to speculate and propose ways for testing their conjectures; the characteristics of their lessons were less explicitly directed by teachers, according to observer judgment, suggesting a higher amount of direction stemming from the ongoing involvement of students with materials; these teachers provided less help and assistance for their students, possibly a concomitant of pupil-directed work.

Perkes concluded that the common assumption of a transfer from instruction on "how to teach" science to actual teaching would appear to be unwarranted. The researcher indicated that the results of the investigation support the proposition that to promote teaching behavior in ways consistent with new curriculum recommendations is to require teachers to adhere closely to pedagogical directives of a guide. This proposition differs from that of many teacher educators who contend that teachers should develop their own style of teaching.

Current educational literature emphasizes the importance of systematic approaches to the evaluations of teacher education programs. A study by Adams (1974) was found which tested an evaluation model to assess
the performance of first-year teachers. The model provided a systematic approach to the evaluation of the graduates.

Adams (1974) studied 38 randomly selected student teachers and 22 of these teachers during their first year of teaching in Kentucky for the 1972-73 school year in an effort to field test a theoretical model suggested in an American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE) publication entitled, An Illustrated Model for the Evaluation of Teacher Education Graduates. A second objective of this study was to compare data obtained in Phase 2 with Phase 1 data to determine what changes, if any, were evident between student teaching and after a year of experience.

The Model was designed to obtain objective, quantifiable data on graduates of the teacher preparation program of Western Kentucky University. Instruments and records used for data collection consisted of a questionnaire, a personality scale, rating scales, direct classroom observational systems, and transcripts of subjects' grades. Instruments were selected on the basis of their merit as a research tool, contribution of the data to the objectives of the study, ease of administration, and availability of required data. The Career Base Line Data Questionnaire was prepared by the researcher to obtain career base line data not readily available from other sources. A complete transcript of each subject's grades was obtained from the Registrar's Office at the end of the spring semester, 1972. The F-scale, forms 45 and 40, developed by Adorno (1964) was used to measure individual prejudices and antidemocratic tendencies. Two rating scales, the Teacher Evaluation by Peer/Supervisor and the Student Evaluation of Teaching (STE), were employed to obtain data on teaching
performance. The Classroom Observation Record was used to assess four dimensions of pupil behavior and eighteen dimensions of teacher behavior. A 14 category interaction analysis system was utilized to record observed classroom behavior. This system was suggested by Sandefur (1970) and is a combination of Flanders' (1960) and Hough's (1969) systems of interaction analysis.

Data were obtained during two visits to each participant's classroom by trained observers; inter-observer reliabilities obtained for Phase 1 were .89 and .92, and inter-observer reliability coefficients for Phase 2 were .93 and .94, respectively. Both in Phase 1 and Phase 2, two observations were made of the same class and at the same time of the day. Classes were observed for 20-minute intervals.

Within the limitations of the study, Adams (1974) concluded that

1. Elementary teachers become less authoritarian after one year of teaching experience.

2. There is no difference between cooperating teacher's ratings of student teaching behavior and peer and supervisor ratings after one year of teaching.

3. Secondary supervisor's ratings are lower than cooperating teacher's ratings for the teaching dimension "Relations with Students".

4. Pupils do not rate elementary or secondary teachers differently after one year of teaching experience compared to ratings obtained during student teaching.

5. Ratings of elementary teachers decreased in the areas of student alertness, teacher fairness and teacher's demonstrated knowledge of subject after one year of teaching experience.

6. Classroom interaction does not differ after one year of teaching experience for elementary or secondary subjects (p. 38).
Graduates of teacher education program in home economics

No follow-up studies of graduates of teacher education programs in home economics were found in the literature. However, an unpublished report by Fanslow (1972) on professional competencies of graduates of the Home Economics Education Department at Iowa State University was available. The investigation by Fanslow was planned to meet specific departmental needs, hence, the absence of procedures which would permit generalizing from the data.

She assessed professional competencies of 1970-71 graduates of the Home Economics Education Department from Iowa State University who were teaching home economics in the State of Iowa during 1971-72. The 29 first-year teachers were asked to respond to a questionnaire which consisted of assessing areas during their first year of teaching for which their undergraduate preparation was most and least helpful as well as four open-ended questions designed to determine the teachers' most satisfying and frustrating experiences during their first year of teaching.

Job descriptions were developed for the teachers on the basis of responses concerning the types of teaching assignments assumed. The first-year teachers responded to a series of tasks designed to determine how well they perceived they could perform a series of tasks related to their role as a teacher. The first-year teachers also responded to a series of tasks judging how well the academic course work, including student teaching at Iowa State University prepared them to perform each of these tasks.

On the basis of a descriptive analysis, some of the most satisfying
experiences of the first-year teachers were relating to pupils and helping them in any way possible, observing changes in pupils' behavior and helping pupils learn, and positive comments from parents, students, and other faculty about the home economics program. Other satisfying experiences included experimenting with new projects and ideas, increased confidence in self, working with other faculty, establishing a new home economics program, teaching family living and clothing and teaching boys. Difficulty in motivating pupils who wanted to only exist in classes and managing being a teacher, homemaker and an individual or management of different classes each hour were some of the most frustrating experiences during their first year of teaching. Incongruent attitudes of students toward each other, teachers and property, classroom discipline, inadequate facilities, funds, and resource materials and evaluation of students and program were additional sources of frustration for the first-year teachers.

Student teaching was found to be the most useful teaching competence acquired in academic courses during undergraduate preparation. A basic understanding of subject matter, lesson and unit plans, including writing objectives and generalizations were considered the most important general topics. The least useful teaching competencies acquired were science courses, and general education courses, with five first-year teachers identifying lesson and unit plans, including writing objectives and generalizations, as being least useful. General comments in relationship to academic preparation indicated that first-year teachers desired earlier and more exposure to actual teaching and more subject matter
preparation in areas other than the area of concentration. Objectives, generalizations, lesson plans, and unit plans were mentioned again with three first-year teachers pleased and two not pleased. The teachers preferred more knowledge and skill in evaluation, grading, test analysis, and department maintenance.

The investigator did not report an over-all performance description of the first-year teachers, but analysis of the responses of the principals of the first-year teachers to a rating scale, "How Satisfactory is Your Home Economics Teacher?", revealed that a majority of the teachers were rated above average in teacher performance.

First-Year Teachers' Problems and Concerns

Realistic pre-teaching experiences are of concern to all public school educators and beginning teachers. It is quite likely that the college has not prepared the new teacher for relating successfully to job responsibilities or experienced colleagues. However, the curriculum in teacher education can provide for only a finite number of experiences.


Saxe (1969) studied 16 first-year teachers to secure feedback from these graduates in the field about the effectiveness of their pre-teaching preparation. The same questionnaire form used during student teaching by the participants who graduated in December, 1964, from Chicago State
College was mailed to them as first-year teachers in May, 1965. Quality of instrument was not reported, however, the researcher indicated that two graduates found the form restricting and sent personal letters instead.

The first item on the form asked which elements of the teacher education program had been "most helpful", and "of no help at all". The findings indicated that student teaching is unchallenged as the one most important experience in the teacher education program. A question about the degree of satisfaction with teaching revealed 10 teachers finding teaching very satisfying, 4 teachers finding teaching somewhat satisfying, and one teacher finding teaching not very satisfying. One teacher did not respond to the item. A communication subsequent to the questionnaire form revealed that the one "not very satisfied" had changed to "very satisfied" via a change in school assignment.

In an effort to discover common problems of new teachers which had not been anticipated in their professional preparation, Saxe requested teachers to respond to an open-ended question, "Why didn't you tell us about:?") The responses included involved problems of discipline and control, record work, faculty relations, conducting a music assembly and teaching phonics.

The 16 new teachers desired the pre-teaching experience to be more realistic. Suggestions to improve pre-teaching preparation include (1) more observation periods where students could observe teachers in different grades who are judged by principals and others to be superior teachers, (2) extending the period of student teaching to a year with the student teacher being given autonomy, (3) more emphasis on realistic
situations in schools and attitudes and practices necessary for disciplinary actions that can be taken by a new teacher, and (4) more methods courses with actual teaching experiences.

One objective of a study by Penrod (1974) was to compare the top ten problems of randomly selected first-year home economics teachers as perceived by the selected teachers, their supervisors, and their administrators during the spring of 1973. The Delphi technique was employed to collect the data and Chi-square analysis was used.

Penrod (1974) reported that there was considerable similarity between the lists of top ten problems as perceived by teachers, supervisors, and administrators identified on the third questionnaire. The top two problems on each list were identical: motivation of students, and working with uninterested, unmotivated and sometimes troublesome students. Other areas identified in the top ten problems included: selecting methods to keep classes moving and interesting, discipline, knowing what to expect of students, and interpersonal relations with students. Items singled out by teachers included: finding time for satisfying personal life and lacking in self-confidence. Supervisors identified two items dealing with care and repair of equipment, while administrators indicated that teachers had problems in learning accepted routine and existing policy of the school and in anticipating and planning for changes or problems that arise.

