

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 327 512

SP 032 826

AUTHOR George, Thomas A.; And Others
 TITLE The Relationship between Teacher Education Admission Interviewer Ratings and Subsequent Performance Variables.
 PUB DATE 14 Nov 90
 NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, November 14-16, 1990). Student teacher evaluation forms may not reproduce well due to small, filled print.
 PUB TYPE -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *Academic Standards; *Admission Criteria; Comparative Analysis; Elementary Education; Higher Education; *Interviews; Preservice Teacher Education; *Student Characteristics; *Teacher Education Programs

ABSTRACT

Acute resource limitations and demands for better prepared teachers have resulted in the imposition of enrollment caps on many U.S. teacher preparation programs. The subjects of this study included students who were selected to enter the elementary education program and who eventually enrolled in student teaching (N=93). Spearman correlations were computed to determine the relationship of admission boards interview ratings and subsequent performance variables. The results support the need to maintain admission boards which include elementary and university faculty, school teachers, and advanced students, since each interviewer type appears to focus on different student attributes, such as academic accomplishments, professional promise, etc. Such boards select better students because of the variety of rater types constituting each admission board.
 (JD)

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

ED327512

Interviewer Ratings

1

The Relationship Between Teacher Education Admission
Interviewer Ratings and Subsequent
Performance Variables

Thomas A. George

Judith A. Boser

Saundra L. Daigle

University of Tennessee

Brenda A. Stevens

Kearney State University

Mid-South Educational Research Association

1990 Annual Meeting

New Orleans, Louisiana

November 14, 1990

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.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. W. George

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Running Head: INTERVIEWER RATINGS AND SUBSEQUENT PERFORMANCE

Abstract

Acute resource limitations and demands for better prepared teachers have resulted in the imposition of enrollment caps on many of our nation's teacher preparation programs. The subjects of this study included students who were selected to enter the elementary education program and who eventually enrolled in student teaching. Spearman correlations were computed to determine the relationship of admission board interview ratings and subsequent performance variables. The results support the need to maintain admission boards which include elementary and university faculty, school teachers, and advanced students, since each interviewer type appears to focus on different student attributes.

The Relationship Between Teacher Education Admission
Interviewer Ratings and Subsequent
Performance Variables

Throughout the nation demands for increased rigor in the selection of preservice teacher education students have been rampant (Cruickshank & Cruz, 1989; Goldman & Barron, 1990; Holmes Group, 1986). As a result, the entry level minimum grade point average has been raised to 2.5 by the accrediting body for teacher education (i.e., National Association of Colleges for Teacher Education) and passing scores on standardized basic skills tests are now required by institutions in many states (Demetrulias, Chiodo, & Diekman, 1990; Tate, 1988; Watts, 1980). Furthermore, a growing number of institutions are requiring teacher education applicants to submit to an interview as a part of the selection process (Benner, George, & Cagle, 1987).

At the University of Tennessee, Knoxville (UTK), basic skills testing was imposed in 1979 and the minimum grade point average was increased from 2.2 to 2.5 in 1982. Beginning in 1985, teacher education applicants, like Law and Medical School applicants, were asked to interview before a board of admission upon successful attainment of other admission criteria.

Concurrent with the public outcry for strengthened admission standards was a call for improved teacher preparation programs. As a result, some institutions have responded by increasing the clinical nature of such programs. Some institutions began limiting enrollment to certain oversubscribed programs so as to permit faculty to work more closely with students both on campus and in the field. Enrollment limitations have been viewed often as a necessary step to program improvement in fiscal environments which prohibit the employment of additional faculty (Freeman, Martin, Brousseau, & West, 1989). In 1983, the faculty at UTK, while in the midst of formulating its reform package was asked to determine the appropriate number of students which should be admitted to each of its preservice teacher education fields. As those reforms were fleshed-out and implementation began, the elementary education faculty in 1986 began limiting preservice enrollment to 75 new students per year. (This particular enrollment cap represented a reduction of approximately 40% of the number of students admitted to elementary education in 1985.) Three years later this cap was adjusted upward to the current 100 students per year.

In strengthening admission requirements and setting enrollment caps, denial rates of students seeking admission to elementary education have ranged from a high of approximately 30% during the period of 1986-88 to a low of near 15% in 1989 when the enrollment cap was raised. With such bold changes have come increased demands for accountability in student selection procedures, as well as in program effectiveness. The purpose of this investigation is to examine the relationship between applicant interview ratings and the subsequent performance of those students who were selected to enter the elementary education program.

