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ABSTRACT

Early field experiences are becoming increasingly important in teacher education programs. Research and reform have focused on clarifying the goals of the experience and defining the relevant activities. Relating to a wide range of purposes and activities, the evaluation of preservice teachers in these early field experiences should also use multiple instruments and sources of data. Cooperating teachers and university supervisors are the personnel directly involved in the process of the evaluation of preservice teachers in early field experiences. The director of field experiences, as a representative of the university, could influence the evaluation by defining the experience and mandating certain practices.

This study investigated the perceptions of these personnel in their role as evaluators in early field experiences. 8 cooperating teachers, 7 university supervisors and 8 directors from 8 institutions offering elementary education in a mid-western state were interviewed on the telephone. These interviews were audio-taped. The transcripts were analyzed based on categories developed by four independent raters. Copies of the transcripts were given to the participants for member checks.

The study shows that evaluation in early field experiences is not formative. Dyadic and triadic conferences are not used by the evaluators to communicate their
comments. Directors handle the paperwork, and use the evaluations to lay a paper trail for the student. Cooperating teachers are the primary evaluators but they are uneasy about the evaluation process and their role in it. They do not like grading students, or offering negative evaluations. They expect the university supervisors to support them and share in the evaluation, in which they are often disappointed. The university supervisors are more involved with the activities on campus related to the field experience than in the field itself. They are not proactive as evaluators but more often play the role of troubleshooters. Finally, neither of them is trained specifically in evaluation, though the cooperating teachers have more opportunities than the university supervisors.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Overview

Teaching has been viewed as a science and as an art. Both aspects of teaching imply that, for the professionalization of teacher education, a knowledge base and practice based on theory are integral to teacher education and the practice of the profession. A teacher education program attempts to provide preservice teachers the opportunity to acquire theory and to translate it into practice.

As a science, teacher education has a knowledge base drawn from various disciplines such as psychology, sociology, philosophy and from subject-specific content areas. These contents represent ideologies of the roles of teachers such as teachers as effective skills trainers (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), 1983; Corrigan & Haberman, 1990; National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education, 1985), and the influences teachers are expected to have on their pupils. The basis for an objective examination of professional needs of teachers, which in
turn define the contents of a teacher education program, are derived from research at schools and colleges of education, and from the craft knowledge of the practitioner (Corrigan & Haberman, 1990; Cruickshank, 1985).

On the other hand, many faculty at the university define teaching as an art which requires selection of talented individuals rather than a formal study of pedagogy (Corrigan & Haberman, 1990). In support of this viewpoint, in teacher education the art of teaching has historically been identified with practice, though the elements that make teaching an art are not clearly delineated. The conditions of practice necessary for the profession are fulfilled in the training practices in the field, or practicum. The importance of field experiences in teacher preparation programs has been recognized, resulting in an increasing emphasis on field experiences.

Background of the study

Practicum has been defined as a "course of study designed especially for the preparation of teachers and clinicians that involves the supervised practical application (as in a classroom or clinic) of previously studied theory" (Webster's new collegiate dictionary, 1979, p. 896). It is "an intensive experience in which education students practice professional skills and knowledge" (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), 1992, p. 66). In terms of the taxonomy of teaching, teaching practices can be categorized as to their placement and sequence (Cruickshank & Armaline, 1986). Both NCATE (1992) and National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) (1991) standards, and the standards set by most states, require practicum experiences that are sequential and incremental so
preservice teachers can develop skills which will enable them to assume full responsibility for classroom instruction.

Traditionally, the practicum has consisted of student teaching, which is a period of extended field experience leading to certification, and other field experiences that precede student teaching. Legal routes in promoting the expansion of clinical experiences have three bases: (1) state laws, (2) administrative rules and regulations of state education agencies, which are laws in the absence of a state statute, and (3) federal laws and programs (Edelfelt, Corwin & Burke, 1990; Freiberg & Waxman, 1990; Hawley, 1990). NASDTEC (1989) states that field experiences should be conducted through "cooperative programs in selected schools having well-planned curricula, appropriate teaching materials, and professionally educated staff members with successful teaching experience" (p. 8). Institutions with teacher preparation programs should also make provisions for training and directing the supervisors of these practicum experiences (NASDTEC, 1989).

Defined as preservice educational activities that are required by training institutions, early field experiences are required to occur off campus and prior to student teaching (Webb, Gehrke, Ishler, & Mendoza, 1981). They also involve a collaborative effort among the institution, the organized teaching profession, and the operating schools and school systems (AACTE, 1983; Hedberg, 1979; Webb et al., 1981). Exploratory field experiences are those pre-service education activities, sponsored by the training institution, which occur typically (but not exclusively) in non-university/college environments and which precede student teaching or intern experiences. "Exploratory" includes, but is not limited to, activities relating to career decision making. "Field experiences" include, but are not limited to, activities such as observing, preparing materials, instructing in small groups or large groups, tutoring, and evaluating. Field
settings include sites, typically off-campus, for example, in schools, businesses, and other settings approved by the training institution (Webb et al., 1981).

Since the early 1970's, when these early field experiences became a requirement, almost all teacher education programs in the United States have placed greater emphasis upon early field experiences within their curriculum (AACTE, 1976). Early field experiences have been mandated by many state departments of education with The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) playing a role in setting the number of hours in the professional education curriculum devoted to practical experiences. Of the institutions offering teacher education programs, 99% utilize early field experiences, and of those, 80% require up to 150 contact hours in the field (Ishler & Kay, 1981). Ohio's teacher education students are required to have 300 hours of field and clinical experiences in a sequential program and in a variety of settings prior to student teaching (Bowyer & Van Dyke, 1986). This change in emphasis to field experience is evidenced in a survey of 217 teaching institutions by Farris, Henniger, and Bischoff (1991) which found that nearly one-third had restructured to increase their early field experiences in the last five years. This was reflected in the findings of Howey, Arends, Galluzzo, Yarger and Zimpher (1994) that early field experiences had increased up to 50% in urban teacher education programs between 1990 and 1992.

The assumption has been made by a number of educators that the more hours spent by the students in the classroom in schools the better prepared they will be upon entering the teaching profession (Zeichner, 1980). As a result, pre-student teaching experiences have also been of increasing importance.

For a long time, field experiences have played a part in the history of teacher education. In normal schools, practice teaching was central to the program and fostered
close ties between pedagogical theory and practice (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988). At the university, when schools and colleges of education were established, laboratory schools were part of the plan and made possible observation and student teaching (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990; Lindsay, 1969). Reform movements and different structures of teacher education programs have provided alternative ways of providing practical experience. The extended 5th-year programs emphasize field experiences that begin early, continue through the undergraduate years and culminate in a fifth year or internship (Holmes Group, 1986).

The lack of emphasis on the practicum in liberal arts colleges may well be supported by the claim that practice teaching could be overrated. Studies conducted indicated that direct experience effects little change in the performance of student teachers (Griffen, Barnes, Hughes, O'Neal, Defino, Edwards, & Hukill, 1983; Grossman, 1980) and that preservice teachers are not positively influenced by field experiences (Tanner, 1982).

The personnel who contribute largely to the field experiences and bear the onus of making it meaningful to preservice teachers are the cooperating teachers, university supervisors and directors of field experiences. Cooperating teachers and university supervisors are partners in the supervision and evaluation of preservice teachers. Their roles and responsibilities need to complement each other. These roles and responsibilities sometimes overlap for purposes of emphasis. For example, both cooperating teachers and university supervisors are instructors to preservice teachers. The difference is that cooperating teachers are more closely connected with the daily routine and they decide on the activities in which the preservice teachers should engage. The university supervisors, on the other hand, define the goals of the program and make sure that the activities
achieve these goals. Thus, while both are involved in instructing the preservice teachers, they each have their sphere of influence.

In the handbooks of student teaching developed by the school, colleges and departments of education, the role and responsibilities of the cooperating teachers are more clearly delineated than those of the university supervisors (Williams, Smith, Ramanathan & Lipsett, 1995). Contrarily, the roles of the cooperating teachers are not referred to in the guidelines to field experiences delineated by Association of Teacher Educators (ATE) which describe the criteria for selection of the cooperating teachers (ATE, 1986). The responsibilities themselves need to be derived from what the directors of field experiences and the university supervisors communicate to the cooperating teachers, which makes communication essential if the program is to be successful.

The role of the directors of field experiences in this professional experience is defined in terms of administering the program. As coordinators of the program, it is their duty to identify, select and train both the cooperating teachers and the university supervisors by providing systematic inservice programs (ATE, 1986). More removed from the field than the cooperating teachers and the university supervisors, they manage the supervision program and consult with the university supervisors and cooperating teachers about the progress of the preservice teachers without necessarily being directly involved in the process of supervision (ATE, 1986).

Many questions are inherent in the concept of the roles and responsibilities of supervisors: the control each of them has over the process of supervision; who the decision maker is in instances; where the lines ought to be drawn when responsibilities are duplicated; and how these questions should be resolved.
Communication is of prime importance in this situation. Yet it is the area with the most problems (Applegate & Lasley, 1986; Rekkas, 1995). Supervision should be a collegial effort between the cooperating teachers and the university supervisors to give the preservice teachers the best experience possible, but the terms of the relationship need to be defined (ATE, 1986; NCATE, 1992). Problems abound in the process: the cooperating teachers change too rapidly for the university supervisors to be able to build a rapport with them; cooperating teachers and university supervisors have little time for communication; the low status accorded to the supervision of preservice teachers in the field is a deterrent to the university supervisors since it does not contribute much to their professional advancement (Applegate & Lasley, 1983, 1986; Goodman, 1988).

One method of communication afforded by the directors of field experiences is written statements (NCATE, 1992) detailing the expectations of the university. These handbooks should explain the program, list the goals of the experience, suggest activities and offer insights into the process of supervision. But these handbooks are often inadequate in their explication of the program; the goals of the program are poorly defined (Williams et al., 1995) and the differing interpretations of the cooperating teachers and university supervisors provide for the resulting misunderstandings.

If the practicum is seen as one complete experience, the evaluations in early field experiences, which is process-oriented should be formative in nature. Student teaching should be the only experience to have a summative evaluation which is product-oriented (Andrews & Barnes, 1990). If evaluation is formative, assessment should occur during several phases of the training program (Davis & Zaret, 1984) so the change and progress of the preservice teachers measured and charted in terms of the goals and objectives of the program. The purpose of evaluation should be to highlight to the preservice teachers their
progress in the areas that have been identified as important—planning and organization, and personal characteristics (McIntyre & Norris, 1980). Evaluations during both the mid-semester and the end-semester triadic meetings (conferences involving the cooperating teachers, university supervisors and the preservice teachers) should concentrate on improvement and future goals being clarified and set. Feedback and conferencing are mechanisms in formative evaluation for helping preservice teachers identify strengths and weaknesses in order to improve teaching. The supervisors will also be able to identify aspects of the preservice teachers' professional development that need to be improved.

Summative evaluations, on the other hand, are achievement oriented. The end-term evaluations and conferences are normally summative with the focus on grades and final evaluations. The final results, perhaps in the form of grades, are of importance and the comments are geared towards assessing the preservice teachers. The evaluation form in early field experiences must reflect the goals of the experience and the tasks specified for the preservice teachers, with a focus on suitability and compatibility with the profession, professional attitudes, and behavior (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990).

The role of evaluator, a role in which supervisors are primarily cast (Williams et al., 1995), is a source of confusion for both cooperating teachers and university supervisors. The input that the cooperating teachers have into the evaluation system is procedural and not decision-making. Only in 40% of the cases are the cooperating teachers asked for their input into the evaluation forms that they use, though these forms may be based on activities they define as in their role as instructor (McIntyre & Norris, 1980). The cooperating teachers are expected to provide feedback for the university supervisors, who may not be in the classroom often enough to get a clear picture. Yet the grade is often awarded by the university supervisors, not the cooperating teachers. In
more than 50% of the cases the university supervisors award the final grades while the cooperating teachers are expected to be consulted but do not have the deciding vote (McIntyre & Norris, 1980; Williams et al., 1995).

Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions of the faculty involved in the supervision and evaluation of elementary education preservice teachers during these field experiences. These faculty include cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and directors of field experiences. More specifically, this study investigated (a) the process of the evaluation of elementary education preservice teachers in early field experiences, (b) the perceptions of the evaluation process according to the cooperating teachers, the university supervisors and the directors of field experiences, (c) the differences and similarities between these perceptions, (d) the role expectations of the personnel involved, and (e) the concerns of the evaluators. A description of what cooperating teachers, university supervisors and directors of field experiences believe is happening in the evaluation process in early field experiences, what they would wish for, and their suggestions to validate the process were recorded and analyzed.

Research Questions

The following questions guided this study:

1. How are elementary education preservice teachers in early field experiences evaluated?
2. What are the perceptions of cooperating teachers, university supervisors and university administrators regarding their own roles and responsibilities in the evaluation of elementary education preservice teachers in early field experiences?

3. What are the perceptions of cooperating teachers, university supervisors and university administrators regarding each others' roles and responsibilities in the evaluation of elementary education preservice teachers in early field experiences?

4. What are the similarities in the perceptions of cooperating teachers, university supervisors and university administrators regarding the roles and responsibilities of each of them in the evaluation of elementary education preservice teachers in early field experiences?

5. What are the differences in the perceptions of cooperating teachers, university supervisors and university administrators regarding the roles and responsibilities of each of them in the evaluation of elementary education preservice teachers in early field experiences?

Justification for the study

The importance given to early field experiences makes research necessary to define the process of evaluation and the personnel involved in it. If an early field experience involves up to 300 hours of student time and is often mandated (McIntyre, 1983), it needs to be explained, justified, and supported by research.

Surveys and research that describe the evaluation of preservice teachers essentially deal with the instruments used, the criteria in the instruments, when and how often evaluation is done, and who is involved in the process (McIntyre & Norris, 1980; Ishler &
Kay, 1981; Pape & McIntyre, 1993). Research does not attempt to differentiate between formative and summative evaluation in early field experiences. Nor has research commented on the efficacy of either type of evaluation.

Collaborative work between university supervisors and cooperating teachers is essential if the field experiences, and the evaluation process therein, are to be successful and valid. Both these parties also need to be aware of their roles and responsibilities and the expectations of the university regarding these roles and responsibilities (Williams et al., 1995). Further, the relationship among the parties needs to be specified and explored.

While there is some research on cooperating teachers and university supervisors and their expectations of themselves and of each other (Applegate & Lasley, 1984, 1985, &1986), there is no specific information regarding the performance of duties of directors of field experiences (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990) Nor is there research about their relationship to other parties, that is cooperating teachers and university supervisors.

To understand and analyze this relationship, communication between them is essential (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990). The cooperating teachers, university supervisors and directors of field experiences need to know what is expected of each other and of themselves. Beyond specific written statements regarding functions, cooperating teachers, university supervisors and administrators need to discuss among themselves the personal meanings they attach to role descriptions. Even when such statements exist, the interpretation of each of the participants needs to be explored (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990). There is as yet no research on the perceptions of these three in the evaluation process.

There may be common concerns and points of interest between teacher educators regarding preservice teachers in various areas of education, e. g. elementary and secondary
education. However, some concerns are likely to be specific to areas and to the subject specialization of the preservice teachers. To facilitate formal comparative studies on the roles and responsibilities of cooperating teachers and university supervisors, information needs to be available about the perceptions of the above participants in the process at specific levels such as elementary and secondary and in subject specific areas (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990).

Assumptions

An assumption that was made for this study was that all evaluators understood the evaluation system, were cognizant of their role in it and were able to articulate their role and responsibilities in the process.

Limitations of the study

This study was subject to limitations that are acknowledged below:

1. The method used in this study was a telephone interview. Hence, this study was subject to all the limitations of the method, including an inability to interpret non-verbal gestures and messages.

2. The data depended on the self-reporting of participants. This influenced the data and the trustworthiness of the data.
Definition of terms

For purposes of this study, the following definitions were used:

Cooperating teachers - also known as the affiliated supervisors or the school-based supervisors are licensed practitioners, the teachers to whom teacher education students are assigned. They provide on-site supervision and direction of the education students during field-based assignments (ATE, 1986; NCATE, 1992).

For purposes of this study, this term further referred to classroom teachers teaching Grades 1 to 6 in self-contained classrooms.

Directors of field experiences - or the co-ordinators of professional experiences are the persons designated by the teacher preparation institution as the individuals responsible for coordinating a program of professional experiences (ATE, 1986; Guyton & McIntyre, 1990).

For purposes of this study, the directors of field experiences were persons whose primary and major function was administration, not supervision (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990). In cases where the director of field experience performed the functions of both administrator and supervisor, and no other university supervisor was available, the director was interviewed in both capacities of director and supervisor.

Early field experiences - are those exploratory, preservice education activities sponsored by the training institution, which occur typically (but not exclusively) in non-college/university environments and which precede student teaching or internship (Webb et al., 1981). It is a classroom activity in which the teacher education student gradually assumes the responsibility for the education of the pupils (Stein, 1990).
For purposes of this paper, early field experiences included the first series of experiences that preservice teachers have in the school sites after they have been admitted into the College of Education, as identified by the director of field experiences.

**Elementary Education** - refers to instruction imparted in Grades 1-8 inclusive or 1-6 in districts which have junior high schools (State of Ohio, Department of Education, 1987).

For purposes of this study, Grades 1-6 were considered elementary.

**Evaluation process** includes feedback; pre-conferences to establish criteria for evaluation; post-conferences to share evaluation findings; mid-term and final evaluations; and awarding grades (McIntyre & Norris, 1980; Smith & Alvermann, 1983). This process involves cooperating teachers, university supervisors and preservice teachers.

**Perceptions** - are the insights gained from seeing and understanding the inner nature of things intuitively or by means of the mind, that is, cognitively (Flexner, 1987; Webster's, 1993).

For purposes of this study, perceptions specifically dealt with the participants' understanding of their roles and responsibilities and their relationships to other supervisors, including (but not confined to) how their roles and responsibilities differed from that of other supervisors, how their roles and responsibilities should be interpreted by other personnel, and the barriers to fulfilling their roles and responsibilities.

**Responsibilities** - are any prescribed activities that a cooperating teacher or university supervisor undertakes in reference to early field experiences. For example, in the role of an instructor, a cooperating teacher might be assigned the task of guiding the preservice teacher (Williams et al., 1995).
In the role of an evaluator, the cooperating teacher might conduct extended
conferences with the field experience student and the university supervisor to review mid-
term and final evaluations.

**Roles** - are essential functions performed in early field experiences which are
descriptive of the relationship intended between a cooperating teacher or university
supervisor and a preservice teacher. For example a cooperating teacher might take on the
role of an instructor to a preservice teacher. Some other roles are orienter, facilitator,
counselor, evaluator, and demonstrator (Williams et al., 1995).

For purposes of this study, the role of the evaluator was considered more closely
than the others.

**University supervisors** - also known as campus-based supervisors are members of
the college or university faculty assigned to supervise teacher education students engaged
in professional, field-based experiences (ATE, 1986; NCATE, 1992).
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The increasing importance of early field experiences in teacher education is evidenced by the fact that in an extensive survey of 249 institutions 99% of the programs reported having exploratory field experiences (Ishler & Kay, 1981). Between 1990 and 1992, the increase in programs offering field experiences prior to student teaching shows that more, and not less, importance has been given to this aspect of teacher preparation (Howey et al., 1994). The areas in early field experiences researched to a certain degree are the effects of early field experiences on preservice teachers, the activities in early field experience programs, and the roles and responsibilities of the participants of field experiences (i.e., the cooperating teachers, university supervisors and preservice teachers). On the whole, the amount of research available on early field experiences is meager and inconclusive about the different variables.

While there is little information on roles and responsibilities of cooperating teacher, university supervisors and preservice teachers in early field experiences (Applegate & Lasley, 1983, 1984, & 1985; Lasley, Applegate & Ellison, 1986), the topic
has been reasonably well-researched in student teaching, which has a longer history in teacher education than does early field experiences (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990). Information from research on student teaching can be extrapolated to inform early field experiences with considerations such as the differences in the goals, the activities of the two programs, and the differing profiles of early field experience students and student teachers being taken into account.

In this chapter, research on early field experiences is summarized to provide a background for the study. The roles and responsibilities of the cooperating teachers, the university supervisors and the directors of field experiences in the evaluation of preservice teachers, in field experiences in general, and in early field experiences in particular, are examined. The process of evaluation in student teaching and in early field experiences are compared and contrasted to see what can be understood from the former to help explicate the latter program in more depth.

Research on early field experiences

Description of early field experience programs

Early field experiences occur essentially prior to student teaching and are typically offered to freshman and sophomores. The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), has played a role in setting the number of hours in the professional education curriculum devoted to practical experiences (Bowyer & Van Dyke, 1986). The actual hours required in early field experiences vary widely from 300 hours as recommended by the state of Ohio to 40 hours as required by Washington and North Dakota (Bowyer & Van Dyke, 1986; NASDTEC, 1991; Stein, 1990; Tamashiro,
Callahan, Adams & Snook, 1982). There is a great variety of programs. On the one hand are those that require preservice teachers to observe beginning the third week of the semester and continue for approximately twelve weeks with the students observing one class period per week or for one and a half hours a day (Ridout, Riehl, de Graaf, Ardrey, Dooley & Holz, 1995; Thompson, 1984). At the other end of the spectrum are programs that provide for preservice teachers to be on site once a week for the entire day (Heinemann, Obi, Pagano & Weiner, 1992).

As for the context of field experiences, those in low socioeconomic status schools seem to elicit the most positive attitudes from early field experience students. Such experiences lay claim to the best achievement and strongest long-term outcomes from preservice students (Malone, 1984).

Early field experiences are designed as part of education courses and are usually associated with general education and methods courses (Ishler & Kay, 1981; Malone, 1984). General education course field experiences tend to be more effective than those in methods courses and to develop preservice teachers attitudes and achievement while methods courses best develop preservice teacher teaching behaviors and long-range skills and attitudes (Malone, 1984).

Curriculum in early field experiences does not have a wide range of content areas. Reading and skills development in reading are the most frequently taught subject areas by preservice teachers in early field experiences, followed by mathematics and the language arts (Dowhower, 1990; Goodman, 1985). In relation to the areas of concentration, elementary education majors are more likely than secondary education majors to be involved in early field experiences, to acquire more contact hours in schools, to have a
more gradual induction into teaching, and to receive more guidance and correction concerning their work (McIntyre & Killian, 1986).

Goals of early field experience programs

Guidelines to the practicum in teacher education (ATE, 1986) state very clearly what the goals of early field experience should be. Early field experiences are a time when preservice education students should interact with culturally diverse and exceptional populations as well as observe, plan, and practice according to previously learned knowledge (Goodman, 1986; NCATE, 1992). The goals of early field experiences, however, are usually not stated precisely or clearly articulated. They can be derived from the activities that preservice teachers are involved in and from the variables of research that are integral to the experience.

Of the studies that relate to the goals of early field experiences, the series of studies by Applegate and Lasley (1983, 1984, 1985 & 1986) detailed the expectations of each member of the triad - the cooperating teachers, the university supervisors and the preservice teachers. These afford an interpretation of the goals of the early field experiences regarding the professionalism, initiative and enthusiasm, teaching behaviors and attitudes, adaptability and diversity and multicultural approach the program should provide for the preservice teachers.

Reports that documented benefits of early field experiences identified a number of advantages to early field experience including: (a) a time for exploration by the prospective teacher to evaluate career decisions and their attitudes about teaching, (b) the opportunity for preservice teachers to polish their teaching skills, and (c) assessment of students' pedagogical potential (McIntyre & Norris, 1980). The first objective finds
support in NCATE's (1992) recommendation that students should be monitored and counseled where necessary and Goodlad's (1990) suggestion that at the end of the first year of their two-year program, the students should be reviewed and the unsuitable candidates should be counseled out of the program.

With regards to the second objective of demonstration of teaching skills, McIntyre's review of related literature (1984), identified personal goals and institutional or programmatic goals. In the perception of preservice teachers, the practicum is a chance to prepare for the student teaching practice in the third year, and an opportunity to demonstrate skills (Evans, 1986).

This goal is reflected in the purpose of early field experience from the viewpoint of the institution which is to provide prospective teachers opportunities to polish their teaching skills before entering student teaching (Evans, 1986; Goodman, 1986; Henry, 1983). This objective is supported by Heath and Cyphert's survey of 174 institutions (1985) which indicated that the goals of the program were teaching experience and skill development. To improve inquiry skills was again an instructional goal identified by McIntyre (1984). Institutional goals are supported by another study by Thompson (1984) which identified the purpose of the observation-participation program as being to increase the amount of involvement of the students of the College of Education in a teaching-learning situation. Dependent upon the setting, students are and should be exposed to a wide range of professional practice and have the opportunity to learn about discipline practices, exceptionalities, and teaching techniques in subject matter areas (Goodman, 1986; Securro & Owen, 1982).

Classroom situations on which to build theoretical knowledge should be provided (Erdman, 1983). The preservice teachers see early field experiences as opportunities to
develop and practice the pedagogy which had been taught to them on campus (Becher & Ade, 1982), proving that preservice teachers are more concerned about what they can do and learn than with what someone else can already do. But often the opportunities for interacting with school administrators or different teachers in particular courses are limited (Securro & Owen, 1982).

The third goal concerning the potential of preservice teachers to teach as evaluated by college and university officials, is not achieved due to inadequate assessment systems and procedures (McIntyre, 1984; Passe, 1994). This may point to the often repeated chant that teacher educators are out of touch with the real world, including that of their students. This may have a direct relation to the goal of involvement of teachers more directly in teacher preparation (Henry, 1983).

Early field experiences should also quicken the development of student to teacher, and to help student's concerns veer from self-survival to pupil-centredness (McIntyre, 1984). On a personal level, the preservice teachers were expected to explore their attitudes about children and teaching, and to be reflective (Goodman, 1986). General education courses tend to develop preservice teachers' attitudes and achievement whereas methods courses improve teaching behaviors of teachers and long range skills (Malone, 1984).

Research in which goals were implicit in the variables was more inclined to deal with the attitude of preservice teachers than with teaching skills (Deeds & Barrick, 1985; Sacay, 1972; Sunal, 1980). The accent of research on attitudes (Deeds & Barrick, 1985; Sunal, 1980) is contrary to Heath and Cyphert's finding (1985) that attitude is not a goal of early field experience. This points to the fact that the connection between the activities and the goals of the program is tenuous and not well-established.
Contradictions have been highlighted by studies on personal goals regarding career plans. Early field experiences are to help preservice teachers make career decisions (Henry, 1983); but Willems, Brown and Arth (1982) found that the decision made by preservice teachers to become teachers was made well before the early field experiences, and these experiences did not influence their decision to take up teaching. Yet teacher educators ranked this goal very high (Lewis, 1993) which probably underscores the allegation that teacher educators do not know their preservice teachers very well.

On the whole, though the literature raises questions concerning goals of early field experience (Holmes, 1990), they are not satisfactorily answered. University programs do not always interpret national and professional guidelines clearly. Nor are students overly aware of the related purpose and goals of field experience though they are in the syllabi, in the printed guidelines for field experiences, and are discussed during orientation (Securro & Owen, 1982).

Initial investigation surrounding early field experiences has revealed that although there continues to be a strong consensus regarding the value of early field experiences, there is still a great deal of confusion about program purpose, organization, and goals (Bischoff, Farris & Henniger, 1988; Evans, 1986; McIntyre, 1986; Paese, 1987; Southall & Dumas, 1981). This is evidenced in the survey by Ishler and Kay (1981) which revealed that 25% of the institutions have no stated objectives for early field experiences. Beset with problems, the need for and the success of field experiences have been questioned by many scholars (Zeichner & Liston, 1987).
Activities in early field experiences

Activities in early field experiences range from observation in which the preservice teachers are passive learners, to teaching a class, an activity in which preservice teachers are engaged in wholly. Given this wide variety available, it is not surprising that early field experience programs are unique, with accents of their own, especially with regard to the activities prescribed.

The activities that preservice teachers engage in are both instructional, having to do with the act of teaching, including planning, and non-instructional, having to do with professional advancement and non-academic activities.

Usually the first early field experience is provided during the generic first few visitations when the preservice teachers are involved almost entirely with observing the activities of the teacher and the students. Ninety percent of the institutions in a survey reported observation as an activity required of the preservice teachers (Ishler & Kay, 1981; Thompson, 1984).

In keeping with the goal that making career decisions is an objective of early field experiences, many of the activities in early field experiences are geared towards providing preservice teachers with a taste of a teacher's responsibilities and are reflective of the time a teacher spends on non-instructional tasks. The highest report is of non-instructional tasks such as student periodic reporting of field experiences (95%), completing non-instructional tasks (91%), operating media (86%), assessing student activity and characteristics (85%). Other activities of a similar nature include supervising extracurricular activities, assessing teacher characteristics, reviewing education literature, supervising laboratory work and field trips, and planning non-instructional activities (Ishler & Kay, 1981).
Extensive surveys reported that the most frequent instructional activities include tutoring (98%), planning instruction (84%) and designing instructional materials (82%) (Bates & Hutchinson, 1984; Ishler & Kay, 1981; Southall & Dumas, 1981). In accordance with the foremost objective of early field experiences, the activities recommended for, and those that the preservice teachers engage in, are all geared towards getting them ready for student teaching. The ultimate outcome for preservice teachers in early field experience is to become a participant in the classroom through tutoring, leading discussions and demonstrating problem-solving procedures (Thompson, 1984).

Preservice teachers view the practicum as a chance to prepare for student teaching. This preparation includes coping, learning to discipline and 'deal with children,' and developing competence in teaching (Evans, 1986).

They also see the practicum as an opportunity to demonstrate skills. A study showed that during the first lessons they taught the early field experience students spent time on the following activities: 28% in management, 20% instruction, 52% activity, 20% engaged motor, 17% (academic learning time), and 25% feedback. During the next lessons they increased time on activity, engaged motor, academic learning time and feedback and required less time to be spent on management. (Paese, 1987). Early field experiences established a focus on instructional tasks and the preservice teachers were able to register an increase in active learning time and in feedback, thus getting prepared to teach in student teaching.

Besides causing the field experiences to be viewed as "apprenticeship experience" (Dewey, 1965), this focus on demonstrating skills has its effect on the preservice teachers. Reflection, which is the means of benefiting from experiences, is pre-empted by this more immediate and practical concern of acquiring techniques (Evans, 1986). In general, field
experiences in teacher education fail to enhance students' reflectivity, contributing to their passivity as they learn how to fit into already-established traditional school patterns (Goodman, 1986; Tabachnick, 1980; Zeichner, 1981-82).

Early field experience students teach certain lessons because the cooperating teacher tells them to teach them, or because that specific lesson is next in line. A third reason for teaching a lesson is that the lesson is required by the curriculum standards set by the school district (Goodman, 1986). The content is then dictated not by what the preservice teachers think should be taught based on their knowledge of theories of curriculum, but by expediency. Subject to the control of the cooperating teachers, the reality of curriculum practices and a lack of ability to take charge of their teaching, early field experience students feel the pressure to "teach to the test" (Goodman, 1985).

Though the avowed purpose of early field experiences is to provide preservice teachers an opportunity to teach, early field experience activities engaged in by five percent or less of responding institutions are teaching mini-lessons (5%), team teaching (4%), teaching total class (2%), and determining pupils' grades (1%) (Ishler, & Kay, 1981). Attending professional meetings (3%) and participating in parent conferences (1%) are not of major importance in early field experiences, either.

Various instructional methods are used to provide these experiences in early field experiences. Some activities likely to promote later active involvement include role-playing, simulations, discussions of realistically filmed classroom settings, and interviews with former student teachers (Killian & McIntyre, 1986a).

While a comprehensive list of activities that preservice teachers engage in has been complied by researchers, there is little evidence to show the relevance of each if them. Nor has it been determined which activities are more important for early field experience
students to perform. These activities and their level of importance are not corroborated by research.

Reactions to and effects of early field experiences

Some of the goals identified for early field experiences seem to be achieved by the programs. The reaction to early field experiences has been uniformly positive. Preservice teachers agree that the practicum is an important part of their training, and that they would recommend the practicum to another student (Lignugaris/Kraft & Marchand-Martella, 1993). The teacher candidates feel that worthwhile experiences occur more than half the time; some even feel they occur more than 75% of the time (Sacay, 1972).

In relation to the goal of career identification, the gains of early field experiences are positive. Preservice teachers achieve clarity in the direction their teaching should take. For example, there may be an increase in the participants’ perceived preference to teach in lower elementary and a decrease in the participants’ perceived preference to teach in upper elementary (Anderson, 1987).

The goals of familiarization of preservice teachers with teaching also seems to be achieved in early field experiences. Preservice teachers agree that they learn a great deal about teaching and show a slight, though not significant, ability to teach (Anderson, 1987; Lignugaris/Kraft & Marchand-Martella, 1993).

An overwhelming majority feel adequately prepared in their area of certification and for teaching in multicultural settings (Peek, 1985). The students are more sure of their preparation and more comfortable with themselves, in all areas, after the 5-week field experience than before it (Feitler & Argyle, 1990).
Early field experiences do positively influence cognitive attainment in subsequent methods of teaching coursework (Denton, 1982). While field experiences may not significantly change student concerns about teaching particular subject areas, student attitudes about content areas and content-specific teaching can be significantly improved if the school implements a new program and the subject area has a high priority in their teaching (Strawitz & Malone, 1986).

Killian and McIntyre (1986b) studied the effects of early field experiences on management techniques of preservice teachers to find that the elementary education majors became more humanistic during the first stage of the field experience and more custodial during their student teaching experience. The same trend, though not statistically significant in the latter case, is apparent for the secondary preservice teachers. This move to a custodial approach was supported by Harty, Andersen and Enochs (1984). In their study field-based teachers were significantly more custodial in their pupil control ideology than teachers in the campus-based program.

Early field experiences seem to help preservice teachers to go through their “reality shock” during their initial quarter in the field. Preservice teachers were more aware of the role expected of a teacher, and consequently approached student teaching with significantly more questions and conflict than those who had not spent time in the field. They also became more positive on self-concept by the end of student teaching than those without previous field experience (Scherer, 1979).

Early field experiences have a positive effect on student teachers. Those who had participated in prior field experience achieved significantly higher confidence ratings and received significantly higher competence ratings by university supervisors and cooperating teachers. It is possible that the more experienced student teachers had a higher level of
compliance with the socialization expectations of the supervisors, enabling them to get better results (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1993).

The effect of early field experiences in which reflectivity of the preservice teachers is promoted has also been studied. The journals of the preservice teachers revealed that preservice teachers with early field experiences journaled more insightfully about their teaching experiences. The treatment group questionnaire responses demonstrated an increased reflectivity and decisiveness compared to the control group (Volkman, Scheffler & Dana, 1992). The treatment group wrote more, in greater detail and depth, and with more analysis and application of a variety of issues that affect schooling success than did the control group. The treatment group analyzed themselves more deeply in terms of understanding differences between their culture and their students' cultures. In the control group, there were only 13 instances of hypotheses being generated, in the case of the experimental group, there were 124 hypotheses generated (Farber & Armaline, 1992).

The number of early field experiences that preservice teachers have has an effect on their attitudes and skills. Preservice teachers who received two courses with related field experiences, which is a moderate number of experiences, exhibit more positive attitudes, superior student teaching behaviors and better achievement than preservice teachers receiving few field experiences. Conversely, exposure of students to many field experiences appears to dramatically diminish previous gains on desired outcomes. Preservice teachers with three or more courses with related field experiences have less positive attitudes, inferior student teaching behaviors and poorer achievement than those participating in a moderate amount of field experience (Malone, 1984).

Henry (1983) found a greater percentage of student teachers having fewer field experiences felt adequate to write and teach a behavioral objective. The following
problems were experienced more often by the student teachers who had fewer field experiences: personal adjustment, supervising teacher relationships, planning, pupil relationships and subject preparation. On the other hand, a greater percentage of student teachers who had increased field experiences felt more adequate to assist pupils with reading difficulties and to teach handicapped students. The two groups were virtually identical in reporting discipline as their major problem. Apart from the frequency of the programs, one conclusion that was arrived at was that a small number of high quality, well-planned experiences were more effective than numerous poorly-planned placements (Applegate & Lasley, 1983).

Tension and stress are frequently associated with field experiences. But preliminary findings suggested that field experiences alone do not increase stress levels for students. Grades, coursework and long hours were ranked first to third as sources of stress. Further, as the reported stress levels of the preservice teachers declined, the level of satisfaction they felt with the university declined, suggesting that the preservice teachers became more critical as they got more used to the program and the experiences, and expected more of the university and the program (Feitler & Argyle, 1990).

All effects of early field experiences are not positive. In contradiction, a study by Lewis (1993) found little support from the respondents on reflective practice and action research, reforms that are in the thick of the mainstream discourse on teacher education. Grossman (1980) reports that in the areas of self-confidence, ability to work with others, and professional attitude, preservice teachers with the least field experience prior to student teaching were rated significantly higher than the students with field experience, providing proof that field experiences are not always a learning experience for preservice teachers. This is quoted as an argument for laboratory and on-campus experiences which
are claimed to promote teacher behavior, affect and understanding (Metcalf & Kahlich, 1996).

On the other hand, if pupil control ideologies tend to return to pre-field experience levels by the end of student teaching, this raises questions about the short-lived influence early field experiences have on preservice teachers. This in turn provides support for advocates of laboratory experiences under controlled circumstances where it is possible to make a more focused effort to change the attitudes of the preservice teachers. If pupil control ideology is relatively impervious to the influences of the field or the campus, then it is the ideology that the prospective teacher brings with him/her that becomes crucial to the kind of teacher he/she will become rather than experiences provided by the practicum (Killian & McIntyre, 1986b).

Early field experiences impact not only the preservice teachers but all the others who are involved, especially the cooperating teachers and the pupils in the classroom. Early field experience students aid the cooperating teachers by assisting them with paperwork, developing materials, and grading assignments. They increase pupils' learning by tutoring them, helping motivate students, and working with small groups and individuals. On the whole, they add a positive influence to the classroom atmosphere (Martin & Wood, 1983; Peek, 1985).

Roles and Responsibilities of the Cooperating Teacher

Student teaching

The importance of the role of cooperating teachers has increased with the accent on collaboration and site-based teacher education but few states have any guidelines for
cooperating teachers. Though the ATE guidelines (1986) call for collaborative organizational structures and cooperative decision-making, such structures, if they exist at all, are only in the realm of ideas and not in practice, even in the 46% of the schools, departments and colleges of education that have written contracts with cooperating teachers (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990).

From the beginning of student teaching to the end, the triadic relationship is more competitive than cooperative (Yee, 1967) in spite of the fact that the ATE guidelines (1986) call for collaborative structures. Agreement concerning the essential function of cooperating teachers has not been forthcoming through national efforts to standardize the roles and responsibilities of student teaching participants. NCATE standards require only that the roles and responsibilities of cooperating teachers and university supervisors must be, "delineated in negotiated written statements" (NCATE, 1992, p.51). Similarly the 1986 Association of Teacher Educator's national guidelines (1986) contain only general descriptions of the tasks for cooperating teachers and university supervisors, advancing no specific tasks (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990). Typical of the ATE guidelines (1986) are statements such as, "establish and maintain open channels of communication" (p. 17). Guyton and McIntyre (1990) point out that such broad statements promote a variety of interpretations by members of the triad who bring individual role expectations to their experience.

Members of the triad typically hold conflicting views regarding the roles of cooperating teachers and university supervisors. A survey by Grimmett and Ratzlaff (1986) revealed that student teachers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors disagreed in 35 of 50 categories defining the tasks of cooperating teachers. Where they did agree, participants perceived the role of cooperating teachers to include tasks of
evaluation, orientation, and professional development and assistance in planning and instruction. The findings of Grimmett and Ratzlaff (1986) confirmed similar findings from previous studies by Castillo (1971) and Copas (1984). Although their specific findings varied, each study revealed conflicting perceptions among members of the triad regarding the role of the cooperating teacher.

The handbooks designed by the university appear to provide little assistance in helping cooperating teachers and university supervisors understand their essential purposes in student teaching, including the kind of relationship they are expected to develop with each other and student teachers. Five of the 61 handbooks included formal role statements for both cooperating teachers and university supervisors. None of these five contained definitions of the stated roles. An average of 13.7 statements per handbook related to the tasks of cooperating teachers and an average of 6.5 statements per handbook related to the tasks of university supervisors. This suggests that a rather limited amount of information, concerning participants and their responsibilities, is available in student teaching materials (Williams et al., 1995).

In an effort to delineate roles and responsibilities of cooperating teachers as expected by university supervisors, a study of student teaching handbooks was conducted by Williams et al. (1995). The results showed that the tasks assigned to cooperating teachers cast these individuals primarily in the roles of evaluator, instructor, and orienter. The role of evaluator seems to focus on formal and informal critiquing of the student teacher's performance, including a strong emphasis on the process of formal midterm and final evaluations. The responsibilities of instructor include practical concerns such as organizing student teaching experiences; assisting student teachers with planning; and mentoring them in the craft of teaching. The one direct responsibility that the cooperating
A major role that cooperating teachers are expected to play in student teaching is that of an evaluator (Williams et al., 1995) and the process of evaluation includes a variety of responsibilities. They design the evaluation forms, conduct mid-term and final conferences, and award grades (McIntyre & Norris, 1980; Williams et al., 1995). Cooperating teachers are mainly involved with formative evaluation and a large part of the evaluation takes the form of conferences (Grimmett & Ratzlaff, 1986). In the process they evaluate continuously and are less formal than university supervisors, jotting down notes that they share with the student teachers at the end of the session. Most feedback is provided on a daily basis at the end of a schoolday, typically in a session lasting five minutes or less. The most common places where feedback occurs are in classrooms, hallways, and the cafeteria (Wilkins-Canter, 1996).

Some cooperating teachers 'hit everything' since time is short; others are selective and focused (O'Neal, 1983). The topics most frequently discussed are discipline, instruction and student concerns. Both written and oral feedback are provided. The former is structured, professional and available for reference at a further date, though it is not immediate, an advantage that oral feedback has (Wilkins-Canter, 1996). But there is little research-based information on the feedback mechanism to prove that a particular method is more effective than any other.

As evaluators, the cooperating teachers have traditionally had a problem evaluating the student teachers with whom they get very personal. This lack of distance from the objective has an influence on the cooperating teachers when grades have to be allotted.
Studies show that they make few evaluative remarks; most are descriptive and explanatory, implicitly telling the student teachers what quality teaching is (Zimpher, de Voss & Nott, 1980).

In fact, the high grades that student teachers are awarded in the student teaching are a source of concern. But these grades may be due to many causes other than evaluator bias. Incompetent or marginal students may have been counseled out before student teaching. Early field experiences may account for high grades since prior experience may add to expertise (Defino, 1983). Since the grading issue is thorny, it is often not brought out into the open or challenged by the participants.

The value of cooperating teachers' assessment of student teachers is questionable since they tend to avoid negative remarks and critical evaluation in assessing the work of student teachers (Zimpher, de Voss & Nott, 1980). Further, cooperating teachers tend to write positive evaluations of student teachers without even observing them thoroughly and extensively (Fink, 1976). This leads McIntyre (1984) to suggest cooperating teachers should not be given sole responsibility for the evaluation of student teachers. Although their contribution both in time and effort to the student teaching experience is greater than that of the university supervisors, the final responsibility for the success of the student teaching experience should not rest solely with the cooperating teachers (McIntyre, 1984).

