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Summary

99% Rate Their Field-Based Program Positively -- Excellent (60%) or Good (39%)

A Total of Eight Cohorts of Students Participated in the Exit Survey this School Year

1. Overall ratings are about the same as last year; there were 122 participants in the survey.

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 Good or Better are considered Positive on a scale of Poor, Fair, Good, Excellent.

3. The Early Childhood Cohorts rated themselves highest in Overall Preparation to begin teaching. 100% of the Milledgeville cohort rated himself or herself excellent, while 83% of the Macon cohort rated himself or herself excellent. Next highest was Special Education with 68% excellent and Health and Physical Education with 56% rating themselves excellent. The MAT cohorts in Secondary Education were lowest at 14% excellent (Macon) and 44% excellent (Milledgeville).

4. All aspects of the conceptual framework were rated Excellent or Good by 91% to 100% of the preservice teachers at graduation.

5. Ability to use technology in teaching was very high with this year’s graduates. 100% of the Early Childhood Macon campus cohort and 100% of the Physical Education cohort rated themselves Good or Excellent in this skill. Lowest rated was the Middle Grades cohort, even so 78% rated themselves Good or Excellent.

6. 100% of the M.A.T. secondary education preservice teachers rated the Core Curriculum as Good or Excellent. This is the best set of ratings ever, and a good reflection on the School of Liberal Arts & Sciences.

7. Satisfaction with the support of the mentor leaders was the lowest ever this spring. Only 60% of the preservice teachers rated the support they received as Good or Excellent. The graduating early childhood cohort started out with two mentor leaders who resigned and were then mentored by another in a combined cohort. This led to dissatisfaction in that group. The highest rated mentor leaders were Dr. Block with 100% of her 9 students rating her Excellent and Dr. Crabb with 64% of his group of 25 rating him Excellent.

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 2003 Graduates of the
John H. Lounsbury School of Education
Georgia College & State University

Ratings of Student Self-Evaluation of their Skills as a Beginning Teacher

The ratings were slightly better than last year; 99% of the respondents rated their overall preparation to begin teaching as Good (39%) or Excellent (60%). Exit surveys were received from 122 participants.

Figure 1

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

There were 6 cohorts from the main campus at Milledgeville and 2 cohorts from the satellite campus at Macon State College. The Milledgeville cohorts were Early Childhood (n = 34), Health and Physical Education (n = 9), Middle Grades (n = 10), Music (n = 0), Special Education (n = 18), and M.A.T. Secondary Education (n = 26). The Macon cohorts were Early Childhood (n = 15) and M. A. T. Secondary Education (n = 10).

New to the GC&SU Mentor Leader Program was Ms. Melissa Adams. All of the other mentor leaders are experienced and finishing their second or third cohort of initial preparation undergraduates.
Since each cohort is a completely different group of students with a different mentor leader, year-to-year comparisons may be very unreliable. There were no music education graduates this year.

There were 13 specific skill areas in which the participants were asked to rate how well prepared they felt at this specific time. The charts on the next page show the percent of good or excellent ratings for each skill rated. These graduating preservice teachers rated their skills consistently high this year; even managing behavior was higher by 9%. There is still a lot of variation in technology ratings from cohort to cohort.
Self-Ratings of Specific Skills Stressed in the JHL-SOE Conceptual Framework

**Figure 4 - May 2003 Graduates**

- Begin Teaching: 98%
- Plan Lessons: 96%
- Evaluate Materials: 96%
- Design Units: 96%
- Manage Behavior: 95%
- Content Area: 95%
- Technology: 92%
- Ask Questions: 91%
- Leadership Role: 91%
- Ethics & Laws: 91%
- Listen & Respond: 91%
- Self-Evaluate: 98%
- Evaluate Materials: 98%
- Design Units: 98%
- Diverse Learners: 96%
- Ethics & Laws: 95%
- Leadership Role: 92%

