

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 430 954

SP 038 538

AUTHOR Bland, Sandra J.; Hecht, Jeffrey B.
 TITLE One Year Later: Follow-up on a Professional Development School.
 PUB DATE 1997-10-17
 NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, October 17, 1997). For paper on the first year of the Professional Development School, see SP 038 537.
 PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Beginning Teachers; *College School Cooperation; Elementary Education; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Professional Development Schools; Program Evaluation; Public Schools; Student Teachers; Teacher Attitudes; Telephone Surveys
 IDENTIFIERS Illinois State University

ABSTRACT

During the fall of 1996, the Technical Innovations in Educational Research (TIER) laboratory at Illinois State University (ISU) initiated a followup study of a Professional Development School (PDS) begun the prior year within a local elementary school district. Researchers conducted telephone interviews with the former ISU student teachers who participated in that PDS and an equal number of randomly selected student teachers in the traditional ISU program from the same time period. The interviews asked about demographics, perceived value of the ISU education class, perceived value of the student teaching experience, current work status, stress in their current jobs, satisfaction with teaching, comparison with other first-year teachers from ISU and from other universities regarding preparedness, support, classroom suggestions, campus suggestions, and student teaching preparation suggestions. Results did not show many statistically significant differences between the two groups. There was no evidence of a significant down side to the PDS project. PDS students felt at least as well prepared for teaching, if not better prepared, than traditional students. Two appendixes contain the telephone interview questions and the group means and t-test results. (SM)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

SP

ED 430 954

One Year Later:
Follow-up on a Professional Development School

Sandra J. Bland
Jeffrey B. Hecht

The Technological Innovations in Educational Research Laboratory
Department of Educational Administration and Foundations
Illinois State University
Normal, IL 61790-5900

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Paper presented at the
1997 Annual Meeting
of the
Mid-Western Educational Research Association
Chicago, IL
October 17, 1997

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Hecht

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CP038538



Full Text Provided by ERIC

Abstract

During the Fall of 1996 the Technological Innovations in Educational Research (TIER) laboratory at Illinois State University initiated a follow-up study of a professional development school (PDS) program begun the prior year at the Community Consolidated School District #21, an elementary school district located in Wheeling, Illinois. Telephone interviews were conducted with the former ISU student teachers who participated in the Wheeling PDS and an equal number of randomly selected student teachers in the traditional ISU program from the same time period. In most cases the PDS group's mean responses were generally higher (more favorable responses) than the traditional group's mean responses, although only four items showed statistical significance. Continued follow-along study with both PDS and traditional program graduates as they move through their first few years of work will also tell if the PDS model enhances participating students' job satisfaction and career longevity.

One Year Later: Follow-up on a Professional Development School

In the 1995-96 school year the College of Education at Illinois State University initiated a professional development school (PDS) pilot program for student teachers in the Community Consolidated School District #21, an elementary school district located in Wheeling, Illinois. The ISU student teachers who volunteered to be in the program were placed into the district at the very beginning of that school year. The program allowed these students to take their final methods courses on site, interspersing their own classroom activities and assignments with an entire year of direct, clinical experience in the Wheeling classrooms.

Was this PDS program more successful than the traditional university based classroom student teaching experience? A follow-up study was designed to provide insight into the ways in which the PDS experience might improve a student's chance of securing their first professional teaching employment, how well (in the students' opinion) it prepared participants for that first job, and ways in which the program might be improved in future years.

Method

During the Fall of 1996 the Technological Innovations in Educational Research (TIER) Laboratory began this first year of the follow-up study. A list of all the of the first year PDS students, and traditional program students who were in their student teaching during the spring semester of 1996, was obtained from the department of Curriculum and Instruction. Throughout September of that year telephone calls were made to the student's permanent phone numbers to obtain current and/or immediate-future phone numbers and addresses. Twenty-four of the Wheeling PDS students were located, with phone numbers and addresses also obtained for 45 randomly selected individuals who were in the traditional program during the same time period. It was anticipated that follow-up with the Wheeling PDS participants would be relatively easy, due to their self-selected desire to be in the program in the first place, while follow-up with traditional program participants would be somewhat more difficult. Thus, the greater number of traditional program students identified in the initial sample.