Early field experiences

The roles and responsibilities of the triad in a field experience, that is, cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and preservice teachers, have been well-documented in the case of student teaching (Copas, 1984; Grimmett & Ratzlaff, 1986; McIntyre & Norris, 1980; Su, 1992a). But few studies look at it in early field experiences.
Expectations of cooperating teachers and university supervisors have been researched (Applegate & Lasley, 1983, 1984, 1985 & 1986; Lasley, Applegate & Ellison, 1986), but the role definition for the university supervisors and the cooperating teachers remains unclear (Kagan & Warren, 1992). No special requirements for cooperating teachers are listed, thus leaving a desired profile vague (Howey et al., 1994).

Heads of units in schools, departments and colleges of education support the roles of cooperating teachers remaining vested primarily in the traditional responsibilities of supervision of student teaching and early field experiences (Howey et al., 1994). As in student teaching, in 75% of the cases the cooperating teachers are expected to supervise, evaluate and instruct preservice teachers (Farris et al., 1991). The expectations of the cooperating teachers themselves are concerned with teacher roles as instructors and they would like to be involved in the teaching that the preservice teachers practice, suggesting topics for the teaching units (Applegate & Lasley, 1986; Tamashiyo et al., 1982).

Considering the activities that preservice teachers are expected to be engaged in, namely, observation and tutoring (Ishler & Kay, 1981), cooperating teachers need to be demonstrators, models and managers. They demonstrate techniques and methods for the preservice teachers to observe and follow. They are managers who make it possible for the preservice teachers to teach and tutor small groups of pupils. They play the part of instructors who can discuss the planning and execution of lesson and units with the preservice teachers.

Before instruction can take place, preservice teachers need to be oriented to the school and its environs. To be focused and in line with the program, cooperating teachers recognize the need to be familiar with the goals of the program (Tamashiyo et al., 1982).
In this, as in other areas, they would appreciate more help from the university supervisors than they are getting (Applegate & Lasley, 1986).

It is not surprising that the cooperating teachers feel uncomfortable as supervisors and teachers of preservice teachers (O’Neal, 1983). In very few instances are cooperating teachers given any training to identify what the goals of the program are (Ishler & Kay, 1981). In about 50% of the cases, cooperating teachers are introduced to the objectives of early field experiences, given an overview of the program requirements and afforded an explanation of the assignments set for the preservice teachers and of the evaluation procedures. They are introduced to university supervisory personnel and to the role definition for site personnel. But this effort is more an orientation than training in nature (Ishler & Kay, 1981). This is in spite of the fact that cooperating teachers recognize the need for training and 77% of cooperating teachers recommend on-site orientation sessions as the best means of communicating program information (Tamashiro et al., 1982).

Cooperating teachers report wishing to have more control over the experience by expressing the desire to have some choice in the preservice teachers who get placed in their classrooms (Tamashiro et al., 1982). They favor the preservice teachers maintaining a proper relation with them, and approve of preservice teachers and university supervisors visiting the site before the early field experiences and following it up with telephone calls (Sacay, 1972; Tamashiro et al., 1982).

As managers of the preservice teachers’ experiences on-site, cooperating teachers need to organize the experiences of the preservice teachers and assess their performance and ability (Applegate & Lasley, 1983). In successful program, in their role as managers or facilitators cooperating teachers provide good experiences for the preservice teachers (Rekkas, 1995).
A primary function is to provide opportunities for the preservice teachers to practice teaching skills and freedom and responsibility to work with pupils (Rekkas, 1995). In the role of instructor, cooperating teachers provide gradual increase from one-on-one to small group instruction to ease the preservice teachers into the mode of teaching and have suggestions for lesson plans and make the preservice teachers feel welcome (Rekkas, 1995).

Concern for cooperating teachers as instructors is reflected in the preservice teachers' expectation of getting practical ideas and insights from the cooperating teachers (Applegate & Lasley, 1983). They regard the cooperating teachers as a source of ideas for planning lessons or of gaining administrative information rather than one who clarifies and explains what s/he does. They ask her/him 'how to' rather than 'why' question (Evans, 1986).

At the first field experiences, the interaction of preservice teachers with cooperating teachers includes general education discussions, planning and preparation, and about the cooperating teacher's teaching and management. In the next phase of the field experience, secondary education majors discuss general education and the professional aspects of the job more with cooperating teachers, while elementary education majors discuss more teaching and management with cooperating teachers (McIntyre & Killian, 1986).

Specifically, preservice teachers expect cooperating teachers to be models of professional practice (Applegate & Lasley, 1983). Teacher educators, too, deem it important to cultivate master teachers or expert teachers in field settings who would serve as mentors or role models to student teachers (Lewis, 1993). But the effect of all this effort is cast into doubt by Becher and Ade (1982) who found that the cooperating
teacher's role as a model and innovator does not have any effect on the final ratings of the preservice teachers. This is reinforced by Killian and McIntyre's finding (1986b) that preservice teachers are more influenced by ideology that they bring into their classroom than by what they learn in the program.

The effect of preservice teachers in the classroom is seen in the responsibilities of cooperating teachers as teachers to their own pupils. As a result of the preservice teacher's presence in their classrooms, the cooperating teachers use small groups more often and more individualization is possible. They tutor pupils with greater frequency spend more time with pupils with special needs (Martin & Wood, 1983).

Following a pattern apparent in student teaching, a third major role that the cooperating teachers play in early field experiences is that of evaluator. University supervisors expect cooperating teachers to assess preservice teachers (Lasley, Applegate & Ellison, 1986). However, a description of the role and the responsibilities entailed are not detailed. Extrapolating from the literature on student teaching, the evaluation must be formative; cooperating teachers need to provide feedback at midterm and end-term conferences; cooperating teachers must be responsible for grading, probably jointly with the university supervisors.

The positive effects of training on cooperating teachers have been established by research. Training for the cooperating teachers could affect the cooperating teachers' behavior and provide them ways of dealing with the demands of the situation. It has resulted in more effective and efficient early field experiences. Preservice teachers are more likely to have active, sequential and systematically evaluated experiences with trained cooperating teachers (Killian & McIntyre, 1986a). Training of cooperating teachers also ensures that preservice teachers are more engaged in teaching full groups,
prepare and plan more, and have more interactions with pupils (Killian & McIntyre, 1985; 1987). A more sequenced program and experience also provides the cooperating teachers more chances of following through the suggestions made at pre- and post-observational conferences. They also provide more feedback, which makes them more effective evaluators.

In spite of such strong motivation, training for the cooperating teachers is not easily achieved. Only 43 out of 240 institutions surveyed by Ishler and Kay (1981) provided training for their site personnel so that cooperating teachers trained in the evaluation of preservice teachers would be rare. Fifteen years later the situation was not very different. Training is provided for cooperating teachers in more than 50% of institutions but it is minimal and does not deal with specific roles and responsibilities (Heath & Cyphert, 1985).

In very few instances are cooperating teachers given any training to identify what the goals of the program are and how they relate to the process of evaluation, though it has been established that training does have a positive effect on cooperating teachers (Killian & McIntyre, 1985; 1987). Further, the cooperating teachers are qualified and trained to supervise. Evaluation is another matter entirely for which they may be not be trained.

If the program depends on the cooperating teachers or the university supervisors being a deciding factor in the graduation and certification of the student, they must be given rigorous training in evaluation especially in feedback techniques and in identifying competencies that can be expected of student teachers (Faire, 1994). The literature, especially in early field experiences, does not detail the kind of training that would help
cooperating teachers or university supervisors in their role as evaluator. The elements of the experience and the training schedule have not been explained.

In playing the role of cooperating teachers, these supervisors come up against problems of which some are related to external factors and others to personal factors. Finding the time to interact with preservice teachers is a responsibility that the cooperating teachers are not able to meet to their satisfaction (Applegate & Lasley, 1983).

While structuring the program and planning the experiences for the preservice teachers, the cooperating teachers are constrained by two factors. The attitude of preservice teachers which is reflected in their attendance and tardiness influences the activities in which they are engaged (Applegate & Lasley, 1986). The preservice teachers' lack of teaching skills make it difficult for the cooperating teachers to provide opportunities for the preservice teachers to be instructors or to interact with the pupils (Applegate & Lasley, 1984). The preservice teachers are thus unable to take advantage of and gain experience from a complete and holistic program.

The fundamental problem that cooperating teachers have in early field experiences is that their work in the field is not adequately respected or rewarded. This is especially significant considering that schools are not very willing to work with early field experience students and with student teachers (Howey et al., 1992). The value placed on the cooperating teachers and the part they play in the field experiences is very low when seen in the light of the remuneration offered to them. Nor does there seem to be a change in the status. In 60% of the institutions surveyed their remuneration had not changed in ten years (Black, 1979)!

In spite of the important and essential work the cooperating teachers do, clinical faculty are not held in high esteem. The profile of the cooperation teachers must be
sharpened and their standing heightened. This can be achieved by a clearer definition of the role they play in early field experiences.

Roles and Responsibilities of the University Supervisor

Student teaching

The responsibilities of university supervisors are more clearly laid out in the guidelines by ATE (1986) than those of the cooperating teachers. These include establishing and maintaining collegial relations with school, orienting all those concerned with the goals of the program and selecting cooperating teachers (ATE, 1986). But the place and value of university supervisors in student teaching is difficult to define given the varied conclusions of individuals who have investigated this subject. Opinions as to the importance of the university supervisor range from the assertion that they make no unique or vital contribution to a student teacher's success (Morris, 1974) to claims that they improve a student teacher's performance (Zahorik, 1988) and that they are an essential component of student teaching (McIntyre, 1984).

The status of the supervision itself is in question when full professors at large universities opt out of supervision duties that are turned over to adjuncts and doctoral students (Goodlad, 1990). Given less attention than the cooperating teacher in student teaching handbooks, the university supervisor is cast primarily in the role of evaluator and secondarily in the roles of instructor, facilitator, and orienter. In contrast, Enz, Freeman and Wallin (1996) found that the role of the mentor or instructor was ranked as most important by all three members of the triad. This difference in interpretation of the role of the university supervisor points to a source of confusion - the role and the emphasis on
responsibilities that the university places on university supervisors are different from the perceptions and requirements of the triad itself.

The responsibilities of the university supervisor differ in the perceptions of the triad. For example, while providing seminars that provide a link between theoretical courses on campus and the practical aspects of student teaching are deemed important by student teachers, the cooperating teachers view it as less important and the university supervisors even less so (Enz, Freeman & Wallin, 1996). This discrepancy might explain in part why the student teachers often fail to find satisfaction with their university supervisors.

Preservice teachers spend more time with the cooperating teachers than with the university supervisors during student teaching (Glickman & Bey, 1990) which makes it difficult for the university supervisors to be on an equal footing with the student teachers. University supervisors, by contrast, tend to depend on their weekly seminars to take up points of interest and hold a conference only now and then. But these conferences, which are appreciated by student teachers (O’Neal, 1983), are held at the convenience of the university supervisors and not when the student teachers need it or the cooperating teachers perceive a need for it (Funk, Hoffman, Keithley & Long, 1982). Student teachers feel that while university supervisors provide more evaluative feedback to the preservice teachers than the cooperating teachers, they would be more helpful if they observed different subjects at different times of the day and spend longer periods in the classroom with the preservice teachers (O’Neal, 1983).

The tasks predominating in the role of evaluator are essentially the same as the cooperating teacher’s evaluative tasks: to conference; to provide feedback; and to prepare periodic written evaluations (Williams et al., 1995). This is supported by Enz, Freeman
and Wallin's (1996) findings that providing feedback to student teachers, and facilitating feedback conferences among the triad are primary tasks of the university supervisors. Yet in this again the supervisors differ from the student teachers in defining the responsibility of the university supervisor. The former feel that they should confer privately regarding the progress of the student. On the other hand, the student teachers do not see the necessity for such a conference but would like to see the university supervisors assist the cooperating teachers in writing an evaluative narrative (Enz, Freeman & Wallin, 1996).

University supervisors report different views of their importance, seemingly based on their role perceptions. When university supervisors perceive their role to be evaluative, they experience little satisfaction or accomplishment in their work (Koehler, 1984). However, when university supervisors consider their role to be one of providing intellectual, professional and emotional support to student teachers, they experience a strong sense of satisfaction and efficacy (Koehler, 1984).

Considering the amount and depth of confusion that surrounds the goals and objectives of a field experience, it would not be surprising to find that the cooperating teachers and university supervisors, the former more than the latter, are unclear about the purpose of the field experience the preservice teachers are engaged in (Williams et al., 1995). This would lead to evaluation that is not dictated by goals, which in turn would be aimless or irrelevant.

University supervisors play a prominent part in the evaluation process. Evaluation forms are for the most part prepared by university personnel (55%), in some cases with input by cooperating teachers and administrators (43%). Preservice teachers have practically no input into the evaluation forms (McIntyre & Norris, 1980; Rieck, 1992). Grade determination is also the prerogative of the university supervisors. In a majority of
the cases (53%) either university supervisors or cooperating teachers was the sole determinant of the grade (McIntyre & Norris, 1980).

A study of student teaching handbooks revealed two important distinctions between the cooperating teachers and the university supervisors concerning the evaluation of student teachers: (a) 86% of the handbooks specifically require the cooperating teacher to conduct midterm and final evaluations while only 5% assign this task for the university supervisor, and (b) the handbooks do not charge cooperating teachers with assigning the final grades for student teachers but rather assign this task to university supervisors (Williams et al., 1995).

It appears contradictory that the cooperating teacher would be assigned the task of summative midterm and final evaluations and not the university supervisor, who is responsible for assigning final grades for the student teachers. Since these handbooks do not explain the ways in which student teaching participants are expected to work together in the student teacher's evaluation, the overlapping tasks of evaluation and the contradiction in the assignment of the final grade may contribute to the kind of role confusion found in the research cited earlier (Williams et al., 1995).

A further problem is that the university supervisors are seen as coaches also; they discuss the planning and instruction of a lesson or unit with the student teachers in great detail. In their assessment of the student teachers, they look for reflections of these discussions. As a result, they tend to end up evaluating the coaching and the discussion they had had with the student teachers rather than assess the student teachers' performance (Ashburn & Fisher, 1984). This impairs their objectivity just as much as the cooperating teachers are affected by the closeness to the student teachers personally.
Whereas it appears cooperating teachers exercise the strongest influence on student teachers (Su, 1992a), their greater influence may be due to the demands placed on university supervisors aside from field supervision. University supervisors report that they have a number of other responsibilities which take precedence over student teacher supervision (Goodman, 1988). According to one study, university supervisors, 84% having professorial rank, were evaluated by their respective institutions primarily on duties other than their work with student teachers, including the duties relating to their classroom teaching, committee work, and research (Solliday, 1982).

An additional constraint on the university supervisors is the number of students they are assigned. Solliday (1982) notes that university supervisors often are assigned student teachers based on economic factors rather than on the supervisory needs of their student teachers. The ratio of university supervisors to student teachers is greatly disproportionate, especially considering the lack of available time apart from their other responsibilities. University supervisors are required to direct large numbers of student teachers ($x = 11.5$) consequently spending little time with each student while student teachers report they would prefer to spend more time with university supervisors in order to receive more input from them (Solliday, 1982).

While university supervisor are perceived as still playing a vital role in preservice teachers’ professional development, the division of responsibilities between the university and the university supervisor is not explicitly mentioned in the literature. It can be presumed from the fact that one of the roles of the university supervisors is an orienter and the responsibilities include interpreting the expectations of the university and the program goals as specified by the university to the cooperating teachers and the preservice teachers (ATE, 1986). This is in close accord with the responsibility of the director of field
experiences to establish and maintain liaison with colleagues, universities and affiliated institutions (ATE, 1986).

In the instance that both the roles are not the same, and the university supervisors are merely conveyors of university policies and are not decision-makers, the question arises how the university makes provision for the university supervisor to be seen as supervisors only by all the parties concerned. The university supervisors, for the most part, seem to speak for and represent the university and the administrators.

Thus the roles and responsibilities of the university supervisors in student teaching cover a wide range, owing allegiance to preservice teachers, cooperating teachers and the directors of field experience, the university and the field site. Neither is the university supervisor given much help in resolving these contradictions that might arise.

**Early field experiences**

By and large the roles and responsibilities of the university supervisors in student teaching and early field experiences do not differ. The university supervisors in early field experiences are expected to communicate the goals of the program to both the cooperating teachers and the preservice teachers. They see it as their responsibility to establish that the varied experiences appropriate to institutional goals occur. They also expect to confirm to the cooperating teachers the correspondence of the activities to the goals, ensuring that the goals are met and procedures effectively coordinated (Applegate, 1982; Lasley, Applegate & Ellison, 1986).

Placement is another issue that university supervisors have to deal with. University supervisors experience no problem at all with regard to placement in elementary education. The problem, when it exists, is with secondary education and special education
Effective and strong public relations is seen as a help in placing students, as is also avoiding placing student teachers and preservice teachers in the same locations (Southall & Dumas, 1981).

Synthesizing their research, Applegate and Lasley (1986) noted that inappropriate placement by the university supervisors could be responsible for the unprofessional behavior of the preservice teachers. The importance of the task is implicit in the problems that the cooperating teachers point out with preservice teachers who are inadequately placed in the wrong programs or in classrooms or cooperating teachers with a different orientation.

It is the responsibility of the university supervisors to make sure that preservice teachers are prepared for the experience. Cooperating teachers have a problem with preservice teachers when university supervisor place those who are not prepared for assignments, have no skills in lesson planning do not understand student behavior, and exhibit no curiosity about the process of becoming a teacher (Applegate & Lasley, 1982). Since cooperating teachers believe that this is not done to their satisfaction, they would like to have some control over this area, causing role and responsibility confusion.

In their turn, preservice teachers expect university supervisors to provide them experiences in various schools and classroom settings (Applegate & Lasley, 1983). These expectations accord closely with the goals of professionalism, making career decisions, and acquiring teaching skills. Problems arise for the university supervisors when, for various reasons, they are not able to fulfill the responsibilities of an orienter. This may be due to university supervisor having a negative orientation or possessing inadequate knowledge of the program (Johnson, 1988).
On site, the role of the university supervisors is a combination of instruction, supervision and evaluation. This is higher for each successive field experience at 47% for the first, 60% for the second and 68% for the third (Farris et al., 1991). Since many field experiences are connected to education courses, methods instructors should participate in clinical experiences. A team approach by methods instructors increases the collegial atmosphere and assists in the coordination of methodology instruction (Bischoff et al., 1988).

Helping the preservice teachers with instruction takes up a large part of the university supervisors' time and focus. Apart from instruction, supervision and evaluation occupy a major part of the university supervisors' time in the first experience. But this proportion is reduced drastically in the following experiences when instruction takes precedence (Farris et al., 1991). This is in contrast to the roles played by the university supervisors in student teaching in which the university supervisors are primarily evaluators. This change in emphasis has not been explained by research.

The university supervisors are expected to visit the classroom regularly, observe the preservice teachers, and work closely with cooperating teachers. This is contradictory to university expectations, according to which in 25% of the urban early field experiences no supervision is provided (Howey et al., 1994). The preservice teachers value most highly the suggestions made by the university supervisor concerning the observed teaching situation and/or extension of the lesson taught. Thoroughness on the part of the supervisor in critiquing the total teaching situation is appreciated. A positive supportive attitude on the part of the supervisor serves to build within the preservice teachers a stronger confidence toward their classroom experience. Of paramount importance to the preservice teachers is a non-interfering role on the part of the university supervisor (Smith &
Alvermann, 1983). The university supervisor is most helpful when acting as consultant and providing suggestions to solve specific problems (Johnson, 1988).

As in the case of the cooperating teachers, the concept of time is a major factor that influences the success of the program. Supervision could be improved if the preservice teachers had more time with the university supervisor (Johnson, 1988). The preservice teachers themselves are very aware of time and praise the university supervisors who schedule observations, are on time for the observations, and stay to observe the complete lesson (Smith & Alvermann, 1983). For the most part preservice teachers are satisfied with the level of support and assistance they get from their university supervisors if the supervisors give them time on site (Johnson, 1988; Pothoff & Kline, 1994; Securro & Owen, 1982).

The university supervisors' role as evaluator is easily and clearly recognized by the preservice teachers. The reinforcement factor is important to the preservice teachers. They want some form of immediate support and commentary following the lesson. The preservice teachers are also concerned about the tone of the conference. They seek positive, constructive commentary about their work. Both the oral conference and the written evaluation are important to the preservice teachers. Placing great emphasis on the handling of the observation process and the feedback method and manner, preservice teachers' concerns do not concentrate on particular supervisors but are generalized to the supervisory process itself (Smith & Alvermann, 1983).

University supervisors believe that evaluation impacts both preservice teachers and cooperating teachers meeting institutional goals (Applegate & Lasley, 1986). This serves to emphasize the importance of understanding the connections between the goals of the program and the evaluation scheme.
Another problem to the feedback and conferencing that university supervisors are expected to manage is the monitoring of cooperating teachers by university supervisors. Scheduling time to meet the cooperating teachers is another management problem that the university supervisors have to face. This in turn leads to lack of communication between them, which is cited as a major problem for both parties concerned (Applegate & Lasley, 1986).

By and large, the cooperating teachers and the preservice teachers have no expectations of the university supervisors though the cooperating teachers expect university support to be available for the preservice teachers (Applegate & Lasley, 1984, 1986). In fact, as the stress of the program declines, the need the preservice teachers have for the university supervisors also declines. Only the university supervisors recognize that they have a part to play in the early field experiences (Feitler & Argyle, 1990).

It is also the university supervisors who recognize and acknowledge that they have a responsibility to make a success of the program. Neither the cooperating teachers nor the preservice teachers take responsibility for that. They would rather blame the university or each of the other members of the triad than take it upon the themselves the lack of success of the field experience (Applegate & Lasley, 1986)

Professional needs for university supervisors focus on mentoring, forming and leading discussion groups and feedback procedures and processes (Faire, 1994). Training for the university supervisors is suggested by ATE (1986) but the literature cites few programs that are useful in this regard.

The trends in field experience that remove authority from the university to the field site have an impact on the role and responsibilities of the university supervisor. Research on the implications of this trend are yet to be available.
Roles and Responsibilities of the directors of field experiences

Though the directors of early field experiences may be far removed from the sites of supervision and evaluation (Ishler & Kay, 1981), in the prevailing atmosphere of collaboration between universities and schools, they play a crucial though small part in the evaluation process in field experiences in preservice teacher preparation. When all is said and done, the director of field experiences and the student teacher have field experiences as a major responsibility (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990).

The coordinators of field experiences are the initial decision-makers in the process of selecting the supervisory personnel and the sites of the experience (ATE, 1986). In their administrative capacity, they organize the program, administer the budget and maintain records (ATE, 1986; Guyton & McIntyre, 1990). They establish and maintain liaisons with the institutions affiliated to and concerned with the field experiences (ATE, 1986; Guyton & McIntyre, 1990).

In keeping with the lack of research on early field experiences, lack of planning by universities is apparent. Student ratings support the teachers' findings that evidence of advance planning and preparation for the field experience is needed (Briscoe, Brooks, Buckner, Olive & Freeze, 1989).

The description that the directors provide of the field experiences and the goals they set for the program should guide the activities of the early field experiences students and determine the goals and objectives of the program. The clarity that they bring to the program may provide preservice teachers with a variety of experiences in different settings with different teachers. Institutional problems are compounded when logistical procedures
are weakly structured or program goals are weakly articulated (Lasley, Applegate & Ellison, 1986) but can be resolved if the directors are clear-sighted.

Communication is lacking between university and preservice teachers. Guyton and McIntyre (1990) suggest three necessary conditions to produce appropriate roles, tasks and goals: (a) Written definition of triad members and written goals for student teaching, (b) interpretation of roles by triad members, and (c) implementation of these roles. Recommendations to implement such suggestions include better scheduling, organization of courses, clearer information about courses and field experiences (Rekkas, 1995).

Cooperating teachers and university supervisors will be influenced by the espoused principles of the directors of early field experiences and the universities as seen in printed matter and documents that are officially available, and the practices encouraged by the directors (ATE, 1986). The expectations of the directors of field experiences and the universities they represent should be reflected in the handbooks that are given out to the cooperating teachers and university supervisors, and in the courses or training workshops that are arranged for the cooperating teachers or university supervisors.

Cooperating teachers need more active involvement of university personnel and often cite university personnel's lack of interest in school norms and professional responsibilities as a problem. To remediate this, the university should provide careful instructions to preservice teachers and develop detailed placement forms that show specificity of planned interaction (Applegate & Lasley, 1982)

Directors of field experiences seem to be the "neglected participant in the student teaching process and no research goes beyond surface level description and no in-depth analyses of the role exist" (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990, p. 520). Research on a profile of directors of field experiences, their role in the planning and implementation of the field
experiences, and in the selection and training of supervisors would help define the features of a successful program (ATE, 1986).

Roles and responsibilities of supervisors and administrators

There is agreement on the importance of quality field experience as a major variable in teacher relationships and student development. The ATE Guidelines for Professional Experiences in Teacher Education (1986) clearly delineates the qualifications and responsibilities of college and university supervisors of professional experiences and the school supervisors to whom student teachers are assigned.

The series of studies by Applegate and Lasley (1982, 1983, 1984, 1985 & 1986) detail the expectations that cooperating teachers, university supervisors and preservice teachers have of other members of the triad and of the field experience itself. The lack of congruence of expectations and role definitions of the participants of field experiences is clearly seen in the analysis of these studies (Applegate & Lasley, 1986). Expectations, desired outcomes and communication cause some concern for preservice teachers and cooperating teachers alike (Briscoe et al., 1989).

The lack of consensus on the goals of the program impacts the roles and responsibilities of the triad. For instance, the preservice teachers expect the cooperating teachers and university supervisors to help them achieve the goal of professional socialization, but the cooperating teachers and university supervisors expect the preservice teachers to be socialized prior to the early field experiences and do not recognize meeting this goal as their responsibility (Applegate & Lasley, 1983).
Acknowledging that problems exist, cooperating teachers, supported by university supervisors, hold preservice teachers primarily responsible (Applegate & Lasley, 1986). The lack of communication between cooperating teachers and university supervisors that has been often reported (Applegate & Lasley, 1984; Rekkas, 1995) ensures that cooperating teachers and preservice teachers seldom receive the on-site attention or direction from university supervisors that is critical to growth and achievement. For this, the cooperating teachers and the preservice teachers undertake no responsibility for smoothing the way but expect the university supervisors to take the initiative (Applegate & Lasley, 1986).

Collaborative work between university supervisors and cooperating teachers is essential if the field experiences, and the evaluation process therein, are to be successful and valid. Both these parties also need to be aware of their roles and responsibilities and the expectations of the university regarding these roles and responsibilities. Further, the relationship between the parties needs to be specified and explored. The cooperating teachers, university supervisors and directors of field experiences need to know what each is expecting of the other and of themselves. Beyond specific written statements regarding functions, cooperating teachers, university supervisors and administrators need to discuss among themselves the personal meanings they attach to role descriptions (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990).
Student teaching

Student teaching is the capstone experience of teacher education. The primary administrative purpose, that is, to establish a graduation requirement (Fant, Hill, Lee & Landes, 1985), is clearly set out in most programs. In 42 states, the university supervisor is either solely responsible or is involved in evaluation. Twenty-six states require the cooperating teachers to be involved in the process. Only one state desires the preservice teachers to be part of the evaluation process (NASDTEC, 1991).

The process of evaluation of student teachers often includes a conference between them and the evaluators. A mid-term and an end-term evaluation may have the same pattern, with the final evaluation becoming part of the official credentials for prospective teachers in preparation for the certification process (McKay, 1994).

The types of grades recorded are in the form of letter grades. Without seeking to distinguish between the quality of students who graduate, 25% to 40% of institutions use pass/fail or satisfactory/unsatisfactory comments (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990; McIntyre & Norris, 1980; Rieck, 1992).

Students view student teaching as a time when they can practice and refine their teaching skills and be inducted into the profession. Since this is a period of learning for the student teachers, evaluation in student teaching should be formative. Student teachers should be evaluated on various occasions and continuously using different instruments (Fant et al., 1985). While 50% of the institutions may subscribe to this and provide for student teachers to be evaluated more than once, in a high percentage of institutions, evaluation in student teaching consists of a summative experience in which the university
supervisors or the cooperating teachers observe the student teachers and give them a grade.

Multiple assessment procedures require multiple instruments. Rating scales, daily logs, anecdotal records, behavior coding, and self-assessment are ways of assessing student teachers, rating scales being the most common (Fant et al., 1985). It is argued that effort, progress and achievement are often ignored in the single grade, and that innovations in curriculum and instruction such as whole language, cooperative learning and outcome-based education call for more flexible approach to reporting achievement (O'Neil, 1991). Portfolio is an alternative assessment tool that is comprehensive, multidimensional but integrated, sensitive to the multiple attributes of effective teaching and learning (Stodolsky, 1984, cited in Ryan & Kuhs, 1993).

The relevant areas that are frequently found in evaluation schemes are (a) knowledge of content and skills areas, (b) knowledge of learners and learning process, (c) use of instructional planning strategies, (d) use of instructional strategies and teaching styles, (e) use of management and discipline strategies, (f) use of communication strategies, (g) use of assessing, (h) diagnosing and evaluating strategies, (i) use of motivational strategies, (j) use of problems-solving and decision-making strategies, (k) use of human relations strategies, (l) personal qualities, and (m) professional characteristics (McKay, 1994; Webster & Byrne, 1994).

The standards advocated by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (1987) are in close accordance with the areas of evaluation in the instruments used. Of these, the standards dealing with knowledge of subject matter, planning instruction, and managing and monitoring student learning are most highly represented.
The professional characteristics that student teachers should exhibit may be loosely connected to the other standards that refer to teacher commitment, reflectivity and professionalism (Webster & Byrne, 1994). The personal qualities that student teachers are evaluated on, which are not low-inference criteria and may be difficult to be evaluated behaviorally, are not referred to by these standards.

In accord with the student teachers' major experience, which is instructional planning and delivery, the most important items in the forms are teaching skills, classroom management, knowledge of materials, planning and organization and personal characteristics. The least important are appearance, professionalism, classroom management, personality and methodology (McIntyre & Norris, 1980).

In an analysis of rating forms used to evaluate elementary student teachers, Reyes and Isele (1990) found that there was an overall emphasis on instructional performance criteria rather than on non-instructional ones. Of the instructional items, 64.5% are high-inference items which account for subjectivity in grading. For example, academic learning time and classroom management, two concepts which can be behaviorally defined and are research based, are represented only up to 15.9% and 4.6% respectively. This finding was reflected in another study by Frankiewicz (1987, cited in Reyes & Isele, 1990) who found that academic learning time and classroom management were represented at levels of 2% each in her sample which included all the elementary teacher preparation programs in Illinois.

Of the non-instructional criteria, administrative professional criteria referring to responsibilities of student teachers that are typical out of the classroom such as these referring to punctuality, dress, record keeping, attendance, and committee work accounted for up to 16% of all items, which is low when compared to studies recording criteria of
twenty years ago (Kerlinger, 1973, cited in Reyes & Isele, 1990). Fourteen percent of the items referred to personal traits such as humor, self-confidence, positive attitudes and cooperation (Reyes & Isele, 1990).

The assessing of minimum performance levels which could be defined as low inference observation skills is augmented by the assessing of higher order teaching skills which may still have a narrow research base (Andrews & Barnes, 1990). High inference skills such as dispositions and attitudes are expected to be assessed and noted as part of the assessment program. Teacher characteristics such as voice quality, sensitivity and enthusiasm find room in assessment scales though no research connects them up directly with effective learning. Further, the assessment items, sometimes just a word or a short phrase, are not clear in their terminology and are open to interpretation (Fant et al., 1985). All these factors make it possible for university supervisors and cooperating teachers to base the evaluation on overall impressions, and for the halo effect to dictate grades (Wheeler & Knoop, 1982). Nor are these criteria represented as a system. There is no follow up or completion of a concept. For example, the concept "rule expectation" is not supported by the concept of "teacher withitness" in the frequency of appearance in rating forms. Thus concepts appear in isolation rather than as part of a model of classroom management. These criteria seem to have been mixed in almost randomly with other criteria (Reyes & Isele, 1990).

It is difficult to find a pattern with these criteria that would suggest that the evaluation is systematic. Individual forms do not have a discernible conceptual framework in which knowledge bases that could have been used to structure the forms could have been used. The lack of subject-specific criteria further emphasizes the lack of a discipline-
oriented conceptual scheme that ought to underpin the evaluation of elementary student teachers (Reyes & Isele, 1990).

The criteria also make it difficult to distinguish between more and less effective student teachers because the rating scales, which are widely used in student teaching evaluation, have a limited range (Defino, 1983; Funk et al., 1982). An effort to overcome this problem was made by Webster and Byrne (1994) by offering seven scales in the grading scheme ranging from Outstanding to Unsatisfactory, enabling the evaluators to make a distinction between the student teachers who have remarkable abilities in all aspects of teaching, those who have mastered certain aspects but not others, and those who are not ready to teach.

A major problem in evaluation of student teachers is the connection of the evaluation criteria to the goals of the program. In addition to a lack of clearly-stated and well-defined roles, the study by Williams et al., (1995) revealed a lack of congruency between articulated goals and their corresponding outcomes provided in evaluative instruments in the student teaching handbooks. In 19 of the 61 handbooks, goals were not included. Moreover, the frequency of outcomes found in the student teaching handbooks examined was consistently higher than the corresponding goals Williams et al., 1995).

Consequently, these student teaching handbooks demand more of students through the evaluative instruments than through what is explicated in the goals found in the same materials. This finding raises a serious question: How can student teachers be held accountable for expectations not established in the goals of the student teaching program? (Williams et al., 1995). This finding may also help to explain observations in the research concerning the lack of agreement among members of the triad regarding the student
teaching program’s goals (Castillo, 1971; Copas, 1984; Grimmett & Ratzlaff, 1986; Guyton & McIntyre, 1990).

Early field experience

Thirty-six states have defined the standards and requirements for evaluation in student teaching (NASDTEC, 1991). Such standards in the case of early field experience have not been defined. Where evaluation in early field experience is concerned, the forms it takes, the instruments used, who plans and executes the evaluation, and the training necessary for it have been researched to a very limited extent.

Evaluation in early field experiences is prevalent with 90% of the institutions using early field experiences to evaluate preservice teachers (Ishler & Kay, 1981). The purpose of this is to benefit the preservice teachers with counseling and advising. Additional benefits include helping to make changes to the program to serve the preservice teachers better.

Most instruments used in early field experiences are in-house and non-standard (Ishler & Kay, 1981). Of the few attempts to base instruments on research, the efficacy of video cases as an examination tool and the process of the examination using video was examined by Pape and McIntyre (1993). Video cases built from snippets of classroom interaction were found to be more authentic than pen and paper tests. Preservice teachers found this form of testing more congruent with their experience; they wanted classes that dealt with their specialty areas and at the grade level they had observed.

Unlike student teaching in which instructional skills are primarily evaluated, in early field experiences non-instructional criteria are used in evaluation forms. Attitudes, interpersonal skills, personal appearance, and emotional and psychological factors are used
as evaluative criteria in early field experiences rather than instructional skills, content knowledge, intellectual skills and leadership (Ishler & Kay, 1981). This is compatible with the goals of early field experiences which are focused on suitability and compatibility with the profession rather than teaching skills (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990). But the question raised in this regard then is how these criteria can be evaluated objectively when it is difficult to define them without a subjective bias (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990).

In most cases it is the site personnel who evaluate the preservice teachers (Ishler & Kay, 1981; McIntyre & Norris, 1980). Eighty-six percent of the cooperating teachers evaluate the preservice teachers while course instructors (38%) and university supervisors (28%) do so to a lesser degree. Preservice teachers, as in the case of formulating the evaluation forms, have practically no say in their own evaluation (Ishler & Kay, 1981).

Cooperating teachers or university supervisors complete the forms after observation, or write out non-structured evaluation reports. In very few cases is a conference held. The chances of preservice teachers being involved in one which might be held are even fewer (Ishler & Kay, 1981). This results in a low incidence of evaluative feedback and discussion of preservice teachers' performance. When it is given, feedback is more summative than formative in nature, occurring at the end of the experience. Preservice teachers thus proceed without much feedback from cooperating teachers at each level (McIntyre & Killian, 1986).

University supervisors believe that evaluation impacts both preservice teachers and cooperating teachers meeting institutional goals (Applegate & Lasley, 1986). Considering the amount and depth of confusion that surrounds the goals and objectives of a field experience, it would not be surprising to find that the cooperating teachers and university supervisors, the former more than the latter, are unclear about the purpose of the field
experience the preservice teachers are engaged in. This would lead to evaluation that is not dictated by goals, which in turn would be aimless or irrelevant.

ATE (1986) calls for training of both cooperating teacher and university supervisors. This training should also be arranged by the director of field experiences, thus ensuring that the training is relevant to the program that they will be supervising. Any training provided, which might include discussion of the grading process, helps to bring about a consensus to the grading procedures, and a high correlation is possible between the ratings of the university supervisors and the cooperating teachers (Webster & Byrne, 1994). This will increase the validity and reliability of the evaluation process. And yet only 43 out of 240 institutions surveyed by Ishler and Kay (1981) provided training for their site personnel proving that cooperating teachers trained in the evaluation of preservice teachers would be rare.

Summary

While early field experiences are assuming a place of increasing importance in teacher preparation, there is not enough research to prove the efficacy of the experience. Nor are the goals and the sequence of activities in programs clearly delineated. If early field experiences, student teaching and professional development are to be seen as a continuum, the view of on-site training in teacher preparation must be more coherent and holistic. The links between the needs of preservice teachers at various levels of their practical aspect of training must be established with greater clarity and force.

If the participants of evaluation in early field experiences, (i.e., cooperating teachers and university supervisors) were oriented to the goals and process of the
experience, the evaluation might be more meaningful. But given the conditions under which early field experiences are planned and conducted, it is not surprising that the evaluation of preservice teachers has little impact on students' evaluation of themselves or the cooperating teachers' evaluation of the student teachers in the student teaching experience (Briscoe et al., 1989; Scherer, 1979).
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Early field experiences in teacher education have increased in both the quantity and the amount of attention given to them (Howey et al., 1994). Yet there is little research in the roles and responsibilities of the parties involved in conducting and evaluating these experiences. The individuals involved in the process are cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and the directors of the field experiences. The purpose of this study was to identify and analyze important variables, themes, patterns and categories in participants' perceptions of this experience in their role as evaluators. The responsibilities of the cooperating teachers, university supervisors and directors of field experiences were seen in a systematically defined situation.

Principles and methods of qualitative research were used in this study to provide better access to thinking and behavior, and to generate information about appropriate roles, responsibilities, and the perceptions of the persons involved. Rather than viewing them as integral components of the experience, studies have traditionally ignored the meanings actors bring to the experience. But more naturalistic methods have included the
participants' frame of reference, particularly those of the supervisors in the triad (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990).

The sample for this study was chosen using random sampling and purposive sampling techniques. Data was collected by means of telephone interviews that were taped. The data was categorized and analyzed for emergent themes. Credibility was established using member checks, and with a peer debriefer and three independent raters. This chapter describes the above process in detail.

Sample

For the purpose of this study, institutions and participants, or individuals in those institutions, needed to be identified. In the following section the process of selection for each category is delineated.

Institutions

The Midwest region confers more first-professional degrees, which includes education, than any other region (NCES, 1992). Of all the regions in the census data, those states designated as the Midwestern states certify a good proportion of teacher candidates in the country, almost 25%. Among all the states, which include Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, N. Dakota, Ohio, S. Dakota, and Wisconsin (U. S. Bureau of Census, 1994), the state of Ohio has the largest number of teacher education institutions accredited by AACTE (1994) totaling 33. Ohio also has the greatest variety in the type of institutions that offer courses in education. Seventeen institutions are categorized as offering baccalaureate degrees; six are graded as Masters type institutions; a further six are classed as Doctoral type institutions; and four
are classified as research-focused institutions (AACTE, 1994; The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1995). Thus, Ohio was chosen with the expectation that these teacher education institutions represent a more varied sample that would lend itself more transferability of findings.

Cluster sampling was used to define the sampling frame. A list of institutions offering an elementary education program was determined from the official list of higher education institutions maintained by the Ohio Board of Regents (1991). Only those institutions offering elementary education program were included in the sampling frame. The sampling frame then consisted of 53 institutions, including the 33 that were accredited by AACTE (1994).

Random sampling techniques were used to select a sample. A random order of institutions alphabetically arranged was generated. A further random selection of institutions was made by choosing every sixth institution on the list. A total of eight institutions were involved in the study.

Participants

Administrators

Since the unit of analysis was the individuals involved in the evaluation of preservice teachers in early field experiences, the selection of participants in the study merited deep concern. A qualitative study of this kind requires participants who have knowledge of the context and the system, specifically the early field experience program in the institutions. This is necessary for the data to be relevant and useful.

Key informants are those who are most knowledgeable about the situation and context (Anderson, Jesswein & Fleischman, 1990). Directors of early field experiences
who are the decision-makers in the institutions with regard to their program area, would have access to information about the program from the viewpoint of the institutional and about institutional policy. Using a positional approach, that is, taking note of those who occupied particular positions and would therefore have the greatest access to the information required (Anderson, Jesswein & Fleischman, 1990), the directors of field experiences who were in charge of elementary education were selected as the sample in the category of administrators. Thus, a sample size of eight directors of field experiences, one from each of the eight institutions selected above, was obtained.

Cooperating teachers and university supervisors

Purposeful sampling is "based on a sample of information-rich cases that are studied in-depth" (Wiersma, 1995, p. 301). Purposive sampling (Gay, 1992) was used to select cooperating teachers and university supervisors for this study. The directors of field experiences in the chosen sample were considered the experts whose judgment would be used to select a sample frame. They were contacted for a list of up to 10 university supervisors and 10 cooperating teachers. These individuals had to be currently working with preservice teachers or should have done so in the recent past, (i.e., in the past academic year). The criteria the directors considered while making this selection included: Knowledge of the field experience program in that institution, and an ability to clearly articulate their ideas and experiences (Appendix A).

For the study to be valid, these individuals would need to know about the program in which they are working, and the goals and objectives of that field experience. The experience of supervising field experience students and training in supervision and evaluation would provide the supervisors with both craft knowledge and a theoretical basis. Supervisors with these experiences may have considered the issues involved in
supervision and evaluation. If they were articulate and knowledgeable, the validity of the data would be increased.

From these lists of supervisors, one cooperating teacher and one university supervisor were chosen at random using a table of random numbers (Gay, 1992). In one institution the roles of the director of field experiences and the university supervisor were played by the same person. This individual was interviewed over four sessions in both these capacities. Thus, seven university supervisors and eight cooperating teachers, one from each institution in the sample, were selected for the study. When one person in a list was unable to take part in the study, s/he was replaced with another person chosen at random from the respective sampling frame.

Entry

Initial interactions in the field are critical as a precursor to establishing trust and rapport (Janesick, 1994). Entry was established by an initial introductory telephone call to the participants. I explained my background, my interest in early field experiences, the purpose of the study, and what would be required of the participants. The purpose of this initial call was to establish my credibility, to explain to the participants the vital role they would play in this study, and to establish the willingness of the person to participate in the study. A date and time for first interview was also sought.

For the data to be valid and reliable and to capture the nuance and meaning of each participant's perspective, it is necessary for the researcher to gain the trust and the cooperation of the participants, and for the participants to believe in the researcher and in the research being conducted (Janesick, 1994). The telephone call was followed by a packet of introductory material mailed to the participants (Appendix B). This material was
designed to explain the study in greater detail and to give more information about myself to the participants. The contents were designed to appeal to participants who had visual or auditory learning styles. This packet contained a letter, my curriculum vitae, and an information sheet.

The cover letter (Appendix B) explained the background of the study, confirmed the date of the first interview with each participant, and assured them of confidentiality.