**Figure 5 - May 2002 Graduates**

- Plan Lessons: 99%
- Evaluate Materials: 97%
- Content Area: 96%
- Design Units: 95%
- Assess Learning: 95%
- Diverse Learners: 93%
- Ethics & Laws: 93%
- Technology: 91%
- Leadership Role: 90%
- Ask Questions: 88%
- Manage Behavior: 82%
- Self-Evaluate: 91%
- Evaluate Materials: 91%
- Design Units: 91%
- Diverse Learners: 91%
- Leadership Role: 90%
- Ethics & Laws: 90%
- Technology: 88%
- Leadership Role: 82%
- Ask Questions: 82%
- Manage Behavior: 82%
Content area knowledge is remaining much higher. Self-ratings of their ability to assess learning in their students have gone up somewhat after the drop last year. The differences in these measures were statistically significant at the .01 level. Each year represents different cohorts of students with different mentor leaders, so some variations are to be expected.
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 below the others, but the improved ratings have been maintained from 36% positive in the 2000 cohorts. Most of the ratings are about the same as last year.

Figure 7 - May 2003 Graduates

Figure 8 - May 2002 Graduates
The drop in ratings of the support given by the mentor leader is unexpectedly low compared to previous years. The Early Childhood cohort in Milledgeville was combined from two cohorts to one and given to a new faculty member. This can account for some of this drop. Also the MAT in Macon cohort was shared between two mentor leaders, one of who was also new faculty.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentor Leaders</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC Mgvle</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC Macon</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MG Mgvle</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAT Mgvle</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAT Macon</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SpEd Mgvle</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HPE Mgvle</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>32.2%</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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Preparation for Praxis 2</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC Mgvle</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC Macon</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MG Mgvle</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT Mgvle</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT Macon</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpEd Mgvle</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPE Mgvle</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Special Education (83%) and Health & Physical Education (100%) Majors feel the best prepared to take the Praxis II exam. Health & Physical Education majors report special study sessions as being very helpful for their Praxis II examinations. 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. However MAT program participants have to take three graduate courses in the major areas.

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.
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 34% of these respondents. Of the remaining students, 83% rated their core classes as Good or Excellent. There were no ratings of poor this year, which is an improvement over last year.

Figure 11 – May 2003 Graduates
### Figure 12 - Satisfaction with Core Curriculum Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC Mgvle</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MG Mgvle</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAT Mgvle</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAT Macon</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SpEd Mgvle</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HPE Mgvle</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The M.A.T. students gave the highest ratings to their core classes; 100% of 29 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.
Breakdown of Exit Survey Satisfaction Ratings by Programs

Secondary Education (M.A.T.)
The Milledgeville cohort (n = 18) had an overall teacher preparation rating of 94% positive. There are some missing data as not all respondents indicated which program they were in.

Figure 13 – Milledgeville (Dr. Crabb & Dr. Jones) M.A.T. Program in Secondary Education 2003 Cohort Ratings of How would you Rate Your Skills as a Beginning Teacher Right Now?

Ratings of Good or Excellent

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

**Figure 14 – 2003 Milledgeville (Dr. Crabb & Dr. Jones) M.A.T. Program Ratings (n = 26)**

Ratings of Good or Excellent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mentor leader</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOE instructors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liscense exam prep</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make connections</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>field experiences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>host tchr teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>host tchr mentoring</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>core courses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Details:
Dr. Crabb & Dr. Jones, M.A.T. Cohort, Milledgeville Campus