An in-depth telephone interview and administration protocol was developed (see Appendix A). AskSam freeform database software was utilized to allow the interviewer to type each individual's responses directly into the computer as the telephone interviews were conducted. This process facilitated more accurate and expedient collection of the data. Further, the quantitative data could then be directly exported from askSam to SPSS for analysis, while the qualitative data could be further analyzed using the askSam indexing and search capabilities. The interview questions, protocol administration process, data transfer methods, and analytical techniques were refined in pilot tests over the next eight weeks. The interview process was then conducted during the first two weeks of December of 1996. Full interviews were completed with 20 (of the 24) former Wheeling PDS student teachers and 23 (of the 45) former traditional program student teachers. The bulk of the students who were not interviewed were not able to be contacted by telephone (either no answer or did not return messages). Only a few of those individuals who were contacted refused to participate in the research study.

Results

Frequencies of response, item means, standard deviations, skews and kurtoses were examined for each of these 43 quantitative questions. This was done to provide both a basic, descriptive picture of the data and to insure that each variable was sufficiently well conditioned for group differences analysis. Group differences were examined using an independent samples t-test approach at significance level of $\alpha = .05$. Open-ended responses to the qualitative questions, along with comments received throughout the survey, were collated according to survey topic. Frequencies of response were tabulated and quotation exemplars representing high frequency, low frequency, and unusual responses were identified for potential inclusion in this report.

Demographics

All of the traditional program student teachers interviewed were based in schools south of Chicago with the exception of one student who was in Arlington Heights. All of the Wheeling PDS student teachers were female; their mean age was 22.9 years. Twenty-one of the former traditional student teachers were female and two were male; their mean age was 24.3 years. Mean salaries for both groups were in the \$10,000 - \$20,000 range with the Wheeling group being somewhat higher in that range. The former Wheeling student teachers reported averaging 3.35 hours per night preparing lessons, grading and general extra-curricular-type activities compared to 2.25 hours per night for the former traditional student teachers.

While the majority of the responses to the questions were positive for both groups, the former Wheeling student teachers' means were higher than the former traditional students on approximately 75% of the questions. The Wheeling group's means were significantly higher than the traditional group's means on only four of the questions that were asked. A table containing these mean values, and the results from the t-tests, is included as Appendix B.

Perceived value of the ISU education classes

A major portion of the interview was dedicated to asking the former student teachers to rank the value of their education classes at ISU in preparing them to teach. The questions addressed the core subjects of science, math, language arts, reading, social studies, and "other" subject-matter classes they felt were particularly good or bad. They were also asked to rank seven additional aspects of teaching. A scale of one to five was used with one being "not at all" and five being "very well".

The means of both the Wheeling group and the traditional group indicated that they felt that their experiences in their education classes at ISU had prepared them well for teaching. The Wheeling group means were, however, higher than the means of the traditional group on 10 out of the 13 questions asked. Two of those ten were significantly higher: preparation to teach the core subject of language arts ($p = .031$) and preparation to teach reading ($p = .026$). The three questions on which the traditional group means were higher, though not significantly so, were: preparation to teach social studies (Wheeling $\bar{x} = 3.25$, traditional $\bar{x} = 3.48$), preparation to cope with paperwork requirements (Wheeling $\bar{x} = 2.60$, traditional $\bar{x} = 3.04$), and preparation to complete paperwork requirements (Wheeling $\bar{x} = 2.65$, traditional $\bar{x} = 2.96$).

Perceived value of the student teaching experience

Another major portion of the interview was dedicated to asking the former student teachers to reflect on the value of their student teaching experience in preparing them to teach. The questions addressed the same core classes of science, math, language arts, reading, social studies and "other" subjects which they felt were particularly good or bad. They were also asked to reflect on the value of their student teaching experience in the same seven additional areas of teaching. The same scale of one to five was used in this section.