An abbreviated curriculum vitae (Appendix B) described my academic background, work experience, and professional achievements. It reflected my research interest and supported my claim of competency to conduct the study. The participants may have some reservations about my ethnicity and background, which in part could be allayed by these biographical details.

A factor I had to consider was my accent and the possibility that the interviewees may have some problems with my accent and pronunciation. Having gained entry, I still had to make the attempt to ease the participant into the interview mode. While interviewing, I had to spend the first few moments talking to let the respondents get used to my accent and speed of speech.

A week before the first interview, a second packet of materials was mailed to each participant (Appendixes C, D & E). This contained a letter, question prompts to give the participants an idea of the areas that would be discussed, and definition of terms that would be used in the interviews.

The letter explained the study more fully and described follow up procedures that involved the interviewees. The list of question prompts formed the basic questions that were asked to elicit answers about areas of interest to the researcher. The question prompts were based on the instrument (Appendix F). Each category of participants (cooperating teachers, university supervisors and directors of field experiences) was given
a different focus. For example, the cooperating teachers were asked for their perceptions of roles and responsibilities of university supervisors (Appendix C); the university supervisors were questioned on their perceptions of the roles and responsibilities of cooperating teachers (Appendix D); and the directors were asked to compare the perceptions of cooperating teachers and university supervisors (Appendix E). The interview schedule also contained an explanation of certain terminology so that when terms were used, their meanings and the context in which they were used were clear to the respondents (Appendices C, D & E).

Data Collection

This was an exploratory study and the purpose was to describe the personal perspectives of participants, not merely their performance. In this study, I was intent not on changing the evaluation practices in early field experiences but on describing them. In an effort to get a better understanding of how the participants saw themselves in relation to each other, my intention was not primarily to make the participants aware of certain concepts or aspects of evaluation. Rather, as a constructivist, I wanted to see how reality was construed by the supervisors. As an interpretivist I was interested in the perceptions of the cooperating teachers, university supervisors and directors of field experiences, and probed into how they interpreted their world and their tasks.

The suggested data collection technique for this type of study in which the persons being interviewed respond in their own words to express their perceptions and feelings is often termed in-depth interviewing (Marshall & Rossman, 1995) or the general interview guide approach (Patton, 1990). The method of data gathering used in this study was semi-structured telephone interviews.
Semi-structured interviews, like unstructured interviews, are an attempt to understand the complex behaviors of members of society. The difference is that semi-structured interviews impose a few a priori categorizations that may limit the field of inquiry. A set of issues that needed to be explored with each respondent were outlined, though the actual ordering of the issues and the exact wording of the questions were not detailed. There was common information that needed to be obtained from each respondent but since the details of the issues varied, the questions needed to be modified depending on each respondent and context (Fontana & Frey, 1994; Patton, 1990).

Concerning informational adequacy (Zeldetch, 1967, cited in Marshall & Rossman, 1995), semi-structured interviews elicit sought-after information, providing opportunities to probe the interviewee’s statements and point of view. An interview guide is a list of questions or issues that need to be explored in the course of the interview. If a number of people are to be interviewed on the same topic, the same concepts should be discussed with them. The interview guide used in this study ensured that this was done. The guide also made it possible for the interviewer to be free to explore, probe and ask questions to illustrate and further explain a point. I could concentrate on establishing the tone of the conversation rather than the basic content. The limited time at my disposal could therefore be used to its maximum to explore the nuances of the subject (Patton, 1990).

Various types of questions were asked to obtain different kinds of information. Knowledge questions are aimed at finding out the factual information the respondent has. Referring to research question 1, these kinds of questions established the process of evaluation, the procedures, or what was done, the instruments used, the persons involved in the process and the frequency of the evaluation. Experience and behavior questions are
about what a person does or has done and elicit descriptions of behavior, experiences, activities, and actions (Patton, 1990). These kinds of questions described the roles and responsibilities of the supervisors and the directors of field experiences and provided data for research question 2. Opinion and value questions are aimed at understanding the cognitive and interpretive processes of people (Patton, 1990). Implied rationality and decision-making, these questions were used to define and probe perceptions and reactions of the supervisors about each other and the administrator, and the administrators about each of the category of supervisors. This kind of questions gathered data for research question 3.

Three purposes of probing have been established: probing for details, for elaboration, and for clarification. Detail-oriented probes entail asking questions such as who, what, when, how and why (Patton, 1990). In this study, these probes were used to flesh out details that arose from knowledge questions. Probing for elaboration is more difficult in a telephone interview since non-verbal gestures such as nods and questioning looks cannot be used (Witkin & Altschuld, 1995). I had to listen carefully to responses, and interpret silences and hesitations, and pick up on verbal cues. Encouraging sounds and gentler approaches such as "I don't think I quite understand, but I'm getting it. Would you please continue?" are sometimes relied on in interviews (Gateway Engineering Education Coalition, 1994).

Probing for clarification is essential when the response is too technical or theoretical and is useful for getting at meanings. Contrast probes such as 'How does x differ from y?' or 'How does this contrast with that?' help to distinguish characteristics and to establish boundaries (Gateway Engineering Education Coalition, 1994; Patton, 1990).

Each participant was interviewed for a total of about 60 minutes. These interviews were taped. Flexibility is the hallmark of a good qualitative research design and I was
prepared to adjust time and schedules to fit the needs of the participants. Since it is
difficult to conduct long, unstructured interviews, the cooperating teachers, university
supervisors and directors of field experiences were interviewed at pre-arranged times for
about 20 minutes a session (Witkin & Altschuld, 1995).

Multiple interview sessions were necessary for various reasons, fatigue being a
major one. An interview that lasts about 60 minutes tends to tire the interviewer and the
interviewee (Frey & Oishi, 1995). The former has to process the information and conduct
the interview, asking questions, guiding responses, and initiating inquiry at the same time.
This is a difficult task and demands a lot of energy and concentration. Interviewee fatigue
may produce responses that are not well thought out, and ideas could be less thoroughly
discussed, causing data to be less complete (Frey & Oishi, 1995).

Another reason for staggering the interview and having multiple stages in data
gathering was that repeated contexts with the participant helped me to establish trust, and
form a firm foundation for a relationship with them (Patton, 1987). The extended period
of time also provided an opportunity to build a sense of familiarity for the participants.
This helped them relax and be more free with their opinions without being defensive. In
turn, this ensured the data were more reliable and valid.

A final reason was that a second or third session provided an opportunity for a
version of the "rolling interview guide" (Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990, p. 63). The
interview could be used to follow up on ideas presented in the previous sessions. The lag
in time gives the interviewer time to review the data gathered the previous session(s) and
identify ideas and suggestions that needed clarification and expansion. Statements could be
substantiated. For these reasons, interviews with each participant were scheduled over a
period of at least two weeks.
**Confidentiality**

Confidentiality of the participants was maintained. The institutions were not to be informed of the names of the respondents. All correspondence to the respondents and the tapes of their interviews were filed under code names or numbers that they chose for themselves. This secured their identity, at the same time giving them access to only their information when they were given copies of their interviews and the tapescripts of the same.

**Instrumentation**

A list of questions that could be used to start the discussion was developed (Appendices F, G & H). The interview guide was comprehensive and covered the various areas that the literature indicated were salient to the study. But the instrument was unstructured enough to allow for rephrasing of the questions and for probing responses. These questions were divided into three parts, each part to be used as a prompt for the three sessions respectively. The first session concentrated on the procedures and instruments used in the evaluation of preservice teachers in early field evaluation. The second session defined scope of the interviewee's role and the responsibilities of the interviewee with regard to the role, while the third described the interviewee's perceptions of the roles and responsibilities of the other supervisors in the process, and of the training required to fulfill their roles.

While certain questions were common to all three types of sample, some questions needed to be modified depending on the interviewee. For instance, the concept of perception of each other's roles was common to all the interviewees but the questions had to be modified when asked of cooperating teachers (Appendix F), university supervisors (Appendix G) and directors of field experiences (Appendix H).
The instrument was examined by a panel of four experts who knew the content and area of study, and who were familiar with the population in the study. Three of these experts were teacher educators based in universities, and who worked with supervisors and preservice teachers in field experiences. They were drawn from various specializations and from different universities. One of the experts was associated with the state department of education with a special interest in preservice teacher education. This established the content validity of the instrument and controlled non-random error.

The interview schedule was piloted with a local institution similar to the sample. Pretesting provided an opportunity to determine the definition of terms, clarity of the questions asked, and whether the questions elicited relevant discussion (Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990). Changes that would clarify the questions and the data were effected. Modifications to the order in which ideas were presented and to the terms used helped increase the validity of the instrument.

**Data analysis**

The analysis of qualitative data involved several activities including: data reduction, sorting the data into categories, displaying the data, reading within and across the categories for themes, and synthesizing the information (Chism, 1994; Huberman, & Miles, 1994).

**Data reduction**

While analysing data that is "conceptually dense," many conceptual relationships which are embedded in a thick context of descriptive and conceptual writing are studied (Strauss & Corbin, 1994). Great familiarity with the data is essential, and data must be
reviewed systematically and often (Chism, 1994) if conceptual density, or richness of concept development and relationships, is to be achieved.

Data reduction was done before, during, and after data collection with a view to making the data more manageable. Transcribing the interviews myself, reading the transcripts often, filing the transcripts, making copies of the transcripts, and managing the data increased my familiarity with the data. Data management was made easier by using different colored paper for each category of supervisor. This helped identify transcripts and analyses with ease.

Employing inductive analysis of tentative categories, noting patterns and themes, making initial and intuitive sense, seeing plausibility, and clustering by conceptual groups (Huberman & Miles, 1994) enabled me to know the data better and formulate a clearer picture of the themes. Discussing on-going analysis and emergent theories with my peer debriefer, or research aide, helped in selecting and condensing data. This resulted in initial theories that were probable and reasonable while at the same time open to modification and verification by subsequent closer analysis and more data input (Huberman & Miles, 1994).

**Sorting the data into categories**

Cognitive anthropologists assume that participants' perceptions are organized into cognitive or semantic schematic-categories of meaning that are systematically related to one another (Marshall & Rossman, 1995). A content analysis of the data should define categories that are coherent with these perceptions. In keeping with the theories of cognitive interactionism, data were analyzed qualitatively to identify domains of understanding (Marshall & Rossman, 1995).
Multiple perspectives must be sought during the research inquiry since this guards against researcher bias. Multiple voices should be attended to and interpreted conceptually. Coding procedures including procedures of constant comparisons and concept development help to protect the researcher from accepting any of those voices on their own terms and giving credence to selective interpretations. To some extent this forces the researcher's own voice to be questioned, questioning and provisional (Strauss & Corbin, 1994).

Conceptual categories that accorded closely with the topics for each session of interview (Appendices F, G & H) were used as initial categories for deductive analysis. The role descriptions and responsibilities that the three parties saw for themselves and each other were recorded. The perceptions of cooperating teachers, university supervisors and directors of field experiences, the aspects in which their roles and responsibilities were similar, the areas in which they overlapped, and how they differed in the interpretation of all their roles were explored. The expectations the supervisors and the administrators had of themselves and of each other in their roles, the competencies they felt were required to perform their functions, and the training they perceived as necessary for such a task were articulated.

Based on their perceptions, the peer debriefer and the raters created their own categories as they emerged from the data. These categories were then integrated by a consensus arrived at by the raters and refined with reference to the research questions. The themes were checked for congruence and the differences were reconciled. Inter-rater reliability was established based on the number of categories that were in common among the raters and were also arrived at by common agreement. A codebook was created (Appendix I) with abbreviations such as E-P for evaluation procedures, I for instruments,
T-A for training available to the supervisors, and T for the training desired by the supervisors. Each interview was coded by two raters.

Displaying the data

A relational database was used to display data. The data were cut and pasted into different files on the computer using a data base program, each field being an institution. The data were then sorted according to categories and themes that emerged in the process of analysis. Repeated readings helped define categories more closely based on those that were internally convergent and externally divergent (Guba, 1978). Printouts were compared for overlaps and duplications. Highlighting the data and noting categories in the margins was one method used to display data.

Reading within and across categories for themes

The perceptions of cooperation teachers, university supervisors and the directors of field experiences were compared to each other. The practices that each reported were compared for similarities and differences.

Synthesis

Researchers should be interested in patterns of action and interaction between and among various types of persons involved in the interaction. Patterns of interaction in this study refer to those between cooperating teachers and university supervisors in the field during the evaluation process. They also refer to those patterns of action between the directors of field experiences and the supervisors regarding evaluation instruments, goals of the program and the evaluation criteria, and about training given to the supervisors.
Changes of condition, either internal or external to the process itself, included the effect of training on the evaluators or an additional support facility. Stages or phases of the evaluation process distinguished by researchers signified a conceptualization of what occurs under certain conditions in early field experiences (Strauss & Corbin, 1994). These comparisons resulted in theories about the evaluation process, and the roles and responsibilities that various participants had in the process.

**Triangulation**

This study was an interpretive work, and interpretive work must include the perspectives and voices of the people who are studied. Built into this style of extensive interrelated data collection and theoretical analysis is an explicit mandate to understand the differing viewpoints of the various participants, which are based on their experiences and expectations.

An copy of the transcript of the interview was made available to each participant. Since the participant had her/his copy of the interview, I made an attempt to clarify the content of the interview with the participant. This process also served for member checks by participants. The data from the interviews were triangulated with the printed materials (e.g. initial letters to cooperating teachers, evaluation instruments) that were sent to the researcher.

All through the process of data gathering and analysis, the research aide, a person who was interested in this area of research and in the methodology used, met with me for two hours a week. She listened to my interviews, critiqued the questions and responses, and suggested follow up questions. She checked my transcription, read the data, shadowed my categorization, commented on the themes that emerged, and endorsed the synthesis of ideas.
A spot check was conducted by three independent raters. The fidelity and quality of the transcription was randomly checked by them. As transcriber, I maintained a log of problems encountered and solutions offered in the process of transcription. This was used by the raters to pinpoint areas of transcription that should be checked. Apart from these pieces of interviews identified as difficult to transcribe, the raters checked at least three hours of the transcription, an hour each of interviews with cooperating teachers, university supervisors and directors of field experience.

Coding procedures involving the raters and the peer debriefer added a dimension to the analysis that served as trustworthiness checks for analysis of the data. The categories were tested against multiple perspectives of the raters as they evolved and were checked with the research aide. Confirmability and dependability of the data and the analysis were thus achieved (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Transferability of information and findings was limited in this study. Certain themes that emerged in the data analysis may be common across experiences with supervisors and administrators. Yet since the data was dependent on the interviewee's perceptions, the transferability of the findings was limited to similar contexts depending on factors such as program goals and description and participant perception.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

In an effort to keep the writing easier to read, and to help further maintain the confidentiality regarding the identity of the participants, in writing this chapter certain conventions have been adopted. Gender-free language has been used though the pronouns used in quotes have been retained from the original. The following abbreviations have been used to identify speakers in quotes: CT - cooperating teacher; US - university supervisor; D - director of field experience; and R - the researcher. The institutions have been carefully named to provide an identity without establishing a stereotype.

This chapter consists of eight major sections, each an analysis of the eight institutions included in the study. Each section describes the evaluation process and the
perceptions of the evaluators of an institution and includes highlights of the institution. A final overview of all eight institutions is provided at the end of the chapter.

University of Ash

Description of the field experience

The field experience offered by University of Ash is typical of an introductory one, including a course component, with seminars on campus. The students are in the field one morning a week for 10 weeks. The field experience is split between two elementary classroom placements of five weeks each. They are assigned to a cooperating teacher for each placement, who supervises and evaluates them. The university supervisor acts as orienter and troubleshooter but does not take an active part in the day-to-day experiences of the students in the field.

Technically, the importance of the course is that the preservice teacher cannot progress through the teacher education program without successfully completing this course with a grade of C or better. If not, the students will be asked to re-take the class. Since the field experience is attached to the course, it must be successfully completed, too.

Evaluation process

Essentially the evaluation process in the field experiences provided by the University of Ash primarily involves the cooperating teacher and the student. The
supervisor, the course instructor and the director of field experiences do not participate actively in the process.

Students take the evaluation sheet with them when they go into the field. At the end of the five weeks that the students are in the classroom, the cooperating teachers complete the evaluation sheets. This piece of paper is filed in the student's permanent folder and is accessed only if problems are identified in any of the later field experiences. If the preservice teacher has unsatisfactory grades from both the cooperating teachers in the two five-week placements in the semester, the matter is referred to the instructor of the course for a decision on the grade to be awarded.

The university supervisor, who is the coordinator of the program and has been a course instructor, expects the cooperating teacher to involve the preservice teacher in a reflective conferencing process in which they will discuss what happens in the field and why, identifying and analyzing critical incidents. Also included in the evaluation are the adjuncts on campus who teach other sections of the course on which the field experience is based. The field experience students are evaluated on the basis of paper and pencil tests, their written assignments and four projects completed as part of the field experience. These teaching adjuncts are more immediately involved in the evaluation process than the university supervisor or the director.
The instrument, a checklist which requires the evaluator to rate the students on a five-point scale from Unsatisfactory to Outstanding, consists of criteria that focus on personal attributes, some performance in terms of their oral communication skills, and manifestations of professionalism of which punctuality and reliability are important aspects. One way a preservice teacher would fail would be caused by "Absenteeism. They, they are late or never show up" (D).

Another purpose of the evaluation is to ascertain the interpersonal skills of the students. The individuals the preservice teachers are expected to interact with include students in the classroom, the cooperating teacher, the principal, other teachers, and the administrative staff in the school. In this experience where they "try to serve as teacher aides," (D) the ability of the students to get along with people they are likely to meet in the course of their career and work is deemed important enough to be a criterion in the evaluation instrument.

We attempt to get some evaluation materials back that might highlight students that would have problems particularly with human relations types of skills working with other people. And typically that is the type of student that gets identified probably most frequently by our early field experience.... Being disrespectful to teachers, students in the classroom. And obviously we have even had, you know, sexual kinds of things that occur between our students and the students out there in the school and the teachers out there in the school.
This purpose closely associates with another purpose of the field experience which is "to provide the preservice teachers with experience in an urban setting, in a culturally diverse urban setting" (US).

According to the university supervisor, the underlying theory of these field experiences is based on constructivist theories of knowing and perceiving. This philosophy of education and of knowing influences the way students look at their own learning and how they view teaching. To develop an instrument more consistent with what the university supervisor sees as the philosophy of the course and the field experience, the course coordinator, who is also the designated supervisor, brainstormed with the adjuncts who teach the course. Together they developed a new evaluation instrument but this instrument is used only on campus to evaluate the course work including the reflective analyses and the assignments of the students. This instrument and these criteria are not used by the cooperating teachers in the field.

Grading

Grading is a major concern. The preservice teachers and the faculty want an objective assessment of the student’s ability to reflect on what is taught in the class on campus, on the course objectives, and on the experiences in the field. The course coordinator felt that objective tests could serve the purpose. This is the only reason cited for pencil-and-paper tests.
I wanted some form of objective test that they could take. That was a grading concern that students had.... And some of the instructors too.

The actual grades offered for the field experiences are not very important if they are to be judged by the effect they have on the students' progress in the program or the use to which they are put. A passing grade as noted by the cooperating teacher is a necessary but not sufficient condition. As observed by the director, unless the student receives low grades from both the cooperating teachers s/he is assigned to that quarter, the evaluation given by the cooperating teacher is not questioned and the quality of her/his experience is not examined.

The field experience is evaluated on what aspects of it are reflected on campus, in the papers students write and the analyses they do. The course instructors, who are all teachers or administrators in schools, evaluate and grade the course work assigned on campus. The content for these assignments can be gathered from the field experiences. It is this grade which is taken directly into consideration to decide whether the student has passed or failed the course. Thus, the effect of the experience on the student as judged by the university personnel carries more weight than the cooperating teacher's.

Perceptions of the cooperating teacher as evaluator

If the importance of the personnel involved in the field experience is to be judged by who does the evaluation, the cooperating teachers have the highest profile. They are the only ones who evaluate the students in the field, filling out a sheet of paper at the end
of the experience. The evaluations the cooperating teacher fills out are placed in the permanent files of the students and are referred to only when a problem is identified with a preservice teacher in later field experiences, specifically student teaching.

The cooperating teacher does not like the present evaluation instruments since s/he finds them too limiting. Checklists are not her/his preferred form of evaluation. S/he has trouble "coming down on a number" (CT) and "tends to draw a line between two of them" (CT) while at the same time realizing that this is not a good or appropriate use of the checklists.

CT I think that messes up their, the look of their rating scale. They may not appreciate it because they, it, it's harder for them to, to do an objective count. I often find that if, if I give them like one to ten I have trouble coming down on a number. And so I, I tend to draw a line, maybe between four and five... I don't know, it's uncomfortable. It really is. I, I don't think it's probably ever, ever truly fair or objective.

Further, s/he does not feel that the numbers s/he is required to put down are representative of what s/he sees regarding the student. However, s/he does manipulate the instrument to suit her/his needs by creating her/his own space to write her/his comments. As s/he says, "I just would like a little better document or space where I could add a comment of my own instead of weaving my comments in between numbers that are on a scale."

The cooperating teacher finds conferencing very difficult to schedule. With the best of intentions, s/he reports very little time or opportunity to sit down with the preservice teacher and talk about the events in the classroom. The cooperating teacher is
very supportive and willing to share her/his classroom with the preservice teacher but s/he has no time for more than a traditional feedback session. As the university supervisors terms it, this type of conferencing usually consists of "a pat on the back, you've done a good job, here're your good points, here're your bad points" (US). The cooperating teacher her/himself makes an effort to be available to the preservice teacher but is not always successful.

CT Their arrival time and departure time, it's usually at the onset of teaching and when they leave we're still teaching, so they're unless we were to call and chat on the phone ... touching base with me ... I always give kids my phone number, so if they wanted to discuss something. ...

The cooperating teacher expresses a disinclination to grade the students under most circumstances. S/he would rather supervise them, work with them and leave the grading to somebody else, like the university supervisor. So far as s/he is concerned, it would be "just pleasant" if the students "could be counted on to arrive and they can do their evaluation of what they see" in the classroom and "I'm not asked to do anything like that."

There have been instances when the cooperating teacher is displeased with the preservice teacher's attitude, approach, or professionalism. Such instances make it necessary to give remarks that are negative in nature. The cooperating teacher does not appreciate being put in a position where s/he has got to make negative remarks about the preservice teacher and is conscious of her/his inability and dislike for making negative evaluations or offering negative comments.
CT I won't be good at telling the kid that, quite frankly. I wouldn't be good at saying, you know, 'I think maybe that shirt, it's fun for you to wear at, at sometimes but perhaps not appropriate for the classroom.' I would have trouble saying that.

When s/he has to make negative remarks, the cooperating teacher would like to discuss it with the preservice teacher first before putting it down in writing.

CT But if he or she performed at a level that I thought was poor, I would probably have trouble confronting them about it. I know I would. I probably wouldn't. I would feel guilty documenting that without having discussed it with them.

The cooperating teacher also appears to personalize the problem if s/he has to give a poor evaluation. S/he feels it is her/his responsibility to inspire enthusiasm in the preservice teachers and make them feel excited about teaching and considers "it a challenge to get somebody who's not academic." If that does not happen, s/he feels that s/he has failed in some way and "I also would probably think that I had not done well enough to get them excited in what was going on in my classroom."

This perception is probably not helped in any way by the fact that the cooperating teacher does not usually see the preservice teacher again at any time in the student's educational career. The 25 hours with the students in the field is apparently not sufficient to build a rapport and is insufficient for her/him to get to know the student well enough to evaluate her. The cooperating teacher feels that the length of time the preservice teacher spends in her/his classroom make a difference in the ease with which s/he can make suggestions or negative evaluations. For example, "If the kid were there every day, for three hours, then I would be more willing to document what I thought was someone who probably shouldn't be in education." Alternatively, if s/he had the preservice teacher for
three quarters consecutively, "Then I would really feel like I knew what I was doing" (CT).

The support the university offers the cooperating teachers is in terms of background information and a resource for problems. The director believes that a formal meeting is not necessary to convey this information.

D The things they need to know in terms of who to contact if there's a problem, what the expectations are for them and for the students - that can be done in a couple of paragraphs in a written form and, you know, a handout, a brochure that goes to them.

On his/her part, the cooperating teacher stated that s/he would like to get a lot more support from the university supervisor. This need is especially felt when faced with having to make negative remarks since s/he is reluctant to grade the student low or to offer anything but positive comments.

CT I may think there's an issue like may be poor attire, that kind of thing and I don't have a, I won't be good at telling the kid that, quite frankly ... If the supervisor were to touch base with me I wouldn't have a problem with that.

However, this appears to be a rare practice at this institution. The cooperating teacher does not feel that s/he is usually greatly assisted by the university supervisor, who, according to the cooperating teacher, seldom goes out into the field and hardly ever observes the student. The university supervisor may not be in the field often enough to offer an opinion of how the students react to their field experiences, except indirectly in their assignments on campus. The cooperating teacher, who appears to be the only individual in a valid position to offer a grade, is very appreciative when her/his evaluation is supplemented by the university supervisor's. On the rare occasions when it happens, the
university supervisor observes the preservice teacher teaching and evaluates her, in addition to the cooperating teacher's evaluation.

CT She took my evaluation and what she observed, knew the girl was young, and knew they had a lot of potential, and melded those evaluations. That to me was very fair. It wasn't just what I said. It was what the girl had done in class and the time filled, units that s/he turned in, plus her observation of this girl in the classroom. It all counted.

A further mismatch occurs at the University of Ash in the case of the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher with regard to the philosophies that influence the activities and evaluations offered in the field component. While the university supervisor perceives a constructivist viewpoint of learning and teaching, the cooperating teacher does not seem to be aware of the distinct slant the program has towards this philosophy. At her/his end, as far as evaluation is concerned, s/he is involved with the same practices as s/he has been in the past. S/he still fills out the same forms that have been in use for the past ten years at about the same time in the grading period. Whether viewed from the director's traditional standpoint or the constructivist view of the university supervisor, the status quo is maintained with regard to the roles and responsibilities of the cooperating teacher.

Perceptions of the university supervisor as evaluator

The requirements of the university for the university supervisors are fairly straightforward. The only time they are required to go out is the first occasion when the
conscientious graduate assistants make arrangements for the transport of the students to the field on the first day of the field experience.

Our supervisors are primarily responsible for making sure everything goes well in the school system that we've got the students placed in. So that's part of their job. To make sure our student are showing up, showing up punctually, doing the work they're supposed to be doing and not, not disrupting the life of the school anyway.... But their main purpose is to make sure they get there.

The concept of these responsibilities is disseminated when the university holds orientation seminars for its supervisors. In what is termed "not an extensive training session" (D) run for a week, the supervisors are trained in their work which is more administrative than supervisory or evaluative.

Within that training session is time for the departments to work with their new GAs. So we do meet but most of it is going to be, now, map out the particular job that they have through the semester in terms of getting kids on vans, getting the assigned to teachers and all that. So it's minimal in terms of, you know, the supervisory part. It's more the day-to-day paperwork kinds of things that they get training in.

In this experience the university supervisor is seen as a manager who plans and arranges routine details. But the evaluation process does not feature the university supervisor in the field. S/he is not very involved in the experience and is not expected to evaluate the students. Any evaluation by the university supervisor is done only when a problem is identified and a second opinion or an official opinion is required. Even in such cases the university supervisors act as troubleshooters rather than as evaluators.

Our supervisors actually do very little of the evaluation in the schools itself. The evaluation form is filled out by the cooperating teacher that they are assigned to. Our supervisors only get involved
only when there is a major problem with the placement of that student with that particular teacher.

On the other hand, this particular university supervisor with her/his focus on constructivism brings a very different interpretation from the cooperating teacher and the director to the field experience. Firstly, s/he is not satisfied with the instrument which s/he feels is not consonant with the philosophy s/he would like to advocate, a constructivist philosophy. On the other hand, “the most consistent type of assessment that is consistent with the constructivist philosophy (is) more of an authentic assessment, and portfolio assessment process” (US) which would better reflect the kind of evaluation more suited to a constructivist philosophy.

Her/his perception of the evaluation process in this field experience includes a dialogical process in which the cooperating teacher, the university supervisor and the student sit down and have a discussion about teaching and learning, conferencing about the process of teaching and learning, which will help the preservice teachers construct their own models of education.

On that form the cooperating teachers are instructed to involve the preservice teachers in a discussion of their lesson where they identify and explain issues concerns and questions that came up during that particular lesson. And then the cooperating teacher involves them through the questioning strategies. ... they reason and justify what went on in that classroom, the type of interactions that affect the learning. You see, this is more constructivist because you're involving the preservice teachers in constructing their own understanding of the teaching and learning interactions that occurred within that particular.

The supervisor would like the concept of a critical friend to be introduced into the conferencing, in a supporting role. The critical friend could be a third party who would act
as mediator and provide a fresh insight into a problem situation or ease tensions by making one person appreciate the other's viewpoint and may influence the evaluation without actually doing it.

But such conferences do not appear to take place. As the university supervisor explains it, factors such as time limitations make it impossible for the cooperating teacher and the preservice teacher to sit down for a post-teaching conference. In other methods courses where time is not a defining factor, such reflective conferences are possible but an introductory course such as this does not allow for such intimate and long-drawn out contact.

The university supervisor recognizes that the cooperating teacher needs to be introduced to a new concept - constructivism, and that if the field experience is to be successful the cooperating teacher must understand and be sympathetic to the philosophy that underlies the experience. S/he would like a series of three courses, the purpose of which would be for the cooperating teachers "to not only understand the theory, the constructivist theory but understand how it translates into a... mentoring program" (US).

The first of these courses will be "definitely dealing with an overview of theoretical and conceptual ideas.... a theoretical foundations course" (US). The second would "involve a clinical experience where they critique and apply the theory... some kind of internship or practical application component where they begin translating this idea of reflective analysis and constructivist learning into a mentoring program" (US). The third one would be the actual field experience "right in the context of the school but with
support of the university faculty member" (US). The cooperating teachers would “actually practice conferencing, serve as teacher, may be taping video tapes or audio taping those conferences, and evaluating and critiquing” (US) while “mentoring the preservice teachers at the school site” (US).

Perceptions of the director of field experiences

In her/his role in the evaluation process the director merely receives the evaluations from the cooperating teachers and files them in the preservice teacher's permanent folders. If the preservice teacher gets an unsatisfactory evaluation from both the cooperating teachers s/he is with that semester, a red flag is raised. In that case the director calls on the instructor of the course to deal with the matter and to talk to the student. The director is content to lay a paper trail for the preservice teacher and handle the paper work for the field experience and expresses no interest in or commitment to a more active role.

The university appears to be more reactive rather than proactive as far as the cooperating teachers are concerned. There is apparently a lack of understanding at the university level concerning what the purpose of the experience is and what the roles of the cooperating teachers and the university supervisor should be in this, except in terms of what the paper work involves. The director seems unaware of the reservations the cooperating teachers have in carrying out their responsibilities. The cooperating teacher would like the input of the university supervisor. Even more specifically, s/he would like
the university supervisor to take responsibility for giving negative evaluations when the need arises. Yet this is not taken into consideration by the university which does not expect the university supervisors to go into the field and communicate with the cooperating teachers unless there is a problem. But the perception of the university, as shown by the director, does not require the university supervisor to take on any responsibility for evaluation in the field.

D ... to follow up any problems that there might be as far as students not showing up or doing something that is not professional in the classroom. And the students are not observed by a supervisors unless there is a problem.... And then they really don't follow up unless there is a problem that we get from... a teacher or principal calling saying, 'We've got this particular student we think has some problems with it. So'. They're troubleshooters more than they are out there guiding our students in any way. ... They seldom go out and to actually observe the students there.

A specific problem the university has with the cooperating teacher is that in spite of being "strong, professional, well-organized" (D), cooperating teachers as evaluators are widely varied in their assessment of students. This variance is attributed to a difference in what the cooperating teachers expect of the students. According to the director, “Some teachers, anybody who shows up is outstanding. For others you've got be god in order to be even acceptable.” In response to this, the University of Ash has decided against including the grading of the cooperating teacher as part of their final grade.

The various alternatives available to the institution could include suggestions made by the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor: making the instrument clearer to the user so that the cooperating teachers understand the grading scheme; university personnel sharing their own rating and evaluation with the cooperating teachers in an
effort to build a consensus and provide a narrower range of grades; and training the cooperating teachers in the evaluative aspect of supervision. But as the cooperating teacher said, “I don’t really feel that’s probably something the university’s going to be doing. If they haven’t even come into the building, I don’t imagine they’re going to be organizing any workshop.”

The director offers none of these as a possibility to help the teachers be more consistent in their grading. The only suggestion offered for training them in evaluation is an “inspirational speaker” (D) rather than a workshop or a course, which runs directly contrary to the expectations of the university supervisor.

Exemplifying a case of the right hand not knowing what the left hand does, the director believes that the purpose of the evaluation is to rate the students on their professionalism, and check on their suitability for a career in teaching and to identify "Any kind of an extreme situation that gonna flag them (students)" (D). S/he makes no reference to the constructivist philosophy on which the university supervisors says the course and the field experience are based.

This mismatch between the perceptions of the cooperating teacher, the director and the university supervisor leads to differing views of what skills the cooperating teacher needs as an evaluator. The cooperating teacher believes that what s/he does will not gain anything in a training session for her/him to perform her/his role as evaluator more effectively. In this the director agrees with her.

CT There's nothing that's expected of that student or of me that... I need to be enlightened or have additional training for.
We're not going to train them to do that in a course that meets one night a week or anything like that that's going to completely change their character that makes them, you know, the outstanding individuals, the teacher.

Overview

Communication at the University of Ash appears to be a problem and results in a lack of compatibility between the goals of the program and the evaluation. In fact, the goals as perceived by the university supervisors on the one hand and the cooperating teacher and the director on the other are very different.

Of the three people involved in the evaluation, the director is not concerned with the experiences in the field. S/he prefers a 'hands-off' attitude and has no role to play apart from filing the paperwork at the end of the experience.

But the role of the cooperating teacher as an evaluator is perfunctory. It is almost as though the paper work done by the cooperating teacher is used to lay a paper trail for the students should there be a need for counseling students out of the program at a later stage.

The connection between the field and the courses based on constructivist philosophy seems to be established fairly firmly in the perception of the university supervisor. But the cooperating teacher is not aware of the influence of this particular philosophy and how this should be played out in the field experience. This leaves her/him using an instrument that is ten years old, which, in the university supervisor's opinion, is without any relevance to the activities of the students. On the other hand, the preservice
teachers are evaluated on the on-campus activities with instruments specially created with relevance to constructivist philosophy. As marks of inconsistency in the process, the evaluation done in the field is not reflected in the grade, nor is the instrument designed to evaluate students from a constructivist point of view.

Thus, the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher do not appear to understand each other at all. It is apparent that the university supervisor has not communicated to the cooperating teacher and the director the new philosophy s/he has applied to the course and the field experiences. Therefore, her/his perception of the skills that the cooperating teacher needs to be trained in is very different from that of the director. Thus in the final analysis, a discussion of a coherent and comprehensive evaluation pattern as it exists at the University of Ash might be fruitless and irrelevant.

Beech University

Description of field experience

The field experience offered by Beech University is the first one that the sophomores have once they have been admitted to the college of Education. The students are located at selected schools called ‘center schools,’ typically two or three in any one building, as close to their area of residence as possible. Typically the students go to the sites from the fourth week of the term for a period of six weeks and the field experience involves two mornings a week, usually Tuesday and Thursday mornings. They do not
necessarily have any previous classroom experience though they might have done some “specific observations in specific classrooms” (CT).

This field experience is attached to a six-credit methods course which is further divided into three blocks of two credits each. The subject areas covered by these methods courses include classroom management, fundamentals of education and a reading program.

Evaluation process

The evaluation process consists of a checklist that is completed by the cooperating teacher, and signed by the university supervisor and the student, indicating “awareness not approval” (D) with the signature. The cooperating teacher is expected to conference with the student regarding the evaluation that has been written by her/him. Copies are made for the cooperating teacher, the university supervisor and for the field office. The paperwork is handled by the education office which files the evaluations for reference at a future date.

If cause for extreme concern is expressed by the cooperating teacher or the university supervisor, a ‘concern conference’ is called. This includes the university supervisor and the director who conference with the student regarding the problem that has been identified.
Instrument

The checklist consists of a 5-point scale starting with Unacceptable and progresses through Below Expectations and Needs Improvement to Good and Outstanding. A scale of Did Not Observe offers an alternative to criteria that are not relevant. There is also “a very small space for comments” (CT).

The criteria, about 20 of them, can be grouped under certain categories. These include personal attributes such as willingness to observe a variety of classes, flexibility and creativity; professional qualities such as punctuality, attendance, possessing effective written and oral communication skills, and having professional potential; pedagogical skills such as having content knowledge, providing for individual differences and designing lesson plans; management skills such as maintaining disciplinary policy, and demonstrating management skills to large and small groups.

Grading

For the final grade, which is awarded by the university supervisor, the work taken into account is the student’s paperwork. A portfolio, which accounts for half the grade, consists of a unit plan including goals, behavioral objectives, a cooperative lesson, a quiz, a test, a checklist rating scale, and a rationale. This unit plan is not implemented in the field. The other half of the grade is based on abstracts that the student write, a library assignment, the journalling of their field experience, and two exams.
Perceptions of the cooperating teacher as evaluator

The cooperating teacher is provided with the syllabus of the course so that s/he has information that “go(es) into great depth in terms of exactly what that student ought to be doing in the field” (D). This information packet also briefly explains the grading and the type of instruction that the student will be receiving at the university.

In agreement with the director, the cooperating teacher is dissatisfied with the evaluation instrument. The space afforded by the instrument is not sufficient for her/his needs.

Further, some of the criteria such as “Has emotional maturity, Is healthy, Has professional potential” (CT) are “vague” (CT). There are others that s/he finds irrelevant to the experience at that grade level. For example, the cooperating teacher reports that the preservice teachers in her/his first grade classroom cannot lead discussions or conduct quizzes. S/he is not quite sure how to deal with such criteria and how the university expects her/him to react in those conditions though s/he could mark them “Not Observed.” S/he would like some input in the matter but since the university supervisor does not come into her/his class, s/he is unable to clear the issue with her/him.

R  Do you have a problem, there are times when you don’t know what to put down when you think there are certain criteria you just can’t talk about, you just can’t give them a grade on that?

CT  I think then I would say, ‘This was not observed or. We didn’t cover this at the time.’ And then I think there’s something’s like that, I thing there’s something that says, Led a discussion group. Well, we don’t discuss too well, especially if I have someone first quarter of first grade.
Certain other criteria such as planning skills beyond the daily lesson plans and demonstrating evaluation skills are evaluated not by the cooperating teacher but by the university supervisor. The student submits a portfolio which contains evidence of these abilities. The cooperating teacher is unaware of this aspect of evaluation and believes that these criteria are not relevant to the experience.

The conference that the cooperating teacher has with the student is formative in nature. With a view to helping the student grow, suggestions for improvements are made.

CT I try and do something of strength first. And then I do tell them (the students) what it is that I see could be improved and needs to be changed and the reason for it and then a way to do it, look if I can think of one or if I'm working with somebody that could change it.

In an effort to give the student more meaningful feedback and to make this a formative experience, the cooperating teacher uses her/his own evaluation technique. As the student teachers or performs the task, s/he scripts the lesson or activity. This provides the student immediate and detailed information which s/he can then act upon in planning subsequent activities.

CT For the student that I'm working with whenever they're doing anything, I script as they're doing it and I hand that to the person and they can either turn it into their teacher or they can put it into the waste basket. The college does not ask me to so that but I think if the young person is presenting something and trying to teach something, they should have some feedback. So I give that immediately, you know, as they're doing whatever they're doing.

The cooperating teacher is not required to give a final, overall grade. In her/his turn, s/he is happy not to be involved in the grading, which is totally university-based. The student is with her/him only two mornings a week and spends more time on campus so
that the cooperating teacher is quite content to have the university supervisor or the
course instructor give the student a grade and not have to give her/him something as
specific as “This is your field experience. You got an A, B, C or D” (CT).

Another factor is that “my expectations are different from what the college tells
them (the students) I should expect” (CT). The cooperating teacher needs to know what
these expectations are so that her/his evaluations can then be valid and “fair to the
student” (CT). In spite of having written information and being trained many years, the
cooperating teacher is not convinced that s/he and the university are on the same page as
far as expectations of the field experience are concerned. If s/he is prepared to mentor a
student throughout the year, s/he would like to be appraised of the purpose of the
experience with greater clarity during “a visit in fall by the university personnel” (CT).

The need to clarify the goals of the experience for the cooperating teacher is
apparent in her/his understanding that the field experience does not involve a lot of
teaching. This is in direct contrast to the director’s requirements of the field experience
which is that the focus of the field experience is on teaching and practicing the theory
learnt in the university classroom. The university is clear that the connection between the
theory and the practice must be emphasized in the field.

D The purpose I think is pretty clear. They're being taught skills and certain
methods of teaching content area and this is an opportunity for them to
practice those skills on a limited basis. Also, doing some unit kind of lesson
planning. I think lesson planning in that, in each of those courses is
something that is given a lot of focus. And I think some lesson delivery.
Another major area of difficulty for the cooperating teacher is saying "That lesson was really junky. This is what you should do to fix it up" (CT). The cooperating teacher is aware that negative remarks are not easy to make and need a lot of tact. The cooperating teacher would like, as part of the training, "some words and techniques to do that."

The cooperating teacher's dissatisfaction with the process and the instrument in use extends to the university supervisor who, in the cooperating teacher's opinion, is not proactive. S/he says, "It doesn't seem this faculty is doing a great deal."

The cooperating teacher at times questions the university supervisor's evaluation and the validity of her/his decision. In a particular instance, the cooperating teacher felt that the student was not suited to teaching and advised the student "to take a good look at what she was doing." The cooperating teacher believes that the university was "not being fair with her to let her continue in the program where she did not seem to be suited."

On two occasions the cooperating teacher asked for help with particular students and did not receive it promptly. S/he had to pursue the matter vigorously before s/he received the level of support that s/he expected. This involves the university supervisor observing the student in the classroom. Though the cooperating teacher followed the protocol and discussed the problem with others and used the university as a last resort, the slow response rate of the university was not very encouraging. Even though instances of this sort are not the norm and do not happen often, this incident has left her/him feeling displeased with the university's policy of dealing with problems.

CT And I only have, as I say, I only had two that I was concerned about with all these people. Generally they're quite well prepared. And they're very cooperative. And when I did have a lot of trouble, it took me a while to get
some help. I first talked to my. We do team-teach in the units. I talked to the other two women. Then I go to my principal. Then I go to the facilitator to the program in Beech University and then we go to the college. And sometimes I had to keep going back and back and back. Leaving phone messages and they would call me back and the I'd leave another phone message. That was a little upsetting.

In one instance the cooperating teacher appealed to the university to send out an observer “and no one came and no one came and no one came until almost the last week” (CT). Without a second opinion, the cooperating teacher felt unable to help the student further and had to recommend that the student repeat the field experience.

In another instance the university did not respond till the cooperating teacher stated that s/he would not pass the student concerned. “Then they appeared and said, ‘Well, could you?’” (CT). When the cooperating teacher wrote a negative evaluation, the university supervisor wanted a change in the wording to reflect a less forceful tone. The cooperating teacher refused to consider it “until we talk. And that time they came out and watched and spoke with the young woman” (CT).