Respondents Responses to Open-Ended Questions

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

- Allowed us to get hands on experience
- Behavior management class prepared me greatly with different techniques and strategies
- Class work was practical and applicable to actual teaching
- Cohort concept
- Dr. Crabb, always there for students to answer questions or help make adjustments
- Dr. Crabb, he is excellent, very caring, approachable and knowledgeable
- Dr. Kevin Crabb
- Dr. Kevin Crabb
- Encouraging myself as well as others to read more and be enthusiastic about it
- Excellent instruction from Dr. Crabb
- Field experience
- Field experiences from day one of the program
- Field experiences, invaluable in learning my student's needs as well as my own strengths/weaknesses as an instructor
- Great host teacher
- Having the same professors for most of your classes
- I felt that the advisors were very knowledgeable about the real classroom
- I learned a good amount about various teaching strategies that are connected to different learning theories
- I learned how to adjust instruction according to students’ level of learning
- I liked that the program was only for one year
- I liked the fall classes more than the spring classes
- It only lasted one year
- LB, BD, ADHD and MR classes were filled with knowledge and I gained a lot from those classes
- Learning hands-on about the "between the lines" curriculum
- Learning of real world application activities to ensure learning
- Liked 1 year program
- Only 1 year, this schedule for 2 years would drive me nuts
- Practical application in the classroom
- Preparing us for the realities of classroom teaching
- Received good base knowledge on ways to conduct a classroom
- Rigorous and extensive teaching experience
- Short duration of program
- Spending a lot of time in classroom getting teaching experience
- Student teaching
- Student teaching allowed us to see what was really involved in the teaching process
- Student teaching prepared me the most. Experience is the key
- Teaching us how to reach appeal to all students
- The 10-week student teaching experience
- The courses
- The emphasis on application and real world application
- The emphasis placed on cultural diversity
- The knowledge and experience of Dr. Crabb
- The mentor leader
- The professors
- The way every one was willing to help
- The wonderful teachers I was placed with during my practicum and student teaching
- The work was beneficial
- Working in a cohort
- Working with very knowledgeable mentor, K. Crabb
2. There were some aspects of the teacher preparation program at GC&SU that could be better. They were:

- Classes required to take in MAT
- Could have had more job hunting info
- Disorganized teachers and program, poor role modeling of accurate and fair grading timelines
- Disorganized teachers in the areas of classroom management, content knowledge, poor role modeling for teacher expectations, not prepared to teach, no consistency in the courses or course work, received no feedback on work
- Evaluate work as we go along. Getting more feedback would be good.
- Guidelines and expectations were not present or were unclear in various MAT courses
- I learned more from my host teacher than I did my mentor
- I want specific content area help in planning and best practices
- Instructor preparation, several instructors seemed unclear on what was required of them and seemed to just "shoot from the hip"
- Instructors chosen for certain classes could have been better. Technology class was a waste
- It would be nice to have a timeline of events we should be doing as 1st year teachers. (When to interview, when should we worry when we do not have jobs, etc)
- Literacy class, not useful for me
- Longer student teaching during spring
- Mentor leader support. She was very supportive but often not there when needed
- Mentor leaders should be rethought. Not Crabb
- Middle school practicum, needs to be more relevant to program instead of just slave labor as it was in my experience
- More effective teachers
- More job search or job search preparation opportunities, how to complete a resume, philosophy, interview, etc
- More organization
- More organization with the program
- More preparation and assistance with resume writing, filling out job apps. When preparing to embark upon finding employment
- Most host teachers with master degree and good reputation for being a good instructor of their subject area
- Need to be very specific with spring student teaching
- Received little or no feedback from mentor leaders or teachers the entire year
- Schedule during spring semester, 3 weeks of solid class? 500 hours of work due last week? Come on…
- Separate class work for better time management
- Some things were not fair
- Structure and material of classes
- Student teaching and classes at the same time, it was difficult to keep up
- Summer, fall, spring, and summer instead of fall, spring only
- Teacher work sample
- Teachers for classes such as technology and reading were extremely ineffective
- Technology
- Technology, did not really learn anything I did not already know
- Technology and literacy to be more useful to all content areas
- Technology class was a huge waste
- Technology class, could be structured to help prepare better
- Technology, class was pointless
- The way in which the 2nd semester was planned. It was particularly brutal
- The way the education classes are structured
- Time constraints
- Too much busy work, seemed to not support anything
- Too much jammed into boring term
- Try not to let people outside the department teach courses because they do not lessen the program structure or the students
- TWS needs to be fixed
- Was not as prepared for Praxis II as I would have liked to be
Secondary Education (M.A.T.) in Macon
The Macon cohort (n = 7) 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 - 2003 (Drs. Alby & Hlawaty) Ratings
2003 Cohort Ratings of How would you Rate Your Skills as a Beginning Teacher Right Now?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>content area</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manage behavior</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plan lessons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>design units</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assess learning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diverse learners</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ask questions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>listen &amp; respond</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-evaluate</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethics &amp; laws</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluate materials</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leadership role</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Details:
Figure 16 – 2003 Macon (Drs. Alby & Hlawaty) M.A.T. Program Ratings (n = 10)