Although both groups ranked all of the questions regarding their student teaching experience as above average, the Wheeling group's means were higher on 10 out of the 13 questions addressed in this portion of the interview. The means of the Wheeling group were statistically significantly higher than the means for the traditional group on the questions regarding how well the PDS students felt that their student teaching experience prepared them to manage a classroom and how well it prepared them to teach "other" specific subjects. The means of the Wheeling group were very close to being statistically significantly higher than those for the traditional group on two questions: preparation to teach language arts (Wheeling \bar{x} = 4.80, traditional \bar{x} = 4.32, p = .055) and preparation to communicate with the parents of your students (Wheeling \bar{x} = 4.75, traditional \bar{x} = 4.32, p = .053). Although not significantly different, the means of the traditional group were somewhat higher than those for the Wheeling group on three questions: preparation to teach social studies (Wheeling \bar{x} = 3.65, traditional \bar{x} = 3.86), preparation to complete paperwork requirements (Wheeling \bar{x} = 4.37, traditional \bar{x} = 4.41) and preparation to help special needs children (Wheeling \bar{x} = 3.60, traditional \bar{x} = 3.85).

The significant difference between the Wheeling group and the traditional group on the question about "other" subjects was based only on responses from 3 of the 20 former Wheeling student teachers and 10 of the 23 former traditional student teachers. For the three in the Wheeling group the following "other" subjects were each named once: technology, different techniques to use in classroom, and being able to work with mentor teachers. For the seven in the traditional group the following "other" subjects were each named once: drama, collegiality, technology, physical education, phonics, professional responsibilities and reading disabilities. The remaining three of the ten respondents from the traditional group ranked their "other" subject as not preparing them at all. These "other" subjects were each listed once: drama, music, art, physical education and religion.

The former students current work status

Ten of the twenty (50%) former Wheeling student teachers and thirteen of the twenty-three (56%) former traditional student teachers currently have full-time teaching contracts. Of those who do not have full-time contracts, seven of the former Wheeling students and seven of the former traditional students are employed as either substitutes and teacher aides. Two of the Wheeling group and three of the traditional group are in day care; one former student from the Wheeling group is a resource person, and one former student from the traditional group is working at a bank. One of the former traditional student teachers who is substituting full-time reported that she also finds it necessary to waitress nights to be able to pay her bills.

In both groups all of the respondents who did not have a full-time job want to, and eventually expect to, go back to full-time teaching. They all reported that the only reason they are in their present jobs is because they have been unable to find a full-time, contract, teaching job.

All of the former Wheeling student teachers who do not have full-time, contract, teaching jobs said they do not have one because they could not find one. The same response came from their traditional student teacher counterparts except for the one student who was working in a bank. The one former traditional student who is substituting and waitressing stated that she was not in a full-time contract teaching job because she could not find one that paid enough.

When asked whether their jobs were in the geographic location of their choice two people from each group answered “No”. These four former students stated that they would wish to be closer to home in order to have less commuting time.

Of those who stated that their jobs were not with the schools of their choice, four (20%) of the former Wheeling student teachers said the reason that they could not find jobs in schools of their choice was that no such jobs were available. One former Wheeling student teacher reported that, although the school she is in was an original choice, she has since found it difficult to work with the curriculum, administration and school politics. Three (13%) of the former traditional student teachers also said they were not in a school of their choice because they could not get jobs in schools they wanted. Another traditional student stated that although the school she is in was originally her choice, it would not be now due to the dangerous atmosphere in the school.

Stress

We asked these former students if they found their present jobs stressful and, if they did, the perceived causes of that stress. Both group’s means indicated that they were approximately neutral in their feeling of stress in their new jobs. However, the Wheeling group rated their stress level lower than, though not statistically significantly so, the traditional group. The reasons for stress cited by the former Wheeling student teachers were the expected strain of a new job and the day-to-day uncertainty of substitute teaching with the associated difficulty of relating to new students every day. The traditional student teachers agreed with the importance of the reasons cited by the Wheeling group and additionally cited the quantity of work involved, the need to participate in extra-curricular activities, time constraints, student abilities, parents, politics and school administration.

When queried about resources offered by their employers to help with stress, the Wheeling group listed peer support, teams, and mentors most often. Workshops and institutes were next most frequently cited, along with “nothing available” being rated third and principal counseling rated as the fourth most common resource. The traditional group cited “nothing available” most often, two and a half times as much as any other resource. Mentors, peers, teams, seminars, workshops and institutes were next most frequently mentioned followed by the least frequent of principal counseling.