The cooperating teacher would like the university supervisor to have a higher profile in the site. While s/he is aware of the limitations of time and space, s/he does not have much sympathy for such considerations. Her/his suggestion is that the university needs to make a choice between the quality and the quantity by which the program should be judged. The cooperating teacher is of the opinion that regardless of all other considerations, all the students must be reached by the university, and must be observed, and must have the chance to conference with the university supervisor.
CT  I think there needs to be a little bit more cooperation or closeness with the university. And if they have so many students that they can't reach, then they need to limit their program. And that's just my own feeling.

For her/his efforts, the cooperating teacher would like corroboration of her/his observations of the student. S/he “would have liked her (the university supervisor) to have sat down and watched him (the student) interact with the children.” Instead, on one occasion, the university supervisor was “in the room for a total of six minutes” (CT) and did not watch the student do anything.

While the cooperating teacher enjoys the process of supervision and having the preservice teacher sharing the classroom, s/he is not convinced of the importance of the field experience as the university sees it. Her/his perception of the experience is that it is not valued very highly by the university.

CT  I think it's a very, I don't want to say lightweight, but it doesn't have. My impression of it is they don't really care a great deal about what the kids have to do. It's more just to give them exposure to the classroom. I don't think it would be a teaching experience. I think it's just an in-class experience to see whether or not you are mature and a professional and. Because there's not a great deal of teaching required.

In her/his turn, the cooperating teacher also believes that s/he is not valued or appreciated. Her/his part in the field experience appears to be “lightweight,” and what s/he thinks is “inconsequential.” S/he feels that her/his input is “almost just an opportunity for the student to be in the classroom” and that “it doesn't have a lot of relevance.” Unfortunately, s/he has not been able to discuss this with any of the university personnel nor have any of them appeared to have picked up on this note of discontent to address it.
The cooperating teacher has undergone specialized training supplied by the university and is called the Classroom Teacher Educator. The university places a lot of reliance in these cooperating teachers and presumes that the training has given them the capacity to conduct the supervision and evaluation of the preservice teachers without the aid of the university supervisor.

But the cooperating teacher feels that experience has taught her/him more than any course or training s/he has had. The cooperating teacher said that the formal training s/he has had as Classroom Teacher Educator is outdated to a certain extent since the purpose of the program and the field experience have changed since s/he took the course. This group still meets twice a year and talks about the expectations of the college and what is expected of the cooperating teacher but these meetings are not sufficient to keep the cooperating teacher updated on the changes in the program.

The cooperating teacher would like to see other evaluators in her/his position have a greater profile in the training given to teachers. “Visiting inservice professors” who are “aware of the feelings of the university and ... of the system here and our own curriculum” (CT) could be called upon to conduct the training sessions for some “congruency” (CT).

Perceptions of the university supervisor as evaluator

The university supervisor at Beech University does not play an active part in the field experience, especially if the student is placed with a Classroom Teacher Educator. In such a case, the university supervisor does not visit the site at all. If the cooperating
teacher is not a Classroom Teacher Educator, the university supervisor observes the student once in the course of the quarter. The university supervisor is not expected to evaluate the student unless the cooperating teacher expresses concern, which might prompt the university supervisor into observing the student and providing an evaluation.

Evaluation in this field experience does not appear to be personalized, though the experiences provided are varied and depend on the student and the cooperating teacher. This seems to be an operational factor in the university supervisor not feeling it incumbent on her/him to base his evaluation on the activities the cooperating teacher provides for the student.

R But you don't really have a chance to get back to the cooperating teacher to discuss what your evaluation of the student is?

US No.

R Do you think that would make a difference to you?

US .... I almost doubt it at this level. Just because the experience is extremely varied. Some of the students get to work with just one or two students. And they're doing more of a one-on-one tutoring. And other students have teachers who just love having them there and they teach them a lot and they let them have a whole class experience. And so they're, their exposure is all over the place.

The substance of the assignments that is graded and the material that is used for the assignments are all gathered from the activities in the field. The university supervisor feels that s/he can see the connection between the activities in the field and the evaluation which s/he needs to do.

R So the activities that they do on campus in your classroom are not really carried out in the field.
Except for the field experience observation. That's carried out in the field. And then who are the student, observations, classroom management, that is in the field. The learner's analysis is in the, their observation in the field. And the rationale they choose for their unit has to be based on the grade they observe and a much as possible the class they've been placed in. And as well as their goals and behavioral objectives.

The university supervisor communicates with the cooperating teacher before the field experience begins. This is in the form of an introductory letter. The university supervisor believes that if the university wishes to define the purpose of the experience and of the evaluation, the initial letter would be the most effective way of doing it.

If you were to send the initial letter and tell something specific that you, you know, in other words, specific directions you wanted, I think you could influence them at that point. I mean, we send a letter of what we expect. And we ask students if they can possibly do it to go over the letter with the teacher so that it can be put in the desk drawer. I think at that point you could say, 'Would you please watch for...’

The university supervisor expects the cooperating teacher to be fair in her/his evaluation of the student. The teachers who take interest in the evaluation and do their part as an service to their profession feel that “they have a responsibility for blocking anybody they consider harmful to kids but encouraging those they think have potential” (US).

One of the purposes of the evaluation is to pick up negative attitudes the students may have. The university supervisor feels that s/he has to be very careful with such judgments since they are most likely to be subjective as no reliable instruments can identify such an attitude.

I would say that it was up to me to pick up that negative attitude. One a person who just shouldn't be in education in the first place. And it has to be pretty blatant because otherwise I don't feel in a position to really judge and I don't think education has, at least I'm not aware of good tools at this point to sit down people who aren't psychologically fit to be in the classroom.
But the university supervisor reports not consulting with the cooperating teacher about the student. Her/his interaction with the cooperating teacher does not include discussing the student unless the cooperating teacher brings it up. Apart from pleasantries and providing the cooperating teacher a chance to talk to her/him if s/he chooses to, the university supervisor does not initiate any in-depth discussion with the cooperating teacher.

**US** First of all I thank the cooperating teacher. And ask if she or he has any concerns or questions or anything. And at that point they either praise the student or take me aside and say they have a little problem about let's say punctuality or something of that nature.

On the other hand, the university supervisor does seek the opinion and observations of her/his peers who would also have had a chance to observe the student for other courses, especially when a concern conference seems required.

**US** If there’s really a lot of problems, and I feel there’s a lot of potential problems, then I can have a concern conference. Then again, I would sit together with any other professors that my student's having and see if my observation matches theirs because they're out in the field in the same place and with the reading literacy course. So they do an hour of literacy observations and two hours for our curriculum and methods in the same placements, on Tuesdays and Thursday mornings. So I do have other people that I can, we can kind of compare notes. And then we get together with the person who is the chair of the field placement and call the student in and just kind of go over our observations just so we have it on record so the student is alerted and can make any adjustments in their behavior that we feel would be appropriate.

On occasions the university supervisor has tried to communicate her/his point of view, it has been with a purpose of changing the cooperating teacher's opinion. Not having been successful in this, s/he does not attempt it often.

**US** The few times when I've had a chance to talk with them, I can't, I can't see that it benefits our students any and I doubt that I have any opportunity to change
their thinking. I mean, they can have their say and they can tell their reasoning but... ...

The university supervisor does not attempt to pull together a triadic conference. If s/he observes the student in the field, which s/he does fewer times than s/he would like to, s/he talks to her/him immediately following the observation. The conference focuses on planning connecting the theory to the practice.

US And if the student is not teaching, which most of the time we don't seem to get there when they're actually teaching or tutoring an individual or something, then I usually take the student aside and spend a half hour, 45 minutes just talking about their units and trying to connect in their minds with the students they're observing even though they may not be always able to teach it but to make it a little more real.

The great variation among the cooperating teachers in their evaluation of the students creates a problem for the university supervisor. Some cooperating teachers “have impossibly high standards” (US) and “are not very encouraging” (US). Others “take it very seriously and they really try to give some indication” (US) of how the student is doing. At the other extreme are cooperating teachers who mark all the students at the highest grade all the way through. The university supervisor reports needing to know the cooperating teacher and the student well to be able to interpret the evaluation. Since the communication with the cooperating teacher appears to be lacking, the university supervisor conferences with the student to determine what a more accurate evaluation could be.

Though the university supervisor may not agree with the grade or the evaluation of the cooperating teachers, s/he does not alter it in any way. Neither does s/he let it affect her/his evaluation of the student.
Occasionally we get one that I don't think is accurate... I don't change the grade on the form. I don't change the grade they've given but I don't let it influence my grading a whole lot because I have a lot of other criteria to use.

If the university supervisor feels that the evaluation of the student is at great variance with hers/his, s/he consults with the student. More than the cooperating teacher's evaluation, her/his grade may be influenced by this dyadic conference.

I collect the evaluations that come in from the teachers at the end of the year, which I think I sent you a copy of that. And if I feel that there is a great discrepancy, then at that point I can try to interpret it with students. Sometimes I empathize with the student and really listen to see if it's a fair assessment or if a it's low, it's especially low, for instance.

In an effort to ease the communication with the cooperating teacher, the university supervisor has considered the possibility of videotaping a lesson. A vignette could then be chosen for discussion by the cooperating teacher, the university supervisor and the student which might be “helpful” (US).

The university supervisor attributes her/his skill as an evaluator to “years of teaching” (US). Both the cooperating teacher and the director appreciate this and expect the university supervisor to have classroom experience and to be able to interpret the evaluation instrument.

I think they should have classroom experience. I think they should have an extensive amount of experience in evaluating and working with people and some good instrument they can share with us, whether we are all on the same baseline and not only the instrument and say, ‘... But if a student does this and this and this, it's a 5. If they do this and this and this, it's a 2.' You know, some explanation, some example of what we would be doing.

Definitely I think that one of the skills is that they been in the classroom recently. Too often they're away from the classroom too long and forget what's going on out there. I also think that having had some experience in supervision certainly would be helpful.
Student input into assessment and grading is being considered by the university supervisor. Peer evaluation is a possibility but in the university supervisor's opinion, "I'd have to think it through a lot more" before it is translated into practice.

**Perceptions of the director of field experiences**

The director at Beech University is involved in the field experience to the extent that s/he makes the placement and files the paperwork. S/he is not directly involved since s/he neither supervises nor evaluates the students. Given the distance between the site and her/him, the director is remarkably well-informed about the attitude of the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor and their involvement in the field experience.

Philosophically, the director is clear about the purpose of the field experience but is not clear on the details. S/he does not know that the cooperating teacher does not grade the field experience at all, and the only grade given is by the university supervisor. S/he expects the course instructor to incorporate the grade from the field experience into the grade for the course but is not clear how it is done, which it is not.

Like the cooperating teacher, the director is dissatisfied with the evaluation instrument. The director expects the student to get a 4 or a 5 on the rating. Anything less than that would be to alert the director to the student's performance or the lack of it.

Further, the checklist does not provide her/him with specific information about the student and some criteria are also seen as vague by the director. In this s/he is in agreement with the cooperating teacher. Certain criteria that the director finds inappropriate are 'Displays
a healthy sense of humor' and 'Designs a lesson plan appropriate to objectives.' "Who determines what’s appropriate?" questions the director. All it does is "kind of raise a red flag" (D). The criteria in the instrument are not specific enough to give the director specific information regarding the student.

D They don’t give me specific information. No. All they do is what you mentioned, is kind of raise a red flag. We can look back and say, ‘Well, you know, they did have trouble out in the field. Therefore this is not a surprise’ And then I would go back to the instructor in trying to gather data to help us during this practicum and the student teaching. You know, where were the weak areas? What can we do to help the student?

The director would like a comparative rating from the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor. The same form could be used so that a comparison of the perspectives of both evaluators on the student could be had. This would help the director with the placement during later field experiences.

The director would also like to see the instrument used as a prompt for the triadic conference which should take place. In the formative evaluation, all the evaluators would complete the instrument and then have a conference where their evaluation is discussed.

D As far as the application of this (the instrument), I would like to have it completed by the course instructor and that cooperating teacher and having them talk with the student rather than it just be an instrument that’s just turned in at the conclusion of the quarter.

A conference between the cooperating teacher, the university supervisor and the student would also help by "offering an opportunity to supply the student with suggestions for improvement, how to, you know, in fact become stronger in these specific areas" (D).

Though the director would like to see conference have prominence in the evaluation process, s/he is aware that the reality is different. In accommodating the
students close to their areas of residence, a problem is created for the university supervisor. Since the sites are so far apart, the university supervisor does not have the time to observe all the students.

D But it's, certainly does create a problem in terms of supervision for the instructor because they have so many students and have many different buildings in which to visit students.

R So supervisors spend a lot of time on the road.

D Absolutely. And what I'm told by those instructors is that they're lucky to get to see all of the students one time. So it becomes a matter of checking in toward the end of the quarter to see how, how they've done.

The director acknowledges that triadic conferences do not take place. A major reason for this is the student-to-university supervisor ratio is very high. Not enough university supervisors are appointed to make this a reality. As the director says, "The manpower isn't there to do it."

A dyadic conference between the cooperating teacher and the student, the next best thing to a triadic conference, is not part of the evaluation, either, according to the director. S/he is aware that the cooperating teacher does not always conference with the student regarding the evaluation that has been done of the student. While the director will not "vouch" (D) for the fact, it is apparent that the evaluation is done when the student is not in school. The evaluation sheet comes to the director by mail from the cooperating teacher "and I don't think she's ever thought" (D) about the grade s/he awards and the remarks s/he makes. As a result the evaluation may not serve the purpose of getting the student and the cooperating teacher to share their views about the student's ability and performance.
The lack of communication between the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor is clearly noted by the director. Instead of a collegial relationship marked by an easy discourse in which they can share their views, the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher at this university have little contact with each other. The cooperating teacher does not expect the university supervisor to come out and observe the students or to share her/his evaluations with the cooperating teacher. As the director says, “Ours (the cooperating teachers) don’t any more because they’re used to it,” referring to the university supervisor not visiting the classroom.

There appears to be a gap between the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher that might need to be bridged. The director is conscious of that as is seen in her/his statement, “There is a definite difference in attitude... In fact at oftentimes public school people don’t really feel that we at the university understand their setting, their role, their responsibilities, that kind of thing.”

The director is aware that the cooperating teacher’s first course of action when s/he has difficulties is to approach her/his peers. “In the methods courses, I think it has to be a very serious situation before they ever call that instructor, that faculty member” (D), an accurate assessment of the cooperating teacher’s sentiments.

As of now, the cooperating teacher tends to call the director’s office with problems rather than call the university supervisor. This is primarily cited due to the cooperating teacher not knowing the university supervisor very well.

D They will call our office, 'There is a problem.' And in the methods courses because the faculty person does the supervisor, we say, 'Look, I will relay that
message for you but I would really encourage you to talk to the instructor directly. And I try to encourage them to do that.

R    Why do you think they don't do that as a first step?

D    Because I don't think they think the faculty member is all that involved in the field portion of the experience.

This lack of understanding appears to be partly due to the university supervisor not visiting the site and becoming familiar with both the cooperating teacher and the activities in the field. As the director sees it, this results in the cooperating teacher approaching the university supervisor only when the situation gets beyond her/his control, and hardly ever does the university supervisor seek the cooperating teacher's help with a problem student might have.

D    I would think that if there were a major problem, the faculty member, the supervisor would go to the cooperating teacher but normally, ..., that isn't the way it works. It isn't the instructor complaining to the cooperating teacher, it is the other way around.

R    Why is it that, do you think?

D    Well, because I think there isn't that relationship between the methods person and our school district people. ... I don't think the instructor really knows what the student is doing out there in the field because they are not able to go out and see until very late in the quarter and they go out for one time, you know.

The director accepts that a difference between the philosophical stands of the student and the cooperating teacher can be reflected in the grades. The university's responsibility in this is to redress the balance.

D    I think that our students are probably graded, probably a bit lower if in fact they haven't done it exactly the way the cooperating teachers want but have attempted to apply all the techniques and so on they've learnt at the university courses. And I think at times that doesn't sit very well with the cooperating teacher.
Another reason for the lack of communication between the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor could be the difference in their understanding of the field experience. Since the university supervisor teaches the course, her/his knowledge of the requirements of the field experience would be very different from the cooperating teacher's. The cooperating teacher could be at cross-purposes with the university supervisor.

D I would think that they (the university supervisors) would certainly know their course better and the type of approach they're expecting, you know, the types of strategies and so on they're advocating in their course. Again sometimes I think that the cooperating teacher doesn't always, their approach doesn't always sit with what we're being taught at the university, what our students are being taught at the university. So, you know, that can become a problem.

In the director's opinion, this could be changed if the university supervisor could establish a closer relationship with the cooperating teacher. Constant, frequent and consistent contact with the cooperating teacher will help the university supervisor establish a healthy relationship with the cooperating teacher. Then the cooperating teacher would "automatically turn to that instructor" (D) rather than to the field office.

The director understands the cooperating teacher’s opinions very well. S/he correctly reads the cooperating teacher’s respect for the university supervisor who has experience in the field and has been a classroom teacher her/himself. As the director says, "I think that if our faculty could have the kind of workload where they were able to go out on a consistent basis, that they would be much more accepted by the school district people."

The director acknowledges that not every good teacher is a good cooperating teacher or a good evaluator. Since the university does not pick who their students should
be placed with, they try to train the teachers with whom their students will work. At the
invitation of the school district, a training session for the cooperating teachers is offered
by Beech University. The purpose of the program is discussed, as also the evaluation
process and the instrument.

Well, we talk about: How do we supervise a student? What are we looking
at? What kind of feedback? How often? What are you really looking for? And
how do you give that feedback to the student? How much responsibility do
they have? When do you back off? How do you help them be creative? All of
those kind of things... . How do you evaluate? You know, what's the criteria?
What should you be expecting from these students? What does your final
evaluation really mean? Is it something that's going to be a learning experience
for them? Is it simply a grade that says nothing? What if you don't feel that this
person belongs in education and the grade is very low? How do you go about
doing that and, you know, making the student a part of that? Yeah, we do go
into all that.

The director describes the Classroom Teacher Educator as an on-going program that is
"in-house" (D) and conducted by the personnel in college. It is designed for the cooperating
teachers “to enhance their supervisory skills, to understand our curriculum, to know what
we’re trying to teach” (D). The cooperating teachers interact with the faculty that teach the
courses. The director reports that, recommended by their principals, these teachers, called
Classroom Teacher Educators, are trained in evaluation and supervisory techniques.
University supervisors find that students placed with Classroom Teacher Educators require
less guidance than those placed with other cooperating teachers, showing the success of
the program, according to the director.
Overview

Formal mechanisms for acquainting the cooperating teacher with the purposes of the field experience are in place. The training offered to them appears to be well-thought out and relevant. The cooperating teachers are given a lot of responsibility and are trained for it thoroughly before they are inducted into their role, thus negating the need for the university supervisor to play a bigger role in the field experience.

The university supervisor involvement in this field experience is minimal and the need for it to be increased is clear in the cooperating teacher’s comments. Moreover, it is apparent that whatever training they receive, the cooperating teachers still feel the need for a support system. One area, emphasized by the cooperating teacher, which s/he feels could be of assistance in the evaluation process is a more prompt response by the university when the cooperating teacher requests help.

Cedar University

Description of field experience

The first field experience that the students have at Cedar University after they have been admitted to the College of Education is as juniors or seniors when they take a general methods course. The field experience accompanying it is sited in a middle school and runs to 20 hours of supervised experience. The times when they are in the field are arranged to suit the convenience of the student and the cooperating teacher and are not dictated by the
university. The field experience is not graded but it has to be signed off as satisfactory by the university supervisor. If it is not, the experience must be re-done.

Evaluation process

The evaluation process involves the cooperating teacher, the site supervisor and a person from the university. The student is evaluated but is not expected to do any self-evaluation.

The actual supervision is done by the cooperating teacher. A checklist of activities guides her/him in the experiences that should be provided to the student. At mid-term the cooperating teacher and the student conduct a conference, listing the things the student has accomplished. This is used by the cooperating teacher to write the final evaluation, and to check if the goals have been accomplished. At the end of the field experience an evaluation form is signed by the cooperating teacher. The cooperating teacher does not give a grade for the field experience though the course instructor does in connection with the methods course on campus. The university supervisor, who is a site-based coordinator, checks off to indicate the field experience has been completed successfully. In cases where the university supervisor feels the field experience has not been successful, a conference between the course instructor, the university supervisor and the student is arranged. As a result, the student may have to re-do the field experience if necessary.

The person from the university, who does not play a major role in the process, collects all the forms from all the cooperating teachers and returns them to the university.
This is the only function s/he performs apart from periodically checking on the students’
attendance.

Some course instructors at the university require that the evaluation form is
submitted to her/him and s/he peruses them before turning them in to the field experience
office. Otherwise, the forms go directly to the office of field experience where, if all is
satisfactory, they are filed. A secretary checks the returned forms for any check marks
below Satisfactory. These are reviewed by the director who may call in the student for a
consultation or counseling session. The form on each student is reviewed by the faculty
before the next field experience. No other form of feedback from the cooperating teacher
or the university supervisor to the student or to the university is required or suggested.

Instrument

The cooperating teacher is offered alternative forms but two of them are used most
often, one for the mid-term evaluation and another for the final evaluation. The first
incorporates a list of goals that the student sets to achieve. The final evaluation form is
course specific to a large extent and was developed with input from the site supervisors,
condensing two or more documents into one succinct sheet.

One side of the paper has generic criteria such as punctuality and initiative. The
other side of the paper lists eleven criteria indicating activities and requirements are that
specific to the course. An instructor may make an insert if necessary to indicate special
requirements. These may include teaching a session, creating a bulletin board, using
questioning strategies and doing a case study. There are three final criteria on which the site-based university supervisor has to sign off. There is space for a narrative in the form, which can be used by the university supervisor or the cooperating teacher to make notes on concerns or the outcomes of the conferences.

A qualitative scale of grading is used to define the student’s achievement. This ranges from Strong through Acceptable to Needs Improvement and Try Again to Not Appropriate.

In an effort to make sure that the instrument reflects the suggested goals and prescribed activities in the field, it is changed every semester because though the course objectives are the same, the instructors may have different requirements of the students in the field. Instructors of multiple sections of the course may consult each other to have a certain consistency in the interpretation of the course objectives. A video was used once as part of the evaluation scheme but was not successful since the teachers in the classroom objected to it.

**Grading**

In this course which is evaluated as Completed / Not Completed, the only grade the students receive is from the course instructor. The cooperating teacher may give a grade on particular activities that the students are required to do but does not give an overall grade for the field experience. The course instructor does give a grade but does not incorporate any of the cooperating teacher’s grades into the final grade.
Perceptions of the cooperating teacher as evaluator

The role and responsibilities of the cooperating teacher are more supervisory than evaluatory. In terms of the process of evaluation, s/he has a mid-term conference with the student when they take stock of what has been achieved thus far and set fresh goals. At the end of the period, s/he completes an evaluation form.

While the cooperating teacher acknowledges that teaching is a complex act and needs thought and effort, s/he does not want to be involved in something which is complicated and takes up a lot of time, such as the evaluation of field-based students. Her/his role as an evaluator is made easier because it is not an elaborate process. The parsimonious evaluation process that the Cedar University has in place allays the fears of the cooperating teacher and does not demand of her/him more than s/he is willing to give in terms of paperwork.

R  So you don't really feel the need for any more paper documentation of this kind.

CT  No, no. And I think if you did that some teachers that are now willing to accept student assistants from Cedar University would be like hesitant because, you know, they they don't feel threatened by having to fill out one form at the end. But the way teaching is now and all the documentation and paperwork, some teachers might be hesitant if there was a lot more work involved.

The cooperating teacher feels “pretty comfortable” (CT) with the instrument which is a checklist. S/he particularly likes the scale ‘Try Again’ since it is formative in nature and encouraging. Its implication of a second chance is very much to her/his liking.

CT  Well, that ‘Try Again’ kind of sounds good. I mean it, it's not so evaluative as just the fact that, try it again, see if you can do it better this time with
some advice or, you know. I kind of like that. That 'Try Again' part doesn't seem so negative to me. Also, if they have the opportunity to try again, if they actually did get to do it again.

The purpose of a grade is lost on the cooperating teacher whose principles of evaluation are formative. If the purpose is to help students learn to be better teachers, there are many factors that influence her/his reaction to the features of the evaluation process. Some of these are the stage at which the students come into her/his classroom, the activities expected of the students, and the decisions s/he has to make and their importance.

As the cooperating teacher understands it, this is probably the first time the students have an opportunity to teach and test their abilities. With a view towards improving their abilities and giving them a taste of the experience of teaching in all its complexity, the implication the experience has for her/him is that it should be experiential and not judged for achievement.

CT I've been teaching for twenty-five years and I still don't have this right. So, so how can I, in all fairness, grade a student on their first lesson that they've ever taught? ... Particularly if it's their first experience in a classroom because I'm sure they're scared to death. And, and what they do that first time may not be an indicator of what kind of a teacher they're going to be. They're just getting their feet wet.

The cooperating teacher is "comfortable" because s/he does not have to give a grade for this experience. If asked to give one, s/he would be very uncomfortable since s/he does not get the students till late in their academic career. A decision-making role at this late stage in their career is not to her/his liking.

CT If I had to give a grade to a field experience person, I would feel the same way. Because you don't usually get them till their junior year. And I feel, I would feel real bad about having to be real negative or give them a bad
evaluation at that point in their education. I don't think it should come from me. I think they should have, should have gotten an inkling of a problem being there before they get to me. I don't think that responsibility should be put on my shoulders.

S/he also believes that the grade should be based on a wide range of activities and not on a single action that may not be indicative of a student's particular ability. But in this instance, it is not so, as the cooperating teacher points out, "The student usually only does one lesson with me, and I, I, I don't think it would be real fair to have much weight on a grade that was only one experience."

The cooperating teacher is very wary of negative evaluation. This is especially so since s/he believes that as juniors and seniors the students who come her/him are too far advanced in their career for her/him to be justified in offering her/his comments. Further, at this late stage, since s/he has not so far influenced their career, s/he should not now have the responsibility of pointing out severe shortcomings.

CT I'm uncomfortable sometimes being involved, involved in the evaluation progress, because it comes so late in their. I guess one thing that would solve the whole situation is if they were in the classroom sooner in their education. You know, so that, okay, they're a freshman, or they're a sophomore and they're finding out that there may be a problem here with this chosen field that they're in. And they still have time to make changes, but the time they get to be a junior and senior, I feel like I'm the one that has to drop the ax on 'em when it comes to evaluating. And I'm not sure that that's fair, a fair responsibility to put on me.

S/he would probably give a negative grade to "a student that really antagonized me" (CT). S/he is also aware of the need to be honest and fair in her/his evaluation. Some students may not be ready to be teachers in which case professionalism demands s/he should note that and remark on it.
CT  I have the responsibility, if there are negative things, I just have to give that grade, I guess, because, you know, ... I can't turn those people loose on society if they're not ready to be, if they're not ready for teacher. So I guess I've gotta look at it that way.

If s/he had to offer a negative s/he would prefer to do it face to face. A conference or a discussion rather than putting it down on paper is a preferable method. It is more humanistic for you can “make it gentle than ... when it’s written down on paper” (CT).

S/he would also like the professor of the course or somebody from the university to take joint responsibility for it. S/he does not appreciate being left alone to deal with the situation.

CT  I guess if the, the college professor or whoever is in charge of this student at this school was working more cooperatively with me so that, so that we were delivering this together, I guess. So that I didn't feel like I had the whole responsibility of telling the student these things or. I guess if I had more help from the, from the professor that would help me.

The university may be sympathetic to the cooperating teacher in certain ways but it seems limited in terms of official support. An introductory meeting to which all the cooperating teachers are invited is organized. But the cooperating teacher does not feel any purpose is served by this meeting. Issues and problems that s/he is concerned about are not addressed. Focused more on introducing the cooperating teachers to the field experiences, these meetings do not discuss issues the cooperating teacher would consider important, such as: How would you approach a negative grade? How would you define what you see as performance into a grade, translating it into either an A or a B or a score or rating scale of some kind?

CT  It's not in depth, and I don't feel like it, it addresses the problems that we've been talking about. And, and that would, they could do that type of thing during that night, but it isn't something that they really, maybe they aren't,
maybe they're not aware of the problems or maybe not really clear about what the teachers would like, then. ... I guess it needs to be more focused, I guess. When I think about what we have done, we sat down and had discussions, but they're very unfocused.

Perceptions of the university supervisor as evaluator

The position of the university supervisors in the Cedar University places them in a school context with access to the university and the personnel there. Since they are site-based and are teachers in the same schools, the university supervisors perform a dual role as cooperating teacher and as university supervisor. They have been trained in clinical evaluation by the university in a program called the Classroom of the Future. The university also offers a campus-based training session in clinical supervision once a week for graduate credit using discussion and case study as methods of instruction.

The university supervisor is part of the evaluation process in that s/he also evaluates every preservice teacher who is on site. Yet s/he is not part of the evaluation of every preservice teacher since s/he is not responsible for every student evaluated. S/he is not the primary evaluator, the cooperating teacher is. The university supervisor realizes that as far as the cooperating teachers are concerned, s/he is more a part of the university than they are since s/he has closer contact with the university personnel. On the other hand, s/he is not formally on the faculty of the university and is not considered part of it by other university administrators. This positioning of the university supervisor provides her/him a unique perspective on the whole experience. Being both of the experience and
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not of it, s/he is able to have a subjective and an objective view of the evaluation process
and the evaluators at one and the same time.

US I guess it would be looking at it from a different perspective in a different
role, you know. I'm looking at it right now totally as a site based supervisor
cooperating teacher, all on the side of the school and the teacher, and not
from, always, from the university's side. Or I'm I'm sort of on the inside
looking out, and that would be more both views. Inside looking out plus
outside looking in.

The director approves of this aspect and lends support to it by expecting the
university supervisor to be objective, to have a wider experience than the cooperating
teacher might have, of different classrooms, different cooperating teachers and varying
contexts.

D The college supervisor can step back in a sense. ... But. ... an evaluator can
look at it I think from the perspective of, a little more objective perspective
I guess of what - Not that we're ever completely objective but at least it's
not bound to the context of the particular teacher's classroom. ... And has
a lot of classrooms and a lot of contexts to compare it to and so you can
look and say, Okay, I've been in other classrooms like this and I see
something else is possible even given this framework, whereas the teacher
might have a more limited base for comparison.

As a teacher in the school, her/his relationship with the cooperating teachers is
two-fold and her/his position does inhibit her/his supervisory activities, while not affecting
her/his responsibilities as a cooperating teacher and an evaluator. Since s/he is on site and
available, the university supervisor feels that the communication between the various
supervisors is easy and informal. S/he is able to talk to the cooperating teachers, though a
special effort has to be made to reach those with whom s/he do not share break or lunch
times.

US Probably just trying to keep touched base with, you know, the different
teachers throughout the semester, making sure that the student observers
are there, that they are active participants, and, you know, just finding the
time to touch base with teachers that that don't eat with me or or don't
have common prep time and, you know, our sixth grade teachers are are
teams and and their schedule's totally different than the rest of the building.
So just finding enough time to, to touch base with each of the teachers, to
see how things are going.

The cooperating teacher is of the opinion that the university supervisor should
observe the student, make her/his own evaluations, and conference with the student. The
university supervisor could then share her/his observations with the cooperating teacher so
that the cooperating teacher could check that they are on the same page even if they do
not agree on everything.

CT I think they should have the time to observe the student and make their
own evaluations and then be able to get back with the student and discuss
those. And then maybe, you know, there should be time for the student to
show that he's improved on those skills. ... I would sit down and talk to
them about what, what I saw and, and, you know what they saw. I mean
we may not even be looking for the same things, but at least we could
share our ideas.

Proximity has its advantages. The university supervisor her/himself appreciates the
opportunity to communicate with the cooperating teachers. If the cooperating teacher
should have questions about the student, s/he is at hand to offer suggestions and support.

US I usually touch base with the teachers once or twice during the the
semester to see if their person's showing up on time, were they satisfied
with, you know, the person. Did the, the person actively participate, and
then too they know that I'm there as a link between Cedar University and
our school. If there is a problem, they don't have to contact Cedar
University, they can tell me.

As an evaluator, the university supervisor comes into play only when the
cooperating teacher refers a problem to her/him or asks for a second opinion in which case
the university supervisor makes time to observe the student in question. This seems to be
understood by all concerned, the university supervisor, the director and the cooperating teacher.

D They're troubleshooting and just generally oversee and serve as resource person. And then they are required also to talk with the cooperating teachers and review the students' performance at the end of the experience and they complete a summary sheet for us which says whether the students completed the field experience satisfactorily or not.

In terms of evaluating students, the cooperating teacher would like the university supervisor's input to add to her/him own impressions. But since the university supervisor is a full-time teacher, s/he admits to a difficulty finding the time to go into the classrooms of other cooperating teachers and observe other students.

However, s/he recognizes that a triadic conference part way through the experience would help the cooperating teacher check her/him evaluation to make sure it is in line with what the university requires. It will also leave the student room and time for improvement and to put into practice suggestions that may be made.

US Probably about two-thirds of the way through. So that way if they were experience, maybe a half to two-thirds of the way through... I would try to make it maybe half-way to two-thirds of the way through so that if there were concerns, that they could still be worked out.

Though communication between the supervisors may not be perfect when the occasion warrants it, the university supervisor feels that they all communicate their concerns and have a concerted plan of action which results in positive action. The conference provides them multiple perspectives of the student's activities, attitudes and abilities.

US I was asked one time to do a conference with a student who was having problems following the directives of the teacher she was placed with. So not only was she talked to by her cooperating teacher and the professor at
Cedar University but I also added some input from another staff member’s perception.

The university supervisor believes that though the cooperating teacher’s role in this early field experience may not be extensive, the university places a certain amount of reliance on her/his opinion. If s/he feels a student has not been successful in completing the course, the student has to repeat the experience. If the cooperating teacher makes a request to have a student back for student teaching, the request is more often than not honored.

The university supervisor believes the evaluator needs a thorough knowledge of the criteria on which the evaluation should be done so that the knowledge will shape the experience and influence the choice of activities. The evaluation instrument should thus loop back into the experience itself.

US Well, I think the evaluator whether it’s a cooperating teacher or the site based supervisor needs to be familiar with the evaluation criteria. And that it’s not something that you get the sheet from Cedar University, put it away, and then oh my, you know, at the end of the semester I’ve gotta fill this out. I think a good site-based person or a good cooperating teacher is going to review those criteria several times throughout the semester so that they have like an ongoing evaluation in their mind and then when it comes time to do the final product, it’s not hard to reach your overall evaluation of the student assistant. So I think it’s the familiarity with the the tool that’s being used and the criteria that they’re going to be evaluated on.

The university supervisor’s relations with the university appear to be easy and free-flowing. Communication with the university seems also more convenient since the university supervisor is the only conduit and that makes it easier for the university to respond to one person. The university supervisor believes that the cooperating teachers
have the advantage of someone else getting information for them without having to spend their time.

US If they're experiencing any kind of difficulty during the semester, the teachers know that they can come to either myself or the other site-based supervisor in our building, and that we'll, what we are like the direct link to Cedar University. Instead of, you know, eight or ten people in our building calling with concerns, it'll be one of two people and I'm usually the person who does the calling if there's a problem. And so they know, you know, if I call with a concern that it's a major concern and I've tried to deal with it within our building.

The access the university supervisor has to the university apparently has other advantages, too. In her/his capacity as a cooperating teacher, when the university supervisor found a particular evaluation form inadequate s/he had no difficulty getting it changed to suit her/his purpose.

US There was not a place before that or before this year that you had to check off successfully complete or has not completed, and I felt mine did not do an adequate job. So I made a notation on the old form. They called me, made up a new form, and had me resign it to document it in her files so that she had to redo the field experience.

Perceptions of the director of field experiences

The director at this university is closely connected with the experience since s/he teaches a course with a field experience attached to it which keeps her/him current and informed of activities in the field. Though s/he does not go out into the field to observe the students, the seminars and discussions on campus seem to keep her/him updated about the events in the field and help her/him keep a finger on the pulse.

D I always review the evaluation forms that come back and I always have a briefing time in class to talk about what's happening in the field. And
perhaps I do more of that because of my dual role as a field experience
director.

The director sees the evaluation in its formative and summative aspects. The
process has to maintain "a very difficult and important balance" (D) between these two
kinds. The university supervisor shares her/his view about the evaluation needing to be
formative though the summative aspect may not be called into question.

US And then too just to look for the growth. You know, with many student
assistants, you know, from the first time they're in your classroom till the
end of the semester, many of them, especially the secondary ones where
they're putting in forty hours, just the, the growth that you see throughout
the semester as they become familiar with the classroom and your routine
and the students and and how they really do just open up and really
blossom and grow throughout the semester.

The director believes that the cooperating teachers should have a considerable
amount of information about the content of the course which should help them to be
better evaluators if the purpose and the requirements are clearly stated. This is not always
the case, which leads to the site supervisors calling the director up with requests for
clarifications of what the university expects them to do.

R If the co-ops know what the methods courses, what the contents are and
whether they are able to make the connection -

D Well, as far as I could see, the requirement sheet, to that extent they know.
But I think, I think that's an area that we need to improve on because as
field director I do get calls from them, the clinical super-, the clinical site
people sometimes tell me teachers are confused about what's expected. So,
that's an area we will need to work on.

The director is confident that the evaluation is influenced by the size of the college
and the intimacy it affords. S/he feels that the informality of the contact does not lessen the
depth of understanding of the issues and problems generated by the experience. Rather,
allied to the frequency of the contact, it enhances the awareness and readiness to deal with the problems.

D We know everybody personally and when there are problems in the field experiences, students feel they can talk with us about them and the school also notifies us directly if there is a problem.

The communication channels between the site and the university appear to be made easier by the director personally being in close contact with the site-based supervisors. Information processing thus may be simpler and more straightforward and could cut through a lot of red tape.

D And these teachers at the site that the ones that are trained in clinical supervision and do the overseeing for us and communicate with me very closely. And then I in turn alert the instructor when there is any problem. We have an informal, verbal kind of communication.

The director would also like a closer tie between the course and the field experience. As of now it is left to the individual instructor to ensure that the connection between the theory espoused in the university is practiced in the site. The director admits that in reality this does not always happen and that the reflection of the classroom in the field cannot be taken for granted. As a result this could have a negative effect on the evaluation and may make it less insightful and valuable.

D I would like for us to a better job of, of, of tying the class instruction to the field experience. I don't feel that there is very much - Now it depends completely on how conscientious and interested the instructor is. Whether there is any accountability for what happens in the field. We know that they're out there. We know that basically behaving as professionals and that the cooperating teachers are basically satisfied. What we don't know is to the extent that they really are practicing what we want them to practice. I don't feel, I don't feel our supervision in the early field experiences is really, anything like thorough enough to guarantee that. Now in the case of one
instructor she monitors it very closely herself and ties it very closely together. But most don't.

This sentiment is echoed by the university supervisor. S/he believes that when it touches the point of giving a grade or not, more participation by the professor of the course is warranted.

US If you had an, an instructor from Cedar University that would actually come and, you know, touch base and and talk to the cooperating teacher and, you know, find out more information so that there was more communication, I think that you could justify a grade. But with the, there is contact but not enough to merit a grade based on it I think.

The university supervisor's participation in the evaluation of the student in early field experience is welcomed by the cooperating teacher. On her/his part, s/he sees it as sharing responsibility if something should go wrong or if a difficult decision has to be made.

CT I guess if the, the college professor or whoever is in charge of this student at this school was working more cooperatively with me so that, so that we were delivering this together, I guess. So that I didn't feel like I had the whole responsibility of telling the student these things or. I guess if I had more help from the, from the professor that would help me.

The director appears to have a clear and insightful understanding of the field experience and the sentiments of the evaluators. Yet s/he does not seem to realize the needs of the cooperating teachers. The training that the director visualizes for the cooperating teacher is quite different from what the cooperating teacher wants. The cooperating teacher would like the focus to be on evaluation methods and techniques such as writing narratives and offering constructive criticism, while the director would
concentrate on exposing the cooperating teachers to types of teaching methods the students were encountering in their classroom on campus.

Overview

An outstanding aspect of the evaluation process at Cedar University is the responsiveness of the university to the comments by the cooperating teachers and the university supervisors. The university personnel, whether they are in the field or on campus, seem accessible and available to the evaluators in the field. There appears to be an easy and constant communication between all those involved in the evaluation. Both informal oral and formal written communication are provided for in the procedures.

Also, the evaluation process is not onerous and does not demand much of the cooperating teacher. Information about the straightforward process is communicated clearly to the cooperating teacher and opportunity for two-way communication in writing is provided.

However, the concept of evaluation at the Cedar University is a ‘one-shot deal’ with no opportunity for the results of the evaluation to feedback into the experience. The non-judgmental evaluation in practice here is probably necessary since the students may be placed neither in their area of specialization nor at the grade level of their choice. These considerations might influence the lack of on-going evaluation.

There is a certain lack of congruence between the purpose of field experience as espoused by the director and as understood by the cooperating teacher. The cooperating
teacher believes it to be an exploratory experience in which the students get a look at life from the other side while the director thinks the purpose is to “allow the students to try out the methods and the theory they are learning in the college classroom.” From the cooperating teacher’s point of view the summative evaluation may be justified but the director’s purpose may be better served with a formative evaluation with more conferencing.

The concept of school-based faculty with an objectivity gained from a wide experience is desirable. How realistic this is when the university supervisor is from the same school that s/he is a teacher at is open to question. Neither does the university make provisions for these personnel to get wide experience in supervision.

Finally, the students are not part of the evaluation pattern at all. As in the traditional model, they are left out of the process and are more evaluated than evaluating. There is no opportunity for them to have any input, or to receive feedback in a conference. Unless the cooperating teacher takes it upon her/himself to provide them the chance, the students are likely to be only at the receiving end of the evaluation. The university does not mandate any conferences, either dyadic between the cooperating teacher and the student, or triadic between the cooperating teacher, the student and the university supervisor. This model makes it difficult to conceive the evaluation to be anything but top-down and summative.
University of Dogwood

Description of field experience

Offered in Fall, this is the first experience that the students at the Masters level at the University of Dogwood have. They are on site for about seven weeks of the ten-week quarter, two or three days a week, for a total of about 21 days, though they are not there in the first or the last weeks of the quarter. The dates are fixed by the university taking into consideration the working days of the school, making sure the schools are not on holiday on those particular days. When they are on site, the students are there for the whole day. All of the methods courses on campus this quarter are focused on grade levels K-3. Therefore, the students are placed in a school setting at grade levels K-3.

Evaluation process

The thrust of this evaluation is formative and involves conferencing in both dyads and triads. At least once each quarter the cooperating teacher, the university supervisor and the student conference formally. The paperwork is minimal and requires the cooperating teacher to fill out a short evaluation form at the end of the experience. This form is filed in the education advising office on campus. As the cooperating teacher understands it, the forms become part of the portfolio the student builds for professional purposes.
The university supervisor, who is also the director in this case, meets with the cooperating teacher every week for a short feedback session. The cooperating teacher and the student also have conferences every opportunity they get though these are not formalized.

Instrument

All the instruments used in the evaluation process at the University of Dogwood are narratives though some of them have prompts that give the evaluator areas to evaluate and directions in which to think.

Two different instruments are used officially in this process. One is a form the director uses when s/he observes the students teaching. This is very open-ended and has four sections: Strength, Suggestions, Comments and Follow-up Needed.

The second instrument requires the evaluator to write a paragraph on each of the specified areas. The criteria on which the students are evaluated are the quality of the lesson plan, rapport with students, the ability to facilitate learning, initiative and self-direction, the ability to communicate and attitude towards teaching, and classroom management skills.