Method

Subjects

Potential subjects were derived from the 273 elementary education students who were admitted to the Elementary Education initial licensure program during the period Spring 1987 - Spring 1989. Complete data were available on 93 students.

Data Sources

Data were collected on each subject's admission interview ratings, student teaching evaluations, final cumulative grade point average (GPA), and performances

on NTE Core Battery and Specialty Area Tests. The interview rating form and student teacher evaluation forms are available in Appendix A and B, respectively.

Admission interview ratings

Upon completing a minimum 45 semester hours, attainment of at least a 2.5 GPA (4-point scale), and earning passing scores on the Pre-Professional Skills Test (Reading = 7th percentile, Mathematics = 11th percentile, and Writing = 16th percentile), applicants for admission to the elementary education preservice program were interviewed by an admissions panel (i.e., Board of Admission). Panels consisted of a practicing elementary school teacher, an advanced elementary education student, a university professor, and a College of Education (COE) elementary education professor. Admission interviews, which are scheduled in the fall and spring, are approximately 25 minutes in length. Each panel member independently rated each interviewee on six variables, recorded a composite score (i.e., based on the variables), and made a recommendation of "should admit", "should not admit" or "undecided". Those six variables are the following:

1. leadership potential
2. professionalism

3. teaching potential
4. written communication
5. oral communication
6. poise/confidence/appearance

Overall interview rating (i.e., derived from all panel members' composite interview scores), GPA, and Pre-Professional Skills Tests scores (i.e., Reading, Writing, and Mathematics) were given equal weight in determining an applicant's admission priority.

Applicants receiving two or more recommendations of "should not admit" from board members were denied admission even when such applicants' GPAs and test scores offset the effects of their low overall interview rating.

Admission to the elementary education program is granted to the 75 - 100 applicants per year with the highest admission priorities. Applicants who are unsuccessful in gaining admission are permitted to interview the following semester and as often as desired, thereafter. Unsuccessful applicants are encouraged to discuss the status of their application with the elementary education coordinator of admissions. Some unsuccessful applicants are encouraged to interview later, while others are advised

to seek other majors.

Cronbach's Alpha was used to estimate the reliability (i.e., internal consistency) of the interviewer ratings for each of the four types of panel members. The following coefficients were derived: COE faculty = .89; university faculty = .88; school teacher = .88; advanced student = .92. Based on these results, a decision was made to collapse each interviewer's ratings into a single score.

Student Teaching Ratings

Each student teacher was evaluated independently by a COE supervisor and a cooperating teacher, using the same student teaching evaluation form. The evaluation form was revised in Fall 1989, and, as a result, 49 students were rated using the original form and 44 students were rated using the revised form. Both forms appear in Appendix B. Cronbach's Alpha was used to estimate internal reliability for both evaluation forms for cooperating teachers and for COE supervisors (see Table 1).

Insert Table 1 about here

Based on the Cronbach Alpha results, it was

decided that the scales contained within each of the instruments could be collapsed, for each form and for both evaluators. This resulted in a composite score for COE supervisors using the original form, a composite score for cooperating teachers using the original form, a composite score for COE supervisors using the revised form, and a composite score for cooperating teachers using the revised form.

Analyses

Spearman correlation coefficients were computed to examine the relationships between the interviewer rating and each of the following variables: cumulative GPA, NTE Core Battery and Specialty Area scores, cooperating teacher and COE supervisor student teaching ratings. Comparisons of rankings of student teaching ratings with rankings of interview ratings were computed separately according to the particular rating form in use at the time student teaching was completed. Coefficients were computed for each interviewer type (i.e., advanced student, school teacher, university faculty, and elementary education faculty).

Results

Student Teaching Ratings Comparisons

Original student teaching rating form. Virtually,

no relationship appeared to exist between any of the comparisons involving interview and student teaching ratings, using the original student teaching rating form. Correlation coefficients ranged from $r = -.03$ to $r = .21$. Complete data appear in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 about here

Revised student teaching rating form. Stronger correlations were found for all comparisons of interviewer ratings and student teacher ratings using the revised evaluation form. The strongest correlations between ratings of students' interviews and student teaching performance involved the ratings of the university faculty and cooperating teachers, $r = .56$. A correlation of similar, but somewhat less, strength was found between the interview ratings of advanced students and cooperating teachers' ratings of student teaching, $r = .49$. The weakest correlation noted was between university faculty interview ratings and COE supervisors' ratings of student teaching, $r = .02$. The remaining correlations appear in Table 2.