Satisfaction with teaching

The former student teachers were asked to rank how much they enjoyed teaching and to explain why they did not enjoy teaching if they reported that they didn't. The responses from both groups were an almost unanimous five, that each enjoyed teaching "very much". In almost all of these cases no additional explanations were offered. The one exception was the one student who was working in a bank, who felt the question did not apply to him since he was not teaching.

A wide variety of responses were given to a question about what might cause these former students to change jobs. The Wheeling group most often cited discomfort or disillusionment with the administration and/or environment, along with the opportunity for a full-time, contract position. Their second-most cited reason was a tie between moving and more education. Curriculum, variety and marriage tied for third, with the need for more money and teaching burnout tied for last place. The traditional group cited curriculum and variety, along with moving, most often with full-time contract position a close second. Behind those reasons the former students listed environment, then each of the following reasons: advancement, change, money, marriage, less travel/commuting and discipline.

If the respondents were currently teaching we asked them to rate the possibility that they would "stick with it". Their responses were gathered on a scale of one to five with one being "not on your life" to five being "absolutely". While both group's means were very close to a perfect five, the Wheeling group's mean response for this question was slightly higher.

The interviewer also asked what, if anything, might cause the respondent to leave teaching. Former Wheeling student teachers listed starting a family the most with "nothing" a close second. These former students also listed administration and burnout, followed by the lack of support and money. The traditional group agreed with the Wheeling group's first and second choices: family and "nothing". However, burnout was mentioned next most often, followed by a lack of support and money next, then retirement, relocation, variety, curriculum and getting fired.

Comparisons

We asked the former student teachers to compare themselves to other first-year teachers from ISU and to first-year teachers from other universities. Each respondent was asked to rank themselves on a scale of one to five, with one being "less well prepared" and five being "much better prepared". Both group's means indicated these former student felt better prepared than their counterparts from other institutions. However, the Wheeling group's mean was much higher than the traditional group's mean when they were comparing themselves to other first-year teachers only from ISU, though it was only somewhat higher than the traditional group's mean when they compared themselves to first-year teachers from other universities.

Support

When asked what kinds of support their school offered first year teachers, the former Wheeling student teachers most often said either "nothing" or that they knew of nothing. They listed mentors, peers/teams and seminars, workshops, and institutes next most frequently with principal counseling a more distant third. The former traditional student teachers talked about

“nothing”, mentors and workshops, and institutes and seminars the most frequently. Unofficial staff support and principal counseling were mentioned second most often with peer/teams a distant third.

We asked the former student teachers to rate how often they participated in any of the above programs if such programs are offered. Based on a scale of one to five with one being “never” and five being “always”, both group’s means were in the mid-range and, although not significant, the traditional group’s mean was the higher of the two.

If someone indicated that he or she did not participate in any of the programs offered for first-year teachers we asked that respondent why they did not. Those in the Wheeling group indicated most often that it was because that no such program was available. The next most cited reason was that the person was working as a substitute teacher so such programs were not available to him or her. One respondent stated that she did not participate because her mentor was not helpful, and one other stated that she had just started her job. Those former students from the traditional group agreed with those from the Wheeling group on the top two reasons that they did not participate: no such program was available, or they were substituting so such programs were not available to them. One former traditional student teacher stated that she was married to a teacher and used him for support; another indicated that her schedule did not permit attendance.

Classroom suggestions

The last three questions in the interview solicited suggestions from the former student teachers about ways classroom experiences, campus experiences and student preparation at ISU could be improved. The former Wheeling student teachers were almost unanimous in their response that classroom experiences would be improved by providing more hands-on experience. Their second most cited suggestion was to get students into the classrooms earlier in their college careers. For example, one respondent suggested:

“... exposure during one's freshman year to make sure she knows what she's doing before it's too late!”

Two other suggestions, each mentioned once, were:

“... incorporate more field-based experience — wider variety of experience, more real-life experience ...”

“... make professors' evaluations more applicable; make them really affect tenure.”

