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Summary of Findings

1. There were 135 participants in the survey from eight different cohorts. Satisfaction ratings for this group of mentor leaders were much higher than last year’s group of students.

2. Results for this entire Exit Survey are broken down for each program and campus. All ratings are given in the percent responding positively, that is ratings of 7 to 10 are considered Positive on a scale of 1 to 10. The Special Education Cohort rated themselves highest in Overall Preparation to begin teaching with a mean of 9.3. Secondary education and health & physical education majors rated themselves lowest; both groups of students had a mean of 8.7.

3. All aspects of the conceptual framework were positively by 90% or more preservice teachers at graduation except for technology skills which were a bit lower at 85% positive.

4. Technology ratings vary by cohort. Middle grades cohorts were the least happy with their technology skill development while the special education cohort students rated themselves highest.

5. Content area knowledge by preservice teachers is an area that has been targeted for improvement by the Board of Regents and is an area that includes teaching by the faculty of Liberal Arts & Sciences. Content area knowledge ratings are highest for the secondary education cohorts and lowest for the special education and health & physical education cohorts. However teaching areas that include K-12 certification have been exempt.

6. 73% of the preservice teachers rated the Core Curriculum at GC&SU as Good or Excellent.

7. The lowest rated area of satisfaction was preparation for the Praxis II tests. This was about the same as last year except for special education cohort students who were 98% positive (rated Good or Excellent). Secondary education cohorts were the lowest at on 38%-40% positive.

8. Written answers to open-ended questions about good and bad aspects of the program are also included. These comments support the validity of quantitative results listed above as well as the strengths of a field-based cohort with a supportive mentor leader and the disadvantages of time constraints that go with the program.

9. This report disaggregates the data for each cohort and it’s mentor leader.
Results of Exit Survey of May 2004 Graduates

This year the preservice teachers were asked to rate themselves on a scale from 1 (poor) to 10 (Excellent). Of a total of 135 graduates, 67% rated themselves as a 9 or 10. The range was 7-10.

**Figure 1**

**Overall, How Would You Rate Your Skills as a Beginning Teacher Right Now?**

![Graph showing overall ratings](image)

The Milledgeville cohorts were Early Childhood (n = 46), Health and Physical Education (n = 7), Middle Grades (n = 12), Music (n = 2), Special Education (n = 23), and M.A.T. Secondary Education (n = 24). The Macon cohorts were Middle Grades (n = 9) and M. A. T. Secondary Education (n = 13).

**Figure 2**

**Breakdown of Self-Ratings of Skills as a Beginning Teacher by Cohort**

![Graph showing breakdown by cohort](image)
There were six students who did not give information on which cohort they were in, but their ratings are similar to the others. Special education majors rated themselves highest while the secondary education and health & physical education majors rated themselves lowest.

There are 13 specific skill areas stressed in the conceptual framework in which the participants were asked to rate how well prepared they felt at this specific time.

**Figure 3- Percent Rating Themselves Above Six on 10 Point Scale**

There is still a lot of variation in technology ratings from cohort to cohort.

**Figure 4 - Use of Technology Self-Ratings by Cohort**
Middle grades majors (Milledgeville cohort) felt least well prepared in their use of technology in their teaching.

**Figure 5 – 49% Rated Themselves a 9 or a 10 in the Use of Technology**

The use of technology has been an area targeted for improvement for the last four years. Much progress has been made now that most cohort students have laptops. Only nine students rated themselves below a six. Four were early childhood majors, two were MAT Macon cohort, two were middle grades Macon cohort and one was middle grades Milledgeville cohort.

**Figure 6 – Content Area Knowledge Ratings by Cohort**

This is also an area that has been targeted for improvement by the Board of Regents and is an area that includes teaching by the faculty of Liberal Arts & Sciences. However teaching areas that include K-12 certification have been exempt. This is obvious in the ratings.
Ratings of Other Important Aspects of Field-based Cohort Programs

The chart below shows how highly rated the field experiences are. On the other hand, preparation for the Praxis II exams again rates lowest. Most of the ratings are about the same as last year except for the improvement in ratings of the mentor leaders. The 23% improvement is statistically significant at the $p < .001$ level.

**Figure 7 - May 2004 Graduates (Percent Good or Excellent)**
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**Figure 8 - May 2003 Graduates (Percent Good or Excellent)**

![Bar chart for May 2003 Graduates]
Ratings of the perceptions of support that the initial preparation candidates received from their mentor leaders vary widely by cohort.

Special Education and Health & Physical Education were the highest at 100% positive and early childhood education was the lowest at 66% positive. The MAT program improved a lot this year to 94% positive. Middle Grades Education had 81% positive.

**Figure 9 – Ratings of Mentor Leaders by Cohorts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support from Mentor Leader</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Grades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary MAT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Physical Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Satisfaction with Praxis 2 preparation was rated low in almost all programs. This is an area that faculty are continually being asked to stress to their cohorts. The objective is to improve the students' perception of being prepared to take the Praxis 2. The very high passing rate is evidence that the students are being well prepared.

**Figure 10 – Ratings of Praxis 2 Preparation by Cohorts**

Special Education (96%) majors feel the best prepared to take the Praxis II exam.

Preparation for the M.A.T. program participants is all in the content areas; their low ratings reflect their major coursework in their baccalaureate institutions. Each person takes a test in his or her content major; there is no pedagogy on those Praxis II tests. MAT program participants have to take three graduate courses in the major areas, but most of them have already taken the Praxis II by then.

The Early Childhood Cohorts at the Milledgeville campus have shown a large variation over the past three years. Students graduating in 2000 gave ratings of only 37% positive (sum of ratings of good or excellent). However the percent positive rose to 92% for the 2001 graduating cohort, but the 2002 cohort ratings fell to 67% positive. The 2003 cohort ratings fell again to only 57% positive. This year the ratings fell to 54% positive. This is an area where mentor leaders might want to improve and try to be more reassuring to their students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Preparation for Praxis II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Grades</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary MAT</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Physical Education</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ratings of Core Classes Have Improved

Finally we take a closer look at the classes students take in their freshman and sophomore year at this liberal arts university. These are known as the core classes. Transfers who did not take their core classes here were 36% of these respondents. Of the remaining students, 73% rated their core classes as Good or Excellent.

Figure 11 – May 2004 Graduates
Figure 12 - Satisfaction with Core Curriculum Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>core courses</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Grades</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary MAT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Physical Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The M.A.T. students gave the highest ratings to their core classes; 91% of 22 who took their core and undergraduate major at GC&SU said that these classes were good or excellent. This is a good reflection on the School of Liberal Arts & Sciences.