The investigator concluded that teachers, supervisors, and administrators agreed that the greatest problems of first-year teachers were in the area of human relations and that differences do exist in the perceptions of problems among the three groups.
Turner (1966) examined selected personal-social and problem-solving characteristics of beginning teachers in relation to their adjustment to teaching in a variety of elementary school settings for grades one through six in 13 Indiana schools. For two successive years, as first-year teachers began teaching they were tested on their performance on simulated problems in teaching, reading, and arithmetic and the personal-social characteristics measured by the Teacher Characteristics Schedule (TCS). Data were obtained through the analysis of results of the TCS, interviews with the elementary supervisor, the director of elementary education or the superintendent, and a questionnaire completed by the principal of each teacher.

Results of the data showed eight categories of school problems, however, no notable problems were observed for 45 teachers. Management, organization, and planning were identified as problems for 26 teachers; subject matter, excluding reading, 26 teachers; discipline and control, 18 teachers; teaching reading, 18 teachers; setting pupil expectancy, 19 teachers; personal problems, 15 teachers; and miscellaneous unclassified, 9 teachers. Scores of teachers in a problem category were compared by analysis of variance with those of the no problem group on the 10 teacher characteristics of the TCS. Among the findings were: (1) Teachers with subject matter problems did not differ significantly on any characteristic from those having no problems; (2) Those with management problems had less favorable attitudes towards the school staff than those with no problems; (3) Teachers with discipline problems differed significantly on six characteristics. The characteristics on which they differed included
warm, understanding; organized, businesslike; attitude towards school staff; stimulating, imaginative; traditional vs. permissive; and problem solving performance.

These results suggest that the characteristics of teachers, measured at the time they begin teaching, have a definite bearing on the types of classroom problems which subsequently develop. Early identification of these characteristics through testing procedures might facilitate appropriate inservice counseling to minimize or eliminate their occurrence.

Summary

Efforts to study effectiveness of teacher education programs involve a follow-up and evaluation of the graduates of such programs. Studies relating to first-year teachers indicate the value of and need for more systematic evaluations of graduates for purposes of continuing the teachers' preparation beyond the preservice level and for evaluating the effectiveness of the teacher preparation program of the institution.

Even though it is generally accepted that student teaching is a predictor of teaching performance, one study (Ort, 1964) did not show a direct relationship. Several studies, however, which reported results of informal research techniques showed student teaching to be a predictor of teaching performance (Vittetoe, 1972; Chrisp, Walter, and Aven, 1969; Adams, 1967; Hall, 1964). Therefore, caution in generalizing the results is warranted. More rigorous studies (Bailey, 1974; Preil, 1968; Thorup, 1968) suggest that a relationship exists between student teaching and first year teaching.

Studies of first-year teachers (Bailey, 1974; Colella, 1975; Holtzen,
1974; Thorup, 1968; Preil, 1968; Lauriana, 1965; Hollis, 1964; Regier, 1963; Beery, 1962) indicate that teachers improved in performance during their first year of teaching. Limited change in teacher performance was found in other studies (Catalano, 1974; Adams, 1974; Perkes, 1971).

Reviews of studies of first-year teachers' problems and concerns (Penrod, 1974; Saxe, 1969; Turner, 1966) reveal information useful in improving the effectiveness of teacher education programs at the preservice and inservice levels. In general, the studies suggest a need to improve teacher education and to improve orientation, induction and inservice education of new teachers.
METHOD OF PROCEDURE

The purpose of this study was to study the degree to which the Home Economics Education Departments at Iowa State University (ISU) and South Dakota State University (SDSU) met selected professional objectives in preparing home economics teachers. Specifically, the focus of the study was to determine if performance during the student teaching experience is indicative of future teaching performance. Additionally, the data from this study were used by Caputo (1975) to investigate the usability of the observation device, the Student Teacher Evaluation: Assessing the Teaching-Learning Process (STE) in rating the teaching performance of first-year ISU and SDSU home economics graduates teaching in the States of Iowa and South Dakota.

The study was based upon the following assumptions:

1. Subject matter area within home economics taught will not influence overall teaching performance.

2. School environment and type of pupils in classroom will not greatly influence the ability of the teacher to perform in the classroom.

3. Classroom interactions observed during class sessions are representative of the teacher's classroom interactions.

4. Home economics education graduates of ISU and SDSU electing to teach in the States of Iowa and South Dakota, respectively, are not different from those teaching in other states.

Sample

Subjects for the study were 40 first-year graduates of the home economics teacher education programs at Iowa State University (ISU) and
South Dakota State University (SDSU); 24 first-year home economics teachers from ISU teaching in Iowa and 16 first-year home economics teachers from SDSU teaching in South Dakota. The first-year teachers graduating from both universities were selected because they were participants as student teachers in a study by Gilbert (1974). Complete student teaching data were not available for one teacher in South Dakota; therefore, she was eliminated from that aspect of the study on the relationship between student teaching and first year teaching.

Student teachers from both universities were selected because of basic similarities in the programs and the potential for a larger sample. The home economics education programs at Iowa State University and South Dakota State University are administered as separate departments within colleges of home economics, and both programs are based upon the objectives and generalizations designated by a representative group of home economics teacher educators as common to all home economics teacher education programs (Kreutz and Anthony, 1966). Cumulative quality point averages of 2.3 on a 4.0 scale are required of students in both institutions as a prerequisite to teacher education courses. In addition, both of the home economics teacher education programs require an eight-week period of time for off-campus student teaching in public schools at junior or senior high school levels.

Instrumentation
A revised form of the Student Teacher Evaluation (RSTE) was employed to collect data. The STE was developed by home economics education faculty and graduate students at ISU during 1973-74 and was used by Gilbert
The 50-item instrument included 32 items measuring classroom performance, 11 items assessing relationship skills, 14 items assessing evaluation skills, and 4 items evaluating management and professionalism (Appendix A). A 99-point scale was selected for use in responding to the items, primarily because it tends to reduce the error variance attributed to person-item interaction by allowing response set to occur and controlling for it (Liu, 1971). The 99-point scale allows for a greater spread in scores, and the procedure allows for differences in the scores at the extremes of the scale to be weighted more highly than differences occurring toward the middle of the scale.

For this study, the 50-item STE was partially revised in accordance with the results of the study by Gilbert (1974). Although several items were eliminated, major revision occurred in reorganization and in increasing item clarity. In the revision, the intent or content of items was maintained. The items were revised in the belief that ratability of the item would be increased. The 47-item revised instrument, RSTE, is composed of two parts. Part I was used to observe classroom performance which includes presentation/laboratory skills, classroom environment, student participation, and relationship skills for each of the selected three classes. Part II was used to observe cumulative assessment over classes. Included in this assessment are student participation, relationship skills, personal growth, and evaluation skills (Appendix B). The relationship of items in the STE with the RSTE is noted in Appendix C.

Inter-observer reliability was established on the RSTE between Caputo and the investigator by the use of videotapes and direct observations in secondary classroom situations. The videotapes were selected from the
videotape library of the Home Economics Education Department at ISU. Five tapes were chosen for practice sessions. The videotapes allowed for establishing inter-observer reliability on Part I. The direct observations provided situations for observers to establish reliability on Part II of the device. Using a three factor analysis of variance with teachers, judges and items as the sources of variance, a reliability coefficient of .58 between judges was obtained on six cases.

Collection of the Data

Arrangements for collection of data

The present study is one dimension of a major research thrust in the Department of Home Economics Education at Iowa State University. Two of the main purposes of the research are the validation of an evaluative device for teacher performance and monitoring of program effectiveness.

The present project reflects both long range goals: refinement of the evaluative device, STE, as reported by Caputo (1975) and the study reported herein, a comparison of performance between student teaching and first year teaching. The research project was funded by Home Economics Research Institute (Hughes and Fanslow, 1974) and the Graduate College Research Program at Iowa State University (Hughes, Fanslow, Adams and Caputo, 1974).

During the Fall Quarter, 1974, letters were mailed to the principals of schools where the 1973-74 Iowa State University graduates of the Home Economics Education Department were employed. (See Appendix D: Letter to Principals A.) Initial contact with the graduates of South Dakota
State University teaching in South Dakota was made to the superintendents of these schools by the Dean of the College of Home Economics at South Dakota State University in January, 1975. The principals were asked if they would be willing for their schools (the home economics teacher and her students) to participate in a research project of first-year teacher performance. A form was enclosed for their response (Appendix D). All principals indicated that they would be willing for their respective schools to participate.

Letters were also mailed to the teachers explaining the purpose of the study and asking for their cooperation. A form was enclosed for their response. (See Appendix D: Teacher Letter 1.) This form also requested the teacher's schedule and the projected dates for units of study in her classes.

After receiving these completed forms, three classes for each teacher, or a total of 120 classes, were randomly selected for observation. A tentative schedule was planned for a 10 to 15 minute pre-conference prior to the first class and a post-conference of 30 to 40 minutes after the last class or during the preparation period. A second letter was then mailed to the teacher explaining more fully the requirements of the research project. (See Appendix D: Teacher Letter 2.) Included in the letter was a list of the three selected classes and a proposed visitation date. On an enclosed card the teacher was asked to indicate if the proposed date for the visit was satisfactory. If it was not, she was requested to suggest a date
that she could be contacted to arrange for another visitation date and return the enclosed card within three days. From the returned cards a schedule was compiled. Dates for the first year visits were confirmed with the teachers by telephone. Two weeks prior to a school visitation, a letter was mailed to the teacher for the purpose of reminding her of the visitation date and selected classes for observation. Another purpose for this letter was to request a set of the evaluative techniques that had been or were being used with the selected courses. The evaluative techniques included formal devices (tests, quizzes), rating scales, checklists, student assignments, projects and performance tests and informal devices such as verbal descriptions describing references made from observations, classroom questions or conversations with students. (See Appendix D: Teacher Letter 3)

On the scheduled days the co-researcher, Caputo, and the investigator traveled to the schools to collect data on the three selected classes and during the pre-conference and the post-conference. A complete day was spent with each teacher and whenever possible, the investigators met with the principal and/or superintendent along with the teacher.