Apart from the above, there is an instrument that the director uses to record her/his observations each time s/he observes students teaching. A kind of running record, s/he refers to it before s/he meets with the student to refresh her/his memory.
Grading

The university supervisor/director grades the student on her/his observation. The cooperating teacher’s observation are not weighted into the grade.

Perceptions of the cooperating teacher as evaluator

The cooperating teacher realizes that the primary purpose of the evaluation is to help the student grow. It is not to report back to the university supervisor with a summative report of where the student is at that point. The focal point of the evaluation, therefore, is the constructive criticism that the student should get.

The cooperating teacher keeps an interactive journal, which has been part of the evaluation culture of the school. This is not mandated by the university, but is done by the cooperating teacher of her/his own volition and, as s/he says, is successful with certain students, although not necessarily all of them.

The cooperating teacher uses the narrative option available in the instrument but does not indulge in long and involved pieces of writing. S/he is “pretty terse and to the point” (CT). As s/he says, “It would help organize myself. I don’t think I would do well on writing a narrative.” If s/he is to make a success of writing a narrative, s/he would like a lot more guidance on what aspects and areas s/he should comment. In a training session that could be offered, the cooperating teacher would like to be introduced to “some examples of evaluative tools rather than the one we have at our school” which would give her/him greater variety.
The conference that the cooperating teacher has with the student seems formative in intent and informal in tone. According to the cooperating teacher, the positive aspects of the teaching are pointed out first before the problem areas are dealt with by her/him and the student. The problems the student have are analyzed for their root cause. Several explanations that might fit the conditions are put forth and examined. The focal point is "self-analysis" (CT). The cooperating teacher "encourages students to do some sort of, why things are the way they happen" (CT) so that they are "able to understand themselves" (CT). Since not a lot of formal evaluation is required, the conferences are not documented except in the interactive journal the cooperating teacher and the student keep.

It is the understanding of this cooperating teacher that other cooperating teachers do not feel that they see enough of the students to make an evaluation that is valid. They also voice this to the director.

US/D Some cooperating teachers stated that they did not work as much as they would have liked with a particular student and since they were required to fill out the form, they wished they'd seen the student teacher more than they did.

The cooperating teacher is very cautious about "mak(ing) a judgment" (CT). S/he realizes that when the experience is not positive, it may "boil down to how you communicate" (CT) and may depend on "how you're paired with one teacher" (CT). Keeping this in mind, s/he is not at ease making negative comments. The friction between the student and her/himself would have to be very sharp for the student to merit such a reproof.
I am not good at confrontation and I am not good at saying negative things about people. It is something pretty major... I've never had to write a negative evaluation of anyone and I hope I never would.

Before s/he writes a negative evaluation, the cooperating teacher would take many measures to explore the issue and solve the problem. The first step is for her/him to "talk to the students themselves" (CT) and "try to work out the problem" (CT). If that is not satisfactory, the cooperating teacher will talk it over with the university supervisor to get another perspective on the issue and to make sure that the issue is valid. The issue would be presented as a case of lack of communication or miscommunication. If the university supervisor does not appear to be dealing with it, the cooperating teacher will then write a negative evaluation and try to let the student down as gently as possible.

If the supervisor didn't take anything into their own hand and said 'well you know, there's a problem here,' then I would probably say, I would try to say it in as nice I way as I could, I guess.

On the whole, the cooperating teacher has a positive outlook and "there are always positive things about people" (CT). But s/he also recognizes that negativism by omission is as potent and telling as negativism by commission, that "things that you don't say sometimes are more telling than the things that you do say" (CT).

There are certain aspects regarding the student that s/he sates s/he does not have a problem pointing out. For example, features of lesson planning or classroom management skills are not as difficult to comment on adversely as opposed to whether "this person should be with children" (CT), since the last is not correctable while the others are. S/he finds that this kind of evaluation is helped when the criteria used are clear and defined. As the cooperating teacher puts it, "That is easier to do, when it is something so, when it is
something so black and white. When it is something that is not black and white, it is pretty hard."

The cooperating teacher values the university supervisor’s backing and support for various reasons such as formalizing the evaluation and conducting triadic conferences. Above all, the cooperating teacher needs the university supervisor to provide a corroborative observation so that when the cooperating teacher offers her/his opinion, s/he understands her/his viewpoint and is able to supplement it.

CT And a lot of times you need different viewpoints. My viewpoint can’t be the only viewpoint to count. So they don’t know they are only going on me and I would prefer that they know this person so that if I say something or drop a hint that this person catches on to it and says okay yes and then we know that okay, this is the pattern then.

The cooperating teacher also feels easier about making negative observations about the student if the university supervisor knows the student well because “I don’t think that it would be fair” (CT). The cooperating teacher admits to a sense of loyalty that does not permit her/him to influence the university supervisor against the student if the university supervisor is not so inclined. “You don’t really want to tell actually someone that doesn’t know this person any of their weaknesses” (CT). On the other hand, if the university supervisor had already formed her/his opinion of the student, the cooperating teacher would not feel solely responsible for the university supervisor’s impression of the student. In such cases, the cooperating teacher says s/he would not feel so inhibited about discussing the student’s shortcomings with the university supervisor. In effect, the
cooperating teacher does not want to be held responsible for what the university supervisor might think of the student.

The cooperating teacher’s perspective on evaluation has been influenced by two instances when the student has evaluated the cooperating teacher’s behavior but the cooperating teacher has not been involved in the evaluation process. The student was apparently given an evaluation sheet and asked to evaluate the cooperating teacher on negative behaviors, to see if “she practices what she preaches” (CT). The cooperating teacher did not see the assessment tool before the activity; there was no pre- or post-conference, nor does the cooperating teacher remember being asked for permission to be evaluated. In another instance, the gender bias that the cooperating teacher might exhibit was evaluated by the student. In this instance also the cooperating teacher claims to have been kept out of the loop.

It appears that the cooperating teacher was evaluated without having a chance to shape the evaluation itself. This may be contrary to the developmental principle on which the student is expected to be evaluated. The cooperating teacher’s objection is that s/he never practices this kind of evaluation where the one who is evaluated is excluded from the process. As s/he explains it, if the student had discussed the tool and the purpose of the assessment with her/him and provided her/him with a chance to explain her/himself and to look at the results of the observation, both s/he and the student would have been involved with the same kind of evaluation regardless of who was being evaluated.

CT I can also see that, you know, teachers are only being used as a way to look at negative behaviors. Is your teacher doing this negative thing? Really following up on what she says she does? ... So my responsibilities
as an evaluator have changed. Used to be that what I said or what I wrote about or what the student and I talked about were the main things that determined what the student's evaluation was going to be. But now this is only because of the student that come in and said after the fact, 'Okay, how do I evaluate you? I have to sit and write down what you did right and what you did wrong, what we learn in class and then we had to take in.' That's going to make you think of, 'Why can't I be a part of that?' If you truly want an evaluation procedure that includes everyone then you're gonna have to include me in the evaluations that you are doing on me.

Recognizing that there are skills that s/he needs as an evaluator, the cooperating teacher would like a training session that is not a course but a "round table kind of thing" that would count as professional development for most teachers. This would be similar to the initial meeting that the director has with the cooperating teachers which lasts about 45 minutes, though the director does not believe cooperating teachers need to attend the meeting second time around unless the program has changed or new information needs to be communicated. The cooperating teacher also realizes the logistics of a series of such meetings are difficult since field experience student cannot be left alone in the classroom and teachers do not have the time to devote to extensive professional development.

Perceptions of the director/university supervisor as evaluator

Three major features seem to influence the process and pattern of evaluation in the University of Dogwood. The first one concerns the personnel. This particular field experience is supervised by the director of field experiences so that the same person plays the roles of both the university supervisor and the director. The coherence in the program is attributed by the director to the concordance in the philosophy and practice of
supervision and evaluation since there are no different views from various university personnel.

The second feature is the philosophy that underlies the program. "Developmental" is the key word to describe the field experience from the university supervisor's point of view. Since the field experience is developmental in nature and philosophy, the evaluation process is also expected to reflect the same. This is made possible because the director and the university supervisor are the same person. The director, in her/his capacity as university supervisor, sees it as her/his task to ensure that the connection between the theory and the practice, between campus activities and the field experience, is explicit.

The third factor at work is the size of the institution, the student population and the faculty. Proximity of the students and the faculty, and the accessibility of the faculty all apparently work towards helping the student be a part of the whole. The university supervisor takes a global and long-term view of the evaluation in this field experience since there is continuity in the university supervisors who supervise and the students whom they see in consecutive quarters.

US/D I think it is an on-going process. We're working. You know, it's a small campus. We do know our student and I think there's a lot of opportunity there to, to see this as a whole. And specially I, I have the wonderful opportunity this year to work with them in both the Fall, the Winter and the Spring quarters. And that's a rare opportunity. And so that's who I feel very strongly about the formative.

The university supervisor would like to make slight changes to the instrument. S/he would like to add a section to the instrument "to identify in conference what are some goals to work on" (US/D) which appears to fit in very well with the developmental
aspect of the field experience. Another tool the university supervisor would like to use is a
video taping of the student teaching. Though this will be “time consuming” (US/D), s/he
feels that the self-reflection that could be made possible with this tool would make it
worth the while. Since this is not student teaching, in her/his opinion the criteria in the
instrument are specific enough and do not need to be changed in and of themselves to
evaluate the videotaped activity.

A major responsibility the university supervisor has is to conference with the
student. Having observed a session taught by the student, the university supervisor helps
the student analyze the lesson and the developmental aspects of the field experience. One
point the university supervisor emphasizes repeatedly is that the whole experience is a
learning experience.

US/D For my evaluation I certainly focus on that. In other words, I work with
them on setting goals, setting, you know, things that are to be worked on
and then they felt they do reflection. And I view that as a very important
part of the evaluation. in other words, what are strengths, what are things
to be worked on? And that’s how the form that I use simply has strengths,
things to work on and comments. And to me that is a developmental kind
of evaluation.

The content of the discussion and the topics covered include the purposes of the
field experience, such as professionalism, suggestions made and implementation of those
suggestions. Both philosophy and practice find a place in these conferences since the
purpose is to help the student get insights into professional practice.

US/D We discussed what was being learned. We discussed professionalism. We
certainly, you know, asked questions and shared information. We made
plans for how the requirements could be met. If there were any problems
we discussed those.
A major task that the university supervisor takes upon her/himself is to make the communication between the cooperating teacher and the university possible. S/he reports conducting regular orientation sessions with cooperating teachers on site. S/he makes her/himself available to the cooperating teachers. S/he seems to take great pains to make sure that each cooperating teacher is made aware of what is expected of her/him in this field experience. S/he also provides things in writing to clarify the process, and the roles and responsibilities of both the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor.

US/D They get as I said, the initial meeting that we have with the cooperating teachers at each school. We have things in writing. We answer questions. And except for times when one or two are not able to be there, we make very certain to talk with them individually.

Even if differences of opinion arise between the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor, the university supervisor appears to be able to deal with the opposing viewpoints without causing friction. In her/his experience, issues have hardly been irreconcilable enough to cause communication to break down.

US/D If there was disagreement, that, you know, that just stands there. You know, there can be different views. I haven't found that to be, you know. I haven't found that to be a black and white disagreement on the performance and the grading.

There are multiple roles the university supervisor plays. One of them is that of the “heavy” (US/D) in cases where negative reports have to be made. The cooperating teachers may be very hesitant to make less than positive remarks about the students. In such cases the university supervisor notes that s/he is called upon to make the necessary moves.

US/D Many cooperating teachers, though I do support them totally, are very reluctant to put in writing suggestions for improvement. they more likely in
that situation would just decide things the student has done and not, not make it as qualitative as I would like... They oftentimes ask for me to be the heavy. They find it very difficult to say to them, you see, 'This is not satisfactory.' We encourage the teachers to that but they say 'We don't like to be the heavy or blow the whistle and so forth.' So I, you know, to do that.

Another role the university supervisor sees for her/himself is that of a model to cooperating teachers. S/he sees it as her/his responsibility to show the cooperating teachers "the importance of very clear evaluation remarks because it's developmental" (US/D). S/he also models the conferences when they have a triadic meeting so that the conferences between the cooperating teacher and the student will also be developmental.

The university supervisor acknowledges that a close association between the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher is essential if a problem arises and needs to be solved amicably. The cooperating teachers need to believe in the university supervisor to do the right thing, even if drastic measures are called for. For example, though the cooperating teachers dislike making negative remarks and are even more reluctant to make them in writing, s/he can persuade them to do it since s/he has a good relationship with them.

US/D This last time when a problems surfaced I did ask them to put their concerns in writing and they did but they said they did not want to. There was some hearings held and they said they did not want the campus to do that. But they did when I requested because they were deeply concerned and they did put that in writing.

The university supervisor has her/himself taught the courses associated with the field experience and has supervised the accompanying field experiences. With the weight of this experience, s/he is convinced that the field experience would be more effective if
the instructor of the course were to be more involved in it. In her/his experience, this will help with the cross-over of the information from the campus to the school, and will tighten the connection between the theory and the practice.

Since this is not the case now, the director networks with the instructor and with the cooperating teacher to clarify for the student the application of the theory to the practice in the field. Since the director and the university supervisor are the same person here, the arrangements that are made may have more coherence, and information gathering and dispersing seem to be more centralized and reliable.

US/D First of all meet with the faculty who have the related methods courses and try to get a clear understanding of their expectations and how the assignments in the field will be, how I can support that and see that it's done and get feedback and so forth. That's one. Another thing that I do is after gathering information from cooperating teachers the quarter before, I oftentimes make suggestions, make changes and so forth. So it's developmental in that way... I meet with the participants during part of their classes back on campus and given them handouts including that list (of placements), explain the procedures, my role and the role of the other supervisor. ... And, as I say, gather information from cooperating teachers if they have. I invite the to give suggestions, preferably in writing.

In establishing the connection between theory and practice, one of the problems the university supervisor appears to face a lack of understanding on the part of the cooperating teachers regarding the theories and practices espoused by the university. The director attributes this to either inexperience on the part of new cooperating teachers, or a lack of exposure on the part of teachers who have been in a classroom too long without keeping themselves abreast of developments in education and supervision.

US/D I hate to say this because I think there are some very inept, young teachers out there and also some older teachers. But oftentimes the older teachers have not been back and do not or are not open to the newer theories and I
see that probably as the biggest problems. Some of our students get
classified, discouraged and so forth when they see practices that are not in
their view good, and are not able able or are not supported by the
cooperating teacher in implementing the thing(s) that they know are good.

The university supervisor's idea of a training course is similar to that of the
cooperating teacher. S/he believes the cooperating teachers "need to be nurtured to give
feedback to see if that is their role and see if that is important." S/he would also make it
possible to "share with them the different forms of observation and critique." A clear
explanation of university expectations of the participants, clarifying what courses the
student take and what level they are at, s/he believes, would help the cooperating teachers
work "more intelligently" with the student and respond "more appropriately" to the
participants.

Overview

The evaluation process of the field experience at the University of Dogwood
appears to be formative in nature. The developmental aspect of the evaluation process
seems to be supported and practiced in many ways. Frequent exchange of views could be
afforded in the dyadic and triadic conferences that are held. The university supervisor
supervises the student over more than one quarter providing the opportunity for a
longitudinal study of the preservice teacher. No grades are awarded even though the
university supervisor does a quality check of the experience.

Two major factors are responsible for the success of this program: the roles of the
director and the university supervisor being played by the same person leading to a
concordance of ideas and philosophy; and the association between the university supervisor/director and the cooperating teachers is apparently long-term and close.

The director has known the cooperating teachers in various capacities and situations, including being an instructor to some of them when they were students themselves. Since s/he has worked at this university for a long time, s/he has had the continued opportunity to build a healthy, trusting relationship with the cooperating teachers. In this case familiarity seems to have bred not contempt but ease of communication.

US/D My background with these principals, teachers and schools go back years and years and years now. Many of the cooperating teachers are teachers I had when they were in undergrad. I think we’ve a good trusting relationship. ... I think it helps the other teachers.

University Of Elm

Description of field experience

Juniors and seniors at the University of Elm who are looking for a minor in Education take this field experience for a quarter. They are out in the field two days a week, usually Tuesdays and Wednesdays. They are in school the whole day, all the time that the cooperating teachers are.

There are courses attached to the field experience specifically dealing with child psychology, children’s literature and writing. The assignments the students do on site are associated with the course work on campus.
Evaluation process

The evaluation is a team project involving the student, the cooperating teacher, the university supervisor and the coordinator of the cohort. Both the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor evaluate the field experience independently.

The process itself consists of two evaluation sheets that are completed twice a term. At mid-term the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor each write a narrative using prompts that are part of the evaluation sheet. At the end of the term the evaluators use a checklist as an evaluation tool. A conference involving the university supervisor and the student is mandatory to discuss the evaluation. The cooperating teacher often joins in to make it a three-way conference. The topics of discussion are the grades, explanations of the basis on which they are awarded, and suggestions offered for improvement. The university supervisor collects the evaluation sheets from the cooperating teacher and hands them in to the coordinator, providing copies of the evaluation forms for the student, the cooperating teacher and for her/himself.

In her/his turn, the coordinator has a conference with the student and discusses the portfolio and the student’s own expected grade. The final grade is arrived at by weighing the grades given by the student, the university supervisor and the coordinator. The cooperating teacher’s grades are taken into account when the university supervisor makes a decision regarding a student, though initially they were disregarded. No paperwork is
maintained officially though the coordinator files the evaluations away for future reference if the student applies for admission into a certification course.

**Instrument**

No formal instruments that have "tested reliability and validity" (D) are used in this evaluation. The two kinds of instruments that are used in the course of the quarter are a checklist and a narrative. The first is a narrative with three prompts: List strengths of the student, List behaviors that need improvement, and List any other comments.

The checklist which is used at the end of the term has about 30 criteria which fall under five major areas: Planning, Implementation, Management, Evaluation, and Professionalism. The rating scale used for this purpose is a four point scale ranging from Satisfactory, Satisfactory Progress to Needs Improvement. Those criteria that do not apply to this particular field experience are expected to be noted with a 'Not Applicable.'

This instrument is generic and is not developed particularly for this course. According to the director, it has been in use for a number of years and is apparently based on research and theory in teacher education.

**Grading**

The university supervisor grades the student on a scale which runs from A through F. Based on her/his observations in the field, this counts for one-third of the total grade. The student suggests her/his own grade and provides a rationale for it. This counts for
another one-third the total grade. The coordinator's grade is based on the portfolio the student puts together, the video of the student's lesson, and the reflections the student writes on the video-taped lesson and on the experience as a whole. Before the grade is finally awarded, the coordinator conferences with the student to come to an understanding. The final grade is arrived at by weighing the grades given by the student, the university supervisor and the coordinator. The cooperating teacher is required to give an overall grade though this may not count towards the final grade.

Perceptions of the cooperating teacher as evaluator

This cooperating teacher is not an evaluator by choice. Though s/he enjoys having students in her/his classroom, by her/his own admission s/he would rather not be involved in evaluation. As s/he says as a classic understatement, "I don't like the evaluation part of it much." This attitude does not appear to be influenced by the cooperating teacher's view of the elements of the evaluation process or the support offered by the university.

To play her/his part well, the cooperating teacher would like to be informed about the purpose of the field experience, the activities prescribed for the student, what s/he could expect them to do, and what s/he needs to provide for them. So far the university has provided her/him with a booklet with the information it deems necessary for her/him to play her/his part effectively. But the cooperating teacher would like something short, brief and crisp. S/he feels that s/he has too many demands on her/his time and would prefer reading a sheet or two that succinctly tell her/him all s/he needs to know.
CT We wanna help and we wanna take the students in and, but we don't have
time to sit down and read a book about what they're expected to do. I
mean, you know, maybe just one sheet of paper, a short, you know, like
checklist of this is what, you know, you should be looking for. You know,
instead of reading all this stuff. 'Cause, you know, I mean it's like we've got
twenty other things to do.

The cooperating teacher is not very satisfied with the instrument used. In her/his
opinion, the experience is too short and the students are too new to the profession to
warrant long and involved evaluations. As of now s/he is required to write narratives
about the student twice in the experience which does not seem to be not justified by the
length of the experience and the activities of the students. As s/he sees it, narratives may
be helpful once in the quarter but twice seems "redundant." S/he would prefer a "simple
scale" at mid-term and a brief narrative at the end of the quarter.

CT I don't think it's necessary to give the narrative at like right in the middle of
the quarter or in the beginning of the quarter and the middle of the quarter
and the end of the quarter. ... I just felt like I is writing the same things
over and over again. You know. I mean it's only a ten week course or a ten
week time that they're here, and you know things change but, you know,
not, they're not gonna drastically change.

The grade that s/he gives is based on aspects of the student and the teaching s/he
does. As in any exploratory experience, the emphasis is on "rapport with children and how
well her/his lessons came across to the children." As can be seen from the instrument,
personal qualities such as flexibility, punctuality, and appearance are also part of the grade.

The cooperating teacher admits to having no knowledge of how the student is
graded by other supervisors for the most part. S/he would like to know how the university
supervisor graded the student. While this knowledge may not cause her/him to change
her/his grade for the student in that instance, s/he agrees that it might influence the way s/he would evaluate another student.

CT I guess my point is that whatever she gives herself and whatever the supervisor gives would not change my opinion.

R Would you have wanted to know why the supervisor gave the grade that she did? Would that have made a difference to the way you'd, you'd perhaps do the evaluation the next time round?

CT Yeah. That could be of a help. Yeah.

Another aspect of evaluation that the cooperating teacher is very wary of is making negative comments and giving a less than positive report. The far-reaching effects of it, as s/he sees it, with the remarks in the student’s file make her/him reluctant to put down such remarks in writing. The difficulty of finding a position without a negative remark in the student’s file gives her/him pause in the kind of comments that s/he would make.

CT However, see, it's difficult for me to tell someone what they're doing wrong. You know, because I feel they're just starting out, you know? And I feel like, oh this is gonna be in their files forever. It's hard enough to get a job, you know, without this in their, their folder.

The opportunity for the cooperating teacher to interact with the university supervisor in an evaluatory capacity appears to be considerable. Conferences that the cooperating teacher participate in are of two types. One is the conference with perhaps only the student that focuses on feedback that is immediate related to what the student has done in the immediate past. The cooperating teacher finds these conferences and discussions “most helpful” and uses this opportunity to give the student positive feedback with suggestions of what could be done the next time round.
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The second kind of conferences is triadic conferences or those involving the university supervisor as the third party. These are arranged and formal and are associated with evaluation. The cooperating teacher states that s/he is not comfortable with this kind of conference where s/he has to offer criticism to the student orally and face-to-face with the university supervisor present. Though s/he does not like writing formal narratives, s/he prefers to give the student less than positive feedback in writing which would make it less confrontational. Since s/he does not see himself as the “authority person” but as a resource for information and observation, s/he prefers being a mentor than an evaluator.

CT I, in my opinion, I think that that made me feel very uncomfortable in a way because I feel better writing something down. When I have a constructive criticism about someone, then I would rather write it down and let them read it than me voice my, you know. Either because you know they are just starting out, and they're not expected to know everything. So that's what I, you know, that's. I mean I just feel that, you know, when you're going to make a constructive remark, then it's better to have it on paper.

Though the cooperating teacher dislikes the idea of evaluation in principle, there are certain support systems that s/he appreciates. S/he would like an initial meeting in which s/he could learn more about the course. A meeting lasting about an hour or so would suit her/him well but attending it more than once or taking it every quarter as a refresher would be “insulting” (CT).
Perceptions of the university supervisor as evaluator

The university supervisor’s definition of evaluation includes feedback, commenting on what needs improvement. Therefore, in her/his view an evaluator needs to be a good communicator, a good listener, and honest about what s/he sees.

US Although people have many different styles of how they, they act as an evaluator, I tried to give, you know, positive feedback each time and have students try to identify the areas they’d like to focus on for improvement. So role of an evaluator I think mostly to provide feedback, to be open about what they see.

The university supervisor appreciates the value of an evaluation instrument that is meant for that particular field experience which can contribute to the success of an evaluation. S/he understand that the purpose of the experience must be clear and must be connected to the evaluation directly. S/he is critical, on the other hand, of a process and an instrument which do not have a significant correlation with the purpose.

US This idea of context specific-ness of evaluation is important to me. Really looking at the criteria of the field experience and building an evaluation tool from that instead of imposing evaluation from without.

Coming from this perspective, university supervisor expresses her/his dissatisfaction with the evaluation instrument currently in use. In her/his opinion, this instrument is generic and the criteria seem more prescriptive than descriptive. In this exploratory experience where the purpose appears to be to help students “get their feet wet” S/he finds some of the criteria are irrelevant. Combined with her/his principle of formative evaluation in which the student sets the goals of the experience, the instrument appears to be inadequate for the purpose and the expectations of the field experience.

US I don't believe there is a just one mold for being a teacher, an effective teacher, a good teacher that really takes it from the student and where they
see they want to be is important. That's why sometimes I had a problem with some of the evaluation form we had because they fit one mold or this is one way as opposed to multiple ways of seeing the role of the teacher. Is very reductionist.

Apart from organizing the experience and observing the students, a major responsibility of the university supervisor as an evaluator is to give the students feedback. This is done both orally and in writing, and is readily recognized by the cooperating teacher also.

CT He observed my, or the students, teach, whatever you wanna call them. On a few occasions he is in, he gave them a written response as to how the lessons went. And he, you know, is basically there to give constructive criticism and make sure everything is going well and positive feedback as well.

The university supervisor seems to be successful in keeping the lines of communication with cooperating teacher open and free. The cooperating teacher feels the university supervisor is available and is willing to communicate with her/him and offered assistance whenever needed.

CT We had three way conferences. If they are not verbal, then they are written. And he communicated with me quite often, I mean just to find out how things are going, and if there is anything I needed, you know from that, from the student teacher.

The university supervisor makes special efforts to fit into the schedule of the cooperating teacher to set up meetings and conferences. The idea, s/he explains, is to discommode the cooperating teacher as little as possible. Using the student as go-between, the university supervisor tries to accommodate the cooperating teacher's requirements.

US It is part of the course requirement and but typically I would, there are weeks when they (conferences) had to be done. So I would go to the students and say that, you, next week we would, we would need to meet and if they could please ask the cooperating teacher the time that would
work for them. And then they would get back to me. As long as I had that
slot available, so they just schedule the conference for that time.

At mid-term the university supervisor does invite the cooperating teachers to sit in
on the conferences that s/he has with the student. Though it is not an “obligation” (US),
s/he observes that many of them do and the feedback they provide at such meetings is
valuable to the university supervisor and the student.

US They are involved in the three-way conference. And there is also a final
conference we did and many of my cooperating teachers joined in on that,
although that wasn't an obligation. And I thought that is important they
provide feedback towards the end.

The final conference is not a requirement for the cooperating teachers out of
consideration for their time and “how much time the cooperating teachers put in" (US).
But, they are always invited by both the student and the university supervisor and “most
often they choose to welcome it” (US) and when they do attend, their input is “very
valuable” (US).

Though all cooperating teachers are expected to give feedback, the university
supervisor notes that not all of them comply with the demands of the university. S/he
agrees that many students are desperate for an idea of what they have done and how they
have fared but all the cooperating teachers are not comfortable giving feedback.

US Some felt more comfortable than others when providing feedback. At times
I had students almost begging for some sort of feedback even if it is
negative feedback. All they wanted is something because some of the
cooperating teacher didn't feel comfortable in that role.

The university supervisor is aware that the cooperating teacher’s perception of
grading and her/his own are not always in alignment. “I think there’s a bit of difference
between the student, and myself and the coordinator at kind of at the second level. And
the cooperating teachers varied it even more” (CT). When the cooperating teacher’s
grades are taken into account, the university supervisor reports that the variance between
the ratings is even greater than between just the university supervisor and the student.

The university supervisor has also observed that the cooperating teachers shy away
from making negative remarks or offering criticism. “They’re really unsure when they
wrote down things without sharing them with the students. A lot of them stayed away
from saying anything negative at all” (US). Rather than say anything negative, they
preferred to keep silent or “really just focused on the positive” (US). Attuned to saying
something positive, they are very uncomfortable having to be negative even if the occasion
warrants it.

However, the university supervisor remarked that on a comparative basis the
cooperating teachers are prepared to comment on the grading of the students and are
willing to grade them low if the student deserved that grade. In fact, in some cases s/he
noticed that the cooperating teacher’s grades are lower than those of either the university
personnel or the student her/himself.

US Perhaps because many of them have had multiple students in their
classrooms and they really, I think they are comparing them to the people
they had over a period of time. And they, they are much more willing to
say, for whatever reason, ’I thought this person is a C for average,’ than we
would, the students themselves would have said or the coordinator or
myself.

In carrying out her/his responsibilities as evaluator, apart from contending with
other personnel, the university supervisor deals with problems of logistics. The university
supervisor has students in different locations and s/he has only two days a week at the site. S/he reported that the more students and sites s/he has to accommodate in that fixed period of time the less concentrated and more piecemeal is the effort and the result.

US Autumn quarter I did (conference with all the students). I is at that one school and I had ten students. Winter quarter I ended up with 14 students and I is at two schools and they are only there two days. So that is harder. I think it is hard both times if you pre-conference and post-conference with the students. I mean less students and more time with each would have been -

In defining her/his own responsibilities, the university supervisor grapples with an important issue: the integration of theory and practice in the field experience. According to the information the university supervisor has, on previous occasions the course instructors have also supervised the field experience and evaluated the students. This apparently provided opportunities for a close connection between the theory and the practice.

US Originally I think the coordinators really wanted it to be an integrated experience where that we would see the lesson from the literature in the field experience and we'd see those lesson plans and we'd be more involved in teaching the literature and the children's development class and the writing class. And more of a back and forth between, you know, the class supporting the field and the field work supporting the classroom work. And I think in the past fro what I've heard that had worked out. There is a more-. I think there are different circumstances such as sometimes the classroom teacher of child development or children's literature is also a supervisor. So they had more of a continuation whereas this time, this year, that is not so. We all just held our own position. We are either a college instructor, you know, for that course, or you are a supervisor. So in, I think they tried to have everyone meet before it all started to get it all integrated and we'd know what is going on in the other classes and what they'd be doing. And that didn't happen. Because of the schedules more than anything.
But the integration of the program is not possible on these terms since s/he her/himself does not teach any of the relevant courses on campus. Further, the contact s/he has with the instructors of the course, which would help her/him make the connection between theory and practice, is apparently intermittent and sporadic, if it occurs at all. As s/he said, “Although I think it is nice to meet with some of the course instructors at some time which we really didn't get the chance to do.”

The support of her/his peer group on campus appears to help the university supervisor to a certain extent. S/he reports having regular meetings with other supervisors and they share information and make suggestions regarding issues and problems. This is not ‘organized’ but is loose and casual. The discussions center around the activities the students are engaged in, individual students and their problems, and how the program could be more integrated.

I received the syllabus from each of the people, teachers of the classes, the child development and the children’s literature. However, I is in contact with some people more than others just because of my - I knew some of the teachers. So we would talk back and forth. But not, it wasn't formal by any means. You know, an exchange... The first quarter that I worked we met probably every two weeks and then informally probably at least once a week. So and that continued pretty much informally we would talk and we kept in contact pretty often, at least once a week. And I'm just you share what's going on in the field.

The university supervisor is very conscious of her/his lack of training. S/he has on-the job training when the supervisors meet once a week and discuss the issues and problems each of them has. The checklist is discussed briefly and those who have been involved in the evaluation earlier offer their experiences and suggestions.
US  We met previous to Autumn quarter and we basically just reviewed the forms. And that first quarter we met periodically to determine exactly, it is almost an on-going construction of how this is all going to work out. And we met to see which points, you know, we are going to have as the evaluation or which ones are just to provide feedback in. So that's basically talking to people who had used the forms before. Both of the coordinators for the, for us had supervised in some more of field experiences and they are just talking about.

S/he would appreciate a more structured training of maybe a course or at least a longer session. S/he attributes the lack of this training to the haste with which decisions are made at the university, leaving no time for a thorough understanding of the job requirements.

US  I think it would be useful to have some course work. Or at least a longer session than just, you know, a very brief, for less that an hour of talking over the forms and things. However, I think the way things at the university go, all of a sudden they need staffing for a position and they just put people on their rolls. I know, it's partially time constraints I think.

Perceptions of the director of field experiences

The director appears to have a clear idea of the process of the evaluation and the personnel involved in it. In her/his opinion, the emphasis the evaluation has on conferencing and observation and the purpose of the evaluation are reflective of the actual practices in the field and those as understood by the evaluators.

D  Most of the evaluation is done through conferencing and observation. The purpose of these conferences and observations is not necessarily to give them a 'grade' on their teaching ability but rather to provide them an opportunity to discuss and talk about what they saw as their strengths and weaknesses as they are beginning to grow and develop as a teacher and try on that role. And so again most of the evaluation is done through conferencing. Two conferences are done with their university supervisor in relationship to their lesson. Another form of evaluation is their own reflective journal in which they are reflective on the experiences they are having. And a third kind of an evaluation is the
videotape itself which they looked at and responded to. And then a fourth kind
of evaluation is a professional portfolio which they presented to the coordinator
of their cohort during a portfolio conference. And again, this provided them an
opportunity for reflection, for them to view their own growth as a professional
and begin to try to understand the complexities of what it means to be a teacher
and how they fit into that scheme of things.

The director’s perception of the university supervisor’s role as an evaluator include
conferencing with the student and with the cooperating teachers. Though not as intensive
as student teaching, continued contact with the cooperating teacher and the student while
out in the site is expected of the university supervisor.

D I think they did everything they should have been doing... . They observed, they
went out, they conferences with students, they talked to teachers. I mean, this
is not student teaching. It’s part of a methods course. So I think they did
everything they are supposed to do.

Given that the cohort coordinator and the university supervisor are graduate
teaching assistants, their standing in the program concerning decision-making would be
different from if they are faculty. The director is conscious of that and expects the chain of
command to end with a faculty member the coordinator would need to consult in case of
problems, in this case her/himself as the faculty in charge of the program.

The director does not meet with the university supervisor regularly. In fact, the
university supervisor has a little difficulty in identifying the director! Most often the cohort
coordinators meet with her/him and chart out a course of action in anticipation of a
problem so that they are proactive rather than reactive. This includes the director being
accessible to students who are not satisfied with their grades even after discussion with the
coordinators. Fortunately, this option is rarely exercised. On the whole, the director’s
opinion is that the university supervisors "handled problems very effectively" on their own and rarely needed her/his intervention.

In viewing the cooperating teacher as a mentor, the director and the cooperating teacher are in close alignment. The director sees the cooperating teacher's primary responsibility as that of a classroom teacher. The concerns of the cooperating teacher regarding the growth s/he expects from the preservice teacher, and the effect the field experience student has on the pupils in the school are subservient to her/his 'loyalty' to the children in her/his care.

D She is responsible for the children. And to me the children always have to come first. That is the bottom line. The kids in the classroom always have to come first. So I think the teacher's role should be similar in terms of mentoring and collaborative. But the teacher if, you know, is in a position to give very specific suggestions of ways that the student can grow as a teacher and if there are issues or problems that emerge, if the teacher is concerned about the learning of the children and feels that that's in jeopardy in some way, then those are issues that have to be addressed.

The director is aware that the cooperating teacher does not like to make negative remarks and is likely to let things slide rather than face unpleasantness. The director is also aware that one of the reasons the cooperating teacher may react so is because s/he takes the criticism personally and sees it as a reflection on her/himself and is not able to dissociate her/himself from the performance of the student.

D I certainly found in my many years of experience working with cooperating teachers that does happen (having divided loyalties). They become very invested in their student and in wanting their student to succeed, some, a lot of that sometimes teachers feel if their student doesn't succeed, it's going to reflect negatively on the as a cooperating teacher. So I think sometimes they let situations, I think they let situations develop without bringing them to the university supervisor's attention until it's too late and then things come to a
head. I think sometimes they're reluctant to point out problems when they are in the beginning stages of occurring.

In the director's opinion, if the cooperating teacher considers the children first and looks at the field experience from the viewpoint of being responsible for shaping a future teacher for them, s/he is more likely to be realistic about the capacity and ability of the student. S/he is also more likely to be more honest with the student, and constructive criticism would not be as abhorrent to the cooperating teacher.

I think that hopefully the cooperating teacher would always think about putting the kids first and that the needs of the children have to come first and she'll have to balance that with the needs of the needs of her students. So if there are problems, she can present those problems to her student teacher, again in a way that that's kind and supportive but points out the concerns that she has in terms of the children.

The director is conscious of the advantages of close and continued association and the effect it has on relationships. The way a cooperating teacher would react would depend largely on how familiar s/he is with the university supervisor. S/he agrees that the university supervisor might profit from a long and renewed contact with the cooperating teacher who might then find it easier to approach her/him with problems. If not, the cooperating teacher is likely to talk to her/his principal. As with all mutual relationships, both the parties have to take responsibility for this connection. They have to be "willing to communicate effectively with each other" (D) so that the "burden" (D) is not solely on one or the other.

Regarding the relations between the university supervisor and the course instructors, the director has a different picture of the communication channels than does the university supervisor. While the university supervisor feels that the instructors and the
Supervisors do not meet often enough, the director believes that the university supervisors and the instructors do meet very often, that the meetings are "formal .. (at) regular times when they are scheduled" (D) and establish a strong connection between the field and the course. As s/he said enthusiastically, "That is great. They met all the time. They really worked as a team. People met together so everybody knew what everybody is doing and everything is quite well synchronized."

The training course that is offered by the university is designed to cater to the cooperating teachers and to concentrate on skills that the director thinks the cooperating teachers would benefit by - conferencing and observation. Information about adult development and stages of student teaching are also part of this course. According to the director, multiple formats such as a one-week workshop, a regular quarter, and a retreat for cooperating teachers have all been successful.

Overview

Coherence and cohesion appear to be the salient features of the evaluation process at the University of Elm. The formative aspects of evaluation seem very clear in that dyadic and triadic conferences are held regularly. Multiple sources of input into the grade are provided for, including the student's.

Significant sentiments are shared by all three individuals. The university supervisor and the cooperating teacher agree on the purpose of this field experience which is helping students "getting started" (CT) and "getting their feet wet" (CT and US). The university
supervisor and the director have insight into the cooperating teacher’s reluctance to express negative evaluations of the student.

The cooperating teacher, to all appearances, is given her/his space and responsibility as an evaluator. Conferences that s/he convenes are not necessarily attended by the university supervisor but are meant for the student. The three-way conferences the university supervisor arranges are meant to provide both a model for the cooperating teacher and a chance for the university supervisor to share her/his evaluations and give the cooperating teacher support in case less than positive remarks have to be made.

However, it is not made clear why the cooperating teacher is asked to give grades for this experience. Since the grades s/he gives do not count in the final analysis, this seems a superfluous task.

University of Fir

Description of field experience

The students at the University of Fir have this field experience in their fourth year of academic studies while they are completing their baccalaureate in Arts and Science. This field experience, the opening school experience, is part of a year-long program. Starting in Autumn when schools re-open, the students are placed in Professional Practice schools one day of the week, any day that is convenient to them and their teacher mentor. Once the university classes began, which is about three weeks later, they are on site for
three hours a day one day a week and are assigned to a specific teacher called the teacher mentor.

In the Autumn quarter, which is the first period of the program, the students take three methods courses though none of them are in particular attached to the field experience. In technical terms, the student need to get a Satisfactory grade in this field experience to "move on in the program" (D).

Evaluation process

In this school-based field experience, the evaluation process is a team effort in certain ways with only the school-based personnel evaluating the student. The teacher mentor completes a mid-term evaluation using the rubric given to her/him and uses the same form for an end-of-term evaluation. The school-based faculty also has a part to play in that s/he evaluates the student twice every quarter and conferences with her/him after every evaluation. Neither the students nor the personnel from the university (i.e., the university supervisor and the director) participate in the evaluation. Since the evaluation is formative, the forms are completed by the teacher mentor and looked at by the instructor of the course though they are not filed in the office. Only those forms that are completed in the Spring quarter are filed in the office for reference before the student is appointed to an internship in the fifth year.
Instrument

The instrument, developed rather quickly by "a small group of people" (US), has not been revised yet, though a revision has been planned. It is composed of rubrics which explain the areas that need to be evaluated. The evaluators measure the performance of the students against these rubrics and make their comments based on the university's expectations expressed in these rubrics.

A checklist with a rating scale that ranges from Unsatisfactory through Minimal and Satisfactory to Exemplary is used by the cooperating teacher to evaluate the student. There are ten criteria including: lesson plans, materials, social responsibility, how the student relates to the children, and professionalism as applied to dress, the ability to relate and to communicate. A rating of 'Unsatisfactory' has to be accompanied by an explanatory note by the teacher mentor. There is room for a narrative on the form which the teacher mentor uses to comment on areas not referred to in the checklist.

Grading

This part of the field experience is ungraded, an experience in which neither the teacher mentor nor the school-based faculty gives a grade. But the student is not deemed to have completed the field experience unless the teacher mentor makes a statement to that effect. However, the professor of the course at the university, who is expected to neither observe the students in the field experience nor see the paperwork, ultimately gives the grade. The components of the evaluation and the activities that it may encompass are
dependent on the instructor. This may range from the lesson plans the students write to the bulletin board they set up which may be viewed by the professor. In certain cases the professor may design a short form that the teacher mentor is expected to fill out after the student has taught a lesson and the grade may depend on this.

**Perceptions of the teacher mentor as evaluator**

The role that the teacher mentor plays in the evaluation of the teacher associate is significant. S/he bears a lot of responsibility for the evaluation in this field experience and the results are dependent on the interpretation s/he puts on the experience and the behavior s/he expects of the teacher associate. As the university supervisor says, "They receive either a Satisfactory grade or an Unsatisfactory grade. And it's mostly dependent on the attendance and, and their participation in whatever ways the teaching associate mentor feels appropriate."

Thus the teacher mentor seems to hold the power to stop a student from satisfactorily completing the field experience. If the teacher mentor decides a student should repeat the experience, the university will not permit that student to do an internship. While technically speaking the university gives the grade, the teacher mentor is apparently the one invested with the power of pass or fail.

The teacher mentor is one of the two evaluators on the scene and the university supervisor maintains that the evaluation done by them is valuable. But the teacher mentor does not seem to be aware of how the university views her/his evaluations. When s/he has
doubts about how close her/his evaluation is to the norm and how wide off-base s/he is, s/he is reminded to be objective but no further help is given to her/him. Her/his impression, gleaned from the few meetings s/he has had with the university personnel, is that not much reliance is placed on her/his evaluation.

R What is the follow up on that (appeal for help)? Did the liaison do anything?

CT No, they didn't make any. Just asked me to be sure that I was being objective and because apparently the university is making some proto-plans and these weren't going to be important.

The teacher mentor is concerned about the evaluation that s/he does but is not really involved with what happens to the evaluation process beyond her/his immediate domain. Once the forms leave the building, s/he is not aware of what happens to them and what the process is. S/he presumes that the evaluation will be filed and the university "will place it in the dossier of the student when they go out" (CT) for interviews for their fifth year position or internship, but this is mere conjecture on her/his part with no definite information.

When the teacher mentor gives written feedback to the student, s/he does not know exactly what the student does with it. Her/his purpose in giving the feedback is to enable the student to understand her/his own performance and to help her/him analyze her/himself. What the student does with the information does not concern the teacher mentor.

R You write these comments, and does it stay with the students, does it go back to the university...?

CT No, that's his and I'm not sure what he does with that. You know, takes it back to his methods course and use that in his discussion. I use it so I can
see how he takes my comments in our discussions and how he, you know, how he will grow, how he will change, how he will add to his change.

From the teacher mentor's point of view, the evaluation is on-going and formative. The conferences that s/he holds with the student are the most effective means of giving feedback.