Only 75% of Early Childhood and Middle Grades Education majors rated their core curriculum here as good or excellent. Special Education majors were of a similar opinion (77% positive).
Breakdown of Exit Survey Satisfaction Ratings by Programs

Secondary Education (M.A.T.)

The Milledgeville cohort (n = 24) had an overall teacher preparation rating of 100% positive.

Figure 13 – Milledgeville (Dr. Crabb & Dr. Alby) M.A.T. Program in Secondary Education

Cohort Self-Ratings of Specific Skills Emphasized in the Conceptual Framework

The questions are in the order that they appear on the questionnaire. These questions are based on our conceptual framework for initial preparation teacher candidates. See details below
Satisfaction with other aspects of the Field-Based Cohort-Only Programs

Figure 14 – 2004 Milledgeville (Dr. Crabb & Dr. Alby) M.A.T. Program Ratings (n = 24)

Details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poor Count</th>
<th>Fair Count</th>
<th>Good Count</th>
<th>Excellent Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mentor leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOE instructors</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liscense exam prep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make connections</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>field experiences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>host tchr teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>host tchr mentoring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>core courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dr. Crabb & Dr. Alby, M.A.T. Cohort, Milledgeville Campus

Preservice Teacher Responses to Open-Ended Questions

I. There were some really good aspects of my teacher preparation program at GC&SU. They were:

- Access to reliable sources of information, experienced people, and honest feedback about my progress or development.
- An introduction to constructivist philosophy.
- Answering questions through experience.
- Being in the classroom so much. The lessons I have learned from my field experiences have been invaluable to me and I feel confident and comfortable in the classroom as the teacher.
- Brain Research, multi intelligence strategies and theories
- Did a great job of covering what we need for preparation for teaching and not being tedious
- Disciplinary strategies: the professors—Alby and Crabb went beyond their duties I think
- Dr. Alby's willingness to help.
- Dr. Crabb and Dr. Alby are FANTASTIC—the information, education and support they provided was exceptional.
- Dr. Crabb and Dr. Alby were great teachers. I learned a lot from them.
- Dr. Crabb modeling good teaching practices that I often referred to in my student teaching classroom.
- Dr. Crabb's example.
- Dr. Crabb and Dr. Alby were excellent! They are enthusiastic, caring, supportive and great teachers!
- Experience—we were offered the opportunities to work in 3 different placements. I feel like I have truly been exposed to real teaching experience. (I feel so prepared).
- Expertise—our cohort mentors modeled what they were teaching us. The taught us how to be better teachers by being a better teacher by example.
- Great mentor leaders—I had all the support I needed when I was in the field and when I was in the classroom.
- I like the 3 different student teaching placements. I feel like we have experiences that prepare me to teach most situations.
- I like the way Dr. Crabb and Dr. Alby always went the extra mile to teach us helpless you out of the classroom.
- I really enjoyed the closeness of the cohort group. It was nice going through all of the experiences together.
- I really enjoyed the cohort set up. I was being with the same people all year.
- I really like being in a cohort, I feel that I established good rapport with my peers
- I really like the accelerated program; it really beats a 2-year program.
- I thought it was very effective to be placed in the field during our course work. It was good to relate.
- Importance placed on working as a team with cohort members. This plays a big role in school systems
- It taught me how to be an effective teacher.
- It was like a crash course in teaching. It too what we knew in content and gave us a brief introductory information about how teach it.
- Learning of the learner or action research classes was great. Very applicable to teaching and rooted in real world teaching.
- Learning the learner class we felt we learned all of the information that will be helpful for me next year.
- Learning the learner course. I learned some very useful materials.
- Mentor leaders were very helpful and excellent role models.
- My host teacher for student teaching.
Patience--they took the time to see our strengths or our weakness. Our mentor teachers (cohort) helped us to work on our weaknesses and use our strengths.

Perhaps the main thing I learned in this program is how to get student to think on a higher and level. I saw this need time and time again throughout my practicums and student teaching.

Placement in the actual classroom
Plenty of field experience and many opportunities to teach, in at least 2 grade levels.
Seeing how a teacher must take in all aspects of all of my students whether cultural differences or special needs are present. This program has exposed me to many aspects of the role a teacher I knew nothing about before.

Student teaching I had a great experience that made me want to continue teaching after my first two practicums
Support during student teaching experience from advisors, classmates.
Support from Dr. Crabb & Ruby
Support from the teachers
Technology course. It was great. I would a good review.
The approachability of my professors/mentor leader. The thoroughness of course material. One-on-one flexibility to meet my academic professional goals
The closeness of the cohort.
The cohort aspect of the program. I got to go through the trial and tribulation with 23 others who were going through the same thing.
The discussion-based aspects of some classes. The small personal size of the MAT cohort. The professors' depth of knowledge.
The field work
The main professors usually had time to talk with the students. Always willing to help with anyone that were having a problem.
The opportunity to attend a professional conference was not only exciting, but it has helped me to improve as a professional teachers.
The practicum hosts were good. I valued hairs both high school and middle school experiences.
The preparation learning experience helped me a lot along with the organization skills--mainly the support of cohort students and teachers.
The special education was very helpful. I learned so much from Mrs. Jones.
The technology class could have had a better room, it was hard to see.
The working as a group to get the job done.
Time to spend in the classroom with students actually teaching.
When professors taught the way they wanted us to teach--modeled it.
Wonderful student teaching placement at Jones County.

2. There were some aspects of the teacher preparation program at GC&SU that could be better. They were:

A reading teacher who was not so over worked.
Better MAT classes overall. Most of the classes in the program really lacked depth they were very superficial and based in theory and not rooted in real world.
Better reading teacher that can relate to met my needs as beginning teacher.
Clarity on expectations for the program and demands of the experience or process.
Communication between MAT professors about correlating class content and application.
Communicator between students and teachers should be better. If teachers e-mail students they expect a replay this works both ways.
Consider a new teacher for the Reading in your content areas class. It was one of the worst classes I have ever taken at any level of education. Not only did I not learn anything but I also felt the instructor tended to talk down to her students when they had a problem understanding the work.

Don't have class during student teaching. Too many things to worry about other than during college class work spending 3 hours in class.

Don't make all students buy laptops. That is a waste of money some don't have.

EDRD 5210--teaching of Reading. Dr. Irwin-Devitis is very kind, but the course did not seem well-repaired at all. The work load was off-balance with WAY too much at the end, when our TWS was due. There was truly a way to know how grading was conducted and instructions were often late or missing altogether for some assignments.

Get things together as far as scheduling
I didn't like being split up in halves for certain classes. But I guess you have to do what you have to do to achieve small class sizes and effective and individual education.