Procedures in collecting data

Data were collected by direct observation between February 3 and April 11, 1975. The 24 first-year teachers in Iowa were visited first, then the 16 first-year teachers in South Dakota. As previously reported, 15 first-year teachers in South Dakota were included in the data analysis due to incomplete student teaching data on one teacher. Part I (Appendix
B) data were collected during the pre-conference and the three selected classes; Part II (Appendix B) data were collected on cumulative teacher performance, personal growth andevaluative skills during the post-conference.

Analysis of the Data

One of the two objectives of this study was to discover if the teachers exhibited different levels of performance, as measured by the RSTE, during their first year of teaching as compared to their classroom interactions during student teaching. The other objective was to investigate the ratability of the observation device, RSTE, in assessing the teaching performance of first-year ISU and SDSU home economics education graduates teaching in the States of Iowa and South Dakota.

The raw data from 80 instruments were prepared for key punching by assigning each instrument a code number corresponding to the code number of student teaching data. Raw data were punched on IBM cards from the original observational devices. Data were transformed to normal deviates.

Two analyses of variance (ANOV) were computed for each of the 25 items in the assessment instrument for each class in Part I and for the 22 items in cumulative assessment for Part II. Detailed procedures for this assessment are reported by Caputo (1975). The analyses were computed to determine the ability of the items to discriminate between teachers and to determine the ability of judges to rate the items reliably. Further, intraclass correlations and reliabilities for the Revised Student Teacher Evaluation device were computed from these data. The agreement among judges is reflected by the correlation between their ratings, the re-
liability. Disagreement is reflected by differences in the mean judgment of each judge or differences in the standard deviation. Furthermore, disagreement is reflected by other reliable differences between judges in how they rate teachers over three observations of each teacher.

The model upon which the analyses were based for Part I of the device was:

\[ Y_{ijk} = \mu + T_i + J_j + T_j J_{ij} + C/T_{ik} + \varepsilon_{ijk} \]

where

- \( i = 1, 2, 3 \ldots 40 \)
- \( j = 1, 2 \)
- \( k = 1, 2, 3 \)
- \( \mu = \) overall mean
- \( C = \) classes
- \( T = \) teachers
- \( J = \) judges
- \( \varepsilon_{ijk} = \) judges by classes within teachers

The expected mean squares are designated in Table 1.
Table 1. Expected values of mean squares in the analysis of variance design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Expected values of mean squares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher (T)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$\sigma_e^2 + j\sigma^2_{C/T} + kj\sigma^2_T$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges (J)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$\sigma_e^2 + k\sigma^2_{TJ} + ktK_j^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers by Judges (T x J)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$\sigma_e^2 + k\sigma^2_{TJ}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class/Teacher (C/T)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>$\sigma_e^2 + j\sigma^2_{C/T}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (JC/T)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>$\sigma_e^2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aTeachers and classes were considered random; judges were considered fixed.

The model upon which the analyses were based for Part II of the device was:

$$Y_{ij} = \mu + T_i + J_j + \epsilon_{ij}$$

where

- $i = 1, 2, 3, \ldots 40$
- $j = 1, 2$
- $\mu$ = overall mean
- $T = $ teachers
- $J = $ judges
- $\epsilon_{ij} = $ teacher by judge

The expected mean squares are designated in Table 2.
Table 2. Expected values of mean squares in the analysis of variance design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Expected values of mean squares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers (T)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$\sigma_e^2 + j\sigma_T^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges (J)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$\sigma_e^2 + t\sigma_T^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (T x J)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$\sigma_e^2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Teachers were considered random; judges were considered fixed.*

Intraclass correlation coefficients were computed for both Part I analysis of variance and Part II analysis of variance to aid in determining the extent of agreement between the two trained judges by item. The formula used was (Winer, 1971, p. 286):

$$r_I = \frac{\sigma_T^2}{\sigma_T^2 + \sigma_e^2}$$

where

$\sigma_T^2 = \text{teacher variance}$

$\sigma_e^2 = \text{error variance}$

In Part II, the judges observed the same behaviors. Thus, $r_I$ reflects the extent to which the judges agreed when they viewed the same behaviors.

In Part I, the judges observed three classes. As a result, the judges'
responses can be correlated when they view the teacher in the same class or when one judge views each teacher in one class and another judge views the same teacher when teaching some other class. In order to make the $r_i$ comparable in Parts I and II, the mean-square, $T \times J$, was used as the "error" in both cases. Thus, the $r_i$ in both cases reflects how well the judges agreed when they viewed the teachers in different classes. As a result, a low F ratio associated with a high $r_i$ reflects good agreement between judges when they viewed the same behaviors but considerable differences in behavior of a single teacher from class to class.

To determine the reliability of the mean of the two judges, the formula used was (Winer, p. 286):

$$r_{jj} = \frac{2r_i}{1 + r_i}$$

where

$r_i = \text{intraclass correlation coefficient}$

The primary focus of this study was to determine if performance during the student teaching experience is indicative of future teaching performance. A correlation matrix between STE scores obtained during the student teaching period and RSTE scores during the first year of teaching was computed. The correlated data included means of two to three (2-3) judges for two to three (2-3) time periods for student teaching and means of two (2) judges on three (3) observations on Part I and means of two (2) judges on Part II for first year teaching. The formula used was:
\[
    r = \frac{\sum (x_i - \bar{x})(y_i - \bar{y})}{\sqrt{\sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2 \sum (y_i - \bar{y})^2}}
\]

where

\( X \) = mean rating for each item for judges during student teaching  
\( Y \) = mean rating for each item for judges during first year teaching

The appropriate degrees of freedom for this correlation coefficient are \( n-2 \) or 37.

The analysis of variance was first inspected to discover the ability of the items to discriminate among teachers and second, to discover the ability of the judges to rate the items reliably. Data on item reliability helped to suggest the adequacy of use of the items in interpreting the correlation coefficients.

In addition, selected STE category means were computed according to the original STE grouping for student teaching and first year teaching to discover change in classroom performance and evaluation skills. The classroom performance category included lesson selection, orientation, presentation, student participation, and relationship skills. The evaluation skills category included planning for evaluation, planning the device, and use and interpretation. Means were computed by item for each sub-category.

Informal interviews were held with the teachers, after formal data collection procedures, to get the teachers' reactions to their teacher education programs. The descriptive data obtained were summarized for the group and reported as most frequently mentioned strengths or competencies and weaknesses or challenges, of the programs. Such information is useful in considering the effectiveness of a program.
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

One of the important objectives of the study was to discover if first-year teachers, as measured by the Revised Student Teacher Evaluation (RSTE) exhibit different levels of performance in classroom interactions as compared to their classroom interactions during student teaching. The RSTE is a judgmental device which consists of items designed to assess selected professional competencies. Items to assess subject matter competencies are not included in the RSTE. Another objective was to investigate the usability of the RSTE in assessing the teaching performance of first-year Iowa State University and South Dakota State University home economics education graduates teaching in the States of Iowa and South Dakota, respectively. Data existed on 39 first-year teachers; 24 first-year teachers in Iowa and 15 first-year teachers in South Dakota.

Usability of the Revised Student Teacher Evaluation

Two analyses of variance were computed for each of the 25 items in the assessment instrument for each class in Part I (Appendix B) and for the 22 items in cumulative assessment for Part II (Appendix B). The analyses were computed to determine the ability of the items to discriminate between teachers and to determine the ability of the judges to rate the items reliably. Further, intraclass correlations and reliabilities for the RSTE were computed. A correlation matrix between STE scores during the student teaching period and RSTE scores during the first year of teaching was computed to study the relationship between the performance during those two periods. The correlated data included means of two or three
(2-3) judges for two to three (2-3) time periods for student teaching and means of two (2) judges on three (3) observations on Part I and means of two (2) judges on Part II for first year teaching.

Assessment of items

Analysis of variance, intraclass correlations and reliabilities were computed for each item and are reported in Table 3 and are summarized from Caputo (1975). Inspection of Table 3 reveals that 10 items for Part I (Items: 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 13, 17, 19, 20, 25) were clearly able to be reliably rated by the judges and differentiated among teachers. These conclusions were reached because there were no significant judge (J) or teacher by judge (TJ) effects. The items were judged to have the most potential for reliably rating the first-year teachers' performance.

Two items (Items: 12, 21) had no significant sources of variance, i.e., no teacher, judge, or teacher by judge interaction effect. These items are not too valid because they did not differentiate among teachers.

Significant T and TJ effects were found for 8 items (Items: 1, 3, 5, 7, 14, 16, 22, 24) and suggested that these items were able to differentiate among teachers, but also suggested judges rated teachers differently. Since items were able to discriminate among teachers, they have potential for the assessment of teaching behavior.