NTE Communication Skills Test Comparisons

The correlations between interviewer ratings and

performance on the Communication Skills test ranged from $r = .04$ to $r = .28$. The strongest correlation found was that involving the university faculty interviewer ratings, $r = .28$; these were followed closely by the interview ratings of the COE faculty, $r = .27$. The weakest correlation noted between performance on the Communication Skills test and interview ratings was that involving the advanced students' interview ratings, $r = .04$. Complete data appear in Table 3.

Insert Table 3 about here

NTE General Knowledge Test Comparisons

Correlations between interviewer ratings and performance on the General Knowledge test ranged from $r = .05$ to $r = .27$. The strongest correlation found was that involving the university faculty interview ratings, $r = .27$. The weakest correlation involved General Knowledge test performance and the interview ratings of the advanced students, $r = .05$.

NTE Professional Knowledge Test Comparisons

Correlations between interviewer ratings and performance on the Professional Knowledge test ranged

from $r = .25$ to $r = .36$. The strongest correlation found was that involving the COE faculty interview ratings and test performance, $r = .36$; this was followed closely by the correlation of university faculty interview ratings and test performance, $r = .35$. The weakest correlation in this series of comparisons involved the interview ratings of advanced students, $r = .25$.

NTE Specialty Area Test Comparison

Correlations between interview ratings and performance on the NTE Specialty Test in Elementary Education ranged from $r = .18$ to $r = .39$. The strongest correlation obtained was that involving the COE faculty ratings and Specialty test performance, $r = .39$. The weakest correlation involved the interview ratings of the advanced student, $r = .18$.

Cumulative GPA Data

Correlations between students' interview ratings and subsequent final undergraduate cumulative GPAs ranged from $r = .24$ to $r = .35$. The strongest correlation found was between school teacher interview ratings and GPAs, $r = .35$. The weakest correlation found involved university faculty interview ratings and GPAs, $r = .24$. Complete data appear in Table 4.

Insert Table 4 about here

Discussion

UTK's revised student teaching rating form is yielding much stronger correlation coefficients than its predecessor form, particularly for those comparisons involving cooperating teacher ratings. Though stronger with the revised form, correlations involving COE supervisors are still markedly weaker than those involving cooperating teachers. Interestingly, university faculty interview ratings provided the strongest correlation with cooperating teacher ratings, followed by advanced student ratings. Surprisingly, the ratings of school teachers and elementary faculty produced the weakest and next to the weakest correlations, respectively, with cooperating teacher ratings.

In all comparisons involving interviewer ratings and NTE test performance, either elementary education faculty or university faculty correlations were strongest or next strongest. Correlations involving the General Knowledge and Communication Skills tests were strongest for university faculty, while

comparisons with the Professional Knowledge and Specialty Area tests were strongest for elementary education faculty. The ratings of advanced students were clearly the weakest across all comparisons with NTE performance. Considering all raters, comparisons involving Professional Knowledge and the Specialty Area tests yielded the strongest coefficients, whereas the comparisons involving General Knowledge and Communication Skills produced the weakest correlations.

Among the various comparisons, none produced coefficients as similar to one another as those involving interview ratings and GPA. All correlations were positive, with the ratings of school teachers being the strongest and university faculty being the weakest.

In conclusion, it appears that raters focus on somewhat different applicant attributes (e.g., academic accomplishments, professional promise, etc.) and as a group actually select better students than would be possible if it were not for the variety of rater types constituting each admission board.

Limitations of Study

1. The findings of this investigation apply only to UTK's Board of Admission in Elementary Education and

are not to be generalized to any other board of admission at UTK or elsewhere.

2. Since more than one group of four raters was necessary to interview the large number of elementary education applicants, differences between groups may actually account for some part of the findings.

3. Evaluation by nature is a subjective process and, therefore, the findings of this study, which involve judgments in student selection and in teaching performance, are limited in their accuracy.

4. The findings are limited by virtue of lack of independence of ratings, since it was possible for an elementary education faculty or school teacher to have been first involved with a student during the selection process and then later to have been involved with that same student during student teaching.

5. Finally, the findings are limited due to the design of this study which includes only successful students, (i.e., ones who gained entry into elementary education and who then advanced to the point of student teaching).