I feel like there could be more taught on dealing with student apathy: how to teach the learner who doesn't care. I had some trouble getting these students to do anything regardless of how engaging the assignment or learning was.

I know we experienced a unique problem of having to have a last minute reading teacher. (While looking back hasn't been all that bad).

I think that during the student teaching placement student should have little in the way of course work to complete. This is the time when we are supposed to really be learning and I know that much of the time during my student teaching was spent at home on MAT assignments.

I think the second semester classes should have all assignments (besides TWS and INTASC) turned in before student teaching status.

I would like to have learned more about the use of reading in my content areas.

It needs to be made clear before the program starts what the technology requirements will be.

Large amount of work at same time of student teaching: all of the work seemed necessary, so I'm not sure how this can be helped. I think it goes along with the fact that this is intense program (not for the faint of heart!).

Less pointless work at the end of spring.

Make the class work relevant to what is going on in the practicums. Don't re-teach things from class to class.

More time to devote to teaching while in student teaching placement. A ton of assignments that take away from planning time is not appropriate.

Planning ahead--this got better as the year went on but it still wasn't completely worked out. Sometimes I felt these things were sprung on me.

Possibly hiring a Reading professor who has time to plan although I know this is not always in your control

Praxis II assistance- we were required to do this completely on our own.

Reading class. Our teacher was never prepared, her assignments were not relevant. Assignments were changed often or not posted. If asked questions she would not answer them she said questions were more important than answers. She changed our class time one day to start 3 hours later, unfortunately with less than 1 day notice I could not attend

So much work, so little time. Hey that is why it is a one year program

Some of the classes not taught by Dr. Crabb and Dr. Alby were inexcusably bad--I felt cheated by both my technology and Reading classes.

Some of the host teachers should not have had student teachers--there were some serous problems that minor screening of potential host teachers might have avoided.

Sometimes the class did not always know where they stood at during the course.

Technology might be improved--we had some problems especially in Reading

The edit class I took with Dr. Elizabeth needed to be more in-depth.
The enrollment process! I realize that "jumping through hoops" is very kind, but at times I felt like I was guiding them by the hand to get my app. materials together ready.

The literacy course. It needs a lot of work. The course was horrible. That was the only course I feel was a waste of time because I'm not sure how it’s going to help me.

The overall schedule and plan needs to be more organized. The expected activities need to be known more in advance.

The reading and special Ed classes while important were not at all effective. I didn't learn anything in either one despite looking forward to both as areas I wanted to know more about.

The reading course could be improved I felt the professor was unorganized and didn't have the time to really teach the class. I feel it could have been taught much better than it was

There needs to be a syllabus or calendar of events that is given out at the start of each semester that should also be adhered to. There are too many random things that pop up.

There needs to be more computer access in the school of education. It is ridiculous that I have to go to another college on campus to be able to type or do education assignments.

There needs to be more teacher cohesiveness among the MAT teachers.

There was so little time for all of the massive amounts of work for classes that weren't as important.

There were too many assignments given to us to complete during student teaching.

There were too many assignments during student teaching that were not directly related to student teaching.
Secondary Education (M.A.T.) in Macon

The Macon cohort (n = 13) had an overall teacher preparation rating of 100% Positive. There are some missing data as not all respondents indicated which program they were in.

**Figure 15 - 2004 (Drs. Jones & Hlawaty) Cohort Ratings**

**Cohort Self-Ratings of “How would you Rate Your Skills as a Beginning Teacher Right Now?”**

Details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Begin Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>content area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manage behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plan lessons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>design units</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assess learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diverse learners</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ask questions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>listen &amp; respond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-evaluate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethics &amp; laws</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluate materials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leadership role</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Satisfaction with other aspects of the Field-Based Cohort-Only Programs

Figure 16 – 2003-2004 Macon (Drs. Jones & Hlawaty) M.A.T. Program Ratings (n = 13)

Details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mentor leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOE instructors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liscense exam prep</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make connections</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>field experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>host tchr teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>host tchr mentoring</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>core courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. There were some really good aspects of my teacher preparation program at GC&SU. They were:

- Amount of time spent in classroom
- Being in Macon, only 5 minutes from my house
- Both Dr. Hlawaty and Dr. Jones showed tremendous interest in our lives—professionally and personally
- Both Jones & Hlawaty's prior experience in education was extremely valuable. They conveyed good practical info
- Dr. Jones connections to school system, great reference.
- Dr. Alby's knowledge of constructivist practices. She was a great example of this also.
- Ease of availability of the professors.
- Fairly good preparation of future teachers.
- Flexible 2 year program
- Great Mentors, understanding teachers, loved the cohort aspect.
- Hlawaty & Jones are dedicated educators & it shows.
- I enjoyed learner & the learner, diversity & research.
- Local knowledge of school system by professors
- Observation of other teachers
- Observations & student teaching invaluable
- The advisors/professors were very caring. I enjoyed the classmates and the diverse knowledge they provided
- The course in the teaching of Reading
- The instructors were all very cooperative and understanding about work life schedules.
- The instructors were very knowledgeable.
- The overall program is very educational
- Working with my host teacher

2. There were some aspects of the teacher preparation program at GC&SU that could be better. They were:

- As a charter member of the two year program, I felt like I fell through cracks. Part of this may have been my fault—communication is not high on my priority list.
- At beginning of year, a general calendar & outline of Expectations (gave out portfolio requirements, etc.).
- Better communication between Macon & Milledgeville. We never knew what was going on!
- Better communication between the Milledgeville & Macon Campuses.
- Better organization would create happier students. For example, give students a list of ALL requirements up front.
- Better organization & more advance notification of meetings outside regular class.
- Communication between professors—if more than one teaching the same class—get on the same page—be better prepared before class starts!
- Communication. We rarely knew what was going on.
- Content related teacher preparation. Focusing classes on specific areas & how to teach more effectively
- Emphasize content
I believe there needs to be better laid out guidelines for the cohort.
I was only observed teaching twice in two years. Although both reports were excellent, I would have appreciated more feedback.
Match up of portfolio assignments with actual coursework. Maybe this was due to being two year and portfolio requirements changed.
More visits to student teaching placement
Most classes didn't use the text books. It wasted money in some cases.
No one should teach fall semester
Organization
Preparation of teachers
The books for the diversity class should include other issues than African American or racial.
The instructors should have less stress/pressure placed on them
The planning of the EDIT 5202 course
The technology course should be more advanced
Early Childhood Cohort

The Milledgeville cohort (n = 46) had an overall teacher preparation rating of 100% positive. There are some missing data as not all respondents indicated which program they were in. Paige Campbell and Revel Pogue served as mentor leaders for this group.