Four items (Items: 9, 11, 15, 18) had significant T, J, and TJ effects. The items differentiated among teachers, but exhibited differences in judge ratings and also had judge by teacher interactions. These items appear to be the least optimum for observation of teacher performance.

One item (Item: 23) had significant T and J effects, i.e., the item
Table 3. F ratios for analysis of variance, intraclass correlations, and reliabilities for the Revised Student Teacher Evaluation device

Part I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>$F_a$</th>
<th>$F_b$</th>
<th>$F_c$</th>
<th>$r_I$</th>
<th>$r_{jj}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. d</td>
<td>Lesson planned to concentrate primarily on one main idea.</td>
<td>2.40*</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>1.60*</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. e</td>
<td>Objectives written in behavioral terms.</td>
<td>9.21**</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. e</td>
<td>Objectives based on student's needs.</td>
<td>2.56**</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>9.77**</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. e</td>
<td>Learning opportunities suited to student's needs and/or interest.</td>
<td>3.46**</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. d</td>
<td>Provided an opportunity for students to participate actively in several ways.</td>
<td>4.01**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.99**</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. e</td>
<td>Indicated objectives of the lesson.</td>
<td>2.19**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. d</td>
<td>Conducted the lesson in a logical sequence.</td>
<td>2.55**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.61*</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. e</td>
<td>Selected appropriate teaching techniques and strategies for the situation.</td>
<td>3.49**</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. f</td>
<td>Was interested in the subject being taught.</td>
<td>2.99**</td>
<td>7.53**</td>
<td>1.76*</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. e</td>
<td>Used example(s) or illustration(s) for conveying ideas during the lesson.</td>
<td>2.41**</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. f</td>
<td>Clarified concepts and concerns as needed during the lesson.</td>
<td>2.51**</td>
<td>9.40**</td>
<td>2.00**</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. g</td>
<td>Followed through with her plans and yet remained flexible enough to adjust as needs became evident.</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. e</td>
<td>Effectively used teaching materials and/or instructional materials.</td>
<td>3.46**</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. d</td>
<td>Effectively used levels of questions to evoke thinking beyond the level of recall.</td>
<td>3.02**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>2.49**</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. Pointed out reasons and relationships concerning facts.

16. Encouraged open-ended inquiry and/or discussion when consistent with instructional goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2.65**</th>
<th>10.85**</th>
<th>2.77**</th>
<th>.85</th>
<th>.92</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.16**</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.49**</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^Degrees of freedom for F are 39, 39. Table values for F are 1.71 at 5 percent and 2.13 at 1 percent.

^Degrees of freedom for F are 1, 39. Table values for F are 4.09 at 5 percent and 7.33 at 1 percent.

^Degrees of freedom for F are 39, 80. Table values for F are 1.60 at 5 percent and 1.96 at 1 percent.

^*Item differentiated among teachers but also had significant judge by teacher effects.

^eItem differentiated among teachers and exhibited no difference in rating by judges.

^fItem differentiated among teachers, but not only exhibited differences in judge ratings but also had significant judge by teacher effects.

^gItem did not differentiate among teachers but exhibited no judge effect which indicates that judges did not differ in the rating of teachers.

*Significant at P<0.05.

**Significant at P<0.01.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>F ratios</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Created a positive, success-oriented learning environment.</td>
<td>5.25**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Arranged physical environment conducive to teaching technique being used.</td>
<td>2.21**</td>
<td>26.18**</td>
<td>1.74*</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Helped the students recognize the relationship of the lesson to previous learning or experience.</td>
<td>1.81**</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Assisted the students in synthesizing, summarizing and/or drawing conclusions.</td>
<td>4.25**</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Provided an opportunity for students to apply their learnings in more than one way.</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Treats the students with respect.</td>
<td>3.73**</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>1.75*</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Maintains an open, positive rapport with the students.</td>
<td>6.65**</td>
<td>5.21**</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Communicates effectively at levels appropriate for the students.</td>
<td>3.97**</td>
<td>6.71**</td>
<td>2.19**</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Recognizes individual student's needs.</td>
<td>1.84*</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^h Item differentiated among teachers but judge had significant differences.
Part II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>F ratios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$T^a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Encouraged the students to describe or show how the learning affects them personally.</td>
<td>18.60**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Talks with students during or after class about their concerns.</td>
<td>15.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Handles discipline problems in a positive, consistent manner.</td>
<td>14.64**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Uses criticism, either positive or negative, in a way that contributes to the student's growth.</td>
<td>11.97**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Relates to each student.</td>
<td>15.67**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Works cooperatively with other teachers and the administration.</td>
<td>5.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Strives for improvement through professional growth activities.</td>
<td>14.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Bases evaluation of pupil growth on the degree of accomplishment toward expected behaviors specified in the instructional objectives.</td>
<td>36.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Encourages pupil's self-evaluation.</td>
<td>27.31**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. In evaluation of performance activities, clearly identifies to student whether process or product is being evaluated.</td>
<td>39.45**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. In evaluation of performance activities, assesses process and product independently.</td>
<td>9.24**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>F ratios</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$T^a$</td>
<td>$J^b$</td>
<td>$r_I$</td>
<td>$r_{ij}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. i</td>
<td>Has used at least 5 techniques for assessing cognitive growth in formal evaluation.</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>4.92*</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. h</td>
<td>Has used at least 3 techniques for assessing affective growth in formal evaluation.</td>
<td>172.08**</td>
<td>12.39**</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. e</td>
<td>Has used at least 2 techniques for assessing psychomotor skills in formal evaluation.</td>
<td>56.31**</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. e</td>
<td>Uses a table of specifications in planning tests.</td>
<td>15.77**</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. e</td>
<td>Constructs well defined test items which reflect the principles of item writing.</td>
<td>16.05**</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. e</td>
<td>Test directions are clearly stated and easy to follow.</td>
<td>17.92**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. e</td>
<td>Summarizes scores obtained from evaluation devices to determine range and mean of scores.</td>
<td>64.22**</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. e</td>
<td>Performs an item analysis on appropriate devices.</td>
<td>51.43**</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. e</td>
<td>Uses results to assess the educative process.</td>
<td>14.81**</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. e</td>
<td>Returns scores and reviews and interprets the device with pupils to provide them with feedback.</td>
<td>14.28**</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. e</td>
<td>Uses techniques of assigning marks of grades consistent with school policy.</td>
<td>37.74**</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^Item did not differentiate among teachers but exhibited significant judge differences.
differentiated among teachers but judges had significant differences which indicates that judges were using the scale differently. The item has potential for assessing teacher performance through further investigation.

Further inspection of Table 3 reveals high intraclass correlations ($r_I$) and reliabilities ($r_{jj}$) for 24 items. The $r_I$ represents the proportion of variance attributable to first-year teachers. The items are designated as having power to discriminate among first-year teachers. Part I shows $r_I$ coefficients range from .54 to .98; $r_{jj}$ coefficients range from .70 to .98. The $r_{jj}$ reliabilities are larger than those reported by Gilbert (1974). Substantially more items were able to clearly differentiate among teachers.

It is concluded that most of the items in Part I were able to differentiate among teachers and to be rated reliably. These items are designated as having potential for assessment of teacher performance through further investigation of the items.

Inspection of Table 3 reveals that 18 items (Items: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22) for assessing cumulative teacher behaviors in Part II were clearly able to differentiate among teachers. Judges used a similar response pattern to rate items. Since these items were clearly able to discriminate among teachers, they have the most potential for assessing teacher performance.

Three items (Items: 9, 10, 13) were able to differentiate among teachers but the judge effect was significant. Since the items were reliably rated, further use of the items for observation of teaching is
recommended.

One item (Item: 12) did not differentiate among teachers but exhibited significant judge differences. This item showed least promise for assessment of a teaching behavior.

High intraclass correlations ($r_i$) and reliabilities ($r_{jj}$) existed for 20 items on cumulative assessment in Part II. The $r_i$ coefficients range from .18 to .98 and $r_{jj}$ coefficients range from .30 to .98. The range for $r_i$ and $r_{jj}$ coefficients is higher for Part I or when more than one assessment of teacher performance was made. High $r_{jj}$ coefficients suggest that the judges were able to rate the items uniformly. All items, except Item 23, in Part II have great potential for assessing the performance of teachers in the classroom.

**Usability of instrument**

Results of the analyses of variance for Part I indicated 10 items clearly able to differentiate among teachers with no significant J or TJ effects; two items had no significant sources of variance, i.e., no T, J, or TJ effects; eight items had significant T and TJ effects which suggested that the items were able to differentiate among teachers, but judges rated teachers differently; four items had significant T, J, and TJ effects which suggest low optimum for item use for assessing teaching performance; and one item had significant T and J effects, i.e., teachers were different in performance but judges rated teachers differently.

Analyses of variance for Part II showed 18 items clearly able to differentiate among teachers; and three items were able to differentiate
among teachers but the judge effect was significant. One item did not differentiate among teachers but had significant judge differences.

The trained judges were able to rate items uniformly. It is believed that the 99-point scale contributed to ease in rating items. The scale allowed for a wide spread in scores; this variance in scores contributed to score reliability. The researcher concluded that the Revised Student Teacher Evaluation device proved usable for the assessment of teacher performance of first-year Iowa State University and South Dakota State University home economics education graduates teaching in the States of Iowa and South Dakota, respectively.