CT I really try to give a lot of positive feedback, that's kind of my style, encourage and so on. But anything that I, that might need work I do expect to see him make efforts in the future to, to change.

But the teacher mentor feels that the student is not in class often enough to have a sense of what the changes required are and how to make these adjustments that should be a part of the student's learning experience. Therefore, this feedback may not really have much effect.

A conference is a significant part of the evaluation and feedback process which is on-going. The student is expected to initiate the conference with the teacher mentor. When problems occur, the teacher mentor expects the school-based faculty to step in, and the university supervisor is called in only when the problems cannot be solved by the school-based faculty and the teacher mentor.

The teacher mentor admits to feeling the weight of the evaluation upon her/his shoulders at times and desiring some corroboration of her/his judgment. The school-based faculty apparently does observe the student and conference with her/him but this does not seem to extend to the teacher mentor who is not informed of the school-based faculty's evaluation. But the cooperating teacher does not seem to view this as an important matter.
since s/he says that the school-based faculty forms her/his own opinion of the student and is available to the teacher mentor when needed.

CT Actually she had really had her own interview and then she'll have conference with the student. There's really not been much interaction between the three of us.

R Would you have liked that? Do you think that's necessary?

CT Well, I think it would be a good idea. Although I don't feel badly about that.

The teacher mentor is conscious that her/his evaluation of the student is influenced by her/his own personality. To offset this bias, s/he seeks to have her/his concern allayed and her/his observations seconded by the school-based faculty.

CT I tend to be a very positive person and so my evaluations perhaps tend to be higher than may be somebody would be. And I know that I've discussed that with the school liaison between the university and (school).

Another area that the teacher mentor is at odds with the university is the content of the evaluation form. There are certain criteria in the instrument that the teacher mentor does not think are appropriate to the field experience. One of them is the criteria dealing with the student's ability to make adjustments. Since the student is not in more than once a week, the teacher mentor believes that the student /he does not have the opportunity to show this ability. The teacher mentor is aware of this short-coming and does not know how to evaluate this aspect.

CT This fourth program the students come in one day a week for 2 1/2 hours. So continuity is not easy. . . . he's there, makes a, makes a presentation, you know, an opening presentation on that. But then a whole week passes before, you know, he sees the children again. And although we communicate, he's really not there to see what the, where they are and how each one is reacting. He is not able to see, the student is not able to see the follow up so well. So it's not easy to, to develop lessons that have the right
kind of continuity. I think one of the questions on the evaluation was, How does the student respond if adjustments have to be made? And I felt that question really is not applicable because it's very hard to grade him since he's not there. I know he will make some minor adjustments if he thinks the lesson is too hard but he can't come back the next day or so and make the proper changes or major adjustments that need to be made.

A large part of the teacher mentor's reservations about the evaluation appear to stem from her/his lack of knowledge of the purpose of the program and hence the purpose of the evaluation. S/he feels that the university knows what the purpose of the field experience is but is not sharing that information with the her/him. In his/her words, "I'm sure the university has, you know, they know what they're looking for but I really feel that I'm not privy to that kind of information."

The teacher mentor would like more information about the goals of the program and the purposes of the experience. S/he feels that s/he will then be able to evaluate the student more effectively and the evaluation would then be valid so that the connection between the theory and the practice could be established.

CT I guess the better informed I am as far as the university goals are and what their expectations of the students, their expectations of the students are, the better, you know, I could use that in their evaluation.

The communication between the university and the teacher mentor does not appear to be as clear as it should be. Except for a brief written communication, the teacher mentor claims to have received no explanation as to the purpose of the field experience.

CT Outside of what I've picked up from the student in our discussions and a letter at the beginning of the quarter, you know, I really don't have any input with or any feeling for what's happening between that first letter and some of the kinds of conversations I have with the students. So it might be strengthened the program if there was more information coming in from
the university so, you know, we could develop, you know, our work, you know, based on that.

In an effort to be more valid in her/his evaluation, the teacher mentor would like the training to include the expectations the university has for the student to be explained to her/him. Presently, s/he makes her/his own interpretation about the purpose of the field experience but s/he is not sure if that is in agreement with what the university expects of her/him and of the student.

CT At the present time, you know, I probably look at the student through my eyes, what's going to make a good teacher, what areas do we need to work on. And I'm not really sure of, you know, what kind of goals the university has. So I think that would be very beneficial in some training for me in how to reach those kinds of expectations.

Perceptions of the university liaison as evaluator

Though the university supervisor may not be involved in the evaluation in any significant way, s/he is the designated evaluator on behalf of the university rather than the school-based faculty. In the instance of this study, the university supervisor was identified by the director as the university person who is most involved with the evaluation rather than the school-based faculty, who has no official standing at the university.

The traditional role of the university supervisor seems to be split between the university supervisor and the school-based faculty. As the director understands it, the school-based faculty is now responsible for the activities in the whole building and communicating with the teacher mentors but the university supervisor is still the representative of the university. The university supervisor feels her/his role is limited
because of the number of student and the number of sites s/he has to oversee. S/he would personally like to be more involved but the university lacks the resources to facilitate that.

The duties of the university supervisor appear to be more supervisory than evaluatory. S/he is expected to “visit each school site about once a week to make sure things are going alright” (US). S/he is not expected to supervise and “not necessarily even observe any teaching by the students” (US). S/he is meant to be “rather just sort of a connection between the university and the school” (US).

The role of the university supervisor in this field experience seems to be laid back and very much in the background. The university supervisor attempts to show her/his trust in the teacher mentor by keeping her/his distance from the site. At the same time s/he realizes the need to monitor the teacher mentor very closely. In undertaking both these tasks, the university supervisor chooses to play a waiting game and appears on the scene only when called upon either by the cooperating teacher or the student. But as far as the student is concerned, the university supervisor recognizes that s/he has the last word. S/he is still seen as “the final authority” (US) by the students.

The university supervisor acknowledges the decision-making power s/he has so far as the evaluation is concerned but claims that s/he is not likely to exercise that power. S/he defers decisions to the actual evaluators who are on the scene.

R  Who do you feel had the final word in all of this?

US  All of it? Me! As the coordinator. But I wouldn't take it. I mean, my final word would be in the case of an evaluation to agree with the people who were the primary assessors.
If the student is not satisfied with the experience provided and is likely to get a poor evaluation, the university supervisor explains that due processes have to be observed in that the student must have various courts of appeal, different persons to whom s/he can talk. In the procedures outlined by the university supervisor, the student has to approach the mentor first, and take the matter up to the school-based faculty only if s/he and the teacher mentor cannot agree on the issue. It is up to the school-based faculty to decide what the next step should be. It may be either to meet the student and the teacher mentor together or separately. If neither occasion resolves the issue, the school-based faculty may call upon the university supervisor to mediate.

While the university supervisor does not convene the meeting, more often than not s/he conducts it. S/he is expected to “add more credibility” and make sure “everybody knows what’s going on” (US).

While s/he does not play a part directly in the evaluation, the university supervisor sees the need to conference frequently with the teacher mentor and the school-based faculty. Feedback is seen as part of the evaluation process and the “debriefing session” (US) is one way of providing that feedback. This give-and-take with the school-based evaluators is expected to enable the university personnel to have greater insight into the evaluation that is done.

US I think that sitting in on debriefing session with students and teachers would be very beneficial. I think having informal conversations with schools-based faculty and teacher mentors would really help in the growing process for university people.
The university supervisor understands the importance of conferences in the evaluation process. The question as to when these conferences are held is not addressed by the university directly in that no time is set aside for them specifically. The cooperating teacher and the student are expected to get together whenever it is possible. "They take place either in the morning before the children arrive, during the teacher's planning bell or after the children leave in the afternoon" (US).

The university supervisor is aware of the enormous responsibility the teacher mentors have to accept in being part of the program. S/he is also aware that they need some support in the course of the program. When, how and in what form this support is given is the crux of the matter.

US In all of our previous programs, evaluation was either shared between the university and the mentor or it is the university who had most of the say-so in the evaluation. In our model, it's the teacher mentor's responsibility to evaluate the students. And some of them, you know, want some support when they do that.

The university supervisor is also clear-sighted about the need to have the teacher mentor being the lead evaluator. S/he her/himself does not often get to see the student teaching. Only in cases of a student struggling or when a problem is identified does the university supervisor see the student in the field experience setting. The legitimacy of the teacher mentor as evaluator is not disputed by the university supervisor.

US I also think, too, in many ways it makes more sense for the teacher who teaches them week in and week out to do the evaluating rather than someone who sees them two or three times during the course of, you know, the quarter. So we weren't getting a real clear picture anyway when we would just see them, you know, two or three times within a ten-week span.
In fact, the university supervisor believes the university personnel would have more difficulty evaluating the student should the need arise. Reflecting on the skills the university person would have, the university supervisor observes that the university personnel are likely to be more ambitious and want to achieve more in a short time so that perhaps the formative aspect of the evaluation will not be emphasized.

US  I think it would be harder to help them see that the students that they would be evaluating benefit from limited number of criticism than a large number. I think that in order for us to become better at things, people can make suggestions. But we need, we have to some choice about, 'I'm going to work on this. I'm going to work on my handwriting on the chalkboard this week and I'm going to work on communicating with parents next month.' . . . A lot of times university people want to fix it all at once. I think that would be more difficult.

The university supervisor reports having to deal with crises and handling problems with which the cooperating teacher may be uncomfortable. Sometimes during the course of the experience the teacher mentor is unable to communicate to the student the importance of the function of the field experience, but does not want this to be reflected in the evaluation. Since the cooperating teacher is going to be working with the student the whole year, the university supervisor expects to be a troubleshooter when required, and relieve the cooperating teacher of the unpleasant task. The university supervisor is prepared to step in at this point and resolve the issue before the evaluation from the cooperating teacher is written.

US  Part of the reason for bringing in a university person at that point is because a lot of times when a teacher sees a student not, not participating, they get a little irritated and having another person there helps them see why it is perhaps that the student had not been involved as we would like. And so it's also a time for the three to talk about how the student can become more involved or how the student can improve whatever it is.
The university supervisor is closely involved with the planning of the field experience which "we sort of believed that it should just be the Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory experience" (US). The responsibilities include developing the instrument, which is based on theory and specific to the experience. "But we haven't figured out what changes we need to make to the form to make it more meaningful" the university supervisor confesses, feeling that the instrument is not complete and needs to be developed more fully.

In the evaluation of the student the university supervisor is involved with the campus activities which reflect the field experience activities. Whether troubleshooting or evaluating the campus activities, a principle the university supervisor finds useful is the pupils in the classroom. This helps her/him judge the extent of the problem and put it into perspective.

US Because I'm an advocate for children, it is my responsibility to make sure that anyone that I have anything to do with certifying is truly qualified to work with children. And so as long as I keep that in mind, the bottom line is children, then, then I can be really honest and tactful but honest in my evaluations with students. When I forget the children then I can be too nice. And that's not good for anybody.

The university supervisor is conscious that the evaluation skills that a university supervisor needs, and the ability to interpret the evaluation that is done by the school-based faculty, are related to the understanding the university supervisor has of the setting. S/he acknowledges that since they may not have taught at the school level in the recent past, not all university supervisors will necessarily be familiar with the present-day classrooms. These are issues that s/he feels need to be addressed in the training for the
university supervisors by including some field trips to classrooms, which will not be required for cooperating teachers.

The university provides an opportunity for the teacher mentors to meet for a discussion of their roles and responsibilities. The university supervisor notes that the three meetings, scheduled before school starts, in December and finally in May, deal with different topics. The first one details the roles and responsibilities of the teacher mentors and what is required of them by way of feedback, conferencing, and oral and written evaluations. The second meeting is a chance for teacher mentors to share strategies that have worked well for them.

And one of the things we've had to do is help teacher mentors focus on the whole lesson, not just bits and pieces of the lesson. You know what I'm saying? In order for them to do that, we've had some mentoring sessions in order to help them learn how to be better mentors. ... We had one before school started, one in December, and we have to the final one scheduled in May. And in the first session we talked broadly about the roles and responsibilities of teacher mentors, their need to do structured observations as well as informal observations, the need for feedback on a weekly basis, informally and in writing and the, we shared the evaluation instrument and give them suggestions on other kinds of very open-ended instruments that could be used in order for them to record their observation. ... And then we had a follow up session in December in which individual teachers volunteered to share strategies that they've used that they find to be effective..

But the teacher mentor is "really not aware" (CT) of this series of meetings. The only information s/he says s/he has of the program comes from printed matter handed out at the beginning of the experience "a letter that I receive at the beginning of the quarter what the requirements are and so on" (CT).
Perceptions of the director of field experiences

Conceptually, the director appears to have a clear idea of the expectations of the field experience but the details do not seem very clear in her/his mind. For example, s/he is not sure if the student in all the three quarters has "a specific assignment with a specific teacher" (D), or whether "typically a team of perhaps three teachers may have the eight interns among them" (D). In this model, the director identifies the cooperating teacher as the one in whose classroom the student is placed but the responsibility for the field experience is shared by all the personnel in the building who are associated with the program and by the university personnel. The director’s perception is that a feeling of community working towards a professional experience should be engendered rather than a one-on-one relationship between the cooperating teacher and the student as is usual in a traditional model.

D There is no such thing as a cooperating teacher. Well, in a sense there is because the associates are out there in someone else’s class. So there is a teacher who is, who’s really the one in charge. The idea is that that person and the university person and the other teachers in the building who have teaching associate and the others teaching associates all work together in a team. So if it works as it should, the cooperating teacher and the university faculty member would be rather interchangeable in terms of what they would do and how they would deal with the students and so on. In fact, I think there is still a kind of a hierarchy that exists because of the tradition of the model that we used for ever. But the idea is that both of those people would be mentors to those students who are in the particular phase of their training.

The roles the university perceives for both the teacher mentor and the university supervisor seem unclear in the similarities and differences they would have. While there may be “no such thing as a cooperating teacher,” (D) the team work and the
responsibilities of each team member do not appear to be spelt out. The director understands that the roles now prescribed for the evaluators is a difficult one and that the confusion as to what one does and the principle on which it is done may not be very clear.

D It's probably hard. It's probably difficult for people of they're, if they cross those roles to do it. And they do cross those roles because the set up now in the end the people who've worked with the students will do the evaluation. There's not someone who stands on the outside and says, 'I'm going to come in and look at and make a judgment on how that person had done.' So I think they probably do struggle, going back and forth between those two roles.

The lack of clarity in the role definition appears to be compounded by the difference between the university supervisor and the director in their definition of supervision and evaluation. Feedback and debriefing are an integral part of the director's concept of supervision while the university supervisor views them as part of the process of evaluation. In consequence, the responsibilities the teacher mentor has in the program are seen by the director as more supervisory than evaluatory.

D They are required to work with the students in the sense of providing experiences for them, monitoring whatever they may do in the way of planning and presentation, debriefing them on what they've seen them doing and making suggestions and so on. Exactly how they're involved in the evaluation part of it, again I'm not so sure of.

This model requires close and clear communication lines between the university supervisor and the teacher mentor but the director acknowledges the difficulties inherent in this expectation. For instance, the university supervisor may not find it easy to communicate with all the cooperating teachers since the culture of the school does not always work in her/his favor. S/he also cites the possibility that teachers are used to a
closed-door policy and may not always welcome the university supervisor’s attempt to communicate freely.

R  Do you think the teachers in the schools are willing to collaborate?

D  Some of them are not. Many I think, either because it’s the way we taught them in the past or because it’s their own socialization to teaching, I think they like the idea of having their own class and their own room and a door that closes and and doing a good job in it but not necessarily working with anybody else to do it. I don’t know how widespread that is but I know a number of teachers who fit that category.

Given that the program rests so heavily on the teacher mentor and is an intensely collaborative effort, the director concedes that the kind of individuals who work in the program should be an important consideration but that there is no definitive selection mechanism in place. In her/his experience, the mentors are chosen partly by self-selection and partly by counseling unsuitable teachers out of it. It is hoped that teachers who do not want to collaborate opt out of the program, making the feedback sessions and discussions an integral part of the evaluation process.

D  Well, I think they will not work well in this kind of a program. I think they will not probably elect to be in it because they should recognize for themselves that that’s not, this isn’t a model they would feel comfortable with.

The director understands that there has been “some informal kind of meetings and sessions” (D) where the university supervisor and the teacher mentors discussed issues. In the buildings, some efforts have been made for the university and the school personnel to meet and talk through what the field experience means, what the program means and what needs to be done. There is no “formal structured training mold” (D) in place as yet but with more schools and teachers being added to the program, s/he is conscious that time is
of the essence and it might become necessary to be more definitive about the training required and offered.

In keeping with the spirit of the program in which decisions are made jointly and the teacher mentors have a high profile, the director believes that the decision for training sequences also needed to be prompted by them. The decision about when and what form the training should take and who should conduct it will all be left to the group to decide.

D So it would be a matter of looking at all those variables and coming up with what those the group that is going to be involved in the training found the most reasonable kind of schedule... ...I think the need certainly would be generated by the team and then I think the notion of whether they can work the ideas through themselves or whether they wanted an outsider who is a specialist, I think that would all be open to question.

The director expects that the training will be non-traditional especially in content. Rather than the regular fare of the methodology used on campus or the evaluation tools being the focus of training, the director would like to offer training to everyone, both teacher mentors and university supervisors, in management skills such as collaboration. An obstacle to this that the director identifies is that time and the opportunity to practice them are not easy to organize.

D And that's a hard one to try to train people for. Partly because it's trying to think for a lot of us to do and partly because it's so incredibly time-consuming and with the kind of school day model and school year model and so on we have, and the constraints that are placed on classroom teachers as far as what they can do with their working day is concerned, it's difficult to find the time to do the kind of collaborating that needs to be done. So that's that's a major problem and how to work around that is something that they would have to try to work out. And it's not easy to do.
Overview

This program which places the students with a cooperating teacher for a lengthy period of time could be an answer to the cooperating teacher's oft-repeated cry of not having enough time with the student to evaluate her/him. This field experience at the University of Fir is non-traditional especially regarding the role and responsibilities of the cooperating teacher in the evaluation process. The cooperating teacher is apparently the key figure in the evaluation of the student and has the power of success and failure invested in her/him totally by the university. The university supervisor may be at hand but comes into the picture only when called upon.

Student participation in the evaluation in this field experience seems to be minimal. In fact, they don't "actually have input" (US) but if they have some concerns about the evaluation, they can add an addendum to it. In this sense they appear to be more acted upon than acting.

The training model the university is planning places even more responsibility on the cooperating teacher. S/he is expected to be involved as a resource person in these sessions.

US One of the reasons they felt so positive about it is that it is coming from other teachers in the same position. So it wasn't coming from the university. And it wasn't even coming from the lead teachers, school-based faculty in the building but rather is coming from other teacher mentors who are doing exactly the same thing they're doing

However, the central role the cooperating teachers play does not seem to be supported either by careful selection of the evaluators or by meaningful training. The roles
and responsibilities of the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor do not appear
to have been defined and articulated clearly so that all the parties concerned are reading
from the same page.

The cooperating teachers are apparently expected to bear responsibilities they do
not particularly like, such as confronting students with criticism, and the cooperating
teachers do not seem to be prepared for this in any way. Teacher mentors are perhaps left
to their devices and are expected to appeal for help when they need it. Considering the
responsibility given over to the school to evaluate the students, the university does not
appear to provide enough training to ensure that the evaluation is fair and successful.

**University of Gum**

**Description of field experience**

The field experience at the University of Gum is the first one for most students.
They are required to be in the classroom for 30 hours, preferably one day a week, by
individual arrangement with the cooperating teacher. Sometimes, for the sake of
convenience and working around their other obligations, the students choose to have all
their experience in a short period of time for an intensive field experience. This field
experience is attached to a methods course which meets weekly on campus.
Evaluation process

The evaluation scenario in this university has a larger cast than is more usually played out, and involves many personnel and a lot of paperwork. It consists of observations and comments by three different people, apart from the student her/himself. The cooperating teacher is expected to observe every lesson that the student teaches and comment on it, both orally and in writing. A supervisor from the university, not necessarily the instructor of the methods course, is also scheduled to observe the student during the teaching process in the field. This lesson is not one of the seven observed by the cooperating teacher but a separate, eighth lesson taught by the student. The third evaluator is a member of the faculty in charge of student and provides an unbiased view of the student's the lesson planning and teaching.

The paperwork for this field experience consists of two different evaluation instruments. A checklist given by the student to the teacher is filled out after every lesson the student has taught. This is generally accompanied by an anecdotal summary that the cooperating teacher writes out, describing the teaching experience.

The second instrument is an objective sheet that is filled out by the cooperating teacher and the student. Both are required to sign it to indicate that certain objectives have been discussed, agreed upon and applied in the course of the field experience. This signed statement is turned in to the course instructor with other paperwork such as a log sheet. The director examines the evaluations before they are filed, to be referred to when required.
Instrument

The checklist used to evaluate every lesson taught consists of four levels of grading. The emphasis is on what the university expects of the student since the levels refer to exceeding, meeting or not meeting expectations. The areas that are evaluated include: personal qualities such as appearance, punctuality and voice intonation; personal motivation such as enthusiasm, initiative; professional qualities including emotional maturity, a sense of humor; professional performance, referring to communication skills, use of time and ethical behavior; interpersonal relations such as the ability to relate to students individually and in a group, and school personnel; and finally, teaching preparation and implementation. Teaching effectiveness is also a concern of this instrument which has criteria such as motivational techniques, review or previous learning and anticipatory set. There is also space for comments. The cooperating teacher is expected to comment on the potential of the student as a professional and on the student's ability to teach.

The second instrument consists of a list of objectives provided by the university to which the student and the cooperating teacher can add. The objectives include experiences that the student should have such as working with groups of varying kinds, teaching different subject areas and foci of observations. The student writes a "brief, concise paragraph" (D) citing evidence of having accomplished each objective.
Grading

The grade for the field experience is given by the university supervisor but in consultation with the student. The students do a self-evaluation, and their ability to evaluate what they have done is reflected in the grade assigned to them. Though there is room on the checklist for the cooperating teacher to give a grade, it is not a requirement.

How the grades from the field experience are included into the grade for the course is not specified. It is an essential part of the overall grade but the weightage is left to the individual instructor of the course.

Perceptions of the cooperating teacher as evaluator

In her/his opinion, the cooperating teacher plays a significant role in the evaluation process in which the emphasis is on the formative aspect, a view shared by the university supervisor. As an evaluator, the cooperating teacher feels that it is important for her/him to have the ability to empathize with the field experience students and identify what they need, depending on their previous experience and the knowledge they bring to the field site.

Conferencing appears to be an important process of the formative evaluation that the cooperating teacher does. After each lesson is taught, the cooperating teacher says that s/he makes it a point to talk to the student and give her/him feedback. The avowed purpose is for the student to analyze her/his lesson and to provide an opportunity for self-evaluation.
The college asks that we have the forms filled out on the lesson and that we provide some time where we can talk about the lesson and usually my technique is to say to them before I even show the the paper, 'How do you think it went?' I like to let them go back and evaluate it, you know. And I'll say, 'Anything you might like to do differently when you teach it again?' Trying to get the to self-evaluate before I give some input.

If a triadic conference is arranged with the student, the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor, the cooperating teacher would like to communicate with the student privately before presenting her/his ideas at the conference. The close relationship between the cooperating teacher and the student, and the sense of loyalty the cooperating teacher has to the student is apparently not lost regardless of whether the evaluation is positive or negative.

It would a disservice to take them (the students) out of the loop and go directly to may be to the supervisor or back to the professor. You have an obligation to certainly share your thoughts and feelings with them first. But then I also think you need to get that back to the professor and to the supervisor who's been, you know, watching on.

One aspect of this evaluation that pleases the cooperating teacher is that s/he does not have to give a grade at all. In her/his view, the purpose of evaluation in this field experience is to see what progress and growth each student has made. A letter grade would imply that the student would be measured against a standard and not individualize the process.

I think that when you look at a student teacher, you want to look at where they're starting and how far they've come and that would be exceedingly difficult to do if you had a letter grade because you'd be measuring them against some sort of standards and they would have to be different for every teacher because they all come in with
a different amount of skill and background and their comfort level's different. I would find that very, very difficult.

While the purpose and the process of the evaluation meets the cooperating teacher's approval, the details of the procedure do not. The instrument that is used is not entirely to her/his liking. S/he would rather evaluate teaching skills and performance than personal attribute, which is partly what the evaluation criteria require.

R How many of those criteria do you think you would rather not comment on, which you think are irrelevant?

CT About half of them. You know, things like their dress and their, those kinds of things. To me, those are, you wouldn't be that far along in the program unless those were absolutely, positively in to it. There's a whole section, and I don't know whether someone calls it. But it's, you know, Is the student dressed appropriately? Is their voice quality appropriate? All the personal things somehow which I don't even think we should enter into unless it is grossly inappropriate.

Personalizing the evaluation using narratives rather than checklists would be appreciated by the cooperating teacher. The entry level of each student would also be a consideration so that the emphasis is on the growth not achievement.

CT I would say for a student who is confident and, you know, you can get rid of all those basic things like, you know, comes prepared to class, and, you know, the foundation things, then I think it should just be a narrative description sort of evaluation. I think those are much more meaningful to the student. You know, those are the things they, they grab on to and read and read over again. And that's where you can give them suggestions to grow and boost their self-esteem, things like that. But check-off lists I don't think means much to them or to me. I know it's harder to write some things. I guess the way I'd like to see, where may be you focus in on different things on different lessons. That might be beneficial.
The instrument has four scales to help the teacher with her/his rating. In the cooperating teacher's opinion, these levels of gradation impose a sense of constraint that is contrary to how s/he would like to evaluate the student and how s/he views the growth aspect of evaluation.

CT The one I have in my possession right now has Excellent, Needs Improvement, and Satisfactory. I don't think those fit. It's very hard to take a student and fit them into one of those categories... It's like putting a square peg in a round hole.

The process of the evaluation also leaves the cooperating teacher dissatisfied to a certain extent. The conferences s/he has with the student do not involve the university supervisor. S/he would like the opportunity after a written evaluation to be able to sit down with the student and perhaps the professor, or the supervisor and talk together. But "Very seldom do you have the opportunity" (CT).

The cooperating teacher would also like to check her/his evaluation against that of the university supervisor. S/he would appreciate some information and reassurance about the evaluation that s/he does.

CT The other thing I would be very interested to know is if my grading of the student is in line with the supervisor's or if I'm far too easy or far too. I would really be interested to see how closely we see the student. And I've never had the opportunity to do that.

But the relationship the cooperating teacher desires does not appear to have been established. The relationship of the cooperating teacher with the university supervisor seems to be brief and superficial. It is poor, if not non-existent, and apparently does not achieve the level of intimacy that the cooperating teacher would like.

CT I very seldom have any other than pleasantries. I don't even talk with the supervisors. In fact, they often don't even want me in the
room when they are there. You know, we say, 'Good morning. How are you? You know, nice day.' But other than that, unless we're having a serious problem, I very seldom do a lot of communicating with the supervisors.

The cooperating teacher sees the university supervisors so rarely that to her/him they do not seem to be part of the evaluation process at all. Neither does s/he seem to be aware that the university supervisor may conference with the students. So far as the cooperating teacher is concerned, the role the university supervisor plays is that of a contact with the university and that of a mediator in a crisis.

CT I felt that they were the liaison between what's going on in the college and what's going on in the classroom. They, they have been a help to me when there has been a rough spot that you have to get through. They act the form of mediator. Other than that. I think since you see them so infrequently it's, they have limited usefulness.

Nor does the university appear to provide any guidelines for the cooperating teacher about the evaluation process and skills such as conferencing. The opportunity for that is welcomed by the cooperating teacher who is enthusiastic about further training.

R And supposing the university were to say, 'If you don't take a course we give on supervision and evaluation, you're not going to have any of our students in your classroom.' How would you feel about that?

CT I think that would be a very good thing actually. I would welcome that because I often, you know, I sit there and think, you know, am I looking for the right thing? Am I hitting the mark? Am I missing mark?

On her/his part, the cooperating teacher personalizes the evaluation and takes responsibility for the student's performance. Thus the reluctance to give students a negative evaluation or a poor grade seem to be connected to the cooperating teacher's
perception that it reflects on the cooperating teacher her/himself, though s/he holds the university responsible for selecting suitable candidates for the course.

CT  I would feel like I had failed if I had to do that (give a student a negative evaluation) by the end of the term. I would feel like somehow, I would have to take some, certainly a big part of the responsibility for that because I wasn't communicating my concern clearly enough to the student and helping them move in the direction I wanted them to go in. So I would, I would take huge responsibility for that.

The cooperating teacher states that s/he relies on experience to provide for skills as an evaluator. But s/he would appreciate efforts to have a clear idea of her/his role and responsibilities in the process of evaluation.

CT  I would have this baseline or measuring stick that I could use to to compare my student skill. I would find that very helpful to see what they would consider Meets Minimum Expectations because their minimum and my minimum aren't the same.

The cooperating teacher reports that s/he benefits from a meeting with the instructor of the course which clarifies her/his expectations and the content of the methods course. This gives her/him direction and helps her/him to be more focused and to connect the theory with the practice.

CT  It was very clear what his expectation were. So then it was very clear for me to evaluate whether or not they had met his expectations. So I felt it was a very good thing. It made it much easier.

Thus establishing the need to connect with the course and the university supervisor, the cooperating teacher's choice of the personnel to conduct the training session are the professor who teaches the course and the supervisor, rather than an expert.

By virtue of knowing the program better, and on the basis of needing to communicate
with and understand their viewpoint, the cooperating teacher would prefer to have university personnel leading the training sessions.

CT Evaluating generally you could have an expert come in and do it. But you when you get down to the specific you need to know that professor and know that person who comes in to visit with your students.

Perceptions of the university supervisor as evaluator

As an evaluator the university supervisor share the responsibility with the cooperating teacher, sometimes even taking on more. The university supervisor is very clear about her/his perceptions of the evaluation process and the kind of people who should be involved in it. According to her/him, the evaluation process must take into consideration the philosophy of the program, the participants, both those who evaluate and those who are evaluated. S/he feels that the authenticity and purpose of the evaluation are jeopardized when there is a lack of connection between the theory espoused and the activities in the field. Thus s/he finds adjuncts who are supervisors, for example, and do not understand what the purpose of the field experience is, emphasize irrelevant criteria and skew the evaluation.

US We had people who thought that the students, expected to get high grades no matter what their performance was. We had people who did not know what was included in the methods courses... the students teachers were enrolled in and therefore they were not evaluating them just on such a simple thing like a lesson plan format... that the people who are not directly involved with us on campus do not espouse the same philosophy.
The university supervisor emphasizes the formative aspect of the evaluation process. The conferences s/he has with the students are a focal point of the evaluation process, and the student participation in this formative type of evaluation is very high. It requires that the students understand their actions and the consequences, and they are able to articulate the philosophy underlying their teaching. Thus from her/his point of view, the evaluation is not merely one of performance but also of conviction.

US I do not give the student a final evaluation until we sit down and talk about what evaluation I had filled out for them and their response to that evaluation. Because I want to know how much of what I see them teach they taught out of their own belief system and how much they taught because it was the expectation of the classroom teacher. And so after we get to that point, I give them what I consider the evaluation for their observation. I never do that without first conferencing with them.

The university supervisor reports that conferences with the student both on campus and on site. On site after the university supervisor has observed a lesson, s/he and the student meet in as secluded a spot as possible and discuss the lesson. This helps her/him build a rapport with the student, and allows the student to understand and analyze her/his performance and the grade that is realized in the end.

US Because I work so closely with the students and talk to them about what really happens in their experiences, I'm able to filter out where the philosophical differences come in and where really the teaching piece of it stays intact.

The university supervisor at this university seems prepared to take responsibility for negative evaluation and communicate that to the students. Advocating a realistic appraisal of the student’s abilities, the university supervisor is prepared to take on
unpleasant task of telling the students when their evaluation is poor, even if the remarks are likely to hurt the students.

**US** I think it is difficult always to make the comments to them that they need to hear. Because you want to build them up, you want them to have a positive experience and yet in all justice you need to point out areas where there is considerable room for improvement or areas they really need to address if they're going to be effective.

The university supervisor realizes the importance of multiple sources of input and would like to have a closer connection with the cooperating teacher. But the university supervisor acknowledges that coming together with the cooperating teacher and the student for a conference is a difficult proposition because of the time constraints of the university supervisor and the differing schedules of the students. Neither can the university take responsibility for freeing teachers and giving them time to attend a triadic conference.

**US** For the co-op to be there for the conference? At this time it is not (a requirement) because we don't have someone who could monitor the children while we have the conference. We don't provide that.

S/he expects to have knowledge of the purpose of the field experience and the theory connected to it. Believing that the cooperating teachers are not always clear about the goals of the experience and that this may influence what they expect of the students, s/he would like to give the evaluation some direction, clarifying the purpose and activities of the experience.

**US** I would like to have is the ability to at least once or twice during the placement separate from my observations to talk with the co-ops to find out what kind of progress the student is making and what kind of emphases they think we're missing in our teaching of methods courses.
However, s/he is not satisfied with the evaluation with which s/he is involved. In the university supervisor’s opinion, the instrument does not lend itself to the primary purpose of the evaluation - to identify good teachers.

US I truly believe in authentic assessment and I think that there is nothing in that evaluation that gives me any kind of an affective opportunity to respond... And yet somewhere in the very depths of your being you know this is a good teacher. And so I don’t see that that evaluation of that instrument gives me the opportunity to really address the fact that good teachers are born.

Perceptions of the director of field experiences

Considering that by her/his own admission the director rarely ventures into the site and hardly makes contact with cooperating teachers, s/he appears to be remarkably well-informed about the process and the requirements of the role of the evaluators. S/he seeks to understand and be appreciative of the university supervisor’s role in the formative evaluation which s/he believes “is to evaluate. ... And I think feedback is very important.”

The director believes that the training for the cooperating teachers and university supervisors should focus on goal clarification rather than on providing skills and techniques. This echoes the cooperating teacher’s needs and the university supervisor’s perspectives on training.

D I don’t think so much that they would need training. What I think might be very helpful is if somehow there could be a meeting of the cooperating teacher, the college supervisor, the instructor of the course and the student to see that these are our expectations, they are the same expectations for all of us and with this information -. A more inclusive kind of communication.

CT Probably a team from the college which would include the supervisor person and the professor. I think they both should, I
think it should be a team approach. I think we need to hear from both of them. We need to hear the meat of it from the professor. But then we also need to hear the theory and the evaluation from the supervisor. I think we need both.

US I think if we could work more closely with them so that we would share our expectations instead of the expectation of the co-op and the expectation of the institution running parallel, that they would more converge. So yes, I can see definite value in some sort of preparation.

Both the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher realize that the most important skills they must possess are communication skills. They are also of the opinion that knowledge of techniques and strategies of evaluation will enhance their abilities as evaluators. But the director plays down both these needs.

CT I think communicating skills are very important. How to offer, I don't want to say criticism. But how to offer suggestions for improvements so that the student can take the in a positive way. People skills, you know, I think that's very important.

US I think the modeling of different types of observations would be appropriate. For teachers, for example, to see how you do a development, how you observe and then evaluate a development lesson as opposed to how you would view and evaluate an appreciation lesson, or review, or cooperative lesson. So I'd like to see them see some models. And I'd like to see them have some specific methods of evaluation that do not rely on A, B, C grades or 1, 2 3 grades or whatever. But various methods of authentic assessment that give them evaluative tools that really will help the student. I also would like to see them get some assistance with strategies for goals setting so that they would be able to, without being combative, assist the student in saying, 'This is what I need to look at for the future.' I also would hope that they would get some suggestions for the type of analysis that would support the student’s strengths as well as identify the student’s weaknesses.
Overview

The University of Gum appears to have a coherent and comprehensive evaluation scheme for the early field experience. It seems formative in nature and to have opportunities for multiple perspectives. It apparently emphasizes the understanding that can be derived from conferencing, though grades are the means of expressing that.

The roles played by the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor, and the techniques they use, seem similar. The evaluation scheme necessitates a heavy investment in time and personnel, both of which are apparently made by this university.

However, perhaps communication between the evaluators could be improved. While both the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor appear to communicate with the student individually, they do not seem to talk to each other. The university supervisor, for example, believes that the conference that s/he holds with the cooperating teacher after each observation is sufficient and fairly informative, an opinion not shared by the cooperating teacher. It also appears that while the university supervisor communicates with the cooperating teacher regarding her/his perception of the student, s/he does not return the favor by commenting on the cooperating teacher’s evaluation.

US When I visit the schools have a conference with the co-op. And if it is not possible for them to join our meeting at the end, then before I meet with the student, I meet with the co-op and I give them a sense of the information I’m going to share with the student and I ask them if they corroborate what I say or if what I’m saying is an isolated thing that only happened that day because I happened to be there or if was a consistent thing they’ve noticed with this student, you know, throughout.
I guess I would like to have the opportunity to have some give and take between all of the parties involved. I think that would be a real plus.

University of Holly

Description of field experience

The field experience, which is the first one for the students once they are admitted into the Upper Division in the College of Education at the University of Holly, is for juniors mainly. It involves about 65 hours in the field, usually with one teacher. The students are in the schools for a maximum of a whole day a week for the quarter or for two half days a week. This is an exploratory field experience, the major purpose of which is to provide the students a “global view” (US) of the school and its activities. Students observe various grade levels, work in the library and the office and perform various duties that a teacher would in the course of a school day to experience life in the ‘real world.’

A seminar course is attached to this field experience and involves discussing issues that arise in the field or are associated with the field experiences. Both the field experience and the course are Credit / No Credit with no grades being awarded.

Evaluation process

The evaluation process in this university includes three persons, all of them in the same milieu. The students are evaluated by three cooperating teachers they observe or
work with in the course of the quarter each of whom completes an evaluation sheet at mid-term and at the end of the term. The three final evaluation forms, one from each of the three cooperating teachers, are filed at the office of the field experience where they “become part of the student’s records” (D) and are referred to when future placements are made. The cooperating teacher is encouraged to discuss the evaluations with the student but it is not mandatory.

The university supervisor conducts the seminar on campus and evaluates the course. The final decision whether the student gets a credit or not for the course and the field experience rests with the university supervisor. If the university supervisor does not agree with the cooperating teacher’s evaluation s/he may have an addendum to her/his evaluation which is also turned in to the field experience office. No further evaluation by anyone else is such as the student is required.

Instrument

The evaluation instrument used in this field experience is a checklist with space for a narrative in which the cooperating teacher may comment on aspects of the student’s work or personality which are not referred to by the criteria in the checklist. The cooperating teacher grades the student using a five point scale ranging from 1 to 5.

Since this is an exploratory experience, the criteria in the evaluation form are generic and include rapport with children, appearance, punctuality, enthusiasm, dependability, cooperativeness and positive attitude.
Grading

There is no grading involved in this course. A Credit/ No Credit field experience, neither the cooperating teacher nor the university supervisor gives a grade to the student.

Perceptions of the cooperating teacher as evaluator

In her/his first year as a cooperating teacher, this cooperating teacher has all the doubts, uncertainties and questions that a neophyte would have. To her/him, her/his role as evaluator is not as important as her/his role as supervisor.

CT For me I don’t think it’s important as me evaluating as me to give them experiences. Any kind of background experiences which will help them in the future.... I don’t see my role as really begin big on evaluation as to being open.

Another problem associated with the evaluation by the cooperating teacher is that s/he feels that s/he is evaluating her/himself rather than the student. The lesson that the field experience student teaches is discussed in detail with the cooperating teacher. The cooperating teacher maintains that oftentimes it is her/his plan which is implemented by the student. Unable to distinguish definitively between her/his contributions and those of the student, the cooperating teacher feels that her/his planning, which is meticulous, is being evaluated and not the student’s ability to teach.

CT I just give them some things that I’ve already detailed for them and they follow the steps. So there’s really not much to evaluate, they’re just doing like I ask.
The cooperating teacher's understanding of her/his role as an evaluator in the University of Holly includes providing the students experiences, and filling out the evaluation forms. She/he does not understand the criteria and the basis on which s/he should evaluate. Being fairly new, s/he is not entirely clear what the scales mean and how s/he is to interpret the criteria.

CT The first time I evaluated her (the student), and I remember talking to her supervising teacher, and I have nothing to compare her to and she asked me, she said, 'How do you feel about these marks?' They're kind of high. And so High, Average and Low. She did seem to have good rapport with the children. Really, you know, always looks nice. That was hard orate, the appearance. I mean, how do you give somebody a High Average or Low? That was a hard one. She was always enthusiastic and sometimes when I asked her she would do it. That kind of goes with, she always cooperated, 'Has a positive attitude.' And so on a scale that was, because she seems to have all those thing to me. Could only between High and Average and that was really hard for me.

In particular cases, certain strengths that the student has are not part of the criteria in the checklist. The question is whether the cooperating teacher should comment on those aspects of the experience on which s/he is not expected to rate the student. This is a problem to the cooperating teacher since s/he is not very clear what the purpose of the experience is and what the focus of the evaluation should be.

CT You asked me how I would (re-do an evaluation she was not satisfied with). I don’t know. That’s a good question. I don’t know how I could do it this way because initiative or professional knowledge isn’t on here. But I don’t know that it really should be waived. I mean, may be initiative. But professional knowledge. I don’t know if that would be appropriate.

The cooperating teacher finds the space given for the narrative is more meaningful than the checklist since s/he is able to personalize the evaluation of each student there, commenting on their individual strengths. The cooperating teacher uses the narrative
section to comment on those criteria that s/he feels are not part of the instrument and to
which the checklist does not give her/him an opportunity to refer to. The narrative that
s/he writes refers to these aspects.

CT I noticed we were just walking around she would notice this student is
having problems and would just jump right in with her own innovations like
that. She really was on the ball. And she’d done a lot of professional
readings. And so that’s what I’d noted in the narrative. And I guess it’s
pretty much what I used the narrative for and that’s what I used the
narrative for something they do and don’t do. That’s where I write it.

Regarding a particular student’s evaluation, s/he feels s/he could have been more
specific and constructive if s/he had been able to use the narrative better. S/he would then
have been able to provide a more balanced and honest evaluation without sounding
negative.

CT May be I would have left the general things the same... . But I don’t know
how you note that. May be in the narrative I said 'She could’ve taken more
initiative.' In the narrative I could have said, you know, in a positive way,
'With more professional reading, with more experience she will grow more
comfortable with the training of this or feel more comfortable with her
classroom management skills' or something like that.

The cooperating teacher feels comfortable conferencing with the student. S/he
finds that suggestions can be made with greater ease and problems discussed at a higher
level of interaction.

CT And I felt being critical of somebody else, I just didn't want to shoot them
down. And I think when you talk to somebody it's easier to soften it or if
their perception or, but, you know. May be you could have done this
better. I really like how you did this.' When you write it down, it really
seems cut and dried, black and white.

The cooperating teacher realizes that if s/he knew the starting point and ending
point of every student’s experience s/he would be able to deal with the experience in
greater detail. S/he indicates that s/he could then provide a more authentic and meaningful experience.

CT  I think to be a fair evaluator, I would need to know what, what they know, what they are expected to know at that point. To be fair, wouldn't be fair if I thought firmer grasp on expectations of a grade level or, you know, how to handle classroom management

The cooperating teacher reports that the one of the most common complaints of the teachers who have students in this early exploratory field experience is that they do not see the student often enough to warrant a fair evaluation. The students are expected to visit more than one grade level and experience working in areas others than the classroom, such as the library and the office, s/he affirms. This leaves some cooperating teachers feeling that the checklist requires them to rate more aspects of the student than they feel capable of, given their interaction with the students.