Former traditional student teachers agreed with the suggestion for more hands-on experience as the most necessary improvement. Their second-most cited suggestion was more real life experience/training, especially in school politics. A distant third suggestion was more technology training. More classroom routine and information on staffing special needs children tied for fourth place. Each of the following was also mentioned once: more information on how to communicate with parents; more science instruction, crisis management and reading instruction techniques; more attention to evaluation methods; less time on writing one-page

lesson plans (with the comment that no practicing teacher has time for this); and instructors who have actually been in the classroom within the last five years.

Campus suggestions

In response to an inquiry about how their overall campus experience could have been improved, both groups were nearly unanimous in their response: “Nothing, I had a good experience.” A distant second in importance for both groups was parking. Most indicated that more parking would help alleviate the time wasted driving around looking for a space. They suggested high-rise garages.

The former Wheeling student teachers were as concerned with advising as they were parking. They reported that they felt they had received no real direction, that advisement needed to be more available, and that advisors should counsel them on how and when to get into classes that have small sections or are limited to upper classpersons. One former Wheeling student teacher suggested a need for more computer labs.

The traditional group agreed with the Wheeling group's first and second most cited suggestions; namely, “Nothing, I had a good experience” and more parking. In addition two former traditional students suggested heightened security across campus, though no specific details were offered. The traditional group also cited each of the following once: more interaction with professors; a big brother/sister assigned to help the first few weeks of one's first semester; more advisement, including listing the names of the instructors who will be teaching a class, not just “staff”; raising the grading scale but leaving standards where they are; more active organizations specifically for prospective teachers; more communication and contact with commuters, e.g. a hospitality room equipped with a microwave so commuters wouldn't have to eat so many peanut butter and jelly sandwiches; and to encourage networking among the students.

Student teaching preparation suggestions

The last question in the interview asked for suggestions about how student teaching preparation at ISU could be improved. Eighty percent of the former Wheeling student teachers responded that the Wheeling program should be expanded to allow all student teachers to have an experience similar to theirs. To quote,

“... everybody should have the chance to do a student teaching experience like Wheeling.”

“... I loved mine — set up more programs like Wheeling so everyone can participate.”

“... the way the Wheeling program worked should be expanded — very valuable to see the entire year.”

In addition the Wheeling group made the following suggestions once each: schedule assignments better; offer a little more math, a couple of lessons before they start teaching; and

give more preparation for the student teaching environment. One former student provided a succinct yet intriguing impression of her time in the PDS program:

“Wheeling trained us to be teachers in an ideal setting — not all schools are like that. They spoon fed us. [It] would have been great if you got a job in Wheeling or another really progressive district but not always possible and not training for real life.”

Approximately 20% of the former traditional student teachers' suggestions focused on the idea of a longer student teaching experience:

“... see the beginning of the year to the end.”

Another 20% of the traditional group mentioned concern with the mentor teachers:

“... do something for the actual cooperating teachers, some type of reward ...”

“Scrutinize them more closely — be more careful who you accept.”

“Prepare the cooperating teachers for the experience so they know what they're supposed to be doing.”

“... education majors should meet with their professors to figure out a good match with the cooperating teacher as this is such a deciding factor in a new teacher's self-confidence/ self-esteem/desire to enter/stay with teaching.”

One former student suggested having cohort groups to add to the overall learning through association with their peers. Another suggested more frequent contact with the supervising teacher, and yet another thought that supervisors should be more conscientious and supportive.

Conclusion

The results of the telephone interviews did not show many statistically significant differences between the two groups. This lack of statistical significance can be attributable to no true significant difference between the Wheeling group and the traditional group. It could also be due to the small sizes of both groups, and/or to the typical trials seen in the first year of most new programs. However, significant differences do not always tell the whole story. A lack of significant difference can also provide valuable information.

In this instance the interviews did not evidence any significant downside to the Wheeling professional development school project. Instead, for the majority of the interview questions, the former Wheeling student teachers' means were higher than the former traditional student teachers' means, although only statistically significantly so on four of these items. These data show convincingly that the former Wheeling student teachers feel at least as well prepared, if not somewhat better prepared, for their new jobs than their traditional program counterparts. As the

program is continued into future years and the ISU implementation of the PDS refined, one would expect this difference to widen on key elements contained within the PDS experience.