Relationship Between Student Teaching and First Year Teaching

The relationship between student teaching and first year teaching was determined by the correlation coefficients presented in Table 4 and Table 5 for Part I and Part II, respectively, along with means and standard deviations by item. Inspection of Table 5 reveals only one significant difference. Item 16 is significant, having a negative correlation with student teaching performance. Interpretation of this correlation suggests that the teachers' ability to construct well defined test items which reflect the principles of item writing was lower during their first year of teaching.

Several conditions for a lack of significant positive correlations between the selected professional competencies during student teaching and first year teaching were suggested. These conditions relate to the use of trained observers in collecting data on first-year teachers, the great dissimilarity of the two teaching situations, and the use of a
Table 4. Means, standard deviations and correlation coefficients between first year teaching and student teaching performance, Part I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>First year teaching</th>
<th>Student teaching</th>
<th>Part I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>St. Dev.</td>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Items as reported on Student Teacher Evaluation, Gilbert, 1974 (See Appendix A).

*b Items not reported on Student Teacher Evaluation, Gilbert, 1974.
Table 5. Means, standard deviations and correlation coefficients between first year teaching and student teaching performance, Part II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St. Dev.</th>
<th>Item&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Dev.</th>
<th>Correlation Coeff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>41&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.36&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-.33*&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>-&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Items as reported on Student Teacher Evaluation, Gilbert, 1974 (See Appendix A).

<sup>b</sup> Item not reported on Student Teacher Evaluation, Gilbert, 1974.

* Significant at P<0.05. Tabular value for correlation coefficient at 5 percent is 0.32. Degrees of freedom are 37.
revised assessment instrument for first year teaching.

From Table 3 it may be noted that the judges were in high agreement in rating teacher behaviors by items and the judges were more able to discriminate among teachers. Further inspection of Table 4 and Table 5 reveals that a wider range on the 99-point scale was used in rating items as is evidenced by larger standard deviations. The trained judges were more varied in their ratings of items and were able to rate changes in teacher performance. This finding suggests the need for more extensive preparation of college supervisors and cooperating teachers to promote greater reliability in ratings given student teachers.

Since the judges did not have prior knowledge of the abilities and capabilities of the first-year teachers as students or as student teachers at Iowa State University or South Dakota State University, carry-over effects which contribute to contamination of data were prevented. Wide standard deviations on ratings for first-year teachers compared to both high means and relatively low standard deviations for the ratings of student teachers suggest a particular kind of response set operating for these latter ratings. This kind of response set refers to the tendency of a person to respond in a certain way, such as rating another person consistently high or consistently low or responding most frequently around the center of the scale, regardless of the content of the items or the teacher being rated.

Another condition for low positive correlations or no significant positive correlations could relate to the great dissimilarity between the student teaching situation and the first year teaching situation. The number of different class preparations varied from less than four during
student teaching to over 10 for first year teaching. A majority of the teachers were in one-teacher departments and, hence, attempted to offer a broad program in home economics. All teachers had non-class related responsibilities, however, many of the teacher's responsibilities for non-class related activities were overwhelming. Non-class related responsibilities included directing pom-pon girls/cheerleaders, coaching girls' basketball, directing girls' drill team, directing plays, and advising junior and senior classes.

For the first time, total responsibility for students was held by the first-year teachers. The absence of support from a cooperating teacher and a college supervisor for student welfare could have been another factor contributing to low and negative correlations between student teaching and first year teaching.

The assessment instrument, Student Teacher Evaluation (STE), was revised for this study in accordance with the results of a study by Gilbert (1974). Gilbert recommended that several items be eliminated and that other items be reworded or that the implication of the item be clarified to judges for further investigation of the ratability of the item. The two investigators spent considerable time in revising and clarifying the intent of the items. This process was considered to have influenced uniformity of ratings of teachers by both judges.

Another aspect of the revision of the STE which could have influenced the correlations involved a reorganization of its format. The change in format was more closely related to a natural classroom sequence and subsequent assessment.
Level of Performance

Since the analysis of data revealed only one significant correlation between student teaching and first year teaching behaviors, a comparison of selected category means for student teaching and first year teaching on the Student Teacher Evaluation and the Revised Student Teacher Evaluation devices was made (Table 6). The categories for this comparison between student teaching and first year teaching were the categories used in the Gilbert study (Appendix A). Inspection of Table 6 reveals that category mean ratings were larger for student teaching ratings. The relationship between student teaching and first year teaching is further illustrated on selected first-year teachers in Appendix E.

Table 6. Category means for student teaching and first year teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom Performance</th>
<th>Student Teaching</th>
<th>First Year Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Selection</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Participation</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Skills</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Skills</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning for Evaluation</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning the Device</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use and Interpretation</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Higher mean category ratings for student teaching could be attributed to the difficulty that former observers had in discriminating among student teachers and in agreeing on the ratings to be assigned. These ratings differ from results of studies by Bailey (1974), Holtzen (1974), Thorup (1968), Preil (1968), Lauriana (1965), Hollis (1964), Regier (1963) and Beery (1962), whereby, teachers improved in performance during their first year of teaching. However, most teachers in the present study possessed one or two special talents or abilities.

Reactions to First Year of Teaching

First-year teachers from both institutions, Iowa State University and South Dakota State University, indicated during informal interviews that their over-all teacher preparation for class related activities was adequate. Many of the teachers found their preparation on selected professional competencies to be above average to outstanding. The most frequently mentioned competencies included human relationship skills, and planning learning opportunities for individual lessons involving greater student participation. Being able to construct lesson and unit plans was a competence many teachers believed they possessed, but indicated a lack of time to make such plans in the format and/or detail learned at the undergraduate level. Student teaching was considered the most beneficial and rewarding undergraduate experience.

Over 85% of the teachers were still enthusiastic about their decision to teach home economics. The teachers thought that home economics was the best major they could have chosen because of its potential for serving more people in a more comprehensive way. The first-year teachers conveyed
a strong desire to teach and work with youth and their parents for greater extension of the value of the subject matter of home economics.

The most serious problems or challenges indicated by the first-year teachers involved long-term curriculum planning, planning for special learners and handling disciplinary problems or situations. Teachers with special learners expressed a lack of competence in working with students with social and learning disabilities. The teachers reported that their greatest surprise was finding discipline problems in schools with small enrollments. They had anticipated discipline to be a problem in larger and city-based schools. Five teachers indicated insecurity in both knowledge and presentation skills in teaching selected areas of family living content.

**Summary**

Since statistical analysis of data revealed only one significant correlation between student teaching and first year teaching, the investigator suggested conditions for low correlations. These conditions for low correlations related to the use of trained observers in collecting data on first-year teachers, the great dissimilarity of the two teaching situations, and the use of a revised assessment instrument for first year teaching.

The Revised Student Teacher Evaluation device was usable to assess first-year teacher performance. Items, in most cases, differentiated among teachers and judges were able to rate the items uniformly. The RSTE has potential for use with more extensive preparation of judges.

Over 85% of the first-year teachers were still enthusiastic about their decision to teach home economics. The teachers considered
their over-all teacher preparation adequate for class related activities and their preparation for selected professional competencies to be above average to outstanding. These competencies included human relationship skills and planning learning opportunities for individual lessons to involve greater student participation. Long-term curriculum planning, planning for special learners and discipline were considered by the teachers as their most serious problems or challenges.
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The effect of preprofessional teacher preparation on teacher performance continues to be a major concern of educators. The preparation of teachers for the nation's classrooms requires continuous evaluation and appraisal of teacher education programs in furthering understanding of the teaching-learning process. Leimkuhler (1966) stated that in a study of the effectiveness of teacher education programs it would seem that the follow-up and evaluation of the graduates of such programs would be essential. Furthermore, Smith (1971) maintained that the chief purpose of research on the education of teachers is to improve the programs of teacher preparation in these institutions.

Studies relating to first-year teacher follow-up and evaluation indicate the value of and need for more systematic evaluation of graduates by the institution to determine the effectiveness of the teacher education program of the institution. Elias (1974) commented that the only true measure of a program is a measure of its products, the program graduates.

The present study is one dimension of a major research thrust in the Department of Home Economics Education at Iowa State University. One of the main purposes of the on-going research is development of an effective device for evaluation of teacher performance; a second purpose is a monitoring of program effectiveness. This research dealt with one aspect of quality of the device: usability of the device for student teachers and teachers in the classroom.

The research also addressed in some detail the extent to which the Home Economics Education Departments at Iowa State University (ISU) and
South Dakota State University (SDSU) met selected professional objectives in preparing home economics teachers. Specifically, the focus of the study was to discover if first-year teachers, as measured by the Revised Student Teacher Evaluation (RSTE) exhibited different levels of performance in classroom interactions as compared to their classroom interactions during student teaching. The RSTE is a judgmental device designated to assess selected professional competencies, not including subject matter competencies. First-year home economics teachers graduating from both universities were selected because as student teachers they were participants in a study by Gilbert (1974).

A revised form of the 50-item Student Teacher Evaluation device (STE) was employed to collect data (Appendix B). The STE was developed by Home Economics Education faculty and graduate students at ISU during 1973-74 and was used by Gilbert (1974). The revised 47-item instrument consisted of two parts: Part I, designed for individual classroom performance, included 25 items and Part II, designed for cumulative assessment over classes, included 22 items. A 99-point scale was used to record the responses to the 47-item instrument. On six cases on Part I, inter-observer reliability established between the investigator and a co-researcher was .58.