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>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOE instructors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liscense exam prep</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make connections</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>field experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>host tchr teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>host tchr mentoring</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>core courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Counts not shown in the bar chart are: SOE instructors - 0, liscense exam prep - 0, make connections - 0, field experiences - 0, host tchr teaching - 0, host tchr mentoring - 0, core courses - 0.
1. There were some really good aspects of my teacher preparation program at GC&SU. They were:

- Appreciation of diversity
- Diversity course
- Field placements
- Most of the classes were relevant and useful
- My classmates
- Research Class
- Support from my host teachers
- The experiences were great in preparation for teaching
- Variety of usable activities
- Working with the same group of students and getting to know them

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

- Better organized according to schedules
- More communication from mentors about requirements, deadlines and expectations
- More mentor leader involvement with individual projects
- More support related to student teaching experiences
- Organization
- Student teaching and classes split
- Ways of making a connection between the classroom and fieldwork
- Direction
- More observations while in the classroom
- More time flexibility. It is nearly impossible to have any sort of job
- Realistic preparation
- Reading, not sure where it fit
Breakdown of Exit Survey Satisfaction Ratings by Programs

**Early Childhood Cohort**
The Milledgeville cohort (n = 29) 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 17 – Milledgeville (Ms. Adams) Early Childhood Education Program**

2003 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>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>content area</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manage behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plan lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>design units</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assess learning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diverse learners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ask questions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>listen &amp; respond</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-evaluate</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethics &amp; laws</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluate materials</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leadership role</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Satisfaction with other aspects of the Field-Based Cohort-Only Programs

**Figure 18 – 2003 Milledgeville (Ms. Adams) Early Childhood Program Ratings (n = 34)**

Ratings of Good or Excellent

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

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>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOE instructors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liscense exam prep</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make connections</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>field experiences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>host tchr teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>host tchr mentoring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>core courses</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ms. Adams’ Early Childhood Milledgeville Cohort

Respondents Responses to Open-Ended Questions

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

4-blocks was great. Real teachers taught us
A lot of time spent in the schools teaching
Ability to learn/teach/support diverse learners
All field experiences a change to implement lessons
My entire field based experiences
Although it was unavoidable, not having one single mentor leader throughout the entire program was detrimental.
Behavior management, management plans.
Certain team teaching opportunities were wonderful to see when successful work was shown
Classes prepared me for teaching
Classes: teachers as learners, psychology educational, culture and language
Classroom preparation. Logical thought materials box. Over materials bought for field experiences and class assignments.
Closeness of students and teachers
Cohort. Having members of the program there to support and encourage me through the challenges and successes
Content knowledge
Course content. Most classes provided me with knowledge that I could immediately use in placement
Creating and implementing lesson plans. 7 weeks of full-time lesson plans (4 QCC referenced) completely written out
Dean Fields openness to students and their ideas
Dr. Rickman was good, I was sad she left
Effective instruction and instructors
Excellent relationship built with host teachers
Exposed to different classrooms with diverse learners
Exposure to different classrooms, discipline styles or management
Field experience
Field experience. I believe this hands-on opportunity was a very efficient way to gain knowledge about this profession
Field experiences, opportunities in the classroom
Field placement
Field placement - developmental learning
Field placements
Full-time teaching was the best for me because I needed the hands-on experience
GCSU education program is known all across the state of Georgia because of its … of creating mostly teachers
Good reputation of the school of Ed
Great experience being in the schools
Great instructors and dean
Great partner schools. I was in great placements with host teachers who taught me a lot.
How to make a unit
I did create some helpful teaching units/projects that will better my future classroom
I feel as though my teachers really cared about me becoming a good teacher
I felt there was too much busy work that I could not find a reason for doing. While I was trying to do my student teaching I had to worry about college work
I had wonderful field experiences at Blandy Hills and Jones County
I know how to make daily, weekly lesson plans, units for every grade level
I learned how to reflect in a meaningful way
I learned theories that have helped me in my teaching preparation
I made a good group of friends in the cohort
I was able to gain knowledge about my teaching through being observed and critiqued
Learned much more in field placements than could have by reading a book
Learning about 4-blocks and brain-based learning
Learning what not to do from all of the horrible placements
Liberal arts connections class
Logical thought. Learning hands-on activities to use in the classroom.
Lots of field experience and time to teach
Lots of field experiences allowed me to see new and different ways of teaching
Many hours in the classroom, great experience
Many hours of field experience
Most of the classes truly helped prepared me for teaching such as logical thought, management, teachers as leaders, and assessment
Most professors provided good feedback and support
Most things connected to prior knowledge
Mrs. Shiver to teach us math
Mrs. Warren really helped me; she was the best instructor I had
Mrs. Warren willing to help in any way she could
My host teacher this past semester
My host teachers were excellent role models
My math course with Dr. Shiver
My time working at Wells primary and the 4-block literacy plan
Placement. Most of what I learned came from field placement
Planning and implementing units
Preparation for the real world, job interviews
Preparation via use of resource files, etc
Preparing me for being a teacher. I feel very prepared
Provided me with a knowledge of theorists, teaching strategies, and management strategies
Provided me with recourse and knowledge to create units that involve all learners
Relation of class concepts to placement
Some courses, culture, language, creative expressions, logical thought, leadership, social studies to name a few, wonderful asset to knowledge
Teachers as leaders class
The ability to work with a group of students that want to be teachers
The activities I was assigned that will be things I can use in my own classroom, such as literacy bags, materials box, etc
The amount of field experience, very helpful, especially the different grades and schools.
The assessment class and teachers as leaders class were very helpful
The content I gained from classes especially teachers as learners and social studies
The field experience in different grade levels
The field experience is fantastic. I attended every grade level with the exception of 1st grade
The field experience was wonderful. I learned a great deal from my host teachers, the different grade levels, and the different schools I was able to work in
The field placements allowed you correct the theories I learned about to the children I was teaching
The help and advisement of several professors especially Dr. Russell;
The many hours of classroom experience
The professor's content knowledge is great. Most are in and out of schools so they are familiar with programs
The teachers as leaders class. It has really prepared me.
The teachers treated us fairly and equally as professionals
The teaching experience in the classroom
The variety of host teachers I was able to have. I saw many teachers, many rules and classroom procedures, room set-ups, etc
There was always someone around to answer my questions, not necessary the mentor leader.
Wonderful Dean of Early Childhood education