CT  When the students, you know, we let them just get oriented to our class, who the students were, their names. And then we spent time sending them to two other grade levels, the library and office. By that time they really weren't, you know, you know, because we've specials and things. So, so when it came time to evaluate, I remember a couple of teachers had said, 'This is kind of tough. I don't know how to give them a fair grade.'

In the cooperating teacher's opinion, the cooperating teachers in general do not take evaluation very seriously. S/he states that there is not a lot of thought that goes into writing the forms and filling them out.

CT  I just know that there's probably a wide variety of differences in between the tutors and they probably all got the same markings and I don't if the teachers have been. I know we share a lot, we talk a lot but as far as evaluating, I don't know if they take it quite as seriously because remember we haven't had that contact... When someone's evaluating. I know a lot of the principal's announcements come over the loudspeakers and say, you know, 'I need to get these evaluations in today.' And so you know, we'll
sit down quickly and, you know, some people do it in five minutes and I don't think it's taken as seriously.

The cooperating teacher is not aware that there are no grades awarded in this course. According to her/him, the university supervisor awards grades. So s/he expects the university supervisor to play a bigger role in the evaluation rather than just “pop in” (CT).

CT I guess I would have expected that person to have a bigger role in the evaluation. I mean, they give them the final grade and then probably did take what we wrote down and translated in an A, B, C grade.

The cooperating teacher declares that s/he needs the help that the university supervisor can give in supporting her/his evaluation of the student. S/he says that s/he makes it a point to meet the university supervisor whenever s/he is in the building and “everything I had written out” (CT) would have been told the university supervisor “in person” (CT), giving the university supervisor a chance to work with the cooperating teacher on the perception of the evaluation and the phrasing of the comments.

R Do you think you'd like to sit down and discuss your evaluation of the student with the supervisor?

CT Yes... . Yeah, it would. You know, because you would have a chance to get to know the supervisor too and things the, that they're looking for. You know, with just a sheet of paper, so you can go so much more if you just have a chance to sit and talk

But s/he does not know exactly what the university requires of her/him. This appears to result in her/his not having a clear idea of her/his role and responsibilities.

CT I think I guess, the first student I came in I, I wasn't quite sure what kind of professional knowledge the students would have and I guess the process of purpose of the evaluation, how much the grade weighed on what... . So I guess I don't have my role clearly defined. So it's hard for me to evaluate.
To help her/him understand the program better, the cooperating teacher would like a meeting at which the purpose of the program is explained and the processes are discussed. S/he feels that s/he will then become familiar with the requirements of the experience.

CT I think at the beginning because I know a lot people are overwhelmed, it would have been hard for the supervisor. I think like a big group meeting because somebody else might have a question I might not have thought of. So probably a big group meeting.

The university, on the other hand, indicates that s/he has been given this information and that s/he is well-equipped to deal with providing a balanced evaluation. The university supervisor and the director believe that an “orientation” (US) is held prior to every field experience in which the cooperating teachers are exhorted to “spend time sharing information with our students” (US) and not to “wait until it’s time to put things in writing” (US). But the cooperating teacher does not seem to have attended any meeting of this kind.

CT The supervisor that we’re dealing with now, she gave us a package of information that told like briefly about what classes the kids had, pretty much what we should expect them to know at this point. But it was very brief and general. It was all in one letter. And we never talked about it. It was sent to us. ... we never had meeting at the beginning because we just got a packet and, you know, we don’t even have that much contact with the supervising teacher.

In an effort to become familiar with the program and to be a better evaluator, the cooperating teacher would like a hands-on approach of looking at evaluation tools that could be used, a practical workshop that points out what to look for in evaluation and how to evaluate the observations. S/he is of the opinion that the workshop would best be
conducted by the supervising teacher or the university supervisor and should last a maximum of two sessions of an hour or so held directly after school.

**Perceptions of the university supervisor as evaluator**

As the university supervisor sees it, the purpose of the evaluation is formative. The accent and emphasis is on making the students aware of themselves as professionals and providing them opportunities to improve their teaching.

**US** I think that the evaluation really should be a real growing kind of experience, I think. In the evaluation not just how they are doing, just how they are doing but ways to improve also, let the know what they're doing well. To assess their behavior as a field experiences student in a classroom and to help them, and to help them improve. Not just assess but assess with the ways to perform the activities even better.

The university supervisor’s part in the process includes deciding whether the students should get a credit for the course or not, and this is usually “in terms of what happens on campus (and) is based primarily on attendance” (US). If the student gets a negative report, the university supervisor declares that s/he investigates it and comes to an independent decision as to how much weight should be placed on the cooperating teacher’s remarks.

As the director says, there are no “real guidelines” for the role and the responsibilities of the university supervisor but what is required of her/him is to communicate to the cooperating teachers what the university expects of them. This is apparently done by frequent discussion with the cooperating teacher. The university supervisor says s/he drops in on the cooperating teacher for a quick word when s/he is in
the building but, more often than not, the cooperating teacher is with the pupils in the classroom and the university supervisor cannot take the time away from the classroom activities. The university supervisor claims that this severely limits the communication s/he can have with the cooperating teacher. To the university supervisor’s regret, nor does the cooperating teacher feel committed enough to the program to meet the university supervisor after the school timings when the pupils are not around.

It is also unrealistic unfortunately, that teachers will not feel committed to come after school to meet with the campus supervisor. And even when I go into the building, sometimes the interaction with the teacher is almost a cursory type thing, you know. How are you doing?... I do meet with cooperating teachers as a group and then sometimes when I go into a building and it's during the school day, I go from room to room. And then I have to be very careful because I don't want to disrupt the instructional process by my going in and, you know, asking how the student's getting along and asking some very specific questions.

The university supervisor’s role as evaluator seems confined to the campus activities so that s/he has no role to play in the actual evaluation in the field. However, the university supervisor is not satisfied with the checklist and the scales the cooperating teachers are expected to use. S/he observes, “The students are graduated High, Above Average, Average, Below Average. And I just have a problem with that type of evaluation in terms of being a meaningful tool for students.”

The university supervisor would like to “move from a checklist to objectives” (US) in which case cooperating teachers would have to give more thought to what they evaluate and cannot merely put a checkmark for the task to be done. The cooperating
teachers could also look at the list of experiences and write about the quality of the experiences and the student's responses to them.

The university supervisor would like the cooperating teachers to have a conference with the students but realizes that the instrument does not prompt such a sharing. There is "not a lot of correlation between the form and what is happening." S/he feels that the criteria are not such as to warrant the kind of meetings the university supervisor would like to see taking place.

US I get the impression that even though the request is made, the majority, many of those cooperating teachers do not sit down. What when you talk about appearance punctuality, enthusiasm, dependability, those are not the type that you're going to sit down and really spend a lot of time discussing. There's nothing on there that speaks to a tutoring which is what we expect the students to spend a large amount of time doing.

Another limitation to the dialogue between cooperating teacher and the university supervisor that the university supervisor recognizes is one of time and opportunity. The schedules of the cooperating teacher and the student do not always allow for an in-depth conference.

US Unfortunately, the time, there's some problems because the students go out. Let's see, they're not there first thing in the morning. So they miss being able to dialogue with the teacher. If we have a student is on a half day and if the students leaves at 11.30 and the teacher wants to go and eat, we miss it again. So some students do not have that opportunity of spending as much time just that interaction with that teacher, you know, alone. That too is sometimes a problem.

Coupled with her/his inability to observe the students, it seems difficult for the university supervisor to relate to some of the criteria in the instrument. S/he states that this
further increases her/his reliance on the cooperating teacher’s perception of the student’s performance in the field.

**US** I did not develop that tool and it was, some of it is absolutely impossible for me to evaluate without just depending on the cooperating teacher. Really, I think some of those, with some of the issues, I probably shouldn't even evaluate them. ... It's truly not my evaluation. It's based on what the cooperating teacher has said about the students.

Some of the criteria in the instrument may require close on-site observation of the student in various situations. Since the university supervisor is not able to devote this kind of time nor has the opportunity to observe all the students, s/he feels that s/he is not in a position to evaluate them. As s/he asks, “How in the world can I, will the seminar leader evaluate rapport with staff?”

The university supervisor is aware that the cooperating teacher does not always give a grade that is consistent with performance. S/he agrees that her/his knowledge of both the reluctance of cooperating teachers to give low grades, and the ability of the students help her/him judge when the grades are not consistent with performance.

**US** Knowing a little about cooperating teachers, too, I get a little bit concerned when I see that about, I would say 95% plus, or let's say 90% plus receive Above Average and High in every category. And I know that is definitely not realistic.

This perception may not be far off the mark, especially when the cooperating teacher is inexperienced. Having low expectations and not knowing where to set the achievement level, this cooperating teacher admits that s/he does err on the side of the student.

**CT** The first time I did it, and I had never. And especially being young student. The first time I did it, I was pretty uncomfortable because. And looking
back on it now, I feel I graded her too high because I'm a very young teacher, too.

This issue of the lack of consistency in the rating of students is of particular concern in this institution because the university supervisor relies heavily on the evaluation of the cooperating teacher for the decision s/he makes about the student. S/he admits that her/his reading of the cooperating teacher's evaluation needs to be corroborated by other evidence, which may not always be easy to find.

**US** I will have a cooperating teacher who will evaluate the student on attendance as the very top category for the student has missed 3 sessions. There are only 10 sessions, you know, in the quarter. And this is where I will change. Base it on, because I get the time sheet every Monday. So I know exactly how much time the students are spending in the building.

To offset this erroneous evaluation, the university supervisor reports that s/he does not make changes to it or set it aside. Instead, s/he adds comments that explain the cooperating teacher's evaluation of the student.

**US** Not very often but does happen on occasion when they (cooperating teachers) evaluate them (students) I think inappropriately... . What I have done in a situation like that, and there have not been very many, is when I do the evaluation I've had to keep that in mind and then there would be some kind. If someone looked at my evaluation and the cooperating teacher evaluation, they would see a real distinction. So I would make some kind of comment in my evaluation so the person looking at this would understand why, without becoming unprofessional.

The university supervisor understands how the campus activities can enhance the role of the cooperating teacher. In her/his opinion, if the tie-up between the campus and the site could be strengthened, the field experience itself could be improved and the evaluation would be more realistic and meaningful.

**US** If the teachers knew a little more about the things that we discuss on a campus, I really think it would help the teachers be better cooperating
teachers. But because of our limited time, I would like to see cooperating teachers really look at the same book that we use on campus that has to do with classroom management.

**Perceptions of the director of field experiences**

The university wants the cooperating teacher to understand her/his role as a cooperating teacher, understand the responsibilities that go with the role. It also wants that the cooperating teacher be "willing to fulfill that role" (D). The director feels that so often the cooperating teacher takes on the role for reasons other than to help a student and this affects the experience s/he offers the student and in consequence her/his evaluation of the student.

D I think they have to first of all understand where the student is in their program and they have to understand that they are working with a neophyte, somebody, you know, who is just entering into the profession.

As an evaluator, the university requires the cooperating teacher to put down on paper her/his "gut feeling" (D) and evaluate the student on her/his response in the classroom, her/his ability to take direction and "just the overall attitude" (D).

The director expects cooperating teachers to get to know their students very well on a personal level, know their hobbies, likes and dislikes, to "become familiar" (D) with them on an "informal basis" (D). The university expects the cooperating teacher to point out to the students what they need to learn yet and areas they must improve.

D I think they have to have very good conferencing skills. They have to be able to say things in a manner that is positive even though they may have to say some things that are not as pleasant as they would like it to be. And sometimes some of them won't say anything at all because they don't want
to say anything unpleasant. So I think they definitely need conferencing skills.

The director does not seem to be entirely in tune with the field experience. For example, s/he is under the impression that all the students in the course are assigned to a building and not a specific teacher and that the university supervisor is able to oversee all of them in a single building. This is in direct contrast to the understanding of the cooperating teacher, who sees her/himself as the chief evaluator of a student allotted specifically to her/him. Also, the university supervisor reports that s/he might have students in as many as six buildings simultaneously and travel as much as 22 miles one way to get to some of the students.

The director states that s/he faces practical problems such as instructors not filing the evaluation forms in time for her/him to study them for future placements of students. The director is also responsible for setting up and monitoring a paper trail should the need arise for one, though the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor are “important people” (D) who would make sure that “the right paper is collected and the right procedures are followed” (D). The director maintains that this paper trail is helpful when after this particular experience, a problem is identified and needs to be explained, or the history of a student can provide an explanation for a specific behavior.

Since the cooperating teacher appears to be the only person who evaluates the field experience, it would be important that the right sort of person is chosen for the task. But the reality does not seem to measure up to the ideal. Both the director and the
university supervisor agree that they do not have a choice in the cooperating teachers who work with their students.

D I don't think in all cases they are well trained or trained enough to do that. There are many sites that we use over and over again and we know we have some very good teachers in those sites and we try to utilize those. We try to impress upon building administrators how important it is for us to use only their very best teachers. But that's very difficult. They're caught up in a, you know, building problem. Well, you know, every teacher has to have an opportunity and, you know, it's so-and-so's turn to work with the students. We almost have to let that teacher do it because, you know, they get caught up with some union problems.

US But I'm concerned about the way teachers are selected to be cooperating teachers. You know, just whoever wants some help is generally what happens...if I could pick, I would like to hand pick them. And I would like the university to develop criteria for the selection of the teachers. And then ask the building principal to use that in determining who should get field experience students. We don't do this and I think it would be helpful. Of course that would create problems at the building level, having been a principal I know that sometime you get the professional envy. 'Why are you selected time after time?' So it's a complex problem with not any simple answer.

Since not all cooperating teachers are apparently good evaluator or supervisors, and the university cannot select its on-site evaluator, what can the university do to help those who do not have the skills? The director agrees with the cooperating teacher's reading that a mandatory training session would not be welcomed by all cooperating teachers. Some would be "irate" (D) and others may feel "they don't need to do this" (D).

In the director's opinion, an important factor in the evaluation is the expectations that the cooperating teachers have of the student's competency level. S/he feels that many cooperating teachers expect a more polished and complete teacher and are disappointed when this does not happen, resulting in unfair and unrealistic evaluations. The importance
of this perception seems to be underscored by the cooperating teacher’s contention that
the instrument has a limited use since it does not cater to all the experiences that a student
has and that need to be evaluated. The director’s understanding of the training needs of
cooperating teachers appears to be clear. Since this is an exploratory experience, s/he
suggests that the cooperating teachers need to be made aware of the purposes of the
experience and what they should be looking for.

D And then they also need to understand how to go through levels of
supervision because sometimes some teachers come on so strong in the
very beginning, they're picking at every little thing. They're not sitting back
and looking at more global types of things and it's almost destroying the
student even before they even get the feet on the ground. So they need to
understand there are different levels of supervision if you're going to come
in very general, you've got to make sure you're looking at the overall,
major things first before you're picking at some of the more minute details
that are going to improve with time.

The training that is offered for the cooperating teachers seems practical and
specific. In a workshop conducted by the director the focus is on how to write narratives
and how to phrase negative evaluations.

D I provide what we call an evaluation workshop which helps them write out
what it is they need to say about the student's performance and help them
look at ways of phrasing. For instance, if the student is an exemplary
student, how do you use that sounds professional, that will express that
exemplary performance as opposed to somebody who is highly successful
or somebody who is average or somebody who is adequate or somebody
who needs, you know, work? A lot of the evaluation used to be written on
potential, you know, 'This person has the potential of being a good
teacher,' which doesn't say anything. So we, we really don't like them to
use phrases like that but be much more specific and and give us some more
direct information on the student's ability, performance ability at that point.
Overview

The evaluation process at this university has certain features of formative evaluation. The field experience is not graded and does not appear to be viewed summatively. There is opportunity for multiple perspectives with three cooperating teachers providing evaluations of the same student. Follow-up seminars on campus afford an opportunity to make connections between the purpose of the field experience and the evaluation.

However, communication still appears to be a problem in achieving consistency in the evaluation. The relationship between the cooperating teacher and the student is non-cohesive since the cooperating teachers seem to complain that they do not have enough time to spend with the students. The support that the cooperating teachers get from the university supervisor may be limited and not timely. Finally, the lack of concurrence between the director and the university supervisor of what actually occurs in the field may contribute to the lack of vigor and thrust in the evaluation process.

Certain limitations of the programs have been recognized by the university and have been catered to in terms of the training that is imparted to the cooperating teachers. But a strong leadership to establish the norms and manage the field experience appears to be missing in the program as of now, with neither the university supervisor nor the director being highly visible parties in the field. The lack of manpower and the reluctance to implement ideas are fundamental problems the University of Holly may need to tackle.
Overview of all institutions

Description of experience

Table J1 provides information about the description of the field experience. The length of the field experience ranges from 20 hours to 65 hours. In 75% of the institutions, the field experiences are associated with methods courses. In three institutions out of the six in which the field experiences are attached to methods courses, course instructors also take on the role of university supervisor. In the others, the discussion is left to the course instructor who is generally not a supervisor in the field.

Of the eight institutions in the sample, two of them have seminars attached to the field experiences. Further, in one of these two institutions the university supervisor also conducts the associated seminar. In the other institution the seminar is conducted by the coordinator who does not supervise the field experiences.

Evaluation process

As seen in Table J2, the cooperating teacher plays a major role in the evaluation process of the students in the field experience. In all eight institutions the cooperating teacher is involved in the evaluation process as an evaluator and completes the required forms. On the other hand, about 60% of the institutions require the university supervisor to play the role of evaluator. In three institutions, personnel other than the cooperating
teacher or the university supervisor participate in the evaluation process, and 25% of the institutions provide for the student to be part of the evaluation procedure.

In 50% of the institutions the university supervisor is required to complete the evaluation forms. Apart from the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor, two institutions ask for evaluation input on paper from other persons.

Conferences, whether dyadic or triadic, are not mandated or required by a large number of institutions. Only 25% of them require a dyadic conference between the cooperating teacher and the student, while three out of eight require one involving the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher. Only one institution expects a triadic conference involving the cooperating teacher, the university supervisor, and the student. But all the institutions lay a clear paper trail by filing papers in the office.

Instrument

Checklists are more widely used than narratives, in fact, in seven out of eight institutions. In all these instruments, there is space for a narrative (Table J3). 75% of the institutions use instruments have not been changed or modified for at least five years. Only one institution modifies the instrument every semester depending on the course, while another has changed the instrument in the recent past, within the last year.
Grading

In most institutions, the first field experience that students have after being admitted to the College of Education does not require grading by anybody as part of the field work. In fact, 25% of the institutions require a grade for the field experience (Table J4) with the cooperating teacher being responsible in one institution. The university supervisor is responsible in 50% of the cases, while the course instructor, who may or may not be the university supervisor, gives the grade in two instances of the eight.

In six out of eight institutions the grade is more often based on activities on the campus while four of the eight institutions take into consideration activities associated with the field experience. In some of these institutions the activities in the campus are associated with the activities in the field, which accounts for the overlap (Table J4).

Cooperating teachers

A majority of cooperating teachers do not like the role of evaluator. In fact, seven out of eight cooperating teachers interviewed state that for various reasons they do not like evaluating students. As evaluators, five out of seven prefer narratives while two out of six express a preference for checklists.

A majority of cooperating teachers, six out of eight, are of the opinion that they do not have sufficient time with the student to make a valid evaluation. Though all of them are able to conference informally with the student, most of them (six out of eight) do not feel comfortable in a triadic meeting. Almost 90% express reluctance to make negative
remarks about the student, and would like to discuss the import of these remarks with the university supervisor before writing out an evaluation. All cooperating teachers want a closer relationship with the university supervisor in terms of wanting to share the evaluation the university supervisor writes for the students.

**University supervisors**

The major role that the university supervisors see for themselves is that of a troubleshooter. Slightly over 60% of the university supervisors interviewed do not complete evaluation forms for the student, evaluating the student only when the cooperating teacher asks them to do so. Almost 70% of them do not give grades for the field experience. An equal percentage express a problem regarding the large number of student and locations involved in the evaluation (Table J6).

**Directors of field experience**

Without exception the directors handle the paperwork and lay a paper trail in the field experiences (Table J7). They do not evaluate the student, with one exception, nor do they teach courses or seminars attached to the field experience, though all the six who referred to it are conscious of a need to connect theory and practice in the field experience.

Though they have no direct contact with the cooperating teachers, most of them have a closer connection with the university supervisor. Almost 90% expect the
cooperating teacher to conference with the student but hardly 50% of them expect the university supervisor to evaluate the student and to conference with them. On the other hand, triadic conferences are not expected of the university supervisor except by one director (Table J7).
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The importance of early field experience in teacher preparation has been increasingly evident as signified by both the time the students spend in it (NCATE, 1992), and the innovations that try to enrich the experience for the preservice teachers (McIntyre & Byrd, 1996). The first field experience that students have after being admitted to the College of Education is gradually acquiring a profile which is distinct from student teaching. The purposes of early field experiences range from career exploration to practicing pedagogical skills (McIntyre & Norris, 1980; Webb et al, 1981) while student teaching is seen as a graduation requirement (Fant, Hill, Lee and Landes, 1985). The activities prescribed for the students in early field experiences are varied and include both
instructional and non-instructional tasks (Ishler & Kay, 1981; Paese, 1987). However, evaluation of the preservice teacher is an aspect of the field experience which has not been researched widely.

Past research indicates that the participants involved in the evaluation of preservice teachers in their field experience are the cooperating teacher, the university supervisor and the director (Applegate & Lasley, 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986; ATE, 1986; Ishler & Kay, 1981; Lasley, Applegate & Ellison, 1986). This study explored their understanding of their roles and responsibilities as evaluators especially in the evaluation process, and their perceptions of the evaluation instruments, the grading procedures, and the training they receive and desire.

Random sampling techniques were used to identify eight institutions in a midwestern state offering elementary education. Purposive sampling was used to choose directors of field experience as participants. Based on the information from them, the first field experience that students have after admission into the College of Education was identified. The directors also provided me with lists of cooperating teachers and university supervisors who were involved in this particular field experience. Random sampling methods were used to select one participant from each list.

Phone interviews were conducted with 23 participants chosen from eight institutions. These included: eight cooperating teachers, seven university supervisors and eight directors. The interviews were transcribed. Relevant categories were formulated by four independent raters to explain and analyze the focus of the study. The data from the
interviews was triangulated with the printed materials (e.g. initial letters to cooperating teachers; evaluation instruments) that were sent to the researcher. Member checks were conducted with the participants by sharing with them the transcripts of their interviews.

In analyzing the data, an attempt was made to compare the understanding of the three categories of participants. Interpretation of the perceptions of each participant was matched with others from the same institution. Their commonalties of ideas and opinions each group shared were highlighted. The differences in their apprehension of various issues were also explored.

Chapter 4 presented the findings on the basis of each institution. The perceptions of each participant were explored for a further understanding of the tasks they performed as evaluator. A cross-case analysis compared the results across the eight institutions.

This chapter will summarize the findings from the interviews. Interpretations of the findings in the light of the literature cited in chapter 2 will be discussed. The implications of these conclusions for teacher education, especially for evaluation purposes, will be presented, and possible effective strategies suggested. Finally, certain areas that are related to the topic will be suggested for further research.
Summary of results

Evaluation process

Though the experience is varied in terms of length and the activities the students are engaged in, the evaluation process in most institutions in the study is remarkably similar. Evaluation is most often completed using checklists. However, in most cases, the checklist is not the preferred tool of cooperating teachers but a narrative is. The completed forms are filed in the education office.

Triadic and dyadic conferences do not seem to figure in a significant way in the evaluation process. Informal conferences between the cooperating teacher and the student, held at the discretion of the cooperating teacher, are more common than the university supervisor - student conferences.

Cooperating teachers

The cooperating teachers play an important part in the evaluation of the student in early field experiences, but the role of the evaluator is not one that they would choose to play. They would prefer not to have to give a grade or make negative statements about the students. They do not feel comfortable giving grades to the students, unless they see the student over a longer period of time so that formative evaluation is possible.

Another aspect of evaluation that the cooperating teachers do not enjoy is offering criticism about the student in writing. If they are compelled to do so, they would like to
discuss it with the university supervisor before committing it to paper. They do not want to take sole responsibility for any negative effect the evaluation may have on the student or her/his career.

They would also like to have the university supervisors sharing their own evaluation with the cooperating teachers. Thus, when the cooperating teachers note a less than positive behavior, they are not the only ones remarking on it.

The support given to cooperating teachers in terms of training offered is also limited. They would like to have meetings that elucidate the purpose of the field experience. Such initial meetings are arranged by most universities. But evaluation skills such as training in and exposure to various evaluation instruments and tools, conferencing skills and collaboration skills are not widely offered. Neither are the cooperating teachers trained to handle the more subtle and difficult aspects of evaluation, for example, offering negative comments.

University supervisors

The role the university supervisors are expected to play in early field experience is very limited in terms of evaluation in the field. For the most part they stay where their title says they should - at the university, teaching associated methods courses and conducting seminars. They are not generally involved with the development of the instrument, which, more often than not, has been in place for many years.
More an orienter than an evaluator in the field, the university supervisors seem to spend more time and energy organizing the experience and troubleshooting than in evaluating the student. Only in very rare cases do they venture into the realms of the site for evaluation purposes, and then it is primarily at the request of the cooperating teachers.

As evaluators, the university supervisors have to face a logistical nightmare of being responsible for students in sites that are distant from each other. Having to evaluate a large number of students in the course of a field experience that runs to a maximum of 65 hours adds to the difficulty of planning an evaluation. Thus, scheduling time to meet cooperating teachers becomes a problem for the university supervisors.

The university supervisors are not required by the university to build a close working relationship with cooperating teachers. Moreover, they seem generally unaware of the cooperating teachers' reservations regarding making negative evaluations, and their desire to be acquainted with the university supervisors' own evaluation of the students. This prompts the university supervisors to be reactive and to wait for the cooperating teachers to approach them, so that observation and triadic conferences occur largely at the request of the cooperating teachers.

They do not usually participate in the training offered to the cooperating teachers, and are themselves not trained specifically in evaluation or supervision. Since their evaluatory duties are light and sporadic, they do not always perceive the need to be trained formally for the role.
Directors of field experience

By and large, the directors of field experiences are not actively involved in the evaluation of preservice teachers in early field experiences. Most of them are in charge of handling the final paperwork, but they rarely supervise or teach associated courses or seminars. In certain cases they offer training to cooperating teachers. They do not know the cooperating teachers individually though they are more familiar with the university supervisors. They expect the cooperating teachers to evaluate the field experience, and the university supervisors to step in when there is a problem. They are largely unaware of the cooperating teachers' needs and sentiments but have a clearer picture of the university supervisors' predicament.

Conclusions

Innovations in early field experiences in elementary education have had an impact on the programs, which in turn have influenced the evaluation pattern to a certain extent. More personnel than just the cooperating teacher or the university supervisor are involved in the field experience evaluation process. This provides for multiple perspectives in the evaluation. The inclusion of students in the evaluation process, as in the universities of Elm and Gum, paves the way for authentic assessment and a shift in the roles played by the evaluators.
Activities directly related to the field experience feature in the grading. The responses of the students to what the cooperating teachers plan for them in the field is evaluated, whether the criteria be teaching skills or personality traits. In other instances when the activities on campus are graded, they are related to the field in the form of journals, interviews or observation notes.

Elements of formative evaluation can be detected in the process. The cooperating teachers express a desire to be acquainted with the student’s previous experiences so that they can plan the present one better. They also feel the need to explain their evaluations of the students in narratives. The evaluation may be used for future placements, or as part of the student’s portfolio.

Varied methods are used in evaluation and feedback procedures. While checklists are still widely used, narratives elements in the instrument are gaining frequency. Space for comments in the instruments invite the cooperating teacher’s personal perspectives. Narrative tools may include prompts or rubrics that indicate areas relevant to early field experience on which cooperating teachers can comment. Interactive journalling involves the preservice teachers and the evaluator reflecting on the activities on a daily or weekly basis, making formative evaluation possible.

Dyadic conferences, as at the University of Gum, seem to be more of a regular occurrence than triadic conferences in early field experiences. The evaluators are interested in the students understanding the intent and meaning of their comments. In
some cases students contribute to the evaluation directly. In others, they could be acquainted with the results and may have the opportunity to respond.

Despite all these modifications, in the 15 years since the survey by Ishler and Kay (1981), the profile of evaluation in early field experience has not changed significantly. The cooperating teacher is still the primary evaluator. Conferences are not the norm, and students are not always actively involved in evaluation. Additionally, training for the cooperating teachers still focuses on the goals of the program and the procedures to be followed, rather than in developing skills necessary for evaluators.

Though there are different perspectives in evaluation, evaluation in early field experience is followed more in the letter of the law rather than in spirit or intent. The university's major purpose appears to be to lay a paper trail for its own reference later in the program should the need arise. As in student teaching evaluation, the forms are required more for administrative purposes than for formative purposes. The evaluations from the cooperating teachers are looked at mostly in times of a crisis. For the most part, the evaluations are not used for further instructional purposes, and not much analysis is done to pre-empt problems unless they are overwhelming. The positive aspects of evaluation are hardly considered, and there is no apparent attempt to build on the strengths a student might exhibit.

The directors of field experience are chiefly administrators concerned with the paperwork (ATE, 1986; Guyton & McIntyre, 1990). This role is played out at this stage of the practicum also. They do not appear to be influential in the evaluation aspect of early
field experience. In fact, they seem content to remain in the background and not get involved with the evaluators or the evaluation procedures in the early field experiences.

The importance of feedback from multiple sources, including the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher, is recognized (NCATE, 1995). Conferencing is an evaluation method that is gaining currency in field experiences (O'Neal, 1983; Wilkins-Canter, 1996). While student teaching lays great emphasis on the formative aspect of pre- and post-observation conferences (McKay, 1994), evaluation in early field experiences do not. With regard to the university requirements, the evaluation in this practicum is summative. A majority of universities do not mandate conferences designed for feedback at regular intervals. Paperwork essentially implies the cooperating teacher completing a form at the end of the experience. The formative aspect of evaluation is left to the cooperating teacher if s/he deems it necessary and is willing to spare the time and energy.

The apparent lack of focus in evaluation in early field experiences is intensified by the communication between the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor, which is limited (Applegate & Lasley, 1986). For the most part, the meetings between the two appear superficial with no exchange of ideas. The cooperating teacher is not sure what the university supervisor's role as an evaluator is and what aspects of the field s/he will evaluate. The university supervisor does not share her/his evaluation with the cooperating teacher.

The current evaluation process in early field experiences do not provide for an in-depth and more meaningful communication between the university supervisor and the
cooperating teacher or the student in the field. The length of the experiences does not encourage the growth of this kind of relationship, and the cooperating teachers hardly see the university supervisors in the role of the evaluator. In fact, as in student teaching, the cooperating teachers feel a greater sense of loyalty to the students whom they see more often than they do to university supervisors (Su, 1992a). The cooperating teachers do not appreciate triadic conferences in which they might have to make negative remarks about students to the university supervisors who are virtual strangers to them.

The cooperating teachers' dislike of triadic conferences is complemented by the university not mandating them. The university supervisors are mostly expected to organize one at the cooperating teacher's request. On their part, the university supervisors are in agreement with the university's viewpoint. Little effort is therefore made to establish a strong relationship with the cooperating teachers in early field experiences.

If orchestrated well, triadic conferences could be very supportive of cooperating teachers (Applegate & Lasley, 1984). In student teaching, the university supervisor is encouraged to take a more active part in evaluation with triadic conferences and participate in more dyadic conferences (Enz, Freeman & Wallin, 1996; Williams et al, 1995). Also, triadic conferences help the evaluators establish an understanding of each other's viewpoints and the cooperating teacher has in the university supervisor a source of input other than her/his own.

Another issue is the kind of power the cooperating teachers wield in early field experiences. They are not decision-makers, involved in designing and shaping the
curriculum of the field experience. Very rarely is their input sought in defining the
evaluation process or the instruments that are used. These are tasks undertaken by the
university. In effect, the cooperating teachers are expected to implement decisions taken
by others. Not in control of the evaluation that they are expected to do, and unable to get
help when they need it, it is not surprising that the cooperating teachers feel neglected.
Further, they do not believe that they are valued by the university, or that the evaluation
process itself has a lot of significance. Some of the directors of field experiences (e.g. at
the University of Gum) recognize this but their efforts to set right this perception appear
to be token gestures rather than significant support systems.

The preparedness of the cooperating teacher for the task of evaluation is an
important issue in early field experiences. In the matter of training, both evaluators and
administrators are agreed that making it mandatory for cooperating teachers would be
unrealistic and unwelcome. But the training could be made more attractive and relevant so
that the cooperating teachers recognize its benefit and request it, as at Beech University.
In this respect, the purpose might be better served for the cooperating teachers if the
university supervisor conducts training sessions. As the person teaching the course or
conducting the associated seminar, the university supervisor will be in the best position to
explain the purpose of the field experience, and explicate the evaluation tools available to
the university supervisor.

If the cooperating teachers are not given encouragement by the universities,
neither are the university supervisors, who are literally thrown into the arena without any
kind of preparation. As most of the university supervisors in this study said, experience, not training, has helped them gain expertise. Apparently the university does not deem it necessary to train the university supervisor for the role of evaluator. The lack of clarity regarding what is expected of the university supervisor as an evaluator makes it all the more improbable that s/he will be an effective evaluator.

Further emphasizing her/his alienation from the cooperating teacher, the university supervisor does not understand the problems of the cooperating teacher. For example, s/he does not realize that the cooperating teacher needs help when less than positive remarks about the student need to be made. Therefore, the university supervisor is not as supportive or helpful.

Finally, the beliefs underlying most early field experiences do not appear to be articulated clearly so that all the evaluators share the same insights. If the philosophical stance is explicit, the evaluation process and the instruments are rarely reflective of it. As a result, the evaluators are hardly on the same page philosophically speaking. The evaluation process and the procedures are not always consistent with the avowed convictions. It is incumbent on the university to appraise all the evaluators of the factors that influence the experience and align all practices with the mission of the program.
Recommendations

Achieving familiarity and establishing trust between the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor is a major task and its importance cannot be over-emphasized. The evaluators must be provided with the opportunity to get to know each other over a period of time. The university supervisor and the cooperating teacher could share their views and establish a rapport that would help them communicate freely with each other.

To achieve this trust and understanding, certain structural changes will have to be made. The school-university relationship must make it possible for the same sites to be used for the particular field experience over a period of time. Rather than a policy of using different schools, such as at the University of Ash, the university could use the same school sites for these early field experiences. The director could assist in coordinating this with school districts. With the increasing emphasis on stronger school-university partnerships, this could become a distinct possibility.

The university supervisors must get acquainted with the features and limitations of the context in which they will be working, and the site in which the preservice teachers will be evaluated. They must also become familiar with the cooperating teachers who will be involved in the evaluation.

To make this possible, the cooperating teachers and university supervisors could be repeated, and not rotated. As exemplified in the cases of the universities of Dogwood and of Elm, they could work together in the same field experience for more than one
quarter or semester. At the building level, this will give them a chance to become familiar with the goals of the program, and with the expectations each has of the other.

Re-using a site could pose certain problems, exhaustion of cooperating teachers being one of them. This could be circumvented by the same building but not the same teachers being used. Cooperating teachers could take it in turns to be mentors so that only some of them are called upon to play the role at a given time, thus providing others the opportunity to concentrate on different aspects of their teaching.

On their part, the university supervisors may have to work with some teachers they do not know. But the familiarity of the site will ease this strangeness and help them understand the problems they encounter. Rather than face both a strange context and unknown teachers each quarter or semester, they will have the support of a known site and at least some teachers that they have worked with previously.

While it may not be possible for the university supervisor to observe the student as closely in the field as the cooperating teacher can, the role that s/he plays as an evaluator can take other dimensions and does not have to duplicate that of the cooperating teacher. S/he does not have to observe and evaluate the student in the field teaching in a classroom, as s/he would in student teaching (Smith & Alvermann, 1983). The university supervisor could teach the related course or seminar so that s/he is familiar with the student’s attitude and pedagogical skills in another context. This will offer her/him the opportunity to gain feedback from the student about the experience in the field. The
university supervisor can then provide an evaluation of the student from another
perspective when s/he conferences with the cooperating teacher.

As in student teaching (McIntyre & Norris, 1980), another responsibility the
university supervisor could undertake is to develop tools that are closely associated with
the field experience. S/he may provide the cooperating teacher with an array of evaluation
methods that are useful and meaningful. Aware of the cooperating teacher’s inclinations,
s/he ought to take into consideration that the cooperating teacher, for example, may prefer
narratives, and should provide space and opportunity for the cooperating teacher to
explain her/himself and her/his perception of the student. Since the cooperating teacher is
the chief user of the tool, her/his opinions could be sought directly by expressly seeking
her/his input. As an alternative, s/he could be co-opted into a committee to develop the
instrument and field test it.

Another model of supervision that might be conducive to strengthening the
cooperating teacher-university supervisor relationship in early field experience is having
school-based faculty play a role in evaluation. As in the case of the University of Fir, the
school-based faculty could be trained as evaluators, and their schedules could be arranged
to provide them the opportunity to conference with the cooperating teachers. Since they
and the cooperating teachers are on site at the same time, and since the cooperating
teachers have known them previously in other capacities, building a strong relationship
based on proximity, familiarity and trust would be easier.
In the prevailing atmosphere of budget cuts and downsizing, evaluation in early field experiences is not likely to be able call for more resources in terms of either money or faculty time. However, articulating goals clearly, connecting the objectives of the early field experience to the evaluation, using personnel efficiently, and establishing communication channels will result in available resources being deployed more effectively. This in turn will contribute to more meaningful evaluation.

Future considerations

This study has contributed certain details to the literature on early field experiences. However, it is neither definitive nor complete in its findings or its conclusion. Since this study is exploratory, like other exploratory research, it has generated hypotheses for further research (Marshall & Rossman, 1995). More questions have been suggested by the study than have been answered.

The study should be duplicated with a larger sample size which might reveal varied perspectives on evaluation and the evaluators. The dissimilar requirements in different states could influence evaluation patterns in disparate ways so that a sample involving many states could provide a diverse perspective of evaluators.

This study also needs to be replicated with evaluators at the middle and secondary school levels, and in various specialties and subject areas. Evaluation in each of these
could be very different, and would add to the professional knowledge that is now lacking about evaluation of preservice teachers at different grade levels.

University supervisors and the multiple cooperating teachers each of them works with could be studied. The interaction between a university supervisor and cooperating teachers that s/he deals with could provide information on the different interpretations of a program and on communication patterns between evaluators.

Based on the administration design and on the evaluators involved in the process, there are many models of evaluation. These models can be classified into types such as university-based, school-based, and a type based on a university-school partnership. These in turn define the number of evaluators in the field experience. Each evaluation pattern influences the roles and responsibilities of the evaluators in the model. These models, and the hierarchy of evaluators in each model, need to be identified. The roles and responsibilities of the evaluators, and their interaction of the evaluators in each type needs to be studied for a fuller understanding of the effect of these evaluation processes.

Early field experience programs have widely diverse goals. The validity of the evaluation process depends on the connection between the purpose of the program and the evaluation methods used. An area that has not yet been explored is the link between the purpose and the product of early field experiences and how well this is established.

The evaluators involved in early field experiences define evaluation and supervision in many ways. The differences between these two concepts need to be made explicit for a greater understanding of the evaluation process. Further, certain programs are firmly
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based on distinctive philosophies. The evaluation patterns and tools that are appropriate for each need to be studied for a deeper understanding of evaluation methods.

A multiplicity of program designs requires a variety of evaluation methods. The alternative evaluation tools that could be used and the responses of the evaluators to each of them must be studied to help decide the most effective ones. Conferencing, both dyadic and triadic, has an increasingly important part to play in formative evaluation. The role of various kinds of conferences in early field experiences, how they can be deployed, and the content of the discussions need further research to help describe the process of evaluation.

The evaluators themselves are under-researched. Since cooperating teachers are expected to take a major role in evaluation in early field experience, their motivation to participate in it needs to be studied. This might help highlight methods in which cooperating teachers could be supported by the others involved in the experience. The study has indicated that training to prepare university supervisors to take on their roles in traditional and non-traditional programs has not been paid enough attention. There is a call for description of effective inservice programs for university- and school-based supervisors that enhance their evaluation skills.

The connection between theory and practice in early field experiences has to be defined more clearly. The perception of the evaluators regarding the evaluation of theory in early field experiences needs to be researched.
Innovations in programs show that certain aspects of evaluation such as division of responsibility need to be defined. Evaluation processes in early field experiences have clearly indicated that the cooperating teacher is at the heart of the experience, and the university has placed the cooperating teacher there. However, when planning the program the university needs to take into consideration the evaluators’ wishes, which may be contrary to the expectations of the university. The university needs to study the infrastructure and support systems, both personnel and in terms of training, that will equip them to perform their role adequately. Communication between evaluators and administrators at all times is the key to successful and valid evaluation in field experiences. Until they share perceptions of the roles they play and the goals of the field experience, teacher education cannot move in the direction we would want it to, and the evaluation of preservice teachers will not be a professional experience.
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APPENDIX A

LETTER TO DIRECTORS OF FIELD EXPERIENCES
Hema Ramanathan  
245 W. Norwich Avenue # A  
Columbus, OH 43201  

Feb.  , 1996  

Dear,  

Thank you for agreeing to help me get a valid sample for my study. For the study I have described in the accompanying letter, I require a sample of cooperating teachers and university supervisors who supervise preservice teachers in early field experiences in your institution. The supervisors need to meet certain criteria. These include:

1. The field experiences they supervise/supervised must be the first or the second practicum in which the preservice teachers are engaged. These experiences are prior to student teaching.
2. They should have been working in your program in the recent past (i.e., the last two years).
3. All cooperating teachers must currently be teachers in self-contained classrooms teaching Grades 1-6.
4. All cooperating teachers must have had at least three years experience as supervisors (preferably with students from your institution).
5. The university supervisors must have at least three years experience as a university supervisor and/or cooperating teacher.

Of those cooperating teachers and university supervisors who meet the basic requirements, please select up to 10 cooperating teachers and 10 university supervisors. It is hoped that the supervisors selected will have a thorough knowledge of the early field
experiences in your institution and will be able to clearly articulate their ideas and experience.

An address and a telephone number is requested of each supervisor so these individuals can be contacted. The attached format may be used to provide these lists. Please be assured that the lists of supervisors provided and the contents of the interview will be confidential. The code name that you choose for yourself will help in this matter. Please see Paragraph 6 in the other letter in this packet for further information about code names.

I would like to start the series of interviews with the supervisors about March 1 and would appreciate hearing from you before February 20, so that I can contact the supervisors in time for their interviews.

To provide a background for my interviews, I would also like any materials that describe your program, and the field experiences in particular. These may be handouts that describe the program, or handbooks given to cooperating teachers and preservice teachers.

Thank you for your assistance in getting the sample of supervisors. Without that information, I would not be able to get an adequate sample. Your help makes it possible for my study to be strong and valid. Your time and effort are much appreciated.

If you should have any questions, please call me at home at (614) 298-8096 or at the office at (614) 292-1280. If I am not available, please leave a message on the answering machine at either number.

Sincerely

Hema Ramanathan
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LIST OF COOPERATING TEACHERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the cooperating teacher</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of the university supervisor</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

LETTER OF INTRODUCTION
Dear,

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study. Following our conversation of ..., this packet of material has been put together to explain the purpose of the study and to more fully give you some information about me.

First of all, my name is Hema (pronounced hayma) Ramanathan (pronounced as it is spelt, with equal stress on all syllables). I am a doctoral student at The Ohio State University majoring in Teacher Education hoping to graduate this August. My resume, an abbreviated version of my professional education and experiences that are relevant to this study, is enclosed. I hope this explains my interest in this area and my competence to do this study.