Data were collected from observations of 40 first-year teachers, 24 in Iowa and 16 in South Dakota. One teacher in South Dakota was not included in selected data analyses due to incomplete student teaching data. Data were collected in two parts. Part I data were collected during a pre-conference and from observations of three selected classes; Part II data were collected on cumulative teacher performance and during a
Two analyses of variance were computed for each of the 25 items in the assessment instrument for each class in Part I and for the 22 items in cumulative assessment for Part II. The purposes of the analyses were to determine the ability of the items to discriminate among teachers and to determine the ability of judges to rate the items reliably. Further, intraclass correlations and reliabilities for the RSTE were computed from these data.

Since the primary focus of the study was to determine if performance during the student teaching experience is indicative of future teaching performance, a correlation matrix between STE scores obtained during the first year of teaching was computed. The correlated data included means of two to three (2-3) judges for two to three (2-3) time periods for student teaching and means of two (2) judges on three (3) observations on Part I and means of two (2) judges on Part II for first year teaching. In addition, selected category means for student teaching and first year teaching on the Student Teacher Evaluation and the Revised Student Teacher Evaluation devices were computed. The categories for this analysis of change in classroom performance and evaluation skills between student teaching and first year teaching were the categories used in the Gilbert study. Furthermore, informal interviews were held with the teachers, after formal data collection procedures, to obtain the teachers' reactions to their teacher education program and their present positions.

An inspection of the various patterns or combinations of significant and nonsignificant effects on the analyses of variance, in conjunction
with the size of the intraclass correlation coefficients and the reliability coefficients, indicated that 23 items in Part I were promising for future research. The analyses suggested that an additional two items were unsatisfactory for assessing teacher performance. Eighteen items for assessing cumulative teacher behaviors in Part II were clearly able to differentiate among teachers. Three items showed promise for future research and one item was unsatisfactory for observation of teacher behavior.

Only one significant correlation existed between student teaching interactions and first-year teaching interactions. The data indicated that the first-year teachers' ability to construct well-defined test items which reflect the principles of item writing was lower during their first year of teaching.

Several conditions for a lack of significant positive correlations between scores on the selected professional competencies during student teaching and first-year teaching were suggested. These conditions relate to the use of trained observers in collecting data on first-year teachers, the great dissimilarity of the two teaching situations, and the use of a revised assessment instrument.

A comparison of selected category mean ratings for student teaching and first-year teaching on the STE and RSTE revealed category mean ratings were larger for student teaching ratings. The generally higher mean category ratings for student teaching could be attributed to the difficulty that former observers had in discriminating among student teachers and in agreeing on the ratings to be assigned.
Over 85% of the first-year teachers from both institutions were still enthusiastic about their decision to teach home economics and also indicated that their over-all teacher preparation for class related activities was adequate. For selected professional competencies, the teachers regarded their preparation as above average to outstanding. Competencies most frequently mentioned included human relationship skills and planning learning opportunities for high involvement of the students. The most serious problems or challenges indicated by the first-year teachers involved long-range curriculum planning, planning for special learners and handling disciplinary problems.

In summary, this study identified 23 items in Part I that showed potential for further use in assessing teacher performance; 21 items in Part II showed potential for use in future investigation of teaching. The trained judges were able to rate items uniformly. Therefore, it was concluded that the Revised Student Teacher Evaluation device was usable for assessing first-year teachers' performance. There was only one significant correlation between student teaching and first year teaching interactions in the classroom.

Based on the results of this study, it is recommended that the Revised Student Teacher Evaluation device be used to assess student teachers and first-year teachers. High intraclass coefficients and reliabilities indicated that trained observers were able to rate most items uniformly. Given the importance of student teaching in a teacher education program, failure to identify specific weaknesses and strengths of prospective teachers leads to a less effective program. Therefore, it is
recommended that observers with more extensive preparation be used to evaluate both student teachers and first-year teachers. College supervisors and cooperating teachers should be better prepared to differentiate among student teachers. Finally, it is concluded that there might be some advantage in using, at least part of the time, observers not having prior knowledge of teachers as students in the undergraduate program or as student teachers.
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APPENDIX A: STUDENT TEACHER EVALUATION AND EVALUATOR'S GUIDE
STUDENT TEACHER EVALUATION

Assessing the Teaching-Learning Process:  Part E, C, D, E, F

Area of H. E.  
Name: _____________________
Grade Level ______
Teaching Center: ____________
Evaluator: _______________
Time: 4 wk ___ 6 wk ___ 8 wk ___

Directions: This instrument will help assess the degree of achievement exhibited by the student teacher at 4 week, 6 week, and 8 week intervals. Please respond to each of the items in the following manner:

If you are certain the teacher was clearly below average in accomplishing the task, place a 1 in the space provided.

If you are certain the teacher was clearly above average in accomplishing the task place a 99 in the space provided.

If you are uncertain the teacher accomplished the task or if there was no opportunity to accomplish it, place a 50 in the space provided.

A score from 1-49 indicates the degree to which the teacher displayed to you below average performance in accomplishing the task.

A score from 51-99 indicates the degree to which the teacher displayed to you above average performance in accomplishing the task.

Feel free to use any number from 1-99 that best reflects your opinion. Please respond to every statement. The general scale is shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>clearly below average</th>
<th>uncertain</th>
<th>clearly above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CLASSROOM PERFORMANCE

THE TEACHER:

Lesson Selection: (refer to lesson plans)

1. planned the lesson to concentrate primarily on one main idea.

2. planned objectives and activities that were suited to the student’s needs and interests.
3. selected appropriate teaching techniques and strategies for the situation.

Orientation: (to be accomplished within first part of lesson)

4. created a positive, success-oriented learning environment.

5. indicated the objectives of the lesson and their importance to the students.

6. helped the students recognize the relationship of the lesson to previous learning or experience.

Presentation of the Lesson:

7. conducted the lesson smoothly so that it was easy for the students to follow.

8. was sincerely interested in the subject being taught.

9. used meaningful examples or illustrations for conveying ideas during the lesson.

10. effectively used a variety of teaching materials and instructional materials.

11. effectively used a variety of levels of questions to evoke thinking beyond the level of recall.

12. emphasized reasons and relationships concerning the facts.

13. clarified concepts and concerns as needed during the lesson. (vocabulary, definitions, etc.)

14. encouraged open-ended inquiry and discussion when consistent with the instructional goals.

15. used questions to elicit thinking and student response consistent with the instructional goals.

16. followed through with her plans and yet remained flexible enough to adjust as needs became evident.

17. was creative and flexible in guiding the learning process.

18. assisted the students in synthesizing, summarizing and drawing conclusions.

Student Participation:

19. provided an opportunity for the students to participate actively and/or to apply their learnings in different ways. (verbal response, non-verbal response)

20. encouraged the students to describe or show how the learning affects them personally.
21...encouraged the students to make generalizations during or at the end of the lesson.

RELATIONSHIP SKILLS

22....treats the students with respect.

23....maintains an open friendly rapport with the students.

24....communicates effectively at levels appropriate to the preparedness of the students.

25....supports and accepts each student as he is regardless of race, sex, nationality or learning potential.

26....recognizes the individual's personal needs.

27....can explain things so students are able to understand.

28....is willing to talk with students during or after class about any problems which might be bothering them.

29....tries to find things that students are "good at" instead of things they are "poor at".

30....works well with other teachers and the administration.

31....handles his/her own discipline problems; is firm but friendly, consistent in policy and self-confident in management of pupils.

32....uses positive, encouraging and supportive criticism, rather than discouragement, blame or shame.

EVALUATION SKILLS

Planning for Evaluation:

33....bases evaluation of pupil growth on the degree of accomplishment toward expected behaviors specified in the instructional objectives.

34....encourages pupil's self-evaluation in both specific and informal ways.

35....in evaluation of performance activities, clearly identifies whether process or product is being evaluated, and keeps measures on these two aspects independent during scoring.

36....has used at least five types of cognitive measures of student growth in formal and informal evaluation.

37....has used at least three types of affective measures of student growth.

38....has used at least two evaluation devices of psychomotor skills.
39. ...in independent and/or group learning projects, evaluates objectives on the basis of each individual's ability to reach objectives stated before the project was begun.

Planning the device

40. ...uses a table of specifications in planning tests.

41. ...constructs well defined test items which reflect the principles of item writing.

Presentation

42. ...takes precautions so that the pupils do not have an opportunity to receive improper aids during the evaluation process.

Use and interpretation

43. ...summarizes scores obtained from evaluation devices to determine range and mean of scores and to estimate good and poor test items.

44. ...uses results of evaluation to determine several aspects of the educative process, not only for assigning grades.

45. ...returns scores and reviews and interprets the device with pupils to provide them with feedback as quickly as possible.

46. ...uses techniques of assigning marks or grades consistent with philosophy of the school.

MANAGEMENT AND PROFESSIONALISM

47. ...is well prepared for class.

48. ...initiates responsibilities for physical environment conducive to teaching technique being used.

49. ...searches for ideas, techniques and procedures in developing a teaching style.

50. ...strives for improvement through positive participation in professional growth activities.
To maintain conciseness in form of this instrument, Assessing the Teaching-Learning Process, items have been described as simply as possible. Hence it was felt that this guide may be of assistance to evaluators in providing further explanation for items which may need elaboration.