Figure 17 – Early Childhood Education Program

2004 Cohort Ratings of How would you Rate Your Skills as a Beginning Teacher Right Now?

The questions are in the order that they appear on the questionnaire. These questions are based on our conceptual framework for initial preparation teacher candidates.

Details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Begin Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>content area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manage behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plan lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>design units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assess learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diverse learners</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ask questions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>listen &amp; respond</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-evaluate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethics &amp; laws</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluate materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leadership role</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Satisfaction with other aspects of the Field-Based Cohort-Only Programs

**Figure 18 – Early Childhood Program Ratings (n = 46)**

Although the preservice teachers’ perceptions of the way they were prepared for the Praxis II tests were low, their actual passing rate was over 90%. Mentor leaders could do a better job of informing them from time to time about how the work they do such as submitting their teacher work samples also contributed to their ability to do well on Praxis II tests. It’s not just what they are told in lectures.
Preservice Teacher Responses to Open-ended Questions

1. There were some really good aspects of my teacher preparation program at GC&SU. They were:

All of the placements in the field were helpful in deciding if this is truly where I need to be
All the field experience we received
Amazing opportunity to be out in the field. "The real world", my host teacher was beyond amazing, I was truly blessed
Applicable (to the classroom) classes that were informative and relative-technology, literacy, assessment, math…..
Application of theory
Basic knowledge of content
Basic knowledge of important teaching concepts
Being able to spend many hours in an actual classroom. If helped put theory into practice.
Being given laptops, this helped integrate technology in some classrooms that didn’t have it.
Being in the cohort was very helpful. It was good to be going through the same experiences or others
Being involved in a classroom at different grades for 2 years
Being well prepared
Connections of class, materials to field experiences. This made the material more meaningful.
Cross curricular emphasis integrate curriculum across the various content areas
Culture language class-diversity how to use it for good
Early on field placements helped prepare me!
Excellent in getting us ready for Praxis II through preparation in exact objections tested on that test
Experience in the field
Field experience
Field experience- I received many opportunities to work in different grade levels and different classrooms with ranging ability that has allowed me to feel very confident as I go into my 1st year of teaching.
Field experience- we got a wide range of grade level experience
Field placements
Field-based experience- a lot of time was spent actually being in the classroom
Getting to know everyone here so well staying with the same group
Getting lots of placement time and hands on experiences in the classroom
Giving us tons of hours of experience in the field
Having a good group of friends that are willing to help w/ projects and assignments
Having our classes with all of the same people. We learned to support each other
Having plenty of time in the field to get used to teaching
Having practical experience in the classroom that helped me to become an effective teacher.
Having so many different opportunities to enter and work with classrooms at many different grade levels.
Having to juggle so many assignments on top of student teaching has made me great at time management
Host teachers and teacher support
I believe I am coming out a better person than when I came in
I do feel ready to have my own classroom.
I feel as though I am ready to teach in my own classroom
I feel confident in my teaching ability. I am well-prepared
I feel prepared to recognize diverse learners and how to incorporate them into my lesson
I feel prepared. I am ready to go into the field
I feel that I could go to a classroom now and be a confident teacher
I felt very prepared to take Praxis II end of Junior year
I gained positive relationships with my mentor leaders, professors, and other cohort students
I got the opportunity to meet a wide variety of friends. Some of my friendships will last a lifetime
I got to know my fellow teacher candidates well
I got to physically interact with many different students
I got to see many different types of teaching styles
I had chances to try different grades in different school systems
I have enjoyed my field experiences and believe that it is those which will help shape me into a wonderful teacher.
I have learned how to write units and integrate a topic into subjects
I have learned that flexibility is something that all teacher must have
In field experience the continuous weeks of field experience in a full time atmosphere was most beneficial in the transition from student teaching to beginning teacher.
Learn how to be flexible
Learning teaching strategies
Learning theories
Lesson planning for greater preparation
Meeting new people and having someone always there to tell me, don't give up
Most of the advisors were helpful and supportive throughout the program
Mr. Wright was awesome! He did a great job of giving constructive criticism, motivating, and preparing us for teaching
My background knowledge as a result of this program is very extensive. I know a lot about early childhood development and teaching strategies.
My Junior cohort mentor: Dee Russell
Open-door policy
Opportunities to become involved in the community
Placements-I learned more from my in class time than any where else
Planning and being able to use lessons in the field
Positive feedback and constructive criticism from mentor leaders, supervisors and host teachers
Preparation to do anything, handle anything
Preparing us for all the paperwork
Relationships & support from most of staff
Resources available
Revel Pogue Dr. Russell
Senior host teacher & school. The encouraged & mentored so much. They were constructive and very helpful.
Senior supervisor & Junior mentor leader, Dee Russell & Jimmy Wright- They were encouraging and helpful.
They answered all of my questions. They would go out of these way to help
Some teachers' support
Spending so much time in an actual classroom.
Student teaching experiences
The ability to choose the grade which you would like experience in
The amount of field experience
The amount of field experience we are allowed
The amount of time in the classroom
The amount of time spent in the public schools helped me learn a lot about teaching that couldn't be taught through college courses.
The amount of time spent in the field
The chance to be in multiple placements, in multiple counties and even in Sweden
The classes gave wide variety of needs
The cohort classes were very informative
The cohort system, gave extra support
The emphasis of parent teacher relationships
The experience I had in actual classrooms.
The friendships that were made through the cohort
The great amount of work that was required of me. It pushed me to be a stronger teacher and person
The mentor leaders gave really good host teachers for me to intern with
The placement in schools, classroom experience
The relationships I built with my peers
The support and guidance I received from my professors and observation teachers
The support from both my host teacher and mentor leader
The support of my friends within the cohort that encouraged me to stick with it
The various field placements to have experiences with
The work load-its prepared us
There were many classes available to further my knowledge of education
Understanding of how to assess
Very personal relationship with mentor leader--provided scaffolding, support, advice
We got toms of hours actually in the classroom.
We were with the same people for 2 years
Willingness to help when asked
Wonderful motivating professors that encouraged deep thinking & a will to strive for more
Working in groups
Working in the field

2. There were some aspects of the teacher preparation program at GC&SU that could be better.

They were:

A couple of my host teachers were not as good examples as they could have been
A lot of busy work that was useless
An overabundance of course work during extensive field, training.
Approachability of some professors
Better feedback from mentor leaders about questions in the class and in the field
Better preparation for Praxis II
Classes that actually show us early childhood material/activities
Clear syllabi which states grading %'s and clear explanations of assignments
Collaboration between mentor leaders
Communication between professors and host teachers/school systems! Make sure that class curriculum and assignments match better with host's curriculum-make a better fit.
Communication b/w students, mentor leaders, and host teachers
Communication between professors of different classes- organization of schedule, coordinating dates, etc could be a lot better! Expect some confusion but this was too much!
Communication between professors-if more than one teaching the same class- get on the same page- be better prepared before class starts!
Communication w/Host teacher. She was not contacted prior to my arrival (sr. year) nor did anyone communicate w/her while I was there.
connecting classes to placement
connecting the course content to the placements in a logical order, EX don't teach assessment in the final semester senior year
Core classes (prior to entering program) to include a history class
Dr. Campbell expects things our of students that she herself doesn't do. Feedback deadlines were not met. She was rarely available. She does not use fact, at all, when giving suggestions.
Forgetting that we have a social life! They (professor) should consider this when making out our work load.
Greater explanation of projects/assignments
Having a better support system, through my mentor leader
Having teachers who were not certified in ECE teaching us how to each them.
Having to do full time teaching and balance an entire schedule here. It was hard! Poor Praxis II prep. how to teach students that are diverse (especial needs)
I also do not feel like I was taught enough material to prepare me for the Praxis II test
I feel that by senior year all classes could be finished before second semester. That way in second semester we could student teach the whole time and get together for special seminars.
I feel that mentor/field teacher did not observe me enough
I feel that there was a lack of support from some of my instructors. The fact that I was scared to talk to them was an awful feeling
I felt like some classes (curriculum, for example) did not teach me anything about what the course was supposed to.
I felt there were some leaders in this program that weren't very understanding or support of me
I often felt very put down by some of the leaders of this program
I won't name names but there are a small number of faculty members here that need some attitude adjustments. They know we've got it tough.
Inconsistency in requirements from some professors
Instructor feedback in certain classes. Clear direction on assignments/deadlines
Irrelevant course work “busy” work
Junior year counseling was a waste of time-useless
Large amounts of busy work
Making sure the requirements are the same regardless of cohorts
Many of the professors look down on us and act like we're babies and are incompetent when we ask questions or question their views of our work.
Mentor leader assistance/ understanding and ability to help emotionally
Mentor leader would be supervisor, who observes you teach throughout the course of the program--they are then better able to offer advice suggestions after watching your development and improvements.
Mentor leaders really need to check out host teachers. There are some horrible host teachers
Mentor leaders should be available to their students at all times. Campbell was not and Pogue could not answer any questions. It was like he was totally our of the loop
Mentor leaders working together are consistent
Mentor leaders. They were helpful but not helpful. I would have to email numerous time to receive an answer- Dr. Campbell was rarely encouraging she acted like was the enemy
More help w/ compiling standards
More positive feedback and encouragement from professors about us teaching
No classes during the last semester Sr. year.
Not enough preparation or info given before TWS and Final presentations were due.
Not having class work due once in placement, and having only material that will help me in the future
Not overwhelming students w/ work that will never be used
Not the busy work and focus on the meaningful activities
Once one has the ability to construct a detailed lesson plan not having to make one for each subject of each class each day.
Order of classes should be reconsidered. Assessment class was taken after TWS was due. Assessment class was poorly executed.
Poor tech. Knowledge and classes for us! Consistent grading policies w/in a class different professor grading the same thing totally differently.
Pressure and anxiety are at an unhealthy high within the cohort
Professor collaboration on work load, class times, overlapping curriculum.
Professors need to grade work in a timely and precise manner. We look to our professors as role models. If they don't feel that it is important to grade papers on time then why should I
Professionalism of some professors. They should not expect things from students that they don't model themselves
Some cohort professors need to treat some students with the respect those students deserve
Some mentor leaders were not professional! They had favorites & you could tell who they were. If one thing I learned from them was how not to teach. Everything I did, according to this mentor leader was wrong. She was hateful and always rude. Even my host teacher my senior year could not stand the way she treated the students. It was like she wanted us to fail. We never know what was expected of us from her and she constantly criticized us in a negative way. It was sad that for Fall 2003 semester, we could not evaluate Paige Campbell!

Some of the assignments didn't help me in preparing to become a teacher. The assignments were nothing but busy work because they didn't help me in the field
Some of the courses were overkill. There are too many overlaps from course to course
Some of the professors seemed like they did not treat the students with enough respect-they treated us like children.
Some of the professors were rude and unwilling to help with answers to important questions. They were not friendly and they never offered to help me
Some of the supervisors/mentor leaders are stricter than others. There needs to be more continuity here. Also, the supervisors need to make sure they communicate thoroughly with host teachers and student teacher.
Some of the work seemed to be "busy work" and not meaningful to the course of our preparation as a teacher
Some subject area based classes I feel did not prepare me enough to teach that subject. I got what I needed through the field experience
Some things were required that teacher never have to do in the "real world" complete thorough one to two page lesson plans per subject.
Student teaching should be just that, with no other assignments
Such an overwhelming amount of work that was so difficult to overcome and enjoy at the same time
Team teaching- should be more of a team. Not one teacher or one watcher
Teacher (mentor) feedback
The amount of work & unrealistic expectations of professors
The amount of work, which always happened to be due on the same day
The attitudes & respect of some mentor leaders
The busy work involved while in the field that was required by the college.
The classes could have been switched around to better accommodate our needs during the semester
The course load could be lessened by collaboration among the professors. Greater content knowledge less work load by making smaller work load more extensive
The lack of communication between instructors and students
The last semester schedule-2 weeks class, 10 weeks field, 2 weeks class. Could we not have class at all the last semester or have class the first 4 weeks, then 10 weeks field?
The math program needs some real work. It needs to be taught by professors who have actually taught in an early childhood classroom.
The mentor leaders could be more open to friendship with all students
The mentor system too many people with one mentor leader
The order of classes was not the best for completing assignments such as TWS
The order of the classes
The overload of work required by some professors
The support we received from our teachers & mentor leaders (positive attitudes/ encouragement)
The very intense work load
The work load became overwhelming
The work was too excessive. Teachers need to keep in mind that we have field work too.
Their pithy comments can many times be very harmful to our attitude about this very difficult program.
There was almost too much work and pressure put on us 3rd semester. They need to break up the work.
This program should be longer. I feel they are trying to cram too much into 2 years. Especially our last semester the last semester should focus more on student teaching and less on course work.