References

- Benner, S., George, T., and Cagle., L. (1987).
Admission boards: The contribution of professional judgment to the admission process. Journal of Teacher Education, 38 (2), 7-11.
- Cruickshank, D.R. & Cruz, J. Jr. (1989). Trends in teacher preparation. Journal of Teacher Education, 40 (3), 49-56.
- Demetrulias, D.M., Chiodo, J.J., and Diakman, J.E. (1990). Differential admission requirements and student achievement in teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 41 (2), 66-72.
- Freeman, D.R., Martin, R.J., Brousseau, B.A., and West, B.B. (1989). Do higher program admission standards alter profiles of entering teacher candidates? Journal of Teacher Education, 40 (3), 33-41.
- Goldman, E., & Barron, L. (1990). Using hypermedia to improve the preparation of elementary teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 41 (3), 21-31.
- Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing, MI: Author.
- Tate, P.A. (1988). Whale or shark? A description of state policy domains for teacher education.

Journal of Teacher Education, 39 (6), 21-16.

Watts, D. (1980). Admissions standards for teacher preparatory programs: Time for a change. Phi Delta Kappan, 62 (2), 120-22.

Table 1

Cronbach's Alpha Coefficients for Student Teaching
Evaluation Forms

| Rater | Original Form | Revised Form |
|---------------------|---------------|--------------|
| COE Supervisor | .77 | .85 |
| Cooperating Teacher | .93 | .73 |

Table 2

Correlations of Interview and Student Teaching Ratings

| Interview Ratings | Student Teaching Evaluation Form | | | | |
|-------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|---------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| | Original | | Revised | | |
| | | COE Supervisor | Cooperating Teacher | COE Supervisor | Cooperating Teacher |
| Elem. Fac. | r | .19 | .21 | .21 | .35 |
| | N | 49 | 49 | 44 | 44 |
| Univ. Fac. | r | -.02 | -.10 | .02 | .56 |
| | N | 36 | 36 | 23 | 23 |
| Sch. Teach | r | -.03 | .17 | .08 | .31 |
| | N | 48 | 48 | 42 | 42 |
| Adv. St. | r | .10 | .18 | .12 | .49 |
| | N | 45 | 45 | 41 | 41 |

Interviewer Ratings

20

Table 3

Correlations of Interview Ratings and Performance on the NTE: Core Battery Tests and Specialty Area Test

| Interviewer | Communication Skills | General Knowledge | Professional Knowledge | Specialty Area Test |
|------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| El. Ed. Fac. N = 93 | .27 | .18 | .36 | .39 |
| Univ. Fac. N = 59 | .28 | .27 | .35 | .33 |
| Sch. Teach N = 90 | .17 | .18 | .27 | .30 |
| Adv. Stud. N = 86 | .04 | .05 | .25 | .18 |

Interviewer Ratings

21

Table 4
Correlations of Interview Ratings and Final Undergraduate Cumulative GPA

| Interviewer | GPA |
|---------------------------|-----|
| El. Ed. Faculty N = 93 | .27 |
| Univ. Faculty N = 59 | .24 |
| Sch. Teacher N = 90 | .35 |
| Adv. Student N = 86 | .27 |

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE
 COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
 ADMISSION TO TEACHER EDUCATION
 INTERVIEW RATING

Date _____

Applicant's Name _____

Telephone _____

Social Security Number _____

Advisor's Name _____

Admissions Board Member

- Elementary Faculty
- University Faculty
- School Teacher
- Advanced Student

| | | | | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------|
| 1. Leadership Potential (Initiative, Ability to motivate Goal directedness, Assertiveness) | 1 /-----/ | 2 /-----/ | 3 /-----/ | 4 /-----/ | 5 /-----/ |
| | Unacceptable | | Acceptable | | Highly Desirable |
| 2. Professionalism (Interest in teaching, Motivation) | 1 /-----/ | 2 /-----/ | 3 /-----/ | 4 /-----/ | 5 /-----/ |
| | Unacceptable | | Acceptable | | Highly Desirable |
| 3. Teaching Potential Abilities (Organization, Sensitivity, Awareness of individuals, Ability to motivate, Social consciousness) | 1 /-----/ | 2 /-----/ | 3 /-----/ | 4 /-----/ | 5 /-----/ |
| | Unacceptable | | Acceptable | | Highly Desirable |
| 4. Written Communication (Expression and mechanics) | 1 /-----/ | 2 /-----/ | 3 /-----/ | 4 /-----/ | 5 /-----/ |
| | Unacceptable | | Acceptable | | Highly Desirable |
| 5. Oral Communication (Expression and mechanics) | 1 /-----/ | 2 /-----/ | 3 /-----/ | 4 /-----/ | 5 /-----/ |
| | Unacceptable | | Acceptable | | Highly Desirable |
| 6. Poise/Confidence/Appearance | 1 /-----/ | 2 /-----/ | 3 /-----/ | 4 /-----/ | 5 /-----/ |
| | Unacceptable | | Acceptable | | Highly Desirable |