The first section of the accompanying instrument "classroom performance, (items 1-22), is to be used to assess the competence of the student teacher in a specific teaching situation. The evaluator should have a copy of the lesson plan before the teacher begins teaching the class.

The items in the remaining sections may or may not be observed in the same classroom situation. Note: a score of 50 indicates "no opportunity to accomplish" or "uncertain the teacher accomplished the task." This is important for statistical reasons.

Clarification of specific items:

1. "One main idea" can be interpreted to include ideas closely related to the main idea."

**Items 36, 37, 38**

Items 36, 37, and 38 are cumulative items. It is necessary that the student teacher reach the minimum number stated in each item at some time during her student teaching. This may occur entirely within one evaluation period, or it may take two or three evaluation periods before she has had opportunities to reach the minimum stated.

To aid you in types of measures of student growth, lists for each item are provided here.

**Item 36  Cognitive measures of student growth**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative answer</th>
<th>Checklists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative answer with corrections</td>
<td>Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td>Incomplete stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay</td>
<td>Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matching</td>
<td>Role playing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple choice</td>
<td>Oral response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 37 Affective measures of student growth

- anecdotal records
- checklists
- incomplete sentences
- incomplete stories
- logs
- participation charts
- rating scale
- role playing
- self inventory
- sociometric diagram

Item 38 Psychomotor measures of student growth

- Checklists
- lab observation
- performance test
- rating scales
- work sample test

Item 40

A table of specifications should include the content covered, and the level of behavior expected for the content. This would reflect the objectives of the unit. For each cell of the table, a relative weight should be indicated. These weights suggest the relative importance of each objective to the total test measurement.

Item 41

The following statements are included in the principles of item writing.

- items should be clear and concisely written at a reading level easily understood by pupils taking the tests
- items should avoid trick and ambiguous wording, double negatives, and sly details which tend to confuse pupils
- terms such as "always", "never", "all", "none", "some", "few", "many", should be avoided where possible
- independent response items should be explicitly stated and qualified so that the intent of the question is evident
- multiple choice distractors should be equally appealing to pupils who do not know the correct answer
- true-false items should not be partially true or partially false
- matching tests should not have more than twelve alternatives
- choices in an item should begin in the same grammatical form
- the entire item should be visible on the page, and not split onto two pages
APPENDIX B: REVISED STUDENT TEACHER EVALUATION AND EVALUATOR'S GUIDE
Part I
Type of Class | Class Enrollment | Grade Level of Class Members | Class Size
---|---|---|---
semester | girls only | 7-11 | 1-10
comprehensive | boys only | 8-12 | 11-20
coeducational | | 9-7-8 | 31-40

Length of time class has met with teacher
---

weeks

Subject Matter Presented:
---

4 Learning opportunities suited to student's needs and/or interest.

5 Lesson provided an opportunity for students to participate actively in several ways.

PRE CONFERENCE
---

1 Lesson planned to concentrate primarily on one main idea.

2 Objectives written in behavioral terms.

3 Objectives based on student's needs and/or interest.

CLASSROOM PERFORMANCE
---

6 indicated the objectives of the lesson.

7 conducted the lesson in a logical sequence.

8 selected appropriate teaching techniques and strategies for the situation.

9 was interested in the subject being taught.

10 used example(s) or illustration(s) for conveying ideas during the lesson.

11 clarified concepts and concerns as needed during the lesson.

12 followed through with her plans and yet remained flexible enough to adjust as needs became evident.

13 effectively used teaching materials and/or instructional materials.

14 effectively used levels of questions to evoke thinking beyond the level of recall.

15 pointed out reasons and relationships concerning facts.

16 encouraged open-ended inquiry and/or discussion when consistent with instructional goals.

Environment
---

17 created a positive, success-oriented learning environment.

18 arranged physical environment conducive to teaching technique being used.

Student Participation
---

19 helped the students recognize the relationship of the lesson to previous learning or experience.

20 assisted the students in synthesizing, summarizing and/or drawing conclusions.

21 provided an opportunity for students to apply their learnings in more than one way.

Relationship Skills
---

22 treats the students with respect.

23 maintains an open positive rapport with the students.

24 communicates effectively at levels appropriate for the students.

25 recognizes individual student's needs.
Part II
Teacher  Observer

SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Enrollment of School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>less than 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>1001-1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>201-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-1000</td>
<td>over 2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CUMULATIVE ASSESSMENT OVER CLASSES

Student Participation
---
1. encouraged the students to describe or show how the learning affects them personally.

Relationship Skills
---
2. talks with students during or after class about their concerns.
---
3. handles discipline problems in positive, consistent manner.
---
4. uses criticism, either positive or negative, in a way that contributes to the student's growth.
---
5. relates to each student.

Personal Growth
---
6. works cooperatively with other teachers and the administration.
---
7. strives for improvement through professional growth activities.

EVALUATION
---
8. bases evaluation of pupil growth on the degree of accomplishment toward expected behaviors specified in the instructional objectives.
---
9. encourages pupil's self-evaluation.
---
10. in evaluation of performance activities, clearly identifies to student whether process or product is being evaluated.
---
11. in evaluation of performance activities, assesses process and product independently.
---
12. has used at least 5 techniques for assessing cognitive growth in formal evaluation.
---
13. has used at least 3 techniques for assessing affective growth in formal evaluation.
---
14. has used at least 2 techniques for assessing psychomotor skills in formal evaluation.

Planning the Device
---
15. uses a table of specifications in planning tests.
---
16. constructs well defined test items which reflect the principles of item writing.
---
17. test directions are clearly stated and easy to follow.

Use and Interpretation
---
18. summarizes scores obtained from evaluation devices to determine range and mean of scores.
---
19. performs an item analysis on appropriate devices.
---
20. uses results to assess the educative process.
---
21. returns scores and reviews and interprets the device with pupils to provide them with feedback.
---
22. uses techniques of assigning marks or grades consistent with school policy.
Evaluator's Guide
for
Revised Student Teacher Evaluation

Directions: This instrument is designed to assess professional competencies of the classroom teacher. In the space at the left of each item, place an appropriate rating for the behavior exhibited by the teacher.

If you are certain the teacher was clearly below average in accomplishing the task, place a 1 in the space provided.

If you are certain the teacher was clearly above average in accomplishing the task, place a 99 in the space provided.

If you are uncertain the teacher accomplished the task, place a 50 in the space provided.

If you are certain the teacher had no opportunity to accomplish the task, place an X in the space provided.

If you are certain the teacher did not accomplish the task when it was appropriate, place a 0 in the space provided.

A score from 1-49 indicates the degree to which the teacher displayed to you below average performance in accomplishing the task.

A score from 51-99 indicates the degree to which the teacher displayed to you above average performance in accomplishing the task.

Item Descriptors

Part I:

Classroom Performance

Item 6. If students proceed without confusion with learning activities, it can be assumed that they understand the objectives.

Item 8. Appropriateness for the situation can be assessed by physical environment, subject matter being taught and student interest.

Item 10. The example tracted through the lesson being presented.
Item 13. Instructional materials were appropriate to learners, setting and content being presented.

Item 17. Positive, success-oriented environment can be assessed by organization, enthusiasm, interest and mannerism.

Item 21. Active participation by students can be assessed by their verbal responses, written work, and projects that occur during the lesson or as a result of the lesson.

Item 22. The teacher listens actively, acknowledges students' hands and accepts students' ideas through restatement and use.

Part II:
Cumulative Assessment

Item 5. Interactions initiated by students are recognized and are responded to with sensitivity and respect by the teacher.

Item 6. The teacher carries out routine duties promptly and accurately; the teacher is considerate of total school needs and shares professional competencies with colleagues.

Item 7. The teacher engages in studies and activities to improve professional competence.

Conference Questions

Questions asked to facilitate the rating of selected items.

Part I:
Classroom Performance

Item 4. What considerations had to be made in planning this lesson for these students?

Item 5. What did you do in this class the other days of the week.
Part II:

Cumulative Assessment

Item 6. Do you have administrative support for your program? What are faculty members' opinion towards this home economics program?

Item 7. Have you had the opportunity to attend any professional growth activities?

Item 8. Is the degree of accomplishment toward a stated objective considered in the overall evaluation of pupil growth?

Item 9. Do you encourage your students to evaluate themselves?

Item 10. When you evaluate performance activities do you separate process and product? Does the student know whether he is being evaluated for the product or the process of the product?

Item 11. In making up a test, how do you decide what percentage of questions to allocate to different topics? (What items to include and how many?)

Item 12. How do you report the results of your tests to students?

Item 13. Do you ever make a determination as to whether your tests are too easy or too difficult? How?

Item 14. How do you use the test results in making decisions about this program?

Item 15. What is the school policy for assigning grades? Are there restrictions?
APPENDIX C: ITEM RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RSTE AND STE
### Item Relationship between Revised Student Teacher Evaluation (RSTE) and Student Teacher Evaluation (STE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RSTE</th>
<th>STE</th>
<th>RSTE</th>
<th>STE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part I Items</td>
<td>Items</td>
<td>Part II Items</td>
<td>Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D: CORRESPONDENCE

Letter to Principals - A
November 8, 1974

The faculty members of the Home Economics Education Department of Iowa State University are pleased that one of our graduates has joined your teaching staff. We hope that she is making a worthwhile contribution to your home economics program this year.