A common theme that supports the PDS concept came through quite clearly in several traditional group responses to the open-ended items. A number of these students said:

“... put the students/student teachers into the classroom earlier, give them more hands-on experience — I wish I could have seen the year from beginning to end.”

And from the Wheeling group came the sentiment of:

“... how grateful I am to have been in the classroom for a whole year of experience; how rewarding it was in ways that go beyond subjects and lesson plans.”

The enthusiasm of these first-year teachers is exhilarating and contagious. The comments made by both groups are clearly supportive of the professional development school concepts. Current studies of this year's PDS and traditional program groups should delineate even more clearly the benefits of this substantive change in student teacher preparation. Continuing to follow these former student teachers as they progress into their careers should reveal the long-term rewards of a PDS program, particularly on job retention, job satisfaction, and increased appreciation for specific aspects of their professional preparation.

Appendix A PDS Telephone Interview Questions

-] Gender (Male=1; Female=2)
-] Age
-] Do you earn a salary outside of your home? (Yes=1; No=2)
-] Which of the following best describes your salary?
(Under \$10,000=1; \$10-20,000=2; \$20-30,000=3; Over \$30,000=4)
-] Are you employed? (Full time=1; Part-time=2)
-] What is your field of employment?
-] If you are teaching, what grade level(s) do you teach?
-] What is the average number of hours / night preparing lessons, grading, extra-curricular, etc.?
-] If you are not teaching, why not?
-] If you are not teaching, do you expect to go back to teaching? (Yes=1; No=2)
-] If not, why not?
-] If you are not teaching, do you want to go back to teaching? (Yes=1; No=2)
-] If not, why not?

On a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being “not at all” and 5 being “extremely”:

-] How stressful do you find your current job?

-] If you find your current job stressful, why?
-] What kinds of resources are available through your employment to help with that stress?
-] Where did you student teach?
-] What semester? (Fall of 95=1; Spring of 96=2)
-] Is your current job in the field you wanted? (Yes=1; No=2)
-] If not, why not?
-] Is your job in a geographic location of your choice? (Yes=1; No=2)
-] If not, why not?
-] Is your job with a school or company of your choice? (Yes=1; No=2)
-] If not, why not?

On a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being “not at all” and 5 being “very well”:

How well did your experiences in your education classes at ISU prepare you to —

-] teach science
-] teach math
-] teach language arts
-] teach reading
-] teach social studies
-] teach other (give examples of other subjects)
-] manage a classroom
-] provide constructive feedback to students
-] communicate with parents
-] cope with paperwork requirements
-] complete paperwork requirements
-] help special needs children

utilize technology

On a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being “not at all” and 5 being “very well”:

How well did your student teaching experience prepare you to —

- teach science
- teach math
- teach language arts
- teach reading
- teach social studies
- teach other (give examples of other subjects)
- manage a classroom
- provide constructive feedback to students
- communicate with parents
- cope with paperwork requirements
- complete paperwork requirements
- help special needs children
- utilize technology

On a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being “less well prepared” and 5 being “much better prepared”:

- How do you feel you compare to other first year teachers from ISU?
- How do you feel you compare to other first year teachers from other universities?

On a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being “not at all” and 5 being “very much”:

- How well do you like your job?
- If you are teaching, do you enjoy it?
- If you don't, why not?

On a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being “not on your life!” and 5 being “absolutely”:

- If you are teaching, what are the possibilities that you will “stick with it?”
- What might cause you to change jobs?
- If you are teaching, what might cause you to leave teaching?

What kinds of support does your school district offer to 1st-year teachers?

On a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being “never” and 5 being “always”:

- How much do you participate in the programs your school has to offer 1st-year teachers?
- Why or why not?

- How can the classroom experiences at ISU be improved?
- How can overall campus experiences at ISU be improved?
- How can student teaching preparation at ISU be improved?

You've been a big help! We really appreciate your time and input! Thanks!