Comments (Please make if average rating is below 3.0 or if recommendation is not to admit)

| | | | |
|---|---------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| <u>Overall Admissions Recommendations</u> | <u>Should Admit</u> | <u>Should Not Admit</u> | <u>Undecided</u> |
| | ----- | ----- | ----- |

- J. Ethical Behavior** ___ 1. Occasionally shows unethical behavior ___ 2. Must be reminded to be ethical ___ 3. Demonstrates ethical behavior ___ 4. Never demonstrates unethical behavior
- K. School-related, Non-classroom Responsibilities** ___ 1. Does not assume out-of-class responsibilities ___ 2. Intermittently assumes out-of-class responsibilities ___ 3. Performs out-of-class responsibilities for smooth operation of the school ___ 4. Is self-motivated; assumes extra responsibilities willingly

Instruction

- L. Preparation** ___ 1. Does not prepare for classroom instruction ___ 2. Sometimes prepares for classroom instruction ___ 3. Consistently prepares for classroom instruction ___ 4. Displays evidence of superior preparation for instruction
- M. Subject Matter Preparation** ___ 1. Does not know content ___ 2. Is well prepared in some areas, inadequate in others (in content area) ___ 3. Exhibits broad subject matter preparation ___ 4. Expands student learning from that presented in textbooks
- N. Explanation of Instruction to Students** ___ 1. Frequently fails to communicate effectively with students ___ 2. Fails to communicate with some students ___ 3. Communicates effectively with students ___ 4. Always communicates effectively during instruction
- O. Teaching Techniques** ___ 1. Demonstrates little variety in teaching strategies which are effective ___ 2. Intermittently uses variety of teaching strategies which are effective ___ 3. Regularly uses a variety of teaching strategies which are effective ___ 4. Develops teaching strategies to meet individual needs of students
- P. Teaching Materials** ___ 1. Demonstrates little variety in teaching materials which are effective ___ 2. Intermittently uses variety of teaching materials which are effective ___ 3. Regularly uses a variety of teaching materials which are effective ___ 4. Develops teaching materials to meet individual needs of students
- Q. Student Involvement in Instruction** ___ 1. Provides no opportunities for student involvement ___ 2. Provides occasional opportunities for student involvement ___ 3. Regularly involves students in instruction ___ 4. Involves students in all aspects of instruction (including planning)
- R. Evaluation of Student Performance** ___ 1. Seldom attempts to evaluate student performance ___ 2. Provides infrequent or inaccurate evaluation feedback to students ___ 3. Provides accurate feedback to students on a regular basis ___ 4. Recognizes improvements of students on all levels of performance
- S. Instructional Effectiveness** ___ 1. Seldom effective in accomplishing instructional objectives ___ 2. Intermittently effective in accomplishing instructional objectives ___ 3. Effective in accomplishing instructional objectives ___ 4. Effective in accomplishing instructional objectives even when confronted with unscheduled interruptions from others

Classroom Climate

- | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|---|---|---|
| T. Positive Affect | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Fails to recognize the need for a positive learning atmosphere | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Provides a positive learning atmosphere for some students | <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Provides a positive atmosphere for most students | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Provides a comfortable learning atmosphere for all students |
| U. Behavior Management Plan | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Shows no evidence of behavior management plan for classroom | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Has behavior management plan that is difficult to enforce | <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Has behavior management plan that can be enforced | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Has behavior management plan that meets needs of all students |
| V. Behavior Management | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Shows little or no classroom control | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Is inconsistent in controlling pupil behavior | <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Consistently establishes and maintains effective discipline | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Plans and implements strategies for pupil self-discipline |

Comments _____

_____ Date

_____ Signature of Cooperating Teacher

Student Teacher Release Request

I request that this evaluation become a part of my Career Planning and Placement file.

I hereby grant permission to the College of Education, The University of Tennessee, to release the contents of this evaluation.