Time spent on meaningless assignments
Timeliness of returned papers and projects
Too many assignments-- this process needs to be streamlined
Too much time required from students
Too much work! Ridiculous amounts!
Trying to complete assignments while in the field senior year was too much detailed LP's are enough on their own
TWS needs to be better explained
Understanding of missed days due to illness appointments, interviews or family emergencies.
Unnecessary assignments that seemed to waste student teaching time
Use of technology in the classroom.
Using class time wisely and efficiently (get to the point- we're adults)
We all stress at times. However, I have felt at times that my mentor leader was unapproachable because I thought she would snap at me
Work not being returned by mentor leaders when they say it will be returned by bad communication: not emailing back, lack of adhering to a syllabi.
Your guidance as far as assignments are concerned.
You should not be required to do assignments while in the field your senior year.
Middle Grades Education Macon 2004 Cohort

The Macon cohort (n = 9) had an overall teacher preparation rating of 100% positive.

**Figure 19 – Macon (Dr. Mumma) Middle Grades Education Program**

**Cohort Self-Ratings of “How would you Rate Your Skills as a Beginning Teacher Right Now?”**

The questions are in the order that they appear on the questionnaire. These questions are based on our conceptual framework for initial preparation teacher candidates. See details below.
Satisfaction with other aspects of the Field-Based Cohort-Only Programs

Figure 20 – 2004 Macon (Dr. Mumma) Middle Grades Program Ratings (n = 9)

Ratings of Good or Excellent

Details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mentor leader</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOE instructors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liscense exam prep</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make connections</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>field experiences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>host tchr teaching</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>host tchr mentoring</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>core courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dr. Mumma’s Macon Middle Grades Education Cohort

Preservice Teacher Responses to Open-Ended Questions

1. There were some really good aspects of my teacher preparation program at GC&SU. They were:

   Convenience of location
   Discussion with cohort members was very valuable.
   Excellent host teachers-I was fortunate to have had excellent teachers who guided me in teaching
   Excellent instructors who helped to prepare me for the Praxis II and for a future of teaching (Mrs. Shiver, Dr.Crawford)
   Grouping as cohort.
   I enjoyed my students and those classes that were not taught by education staff professors!!!
   I loved the English courses and Dr. Crawford’s courses. The courses were not organized well at all!!!
   Plenty of field experiences. I would not imagine going into a classroom for the very first time in my student teaching
   Reading classes very helpful
   Bonding with my fellow cohort members
   Technology class was very helpful. All my field placements were great. Having the laptop was critical for my homework.
   The preparation I received to feel confident that I can go out into the work force and be a good one
   Time in the field--nothing but experience is the best teacher.
   Time spent in the field experiences.

2. There were some aspects of the teacher preparation program at GC&SU that could be better. They were:

   A class on classroom management strategies most especially in regards to student behaviors
   Better class location. We were told that all of our classes would be taken at Macon state
   Layout of classes for program would have benefited more of some classes had been given sooner and some later
   Learning to speak to people (Don Jackson)
   More guidance on major project (i.e., teacher work sample, portfolio)
   Not leaving Macon cohort out in the dark
   Planning the curriculum so that it's equal for everyone. Science got a really raw deal with every one else getting a core class their first semester (plus we didn't know we had to take another science until our senior year!)
   Program changing--adding classes, travel schedule changes, night classes-the program in itself was a night mare.
   Requirements more clearly laid out
   Staying with the course syllabus and not adding other assignments
   Student workload and entirely too much for seniors to take on and still be able to work a which is what you worked so hard do
   Teacher attitudes: the professors should encounter over 2 years have for the most past been rude, and unwilling to help but when really needed it.
   Time management--not enough attention is placed on what assignments are meaningful.
   Too much emphasis one project, teacher work sample etc while just amount to a lot of work
   Truthfulness--if classes are not to be held in Macon why tell incoming transfers that they will be?
Middle Grades Milledgeville Cohort

The cohort (n = 12) had an overall teacher preparation rating of 100% positive. There are some missing data as not all respondents indicated which program they were in.

Figure 21 – Milledgeville (Dr. Klein) Middle Grades Education Program

Cohort Self-Ratings of “How would you Rate Your Skills as a Beginning Teacher Right Now?”

The questions are in the order that they appear on the questionnaire. These questions are based on our conceptual framework for initial preparation teacher candidates. See details below.
Satisfaction with other aspects of the Field-Based Cohort-Only Programs

Figure 22 – 2003 Milledgeville (Dr. Klein) Middle Grades Education Program Ratings (n = 12)

Details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentor leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOE instructors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liscense exam prep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make connections</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>field experiences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>host tchr teaching</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>host tchr mentoring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>core courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dr. Klein’s Middle Grades Education Cohort
Preservice Teacher Responses to Open-Ended Questions

1. **There were some really good aspects of my teacher preparation program at GC&SU. They were:**

   - A supportive cohort that helped me make it through.
   - Close-knit learning community-cohort members, professors and mentor leader good for communication.
   - Continuous reflection of field work, placement the environment the school, the students, administration our host teachers.
   - Courses on student development, assessment, relating literacy in all content areas, ethics of teaching, courses were inputs to the development as future educators.
   - Creating creative units to keep my students engaged.
   - Feedback I received from professors and host teachers
   - Having a laptop to use in the classroom and for personal use
   - Learning how to have effective classroom management which is essential to being an effective teacher.
   - Learning how to reflect everyday to think about how to make changes as needed to our lesson plans.
   - Learning the importance of teamwork by being required to open time with host learners and having to their responsibilities and collaboration with them
   - Learning to work as a team.
   - Learning what makes a middle school learner tick.
   - Lots of experience! The work in most our courses could be done inside of our placements.
   - Placements were wonderful and I enjoyed being in the classroom. I enjoyed seeing my students grow over a long period of time.
   - Professor who were fair, honest, and showed us our strengths while helping us with our weaknesses.
   - Providing overall experiences, For example, even social studies teachers could participate in project wet and wild and obtain those resources for future use! Lots of resources.
   - Spending so much time in field placements and with various host teachers increased amount and quality of experiences and comfort level in the classroom.
   - The assignments were related to classroom experiences and were things that I could eventually use in the classroom.
   - The support and guidance received from Dr. Trish Klein, Mrs. Leigh Hern, and Dr. Nancy Mizelle
   - The time I spent in the middle school classroom.
   - Working in the school system for 2 years helped out tremendously with teacher preparation and understanding the classroom dynamics. It also helped us meet contacts and build relationships with administrative personnel.
   - Working with a team of student teachers that were preparing for the same program

2. **There were some aspects of the teacher preparation program at GC&SU that could be better. They were:**

   - Adjusting the schedule a little better in considering how much we have to do our senior year.
   - Design classes that last longer than two weeks to give finals on or if giving a final in two week class. Let it be in the two week class not four months.
   - Different ideas of ways to teach a concept would be beneficial.
   - Guiding us some more guidance on the standards portfolio our junior year instead of the middle of our senior year.
   - Having the content classes relate more to education.
Helping to prepare the students with more content based teaching, prepare the teachers with ideas of instructor towards content.
Meeting hours of professors.
More visits from our mentor leaders. I feel that they rely too much on our host teacher evaluations. I think there should be more visits and more feedback given to the cohort students from mentor leaders.