The topic of my research is *Perceptions of cooperating teachers, university supervisors and directors of field experiences in the evaluation process in early field experiences*. The purpose of this study is to determine the perceptions of cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and directors of field experiences involved in the supervision and evaluation of elementary education preservice teachers.

As I said on the phone, to understand your perceptions of the evaluation process, I would like to interview you in three sessions of about 20 minutes each. The first interview will be on at .

Please be assured that the contents of the interview will be confidential. To protect your identity, choose a name for yourself that I can use to address you in the interviews. Fill in the attached information sheet to define your code name and return it in the enclosed envelope.

I am grateful to you for sharing your views and experiences in a role that you have voluntarily taken upon yourself. Thank you for your time and for your commitment to the betterment of education. If you should have any questions, please call me at home 269.
at (614) 298-8096 or at the office at (614) 292-1280. If I am not available, please leave a message on the answering machine at either number.

Sincerely

Hema Ramanathan
INFORMATION SHEET

Please fill in the details below.

Choose a code name and write it in the appropriate place. This is the name that will be used to store all your data under, and to address you in the interviews. This information will not be made available to anyone else without your permission.

Please print or type.

Name __________________________________
Institution __________________________________
Signature __________________________________
Date __________________________________
Code Name __________________________________
Telephone number __________________________________
Address __________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________
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CURRICULUM VITAE OF
HEMA RAMANATHAN

EDUCATION

The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio
Ph.D., Summer 1996
Major: Teacher Education
Minors: Research and Evaluation; English as Second Language

Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages, Hyderabad, India
Post-Graduate Certificate in the Teaching of English, 1988

Madurai-Kamaraj University, Madurai, India
M.Ed., Educational Administration, 1985
M.A., English Literature, 1982

Madras University, Madras, India
B.Ed., Special English, 1979
B.A., English Literature, 1972

RELEVANT WORK EXPERIENCE

Graduate Teaching Assistant, Sept. 1993 - June 1996. The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio
  • Designed and co-taught a course Directing Student Teaching at the graduate level in Winter 1996.
  • Conducted sessions on laboratory experiences, specifically microteaching, for graduate students in a Teacher Education course in Fall 1995.
• Taught undergraduate pre-service teachers a General Methods course, which emphasized applications of educational psychology in the classroom, that is, microteaching, Reflective Teaching, collaborative learning, writing lesson plans, and an introduction to various teaching strategies.

• Evaluated classroom and field experience components, and was responsible for any curricular changes.
• Supervised the field experience of undergraduate education majors.
• Designed evaluation of the course.

Graduate Research Assistant, June - August 1994; July 1995 - June 1996. The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio


Head of the Department - English, July 1989 - December 1989. Sawan Public School, India

Head of the Department - English, 1987-89. Rishi Valley School, India

Head of the Department - English, 1976 - 1989. P.S.Senior Secondary School, India

PUBLICATIONS:

Book


Articles and Reviews


**SELECTED PRESENTATIONS**

**National**


Regional and Local


APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW PROMPTS: COOPERATING TEACHERS
Dear,

In preparation for our interview on Feb. 12, at 8.00 p.m., I have enclosed materials that might help you understand the purpose and direction of the study.

As I said in my last letter, the topic of my research is *Perceptions of cooperating teachers, university supervisors and directors of field experiences in the evaluation process in early field experiences*. The purpose of this study is to determine the perceptions of cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and directors of field experiences involved in the supervision and evaluation of elementary education preservice teachers. This study investigates the process of the evaluation of elementary education preservice teachers in early field experiences; the perceptions of the evaluation process according to the cooperating teachers, the university supervisors and the directors of field experiences; the differences and similarities between these perceptions; the role expectations of the personnel involved; and the concerns of the evaluators. I hope you find the issues as interesting and significant as I do!

The interview prompts give an idea of the areas I would like to discuss in each session. The terms that we will be using are also defined so that we both interpret them in the same sense.

Please be assured that the contents of the interview will be confidential. The data will not be accessible to anybody except me. Should anybody else need to listen to the interviews, the tapes will be edited to keep your identity secret! The interviews will be taped and you will receive a copy of the interview with a copy of the transcript. This will give you an opportunity to clarify statements, and make corrections.

Thank you for sharing your views and ideas about the topic. I am looking forward to the interview, and to talking to you about this subject which is of such interest to us.
If you should have any questions, please call me at home at (614) 298-8096 or at the office at (614) 292-1280. If I am not available, please leave a message on the answering machine at either number.

Sincerely

Hema Ramanathan
INTERVIEW PROMPTS

Topic: Perceptions of cooperating teachers, university supervisors and directors of field experiences in the evaluation process in early field experiences

The prompts listed below indicate topics I would like us to discuss during the interviews related to evaluation in early field experiences. These topics may also help you organize your thoughts for the interview. The prompts are not the exact questions I will ask, but are indicative of the topics that will be discussed.

The session numbers indicate the constituents I would like us to focus on in each of the three our multistage interviews. I am very interested with regards to your experiences in, and opinions of, these areas. In the course of our discussion I hope to listen to you expand freely on any points that are important to you as an evaluator of early field experiences. If you have any reservations about discussing any of the topics, please let me know.

As I indicated earlier, all your comments and observations are confidential. You will not identified by name or institution.

Session 1

Procedures in evaluation:

- Purpose of the evaluation in early field experience
- Persons involved in the evaluation process
- Frequency (how often, when, etc.)
- Methods and process (conferencing, grading, etc.) used in the evaluation process in early field experiences
• University requirements and problems meeting them

**Instrumentation (if any):**

• Description of instruments used in evaluation in early field experiences
• Creation of the instruments (by whom, when, why)
• Criteria used in the instruments

**Session 2**

**Your role in the process:**

• Description of your role and responsibilities as an evaluator in early field experiences
• Problems faced in your role as an evaluator in early field experiences
• Support systems and support personnel available to you as an evaluator in early field experiences

**Session 3**

**Role of other evaluators in the process:**

• Descriptions of role and responsibilities of university supervisors and directors of field experiences as evaluators in early field experiences
• Expectations university supervisors and directors of field experiences have of you in your role as an evaluator in early field experiences

**Training:**
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• What skills you think are necessary for both cooperating teachers and university supervisors in the role of evaluator in early field experiences
• Description of the training available to help in your role as evaluator in early field experiences
• Description of an ideal training course/seminar/program for evaluators in early field experiences
Definition of terms

Cooperating teachers / affiliated supervisors / school-based supervisors - Classroom teachers to whom teacher education students are assigned. They provide on-site supervision and direction to the education students during field-based assignments.

University supervisors / campus-based supervisors - Members of the college or university faculty assigned to supervise teacher education students engaged in professional, field-based experiences.

Directors of field experiences / co-ordinators / university administrators - Persons whose primary and major function is administration, not supervision

Early field experiences - Exploratory, preservice education activities which occur typically in non-college/university environments and precede student teaching or internship.

Evaluation process - Includes feedback, pre-conferences, post-conferences, mid-term and final evaluations, and awarding grades.

Perceptions - Participants' understanding of their roles and responsibilities, how they differ from that of other supervisors, how they should be interpreted by other personnel, and the barriers to fulfilling them.

Responsibilities - Any prescribed activities that a cooperating teacher or university supervisor undertakes. For example, in the role of an evaluator, the cooperating teacher might conduct extended conferences with the field experience student and the university supervisor to review mid-term and final evaluations.
**Roles** - Essential functions which are descriptive of the relationship intended between a cooperating teacher or university supervisor and a preservice teacher. For example, evaluator, instructor, orienter, facilitator, counselor, and demonstrator.
APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW PROMPTS: UNIVERSITY SUPERVISORS
Dear,

In preparation for our interview on ............ at ..........., I have enclosed materials that might help you understand the purpose and direction of the study.

As I said in my last letter, the topic of my research is *Perceptions of cooperating teachers, university supervisors and directors of field experiences in the evaluation process in early field experiences*. The purpose of this study is to determine the perceptions of cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and directors of field experiences involved in the supervision and evaluation of elementary education preservice teachers. This study investigates the process of the evaluation of elementary education preservice teachers in early field experiences; the perceptions of the evaluation process according to the cooperating teachers, the university supervisors and the directors of field experiences; the differences and similarities between these perceptions; the role expectations of the personnel involved; and the concerns of the evaluators. I hope you find the issues as interesting and significant as I do!

The interview prompts give an idea of the areas I would like to discuss in each session. The terms that we will be using are also defined so that we both interpret them in the same sense.

Please be assured that the contents of the interview will be confidential. The data will not be accessible to anybody except me. Should anybody else need to listen to the interviews, the tapes will be edited to keep your identity secret! The interviews will be taped and you will receive a copy of the interview with a copy of the transcript. This will give you an opportunity to clarify statements, and make corrections.

Thank you for sharing your views and ideas about the topic. I am looking forward to the interview, and to talking to you about this subject which is of such interest to us.
If you should have any questions, please call me at home at (614) 298-8096 or at the office at (614) 292-1280. If I am not available, please leave a message on the answering machine at either number.

Sincerely

Hema Ramanathan
INTERVIEW PROMPTS

Topic: Perceptions of cooperating teachers, university supervisors and directors of field experiences in the evaluation process in early field experiences

The prompts listed below indicate topics I would like to discuss with you during the interviews related to evaluation in early field experiences. These topics may also help you organize your thoughts for the interview. The prompts are not the exact questions I will ask, but are indicative of the topics that will be discussed.

The session numbers indicate the constituents I would like us to focus on in each of the three our multistage interviews. I am very interested with regards to your experiences in, and opinions of, these areas. In the course of our discussion I hope to listen to you expand freely on any points that are important to you as an evaluator of early field experiences. If you have any reservations about discussing any of the topics, please let me know.

As I indicated earlier, all your comments and observations are confidential. You will not identified by name or institution.

Session 1

Procedures in evaluation:

- Purpose of the evaluation in early field experience
- Persons involved in the evaluation process
- Frequency (how often, when, etc.)
- Methods and process (conferencing, grading, etc.) used in the evaluation process in early field experiences

287
University requirements and problems meeting them

**Instrumentation (if any):**
- Description of instruments used in evaluation in early field experiences
- Creation of the instruments (by whom, when, why)
- Criteria used in the instruments

**Session 2**
*Your role in the process:*
- Description of your role and responsibilities as an evaluator in early field experiences
- Problems faced in your role as an evaluator in early field experiences
- Support systems and support personnel available to you as an evaluator in early field experiences

**Session 3**
*Role of other evaluators in the process:*
- Description of role and responsibilities of cooperating teachers and directors of field experiences as evaluators in early field experiences
- Expectations cooperating teachers and directors of field experiences have of you in your role as evaluator in early field experiences

**Training:**
- What skills you think are necessary for both cooperating teachers and university supervisors in the role of evaluator in early field experiences
• Description of the training available to help in your role as evaluator in early field experiences

• Description of an ideal training course/seminar/program for evaluators in early field experiences
Definition of terms

Cooperating teachers / affiliated supervisors / school-based supervisors - Classroom teachers to whom teacher education students are assigned. They provide on-site supervision and direction to the education students during field-based assignments.

University supervisors / campus-based supervisors - Members of the college or university faculty assigned to supervise teacher education students engaged in professional, field-based experiences.

Directors of field experiences / co-ordinators / university administrators - Persons whose primary and major function is administration, not supervision.

Early field experiences - Exploratory, preservice education activities which occur typically in non-college/university environments and precede student teaching or internship.

Evaluation process - Includes feedback, pre-conferences, post-conferences, midterm and final evaluations, and awarding grades.

Perceptions - Participants' understanding of their roles and responsibilities, how they differ from that of other supervisors, how they should be interpreted by other personnel, and the barriers to fulfilling them.

Responsibilities - Any prescribed activities that a cooperating teacher or university supervisor undertakes. For example, in the role of an evaluator, the cooperating teacher might conduct extended conferences with the field experience student and the university supervisor to review mid-term and final evaluations.
Roles - Essential functions which are descriptive of the relationship intended between a cooperating teacher or university supervisor and a preservice teacher. For example, evaluator, instructor, orienter, facilitator, counselor, and demonstrator.
APPENDIX E

INTERVIEW PROMPTS: DIRECTORS OF FIELD EXPERIENCES
Hema Ramanathan  
245 W. Norwich Avenue # A  
Columbus, OH 43201

Feb.  , 1996

Dear ,

In preparation for our interview on ............. at ..........., I have enclosed materials that might help you understand the purpose and direction of the study.

As I said in my last letter, the topic of my research is Perceptions of cooperating teachers, university supervisors and directors of field experiences in the evaluation process in early field experiences. The purpose of this study is to determine the perceptions of cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and directors of field experiences involved in the supervision and evaluation of elementary education preservice teachers. This study investigates the process of the evaluation of elementary education preservice teachers in early field experiences; the perceptions of the evaluation process according to the cooperating teachers, the university supervisors and the directors of field experiences; the differences and similarities between these perceptions; the role expectations of the personnel involved; and the concerns of the evaluators. I hope you find the issues as interesting and significant as I do!

The interview prompts give an idea of the areas I would like to discuss in each session. The terms that we will be using are also defined so that we both interpret them in the same sense.

Please be assured that the contents of the interview will be confidential. The data will not be accessible to anybody except me. Should anybody else need to listen to the interviews, the tapes will be edited to keep your identity secret! The interviews will be taped and you will receive a copy of the interview with a copy of the transcript. This will give you an opportunity to clarify statements, and make corrections.

Thank you for sharing your views and ideas about the topic. I am looking forward to the interview, and to talking to you about this subject which is of such interest to us.
If you should have any questions, please call me at home at (614) 298-8096 or at the office at (614) 292-1280. If I am not available, please leave a message on the answering machine at either number.

Sincerely

Hema Ramanathan
INTERVIEW PROMPTS

Topic: *Perceptions of cooperating teachers, university supervisors and directors of field experiences in the evaluation process in early field experiences*

The prompts listed below indicate topics I would like to discuss with you during the interviews related to evaluation in early field experiences. These topics may also help you organize your thoughts for the interview. The prompts are not the exact questions I will ask, but are indicative of the topics that will be discussed.

The session numbers indicate the constituents I would like us to focus on in each of the three our multistage interviews. I am very interested with regards to your experiences in, and opinions of, these areas. In the course of our discussion I hope to listen to you expand freely on any points that are important to you as an evaluator of early field experiences. If you have any reservations about discussing any of the topics, please let me know.

As I indicated earlier, all your comments and observations are confidential. You will not identified by name or institution.

Session 1

**Procedures in evaluation:**

- Purpose of the evaluation in early field experience
- Persons involved in the evaluation process
- Frequency (how often, when, etc.)
- Methods and process (conferencing, grading, etc.) used in the evaluation process in early field experiences
University requirements and problems meeting them

**Instrumentation (if any):**
- Description of instruments used in evaluation in early field experiences
- Creation of the instruments (by whom, when, why)
- Criteria used in the instruments

**Session 2**

**Your role in the process:**
- Description of your role and responsibilities as an administrator in the evaluation process in early field experiences
- Problems faced in your role as an administrator in early field experiences
- Support systems and support personnel available to you as an administrator in early field experiences

**Session 3**

**Role of evaluators in the process:**
- Description and comparison of role and responsibilities of cooperating teachers and university supervisors as evaluators in early field experiences
- Expectations cooperating teachers and university supervisors have of you in your role as administrator/evaluator in early field experiences
Training:

- What skills you think are necessary for cooperating teachers and university supervisors in their role of evaluator in early field experiences
- Description of the training available to help in their role as evaluator in early field experiences
- Description of an ideal training course/seminar/program for evaluators in early field experiences
Definition of terms

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions are used:

**Cooperating teachers / affiliated supervisors / school-based supervisors** - Classroom teachers to whom teacher education students are assigned. They provide on-site supervision and direction to the education students during field-based assignments.

**University supervisors / campus-based supervisors** - Members of the college or university faculty assigned to supervise teacher education students engaged in professional, field-based experiences.

**Directors of field experiences / co-ordinators / university administrators** - Persons whose primary and major function is administration, not supervision

**Early field experiences** - Exploratory, preservice education activities which occur typically in non-college/university environments and precede student teaching or internship.

**Evaluation process** - Includes feedback, pre-conferences, post-conferences, midterm and final evaluations, and awarding grades.

**Perceptions** - Participants' understanding of their roles and responsibilities, how they differ from that of other supervisors, how they should be interpreted by other personnel, and the barriers to fulfilling them.

**Responsibilities** - Any prescribed activities that a cooperating teacher or university supervisor undertakes. For example, in the role of an evaluator, the cooperating teacher might conduct extended conferences with the field experience student and the university supervisor to review mid-term and final evaluations.
Roles - Essential functions which are descriptive of the relationship intended between a cooperating teacher or university supervisor and a preservice teacher. For example, evaluator, instructor, orienter, facilitator, counselor, and demonstrator.
APPENDIX F

INTERVIEW GUIDE: COOPERATING TEACHERS
INTERVIEW GUIDE
COOPERATING TEACHERS

Session I

Evaluation procedure:
Who is involved in the evaluation of preservice teachers in the field experience?
What is the procedure for evaluating the preservice teachers? (pre and post-conferencing, observation, grading, filling out forms, etc.)
What papers do you require at the evaluation meeting? (notes you might have made, work submitted by the preservice teacher, etc.)
Do you conference with the university supervisors and/or the preservice teachers when evaluation is done?
What do you think is the purpose of the evaluation? (formative, summative)
What are the procedures mandated and required by the university?
Are you able to follow all these instructions, fulfill all these requirements?
What difficulties do you have in meeting these requirements?

Instrumentation
What type of instruments do you use in the evaluation process? (checklists, rating scales, logs, journals, narratives)
Who creates these instruments?
Are these instruments explained to you? By whom? On what occasion?
How do you arrive at the grades you give the preservice teachers?

Do you have a standard against which you judge all preservice teachers (criterion-referenced)?

Do you compare each preservice teacher against others you have had before (norm-referenced)?

What teaching behaviors do you expect the preservice teachers to have?

What long range skills do you expect them to have at the end of the experience?

What activities are taken into account when evaluation is done?

Do you think the criteria in the evaluation instruments are based on theory?

If yes, do you know the theoretical bases for the criteria?

What do you perceive to be the goals of the program?

How well are the criteria allied with the goals of the program?

What types of instruments would you like to use in the evaluation process? (checklists, rating forms, narratives, logs, journals)

What do you think should be the final presentation of evaluation? (letter grades, comments, etc.)

Session II

Your role as supervisor

What are your responsibilities as an evaluator?

Who awards grades?
Who should award grades? Why?

What are problems do you have in the role as evaluators?

With whom do you discuss these problems?

How are these problems resolved?

Is the university supervisor often able to find solutions to your problems?

What would happen if you and the university supervisor disagreed on the grade for a preservice teacher?

Session III

Re university supervisors as evaluators

What do you understand to be the role and responsibilities of the university supervisors as evaluators?

Do you think that the university supervisors you have worked with in the past two occasions have fulfilled these expectations?

If not, what else would you like them to have done?

Do you discuss your perceptions with the university supervisors? If so, when? If not, why not?

What do you think the university supervisors understand to be the role and responsibilities of the cooperating teachers as evaluators?

How do the university supervisors communicate this to you?

Do you discuss these perceptions with the university supervisors? If so, when? If not, why not?
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What should be the nature of your interaction with the university supervisors?

**Re directors of field experiences**

In your role as an evaluator, what responsibilities do you think you have as far as the university is concerned?

How does the university communicate this to you?

Have you met the director of field experiences?

What have been the nature of your interactions with the director of field experiences?

**Training**

What skills are necessary for an evaluator?

Were you trained to be an evaluator?

Describe the training program and facilities now available for your training.

What forms did the training take? (meeting on the university campus, course work, workshop, etc.).

Is the training continuous? intermittent? one-off?

Is training a requirement for your work as a cooperating teacher?

Describe the training program and facilities that should be available for you.

Who should train you? (university supervisors, director, guest trainer, your school administrator, etc.)

Where should the training take place?

Do you have any final thoughts about the evaluation process or as an evaluator in early field experiences?
APPENDIX G

INTERVIEW GUIDE: UNIVERSITY SUPERVISORS
INTERVIEW GUIDE
UNIVERSITY SUPERVISORS

Session I

Evaluation procedure:
Who is involved in the evaluation of preservice teachers in the field experience?
What is the procedure for evaluating the preservice teachers? (pre and post-conferencing, observation, grading, filling out forms, etc.)
How often is the evaluation to be done?
What papers do you require at the evaluation meeting? (notes you might have made, work submitted by the preservice teacher, etc.)
Do you conference with the cooperating teachers and/or the preservice teachers when evaluation is done?
What do you think is the purpose of the evaluation? (formative, summative)
What are the procedures mandated and required by the university?
Are you able to follow all these instructions, fulfill all these requirements?
What difficulties do you have in meeting these requirements?

Instrumentation
What types of instruments do you use in the evaluation process? (checklists, rating forms, narratives, logs, journals)
Who creates these instruments?
Are these instruments explained to you? By whom? On what occasion?
How do you arrive at the grades you give the preservice teachers?
Do you have a standard against which you judge all preservice teachers (criterion-referenced)?
Do you compare each preservice teacher against others you have had before (norm-referenced)?

What teaching behaviors do you expect the preservice teachers to have?
What long range skills do you expect them to have at the end of the experience?
What activities are taken into account when evaluation is done?
Do you think the criteria in the evaluation instruments are based on theory?
If yes, do you know the theoretical bases for the criteria?
What do you perceive to be the goals of the program?
How well are the criteria allied with the goals of the program?

What instruments would you like to use in the evaluation process?
What do you think should be the final presentation of evaluation? (letter grades, comments, etc.)

Session II

Your role as an evaluator
What are your responsibilities as an evaluator?
Do you teach seminars or courses for the preservice teachers on campus?
If yes, how does this relate to evaluation in the field experiences?
Who awards grades?
Who should award grades? Why?
What are problems do you have in the role as evaluators?
With whom do you discuss these problems?
How are these problems resolved?
Is the cooperating teacher often able to find solutions to your problems?
What would happen if you and the cooperating teacher disagreed on the grade for a preservice teacher?

Session III

Re cooperating teachers
What do you understand to be the role and responsibilities of the cooperating teachers as evaluators?
Do you think that the cooperating teachers you have worked with in the past two occasions have fulfilled these expectations?
If not, what else would you like them to have done?
Do you discuss your perceptions with the cooperating teachers? If so, when? If not, why not?
What do you think the cooperating teachers understand to be their role and responsibilities as evaluators?
How do the cooperating teachers communicate this to you?
Do you discuss these perceptions with the cooperating teachers? If so, when? If not, why not?
Re directors of field experiences

In your role as an evaluator, what responsibilities are you expected to fulfill by the university?

How does the university communicate this to you?

Have you met the director of field experiences?

What have been the nature of your interactions with the director of field experiences?

Training

What skills are necessary for an evaluator?

Were you trained to be an evaluator?

What forms did the training take? (meeting on the university campus, course work, workshop, etc.).

Describe the training program and facilities now available for your training.

Is the training continuous? intermittent? a one-time deal (one-off)?

Is training a requirement for your work as an evaluator in early field experiences?

Describe the training program and facilities that should be available for your training.

Who should train you? (other university supervisors, the director of field experiences, guest trainer, etc.)

Where should the training take place?

Do you feel competent to train cooperating teachers?

If you needed to train cooperating teachers, what preparation would you need?

Do you have any final thoughts about the evaluation process or as an evaluator in early field experiences?
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INTERVIEW GUIDE
DIRECTORS OF FIELD EXPERIENCES

Session I

Evaluation procedure:
Who is involved in the evaluation of preservice teachers in the field experience?
What is the procedure for evaluating the preservice teachers? (pre and post-conferencing, observation, grading, filling out forms, etc.)
Do you attend evaluation meetings?
What papers do you require at the evaluation meeting? (notes you might have made, work submitted by the preservice teacher, etc.)
Do you conference with the university supervisors, cooperating teachers and/or the preservice teachers when evaluation is done?
What do you think is the purpose of the evaluation? (formative, summative)
What are the procedures mandated and required by the university?
Do you think cooperating teachers and university supervisors are able to follow all these instructions, fulfill all these requirements?
What difficulties do you think you would have in meeting these requirements?

Instrumentation
What types of instruments are used in the evaluation process? (checklists, rating scales, logs, journals, narratives)
Who creates these instruments?
Are the preservice teachers graded on a developmental level or on an absolute level?

Is the grading criterion referenced or norm-referenced?

If it is norm-referenced, with whom are the preservice teachers compared?

What attitudes do you expect the preservice teachers to have?

What teaching behaviors do you expect the preservice teachers to have?

What long range skills do you expect them to have at the end of the experience?

What activities are taken into account when evaluation is done?

Do you think the criteria in the evaluation instruments are based on theory?

If yes, do you know the theoretical bases for the criteria?

What do you perceive to be the goals of the program?

How well are the criteria allied with the goals of the program?

What instruments would you like to see being used in the evaluation process?

What do you think should be the final presentation of evaluation in the transcript? (letter grades, comments, etc.)

Session II

Your role as administrator in the evaluation process

What responsibilities are expected of you as an administrator of evaluation by the university?

How does the university communicate this to you?

What are problems you have in the role as an administrator of evaluation?

With whom do you discuss these problems?
How are these problems resolved?
Who awards grades?
Who should award grades? Why?
If there is a difference of opinion between the university supervisors and cooperating teachers in the evaluation of a preservice teacher, who would you expect to have the final word? How would this be resolved?

Session III

Re cooperating teachers
What do you understand to be the role and responsibilities of the cooperating teachers as evaluators?
What are problems do cooperating teachers have in their role as evaluator in early field experiences?
With whom do they discuss these problems?
Who is expected to find solutions to their problems?
Do you think that the cooperating teachers you have worked with in the past two occasions have fulfilled these expectations?
If not, what else would you like them to have done?
Do you discuss your perceptions with the cooperating teachers? If so, when? If not, why not?
What do you think cooperating teachers expect of you as an administrator of evaluation?
**Re university supervisors**

What do you understand to be the role and responsibilities of the university supervisors as evaluators?

What are problems do university supervisors have in their role as evaluator?

With whom do they discuss these problems?

Who is expected to find solutions to their problems?

Do you think that the university supervisors you have worked with in the past two occasions have fulfilled these expectations?

If not, what else would you like them to have done?

Do you discuss your perceptions with the university supervisors? If so, when? If not, why not?

What do you think the university supervisors expect of you as an administrator of evaluation?

**Comparison of perceptions of university supervisors and cooperating teachers**

What do you think the cooperating teachers understand to be the role and responsibilities of the university supervisors as evaluators?

How do the cooperating teachers communicate this to you?

Do you discuss these perceptions with the university supervisors? If so, when? If not, why not?

What do you think the university supervisors understand to be the role and responsibilities of the cooperating teachers as evaluators?

How do the university supervisors communicate this to you?
Do you discuss these perceptions with the cooperating teachers? If so, when? If not, why not?

What would happen if the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor disagreed on the grade for a preservice teacher?

**Training**

Describe the training program and facilities now available for university supervisors and for cooperating teachers at your institution.

Describe the training program and facilities that should be available for university supervisors and for cooperating teachers.

Who should share in this responsibility to train the supervisors? (university, school district, school principal, etc.)

What skills are necessary for an evaluator?

Are you trained to be an evaluator?

What forms did the training take? (meeting on the university campus, course work, workshop, etc.).

Should the training of the university supervisors/cooperating teachers be continuous? intermittent? one-off?

Is training a requirement for cooperating teachers/university supervisors?

Who should train them? (others university supervisors, you, guest trainer, etc.)

Where should the training take place?

Do you have any final thoughts about the evaluation process or as an administrator of evaluator in early field experiences?
APPENDIX I

CODEBOOK
CODEBOOK

- Code at the level of an idea. A complete sentence may have more than one idea. In which case, break the sentence up into the ideas and code each idea.

- Bracket an idea to identify it.

- Do remember that an idea may be coded for two different categories. For example, for Grading (E-G) and for Cooperating teacher's opinions on grading (CT-G)

- Code only what is categorized here. If anything else comes up, as it will, bring it to the table on Friday and we'll expand the categories. We are flexible!!

- It might help to code in pencil at first. Will be easier to make changes!!

- If the codes are too obscure or the connections to categories are not prompted easily, we can make changes.

- Don't get psyched by the long list of codes! The categories are repetitive. The codes only change depending on whether we are talking about cooperating teachers or university supervisors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODES</th>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of field experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| L     | Logistics  | When the students have this field experience  
|       |            | How long this experience is  
|       |            | By whom it is taught  
|       |            | The total time required in the field  
|       |            | When and how often students are required in the field |
| C-Desc| Description of course | Connection between coursework and activities in the field |
| **Purpose of field experience** | | |
| PFE-DF| Purpose of field experience | Goal. Objective of the experience. Why?  
|       |            | As understood by directors of field experience |
| PFE-US| Purpose of field experience | Goal. Objective of the experience. Why?  
|       |            | Objectives of the course  
|       |            | As understood by university supervisors & instructors of the courses |
| PFE-PST| Purpose of field experience | Goal. Objective of the experience. Why?  
|       |            | As understood by the students |
| PFE-CT| Purpose of field experience | Goal. Objective of the experience. Why?  
|       |            | As understood by cooperating teachers |
| **Supervision** | | |
| S/E   | Difference between supervision and evaluation | How is supervision defined?  
<p>|       |            | How is evaluation defined? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODES</th>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| S-L   | Logistics           | No of site visits  
|       |                     | Frequency  
|       |                     | Model (if any)  
|       |                     | Ratio of students is to supervisor |
| E-Pur | Purpose of evaluation | Why should students be evaluated?  
|       |                     | Should the evaluation be formative or summative?  
|       |                     | What are the consequences of evaluation on preservice teachers? |
| E-P   | Process             | Activities - conferencing, paperwork  
|       |                     | How often it has to be done  
|       |                     | What kind of paperwork  
|       |                     | Who signs it  
|       |                     | Who sees it  
|       |                     | To whom it is passed on  
|       |                     | Where it ends up |
| E-I-Desc | Description of instrument | What kind of an instrument is used - rating scale, checklist, video, narrative |
| E-CI  | Criteria in the instrument | Mention of criteria  
|       |                     | Kind of activities reflected in the instrument  
|       |                     | Does the instrument measure what it should? |
| E-I-DEV | Development of the instrument | Who developed the instrument?  
|       |                     | When was it done?  
|       |                     | What procedures are adopted to modify it?  
|       |                     | How often is it modified?  
|       |                     | Who should be /are involved in the process of modification? |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODES</th>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-G</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Is it given?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>By whom?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Do the evaluators like giving grades?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What is the connection of the grade in the field experience to the grade in the coursework?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-T/P</td>
<td>Connection between theory and practice</td>
<td>How is this reflected in the instrument?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consistency between course objectives and evaluation method and criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University supervisor/site-based supervisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-Pur</td>
<td>Purpose of evaluation</td>
<td>University supervisors’ opinions on:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Why should students be evaluated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Should the evaluation be formative or summative?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What are the consequences of evaluation on preservice teachers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-P</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>What role do the university supervisors play in the process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What activities do the university supervisors participate in? - conferencing, paperwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How often do the university supervisors do it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What kind of paperwork are the university supervisors involved in?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Do the university supervisors signs it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Who sees what the university supervisors evaluate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To whom do the university supervisors pass it on?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Where the paperwork ends up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-I- Desc</td>
<td>Description of instrument</td>
<td>What kind of an instrument do the university supervisors use?- rating scale, checklist, video, narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CODES</td>
<td>CATEGORIES</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-CI</td>
<td>Criteria in the instrument</td>
<td>What is the opinion of the university supervisors of: criteria in the instrument kind of activities reflected in the instrument Does the instrument measure what it should?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-I-DEV</td>
<td>Development of the instrument</td>
<td>Do the university supervisors know: who developed the instrument? when was it done? what procedures are adopted to modify it? how often it is modified? According to the university supervisors, who should be involved in the process of modification?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-G</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Is it given? By whom? Do the university supervisors like giving grades? What alternatives do they offer? What is the connection of the grade in the field experience to the grade in the coursework?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-T/P</td>
<td>Connection between theory and practice</td>
<td>What is the opinion of the university supervisors re: how the T/P connection is reflected in the instrument Consistency between course objectives, evaluation method, and criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-Char</td>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td>Skills and attitudes needed for a university supervisor as evaluator What university supervisors do as evaluator What university supervisors should do as evaluator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CODES</td>
<td>CATEGORIES</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-T-A</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>What is available as training for university supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-T</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>What the university supervisors would like - topics and skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What the directors think university supervisors need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What the cooperating teachers think university supervisors should have training in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Description of an ideal training course - when, where, how often, by whom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperating teacher</td>
<td>University supervisors' opinions on: Why should students be evaluated? Should the evaluation be formative or summative?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What are the consequences of evaluation on preservice teachers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT-P</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>What role do the cooperating teachers play in the process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What activities do the cooperating teachers participate in? - conferencing, paperwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How often do the cooperating teachers do it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What kind of paperwork are the cooperating teachers involved in?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Do the cooperating teachers signs it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Who sees what the cooperating teachers evaluate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To whom do the cooperating teachers pass it on?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Where the paperwork ends up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT-I-</td>
<td>Description of</td>
<td>What kind of an instrument do the cooperating teachers use? - rating scale, checklist, video, narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desc</td>
<td>instrument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODES</th>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CT-CI  | Criteria in the instrument         | What is the opinion of the cooperating teachers of: criteria in the instrument  
|        |                                     | kind of activities reflected in the instrument  
|        |                                     | Does the instrument measure what it should?                                           |
| CT-I-DEV | Development of the instrument   | Do the cooperating teachers know: who developed the instrument?  
|         |                                     | when was it done?  
|         |                                     | what procedures are adopted to modify it?  
|         |                                     | how often it is modified?  
|         |                                     | According to the university supervisors, who should be involved in the process of modification? |
| CT-G   | Grade                              | Is it given?  
|        |                                     | By whom?  
|        |                                     | Do the cooperating teachers like giving grades?  
|        |                                     | What alternatives do they offer?  
|        |                                     | What is the connection of the grade in the field experience to the grade in the coursework? |
| CT-T/P | Connection between theory and practice | What is the opinion of the cooperating teachers re: how the T/P connection is reflected in the instrument  
<p>|        |                                     | Consistency between course objectives, evaluation method, and criteria |
| DF-CT-P | Directors' perceptions of cooperating teachers | What cooperating teachers do as evaluators |
| DF-CT-I | Director's ideal of cooperating teachers | What cooperating teachers should do as evaluator |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODES</th>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CT-Char</td>
<td>Characteristics of</td>
<td>Skills and attitudes needed for a cooperating teacher as evaluator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cooperating teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT-T-A</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>What is available as training for university supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT-T</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>What the cooperating teachers would like - topics and skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF-CT-T</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>What the directors think cooperating teachers need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-CT-T</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>What the university supervisors think cooperating teachers should have training in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT-T-</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Description of an ideal training course - when, where, how often, by whom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codes</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>US-Pur</td>
<td>CT-Pur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-Desc</td>
<td>US-P</td>
<td>CT-P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-I-Desc</td>
<td>CT-I-Desc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFE - DF</td>
<td>US-CI</td>
<td>CT-CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFE - US</td>
<td>US-I-DEV</td>
<td>CT-I-DEV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFE-PST</td>
<td>US-G</td>
<td>CT-G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFE-CT</td>
<td>US-T/P</td>
<td>CT-T/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF-US-P</td>
<td>DF-CT-P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/E</td>
<td>DF-US-I</td>
<td>DF-CT-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-L</td>
<td>US-Char</td>
<td>CT-Char</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-T-A</td>
<td>CT-T-A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-T</td>
<td>CT-T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Pur</td>
<td>DF-US-T</td>
<td>DF-CT-T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-P</td>
<td>CT-US-T</td>
<td>US-CT-T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-I-Desc</td>
<td>US-T-Desc</td>
<td>CT-T-Desc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-I-DEV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-T/P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J

TABLES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Ash</th>
<th>Beech</th>
<th>Cedar</th>
<th>Dogwood</th>
<th>Elm</th>
<th>Fir</th>
<th>Gum</th>
<th>Holly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of experience</td>
<td>10 weeks</td>
<td>10 weeks</td>
<td>20 hrs.</td>
<td>7 weeks</td>
<td>10 weeks</td>
<td>10 weeks</td>
<td>30 hrs.</td>
<td>65 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency days /week</td>
<td>1 morning</td>
<td>2 mornings</td>
<td>By</td>
<td>2 or 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 or arrangement 2x1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum requirement for</td>
<td>Grade C</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Completed/ S/U</td>
<td>Grade C</td>
<td>S/U</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Credit/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completion of field</td>
<td>Not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Credit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated with methods</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated with seminars</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** S/U - Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory
Table 2
Description of Evaluation Process in Early Field Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Ash</th>
<th>Beech</th>
<th>Cedar</th>
<th>Dogwood</th>
<th>Elm</th>
<th>Fir</th>
<th>Gum</th>
<th>Holly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator of field experience</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>CT, US</td>
<td>CT, US</td>
<td>CT, US, SS</td>
<td>CT, US</td>
<td>CT, US, SS</td>
<td>CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms completed by</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>CT, US</td>
<td>CT, US</td>
<td>CT, US</td>
<td>CT, SBF</td>
<td>CT, US, SS</td>
<td>CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms filed in the office</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT-SS conference mandatory</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-SS conference mandatory</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triadic conference mandatory</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: CT-Cooperating teacher; US-University supervisor; SS-Student; SBF-School-based faculty
Table 3
Instruments Used in Evaluation in Early Field Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Ash</th>
<th>Beech</th>
<th>Cedar</th>
<th>Dogwood</th>
<th>Elm</th>
<th>Fir</th>
<th>Gum</th>
<th>Holly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checklist</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space for narrative in checklist</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When developed / revised ago</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>Don't</td>
<td>Every</td>
<td>Don't</td>
<td>Don't</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Don't</td>
<td>Don't</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When developed / revised semester</td>
<td>know</td>
<td>semester</td>
<td>know</td>
<td>know</td>
<td>know</td>
<td>know</td>
<td>know</td>
<td>know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4
Grading in Early Field Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Ash</th>
<th>Beech</th>
<th>Cedar</th>
<th>Dogwood</th>
<th>Elm</th>
<th>Fir</th>
<th>Gum</th>
<th>Holly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Based on field activities</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on campus activities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on traditional tests</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passing grade for field experience necessary</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall grade given by</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>US, SS, CO</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final decision rests with</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>US, SS, CO, CT</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT's grade weighted in final grade</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** CT-Cooperating teacher; US-University supervisor; SS-Student; CI-Course Instructor; CO-Coordinator; N/A-Not Applicable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Ash</th>
<th>Beech</th>
<th>Cedar</th>
<th>Dogwood</th>
<th>Elm</th>
<th>Fir</th>
<th>Gum</th>
<th>Holly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likes evaluating students</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes checklists</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes narratives</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is interested in development</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of instrument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like to give final grade</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels time with SS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

sufficient for evaluation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Ash</th>
<th>Beech</th>
<th>Cedar</th>
<th>Dogwood</th>
<th>Elm</th>
<th>Fir</th>
<th>Gum</th>
<th>Holly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is able to conference formally with SS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is able to conference informally with SS</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is comfortable stating views in a triadic conference</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reluctant to make negative remarks about SS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Ash</th>
<th>Beech</th>
<th>Cedar</th>
<th>Dogwood</th>
<th>Elm</th>
<th>Fir</th>
<th>Gum</th>
<th>Holly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desires to discuss with US prior to a negative evaluation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wants US to share evaluation with CT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tends to personalize evaluations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels valued</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Ash</th>
<th>Beech</th>
<th>Cedar</th>
<th>Dogwood</th>
<th>Elm</th>
<th>Fir</th>
<th>Gum</th>
<th>Holly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desired</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desired</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Purpose of</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Purpose of</td>
<td>Purpose of</td>
<td>Purpose of field</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training:</td>
<td>evaluation</td>
<td>field</td>
<td>evaluations</td>
<td>tools</td>
<td>field</td>
<td>field</td>
<td>experience;</td>
<td>tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>experience</td>
<td>Rating scale</td>
<td>experience;</td>
<td>experience</td>
<td>Associated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: CT-Cooperating teacher; US-University supervisor; SS-Student
Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Ash</th>
<th>Beech</th>
<th>Cedar</th>
<th>Dogwood</th>
<th>Elm</th>
<th>Fir</th>
<th>Gum</th>
<th>Holly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University-based</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of evaluatory visits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes evaluation form</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluates SS only at CT's request</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives grade for field experience</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved in developing instrument</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Ash</th>
<th>Beech</th>
<th>Cedar</th>
<th>Dogwood</th>
<th>Elm</th>
<th>Fir</th>
<th>Gum</th>
<th>Holly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arranges triadic conferences routinely</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranges triadic conference only on request</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primarily a troubleshooter</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences with other USs of field experience</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaches associated course / seminar on campus</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicates with course / seminar instructor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Ash</th>
<th>Beech</th>
<th>Cedar</th>
<th>Dogwood</th>
<th>Elm</th>
<th>Fir</th>
<th>Gum</th>
<th>Holly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiences problems with</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>large number of SSs and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>locations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is aware of CT’s attitude</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regarding negative remarks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participates in training CT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has received formal training in evaluation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Ash</th>
<th>Beech</th>
<th>Cedar</th>
<th>Dogwood</th>
<th>Elm</th>
<th>Fir</th>
<th>Gum</th>
<th>Holly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desired training:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desired training:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Purpose of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>field experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has explicit</td>
<td>Constructivist</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>philosophical stand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** CT-Cooperating teacher; US-University supervisor; SS-Student
Table 7
Director of Field Experience in the Evaluation process in Early Field Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Ash</th>
<th>Beech</th>
<th>Cedar</th>
<th>Dogwood</th>
<th>Elm</th>
<th>Fir</th>
<th>Gum</th>
<th>Holly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manages paper trail</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluates student</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is conscious of need for theory-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practice connection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaches associated course / seminar</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participates in training CT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has direct contact with CT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expects CT-SS conference</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is aware of CT’s attitude regarding</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative remarks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Ash</th>
<th>Beech</th>
<th>Cedar</th>
<th>Dogwood</th>
<th>Elm</th>
<th>Fir</th>
<th>Gum</th>
<th>Holly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has direct contact with US</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expects US to evaluate student</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expects US to be</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>troubleshooter primarily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expects US-SS conference</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triadic conference expected by university</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expects CT-US relationship to be close</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes problems in CT-US relationship</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Ash</th>
<th>Beech</th>
<th>Cedar</th>
<th>Dogwood</th>
<th>Elm</th>
<th>Fir</th>
<th>Gum</th>
<th>Holly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participates</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training for</td>
<td>Inspirational</td>
<td>Purpose of</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Purpose of</td>
<td>Purpose of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT: speaker</td>
<td>field methods</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>skills</td>
<td>field</td>
<td>field</td>
<td>experience</td>
<td>experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>experience and critiquing conferencing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>strategies techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tools and</td>
<td>Purpose of Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategies</td>
<td>field tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td>Theory of supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Ash</th>
<th>Beech</th>
<th>Cedar</th>
<th>Dogwood</th>
<th>Elm</th>
<th>Fir</th>
<th>Gum</th>
<th>Holly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training for</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Purpose of</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US:</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>skills</td>
<td>field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>conferencing</td>
<td>experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory of</td>
<td>supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** CT-Cooperating teacher; US-University supervisor; SS- Student