Signature of Student Teacher

Signature of Student Teacher

Name of Student Teacher _____
 Last First Middle Sec. No. Name of Cooperating Teacher _____

Final Performance Level

Personal

- A. Self Confidence** ___ 1. No self confidence ___ 2. Self confidence varies ___ 3. Generally self confident ___ 4. Self confident in all situations
- B. Critical Feedback** ___ 1. Ignores or rejects criticism ___ 2. Accepts criticism, does not change behavior ___ 3. Accepts criticism, modifies behavior ___ 4. Solicits criticism, modifies behavior
- C. Enthusiasm** ___ 1. Little or no enthusiasm ___ 2. Sometimes enthusiastic ___ 3. Consistently enthusiastic ___ 4. Generates enthusiasm in others (students/peers)
- D. Initiative** ___ 1. Ignores requests for involvement ___ 2. Accepts requests for involvement, does only what was asked ___ 3. Accepts requests for involvement, does an outstanding job of what was asked ___ 4. Suggests involvement, does an outstanding job

Professional

- E. Student Relationships** ___ 1. Unresponsive to needs of students ___ 2. Intermittently sensitive to needs of students ___ 3. Demonstrates sensitivity to needs of students ___ 4. Willingly provides extra effort to meet students' needs
- F. Peer Relationships** ___ 1. Little or no interest in interacting with peers ___ 2. Intermittently shows interest in activities of peers ___ 3. Works well with peers ___ 4. Works hard to promote good working relationships with peers
- G. Sense of Professional Responsibility** ___ 1. Does not fulfill directed school responsibilities ___ 2. Needs to be reminded to meet directed school responsibilities ___ 3. Fulfills directed school responsibilities ___ 4. Is self motivated, assumes extra responsibilities willingly
- H. Self-Evaluation** ___ 1. Never evaluates performance or behavior ___ 2. Evaluates performance or behavior when requested to do so ___ 3. Initiates self evaluation ___ 4. Offers insightful suggestions after self-evaluation
- I. Ethical Behavior** ___ 1. Occasionally shows unethical behavior ___ 2. Must be reminded to be ethical ___ 3. Demonstrates ethical behavior ___ 4. Never demonstrates unethical behavior
- J. School-related, Non-classroom Responsibilities** ___ 1. Does not assume out-of-class responsibilities ___ 2. Intermittently assumes out-of-class responsibilities ___ 3. Performs out of class responsibilities for smooth operation of the school ___ 4. Is self motivated; assumes extra responsibilities willingly

Planning

- K. Preparation** ___ 1. Does not prepare for classroom instruction ___ 2. Sometimes prepares for classroom instruction ___ 3. Consistently prepares for classroom instruction ___ 4. Displays evidence of superior preparation for instruction

Instruction

- L. Subject Matter Preparation ___ 1. Does not know content ___ 2. Well prepared in some areas inadequate in others (in content area) ___ 3. Broad subject matter preparation ___ 4. Expands student learning from that presented in textbooks
- M. Communication with Student ___ 1. Frequently fails to communicate effectively with students ___ 2. Fails to communicate with some students ___ 3. Communicates effectively with students ___ 4. Always communicates effectively during instruction
- N. Teaching Technique ___ 1. Little or no evidence of variety in teaching strategies ___ 2. Intermittently uses variety of teaching strategies ___ 3. Uses a variety of teaching strategies which are effective in achieving objectives ___ 4. Develops exceptional teaching strategies to meet individual needs
- O. Evaluation of Student Performance ___ 1. Seldom attempts to evaluate student performance ___ 2. Infrequent or inaccurate evaluation feedback provided students ___ 3. Students evaluated accurately on a regular basis ___ 4. Recognizes improvements of students on all levels of performance

Management

- P. Management Plan ___ 1. No evidence of management plan for classroom ___ 2. Has management plan, occasionally fails to enforce ___ 3. Enforces management plan ___ 4. All students know management plan
- Q. Classroom Management ___ 1. Little or no classroom control ___ 2. Is inconsistent in controlling pupil behavior ___ 3. Establishes and maintains effective discipline ___ 4. Plans and implements strategies for pupil self discipline
- R. Classroom Organization ___ 1. Little or no skill in organizing the classroom learning environment ___ 2. Ineffectively manages the classroom learning environment ___ 3. Maintains a functional classroom learning environment; selects appropriate activities ___ 4. Assesses and adjusts the setting to provide for a variety of learning styles

Comments _____

Signature of Cooperating Teacher

Date

Student Teacher Release Request

I request that this evaluation become a part of my Career Planning and Placement file

Signature of Student Teacher

I hereby grant permission to the College of Education, The University of Tennessee, to release the contents of this evaluation

Signature of Student Teacher