The interest that we have in our students and our concern for their continued professional growth does not end at the time of their graduation but continues as an inservice program. One part of this program provides that some of our faculty members will make visits to all of the home economics education graduates who are beginning teachers in Iowa. Through these visits we hope to assist and encourage these teachers.

We would also like to use these visits as an opportunity for the Home Economics Education Department at Iowa State University to collect some data related to our continuing effort to improve the teacher education program. The purpose of the research project in which these data will be used is to help us evaluate the effectiveness of the competency-based teacher education program. All information will be treated as confidential; the research project is being conducted by Dr. Ruth Hughes and Dr. Alyce Fanslow.

Participation in the study would involve having two faculty members spend the day with the home economics teacher. The faculty members would meet with the teacher in the morning prior to her first class for a 10 to 15 minute conference and after her last class or during her preparation period for a post conference. During the day we would like to observe some of her classes. The classes to be observed will be determined prior to the visit.
Plans are being made at Iowa State for faculty members to visit from February through April, 1975. Enclosed is a copy of the letter written to your home economics teacher. She will be in contact with you to obtain your permission for her participation in the study.

We sincerely hope that your school will not only be willing for us to visit with the first year teacher but also that it will be possible for us to collect the designated data. If you will indicate your willingness on the card enclosed for your reply, we will begin to make our plans. If you have any questions, please call Dr. Alyce Fanslow collect at 515-294-5307.

Sincerely,

Ruth P. Hughes
Professor and Head
Home Economics Education

Alyce M. Fanslow
Associate Professor
Home Economics Education

Enclosures
(PLEASE CHECK)

Yes, I am willing for you to visit our first-year teacher and for our school to participate in your research project evaluating the competency-based teacher education program.

No, I would prefer that you did not visit.

Signed

School
Teacher Letter - 1
Greetings to you from all of the Home Economics Education Faculty at Iowa State. We hope that you are having a challenging and rewarding experience in your first year of home economics teaching.

You recall from Miss Miller's previous letter that we would be contacting you concerning a visit. From February through April, 1975, Leola Adams and Colleen Caputo, two members of our faculty, will visit beginning teachers. Through this visit we hope to assist you in your home economics program, share some recent teaching aids and learn of the frustrations and pleasures in your teaching activities.

We would also like to use this visit as an opportunity to evaluate the competency-based home economics teacher education program by collecting data on our 1973-74 home economics education graduates. All data collected will be summarized for the group; data for each participating teacher will remain anonymous.

Our visit will involve a 10 to 15 minute pre-conference prior to your first class and a post-conference after your last class or during your preparation period. During the day we would like to observe some of your classes. The exact date of the visit and the classes to be observed will be established during January through further correspondence.

We hope that it will be possible for us to visit you and to collect the desired data. We have also contacted your principal requesting his permission for our visit. Please check with him concerning his willingness to have you participate. We encourage your participation in the proposed evaluation as we do need input from each of our teaching graduates in order to evaluate the teacher education program.
November 8, 1974

In order for us to make plans for our visit, would you please send us your schedule and an approximate idea of the subject matter areas you will be teaching from February through April, 1975. A form on which to provide this information along with a stamped, addressed envelope is enclosed to facilitate your reply. May we have your response by November 18?

We look forward to visiting you, sharing some ideas together, and learning about your experiences in your first teaching position. If you have any questions concerning the visit or the data to be collected, please call Dr. Alyce Fanslow collect at 515-294-5307.

Sincerely,

Ruth P. Hughes  
Professor and Head  
Home Economics Education

Alyce Fanslow  
Associate Professor  
Home Economics Education

Enclosure
Yes, I would like to have you visit and am willing to participate in the proposed evaluation of the home economics teacher education program. I have talked with my principal and determined that your proposed data collection is acceptable.

Would you give us some idea of the course title, type and grade level you will be teaching from February through April.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Semester/ Comprehensive</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>*Tentative Content (if possible)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example:</td>
<td>Homemaking I</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nutrition, Meal Planning, Food Preparation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate below your daily time schedule for the February through April period:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If you do not have the content plans for second semester at this time, information will be obtained at a later date.
Teacher Letter - 2
January 10, 1975

It is our hope that your holiday season was both stimulating and relaxing. We are looking forward to visiting with you concerning your experiences as a first year teacher. We would also like to express our appreciation for your willingness to participate in the research project designed to provide some data for helping us to evaluate our teacher education program.

In our first letter to you, we mentioned that two faculty members, Ms. Leola Adams and Mrs. Colleen Caputo, would be spending a day with you, having a 10 to 15 minute preconference prior to your first class and a post-conference of about 30 minutes during your preparation period or after school. If you have some questions related to your teaching, we would be pleased to discuss these with you also.

Upon inspecting your class schedule for February through April, the following classes have been selected for our research project:

The visit to your school has been scheduled for [insert date]. Please return the enclosed card as verification of this date. If there are planned school activities for this date which will prohibit class meetings, will you please let us know on the enclosed card so that we can decide on another visitation date.

The classes we would like to observe should involve teacher-pupil discussions of approximately 30 minutes in length. The discussion should include an exchange of questions and ideas with the teacher leading the
discussion. Since we are not including the following in our definition of discussion, please do not include in the class session to be observed such activities as pupil buzz groups, pupil reports, extended role playing, or independent study. We would like to request that clothing construction and/or foods laboratory sessions be teacher-directed, i.e., you direct the learning activities such as illustrating, questioning, clarifying concepts, or laboratory demonstrations.

Sometime during the day spent with you, we would like to have a brief conference with your principal. Perhaps you can help to arrange an appointment around the classes we specifically would like to observe. If it is convenient with your schedule, you are welcome to attend this meeting.

We will be looking forward to visiting with you. Please return the enclosed card within three days so that we can make definite plans for our visit with you. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Alyce M. Fanslow, Ph.D.
Associate Professor

Ruth P. Hughes, Ph.D.
Professor and Head

Enclosure
Yes  This date is acceptable. Classes are scheduled, will call collect if there are changes. 515-294-5307.

No  This is not an acceptable date. Please call me at ________________date
    ________________time
    ________________number
    to arrange for another visitation date.

Signed  _______________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

School
Teacher Letter - 3
The school year is half over and it will not be long until you will be looking back on your first year of teaching experience in home economics. We are anxious to hear about your experiences and look forward to visiting with you on

Our plan is to arrive at the school by and would like to have a pre-conference for 10-15 minutes about the classes we will be observing. Would you please have available a copy of your lesson plan for each class we plan to observe? A detailed lesson plan is not expected -- just a general indication of your lesson goals.

We would also like to have a set of any evaluation techniques you have used in the three classes. These evaluation techniques could include formal devices (tests, quizzes), rating scales, checklists, student assignments, projects and performance tests or informal devices which are verbal descriptions describing references made from observations, classroom questions or conversations with students. We would be most appreciative if there were duplicates of your evaluative materials that we could look over during the classes we are not observing.

We are still planning to observe the following classes:

Sincerely yours,

Leola Adams

Colleen Caputo
January 29, 1975

It is our hope that your teaching experiences have been both stimulating and rewarding. We are looking forward to visiting with you concerning these experiences as a first year teacher. We would also like to express our appreciation for your willingness to participate in the research project designed to provide some data for helping South Dakota State evaluate its home economics teacher education program.

In Dean Gilbert’s letter to you, she mentioned that two graduate assistants, Ms. Leola Adams and Ms. Colleen Caputo, would be spending a day with you, having a 10 to 15 minute preconference prior to your first class and a post conference of about 30 minutes during your preparation period or after school. If you have some questions related to your teaching, we would be pleased to discuss these with you also.

Upon inspecting your class schedule for March through April, the following classes have been selected for our research project:

The visit to your school has been scheduled for
We will be calling you on Monday morning February 10 to verify this date. If there are planned school activities for this date which will prohibit class meetings, will you please let us know at the time of our phone call so that we can decide on another visitation date. If you are unable to be reached for this call, please leave a message for us at the office.
The classes we would like to observe should involve teacher-pupil discussions of approximately 30 minutes in length. The discussion should include an exchange of questions and ideas with the teacher leading the discussion. Since we are not including the following in our definition of discussion, please do not include in the class session to be observed such activities as pupil buzz groups, pupil reports, extended role playing or independent study. We would like to request that clothing construction and/or foods laboratory sessions be teacher-directed, i.e., you direct the learning activities such as illustrating, questioning, clarifying concepts or laboratory demonstrations.

Sometime during the day spent with you, we would like to have a brief conference with your principal. Perhaps you can help to arrange an appointment around the classes we specifically would like to observe. If it is convenient with your schedule, you are welcome to attend this meeting.

We will be looking forward to visiting with you.

Sincerely,

Leola Adams
Graduate Assistant

Colleen Caputo
Graduate Assistant
APPENDIX E: GRAPHIC PRESENTATION OF SELECTED COMPETENCIES
Table 7. Graphic presentation of professional competencies on Part I of RSTE of a teacher judged of lesser performance

- Data not compared

- Student teaching

- First year teaching
Table 8. Graphic presentation of professional competencies on Part I of RSTE of a teacher judged of better performance

- X Data not compared
- Student teaching
- First year teaching