My mentor leader never fully observed me in my last semester. I had no feedback from her and was unable to accurately reflect on my strengths and weaknesses because she never gave me any feedback on my teaching.

Not plan so much work on student their senior year
Planning of classes to be taken (ethics and our computer class should have been first)
Prepare the standards along with instruction.
Screening host teachers before placements, perhaps through professor observation of the teacher.
Taking classes and then finals months apart has proven to be frustrating. I would rather meet on a regular basis to get my questions. Answered and keep the material fresh on my mind.
The amount of time required to meet certain requirements they should not focus on such a broad time frame—for example the TWS should be broken down into section not one having project.
The inclusion of more courses related to our primary concentration. All would have benefited me to have had a math course where we discussed the standards state and national and ways to cover the material.
The planning and timing of course work and course work due dates. Better communication amongst faculty would alleviate this problem.
The TWS should be our final work maybe the portfolio should be secondary.
Special Education Milledgeville 2004 Cohort

The cohort (n = 23) had an overall teacher preparation rating of 100% positive.

**Figure 23 – Milledgeville (Dr. Jackson) Special Education Program**

**Cohort Self-Ratings of “How would you Rate Your Skills as a Beginning Teacher Right Now?”**

The questions are in the order that they appear on the questionnaire. These questions are based on our conceptual framework for initial preparation teacher candidates. See details below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Begin Teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>content area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manage behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plan lessons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>design units</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assess learning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diverse learners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ask questions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>listen &amp; respond</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-evaluate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethics &amp; laws</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluate materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leadership role</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Satisfaction with other aspects of the Field-Based Cohort-Only Programs

**Figure 24 – 2004 Milledgeville (Dr. Jackson) Special Education Program Ratings (n = 23)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details:</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentor leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOE instructors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liscense exam prep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make connections</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>field experiences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>host tchr teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>host tchr mentoring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>core courses</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dr. Jackson’s Special Education Cohort

Preservice Teacher Responses to Open-Ended Questions

1. There were some really good aspects of my teacher preparation program at GC&SU. They were:

Amount of IEP practice required--I am ready to write them & host meetings
Application of coursework to classroom practicums-made teaching feel "real" & gained useful experiences
Attending professional conferences.
Behavior management class. Learned about various behaviors disorders and learned a variety and techniques and behavioral modification
Being prepared to begin teaching
Caring staff at GC&SU as well as community members
CEC-council for exceptional children, professionalism
Communicating and working in groups as a family.
Course work demanding but worth it
Culture and language class. Learned how to accept and teach a very diverse group of learners. Learned how to effectively communicate my families and students.
Culture and language, ethnographic interventions, neighborhood maps
Evaluation class. Learned various evaluations to give and assessments
Focus on teacher preparation program in order to better upcoming teachers. The behavior courses were helpful.
Getting to know my mentor leader as a professional and as a friend. She was very supportive throughout the whole thing!
Getting to know others in my field and having a support system throughout the program.
Going through 2 years with the same people. Get to know everyone well and comfortable sharing and asking for help
Guidance (leadership)
Hands on experience, working in the classroom, and taking charge of the classroom for a year
Having a lot of time in the classroom during my placements
Having others to help you because they are going through the same things you are
I feel as though I can talk intelligently about my field.
I felt that our time in the classroom was beneficial
I have been able to improve my organization skills because in this program you have to be. I have become much better with my time management and practicing.
I have been fortunate to work in a wide variety of school systems that have helped me to observe different teaching styles and their effectiveness.
I really enjoyed having a mentor leader who was always there for me and help me grow into a professional teacher.
I was able to get a lot of field experience in many different grade levels.
I was given a mentor leader that honestly cared about me as a person and strived to turn me into a highly qualified educator.
Legal classes, learning classes and policies, and technology
Making sure that I developed into a professional special education teacher
Making sure that I utilized what I learned in the classrooms
Making sure that I was involved in field work.
Mentor leader-Dr. Jackson is awesome. She is always there when needed and helps with personal/school related situations.
My cohort mentor was very supportive. She always available and give redirection if necessary.
My mentor leader being so helpful when I had questions
My mentor leader Dr. Rosemary Jackson was extremely professional, caring, organized and supportive. My mentor leader was wonderful. My senior year placement. This helped me see how much I really know and what I can improve on. Obtaining content knowledge to support teaching knowledge in field placements. Over 1000 hours of classroom experience-priceless!

Student/mentor relationships
Support system, advisor hands-on very personal, felt like I was valued as a student.
Teachers at GC&SU were willing to help and were very understanding in crisis situation.
The ability to stay ahead of the game when it comes to strategies in education.
The amount of field placement time was extremely helpful. I feel prepared in going into a classroom.
The amount and variety of field placement
The amount of classroom experiences
The behavior courses offered were extremely beneficial to me in the development of my behavioral intervention strategies.
The bond between cohort members and professors
The cohort program itself, I love being close with 24 people for 2 years. You have each other to learn on during good and bad times.
The collaboration between members of the cohort.
The experience in the classroom. Everything I learned in my classes came together during my placements.
The field base experience was valuable. I feel better prepared for my 1st year teaching.
The field based intense program.
The field experience opportunities.
The field placement experience.
The intimacy of a small cohort group to take classes with.
The major projects (TWS, service learning) helped me in writing not only lessons but assessing student learning.
The mentor leader. I was able to form a close relationship with my leader and this helped tremendously throughout the year.
The numerous classes on diversity.
The opportunity to be out in the classrooms.
The placement teachers.
The support of the professors and instructors in getting assignments completed and positive feedback on all assignments.
The willingness of my cohort leader to help me in any way she could.
To guide and show us how to become professional.
To help us become architect of change.
Wonderful advisor (Dr. Rosemary Jackson)
Working with Dr. Larry Bacnik who is great with technology realizing the effectiveness I have in being a teacher. Being able to see how well a classroom can be with thorough preparation.
2. There were some aspects of the teacher preparation program at GC&SU that could be better. They were:

Accommodations for nontraditional students such as placements closer to their home for less distance commuting.
Advise students to start taking the 4S/6A history tests before the cohort or starting their junior year.
All aspects of this program were satisfying to the best of my knowledge, and no improvements needed at this time.
All aspects were great the only thing I wanted to cancel or be changed was the amount of class time that was all with practicums.
At times the intensity of the program becomes overwhelming.
Better qualified host teachers
Collaboration. Work more with early childhood and middle grades to improve views and attitudes towards special education.
Content courses; provide more instruction on practical ways to teach these different subjects. Our classes just taught skills, not methods
Distribution of work load. Distribute projects more evenly throughout the year. I felt some of the course work was redundant or busy work during free time teaching it is extremely difficult to teach, plan for your students, do your own class work.
Evaluations from our host teachers could be done less (instead of every week)
Finding an easier way to manage class work and field work for students
Have definite distinctions between each class that is taken because they have similarities that prove to be confusing.
I feel as though the special education got left out of many things as was always last to be told any changes going on.
I felt that as a special education teacher, the science class was not beneficial.
I think they should think of more collaboration ideas or classes with the other cohorts in education
Involvement in field placements. I would have liked for my mentor to see more of what was taught in the classroom
More accountability of host teachers
More collaboration among GC&SU professors and other cohorts
More direction in the beginning--some of the time I felt like I didn't really know what was going on and the teachers didn't either (mostly in classes like science and culture & language)
More subject-based courses to prepare for curriculum in schools.
One of my host teachers was a provisional and had not taken Praxis I. I was not able to gain useful knowledge and experience from her.
Placements in both years maybe have students be able to take classes for beginning of semester and then go out into schools. It was difficult to focus on more individual aspect of learning.
Project explanations; focus on a group at a time
Schedule. There was a lot of class work at times and almost none at others. It would be helpful to spread the coursework over a longer period of time.
Science course
So many assignments/projects going on at the same time
Some of the classes we took during our two years were useless to me.
Some of the course work in the program could be taken out
Some of the other classes that were useless
The classes take with early childhood, make more connection to special education and make more connection to high school and middle grades
The literacy and technology courses offered during fall semester of my senior year were not geared toward application. Concepts presented, additionally, these courses were not considerate of our target audience, which was children with exceptional needs.
The literacy course had nothing to do with special education and wasn't able to apply anything from that class in my placement.
The load of work could be lightened and little
The open mindedness of some professors to new ideas
The preparation in core subject areas like math and science as fluent to educators
The required math class. I feel the instructor focused more on early childhood and middle grade
The requirement to travel and buy a manual for science class
The science class could have been better. I did not feel like I got any useful knowledge from it.
The science class offered during the fall semester of my junior year was extremely unorganized. I took nothing from this class. The lecture and activities were boring and inconsiderate of multiple intelligences and learning styles.
The science class! Lacked organization, and goals. The science class had nothing to do with teaching science!! There was guidance.
The technology class was horrible. The teacher was nice but a bite but had noting to do with using technology in my classroom.
The work load was hard, but it was when we had to do it that was harder. We had too many tasks at one time.
There were some classes in the fall semester of my junior year that were not helpful in my teacher preparation.
We should be able to keep our laptop for the next two years so that we can implement all that we have learned about technology in our classroom.
Health & Physical Education Milledgeville 2004 Cohort

The cohort (n = 7) had an overall teacher preparation rating of 100% positive.

**Figure 25 – Milledgeville (Dr. Block’s) Health & Physical Education Program**

**Cohort Self-Ratings of “How would you Rate Your Skills as a Beginning Teacher Right Now?”**

The questions are in the order that they appear on the questionnaire. These questions are based on our conceptual framework for initial preparation teacher candidates. See details below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Begin Teaching</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>content area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manage behavior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plan lessons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>design units</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assess learning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diverse learners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ask questions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>listen &amp; respond</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-evaluate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethics &amp; laws</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluate materials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leadership role</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Satisfaction with other aspects of the Field-Based Cohort-Only Programs

Figure 26 – 2004 Milledgeville (Dr. Block) Health & Physical Education Program Ratings (n = 7)

Details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentor leader</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOE instructors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>license exam prep</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make connections</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>field experiences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>host tchr teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>host tchr mentoring</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>core courses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **There were some really good aspects of my teacher preparation program at GC&SU. They were:**

   All of the field-based work in the schools really prepared me to work alone in the classroom. Received plenty of experience working in the classroom.

   Classroom management techniques

   Dissipated time in actual classroom.

   Developing my own health and PE unit plans to teach using my own ideas. Learning how to write unit & lesson plans.

   Diversity in classroom knowledge.

   Dr. Betty Block gave me excellent preparation. Dr. Mike Martin, my field placement at Clifton Ridge Middle School

   Help that I received from fellow cohort members

   I was very well prepared for field work by professors

   Learning to deal with and help exceptional students

   Learning to teach all grades

   My instructors Dr. Black, Dr. Martin.

   My instructors were able to assist in any way I needed

   Program coordinator, Betty Block, was willing to and did help in any way possible.

   School placements

   Student teaching internship at GMC

   Support of Dr. Block and my classmates, became close like a family. We all helped each other with school work.

   Teacher work well one-on-one

2. **There were some aspects of the teacher preparation program at GC&SU that could be better. They were**

   All professors congruent with each other's material in the cohort.

   Change in program, abruptly, and in the middle of my cohort experience

   Dr. Nigel Davies--very narrow minded in our teacher preparation criteria and instruction. He really left us lacking in certain content area knowledge and deterred our motivation

   Extreme differences in professors' views on education styles and techniques.

   For the instructors to give us more field experience in coaching.

   Learn how to write unit plans in the first year instead of the second year.

   More activities classes (work sports)

   More feedback in health classroom

   More in school experience working with students.

   New faculty not complying with program coordinator's goals and requirements, and not possessing effective communication skills or forming positive relationships with students

   Overall process of teaching ex. School fun. Etc

   Professors' support. I felt like I only had the support to succeed from Dr. Block. Dr. Davies game me the impression that he didn't want the senior class to graduate.

   Skills Class. Team sports & individual sports should deal with learning how to teach students several sports.

   Standard format for lesson plans, block plan.

   Two professors had different evaluating form for same lesson. They should have been similar.

   Two professors had different standards for some lesson/work. They should have been on the same page.
Satisfaction with other aspects of the Field-Based Cohort-Only Programs

**Figure 27 – 2004 Milledgeville (Dr. Tolbert’s) Music Education Program Ratings (n = 2)**

![Bar chart showing ratings of Good or Excellent for different aspects of the program.](chart.jpg)

Details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mentor leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOE instructors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liscense exam prep</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make connections</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>field experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>host tchr teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>host tchr mentoring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>core courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dr. Tolbert’s Health & Physical Education Cohort
Preservice Teacher Responses to Open-Ended Questions

1. **There were some really good aspects of my teacher preparation program at GC&SU. They were:**

   Availability of Professors for Consultation

2. **There were some aspects of the teacher preparation program at GC&SU that could be better. They were**

   None