Appendix B
Group Means and t-test Results

Question	PDS	Trad	t	p
Age?	22.90	24.26	1.260	0.219
Do you earn a salary outside the home? (1=Yes; 2=No)	1.00	1.00	---	---
Salary range? (1=< \$10,000; 2=\$10-20,000; 3=\$20-30,000; 4=>\$30,000)	2.35	2.22	0.521	0.605
Type of employment? (1=Full time; 2= Part time)	1.10	1.13	0.304	0.763
Average number of hours/night preparing lessons, grading, extra-curricular, etc.?	3.35	2.25	1.927	0.068
Do you expect to go back to teaching? (1=Yes; 2=No)	1.00	1.08	0.860	0.400
Do you want to go back to teaching? (1=Yes; 2=No)	1.00	1.08	0.860	0.400
How stressful do you find your job? (1=Not at all; 5=Extremely)	2.65	2.91	0.913	0.366
Is your job in a field you wanted? (1 = yes; 2 = no)	1.30	1.22	0.607	0.547
Is your job in a geographic location of your choice? (1=Yes; 2=no)	1.10	1.04	0.713	0.480
Is your job with a school of your choice? (1=Yes; 2=No)	1.25	1.22	0.247	0.806

On a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being “not at all” and 5 being “very well”, how well did your experiences in your education classes at ISU prepare you to —

teach science?	3.21	2.96	0.704	0.485
teach math?	3.80	3.70	0.316	0.754
teach language arts?	4.35	3.70	2.240	0.031
teach reading?	4.35	3.70	2.240	0.031
teach social studies?	3.25	3.48	0.630	0.532
teach other specific subjects?	3.64	3.24	0.600	0.554
manage a classroom?	3.45	3.00	1.119	0.270
provide constructive feedback to your students?	3.90	3.57	1.040	0.304
communicate with the parents of your students?	3.45	2.78	1.660	0.104

Question	PDS	Trad	t	p
cope with paperwork requirements?	2.60	3.04	1.145	0.259
complete paperwork requirements?	2.65	2.96	0.819	0.418
help special needs children?	2.85	2.74	0.313	0.756
utilize technology?	3.20	3.13	0.182	0.856

On a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being “not at all” and 5 being “very well”, how well did your student teaching experience prepare you to —

teach science?	3.68	3.55	0.365	0.717
teach math?	4.40	4.00	1.490	0.144
teach language arts?	4.80	4.32	2.006	0.055
teach reading?	4.60	4.41	0.831	0.411
teach social studies?	3.65	3.86	0.518	0.607
teach other specific subjects?	5.00	3.50	2.666	0.026
manage a classroom?	4.85	4.18	2.606	0.015
provide constructive feedback to your students?	4.70	4.41	1.384	0.176
communicate with the parents of your students?	4.75	4.32	2.010	0.053
cope with paperwork requirements?	4.37	4.36	0.018	0.986
complete paperwork requirements?	4.37	4.41	0.160	0.874
help special needs children?	3.60	3.85	0.758	0.453
utilize technology?	4.25	3.57	1.821	0.078

How well do you like your job? (1=Not at all; 5=Very much)	4.10	3.96	0.430	0.669
If you are teaching, do you enjoy it? (1= Yes, 2=No)	4.95	4.95	0.067	0.947
If you are teaching, what are the possibilities that you will "stick with it"? (1="Not on your life"; 5=Absolutely)	4.70	4.55	0.753	0.456
How much do you participate in the programs your school has to offer first-year teachers? (1=Never; 5=Always)	3.46	3.75	0.468	0.64



U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: ONE YEAR LATER: FOLLOW-UP ON A PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOL	
Author(s): SANDRA J. BLAND AND JEFFREY B. HECHT	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: OCTOBER 17, 1997

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

_____ Sample _____

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

↑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

_____ Sample _____

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

↑

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

_____ Sample _____

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

↑

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: <i>Jeffrey B. Hecht</i>	Printed Name/Position/Title: JEFFREY B. HECHT, Assoc. Prof.
Organization/Address: CAMPUS BOX 5900 NORMAL, IL 61790-5900	Telephone: 3094385585 FAX: 3094388683
	E-Mail Address: jhecht@ilstu.edu Date: 5/19/99