2. There were some aspects of the teacher preparation program at GC&SU that could be better. They were:
Arrangement of course classes. Assessment at beginning. Theorist towards the end.
Assessment should be on junior year. They need it to know how to plan units, and it is on the Praxis II, which you take in the summer
Be sure of whom the cohort leader is before you assign one to a cohort. In cohort in Milledgeville (ECE) had 3 (disequilibrium in students)
Better explanation of course work junior year, much of it seemed to be busy work, not helping me in my teaching
Both cohorts were not always treated fairly and were not all given information in a timely manner
Busy work, some assignments were helpful and meaningful, but several were not
Class work while in placement was extremely stressful sometimes
Classes could have been in better order. Assessment before TWS
Collaboration by the instructors, science, assessment.
Communication between faculty and students
Consistency with all cohorts in same are like EC or all MG
Co-teachers need to be consistent when grading
Course work required during final internship
Course work. Most of the work completed was busy work and did not help me become a better teacher
Double standards. We are expected to be professional but the way Mrs. Adams acts is very unprofessional
Each class we took needs evaluation of the objects being taught and who is teaching to us
Effect communication. Classes changed frequently. Assignments not clearly stated
Elimination of projects that are not going to really apply to teaching
Entirely too much busy work while we are in our placements
Feedback from mentor leader. Senior year only; junior year was great
Half of the courses given will never use. I also know this because I talked to seniors last year who said that they were …
Have assessment class before unit. It would make more sense knowing the purposes of assessment, different types, etc
Have classes that pertain to early child. Ed, science and SS did not really pertain to us. The info, we learned was for middle grades.
Having to drive to Macon and often elementary schools to the classes
I feel like the mentors chosen to lead us should want to be here to help support the students, not just to receive a paycheck
It was very hard to focus on being a good student teacher because I had to be overly concerned about my GCSU work on top of student teaching
Keeping one host teacher for the entire 2 years program. One teacher per group for the full 2 years early childhood program
Length of classes. Too long in one subject
Less busy work and more meaningful work
Literacy 3 was ineffective not relevant I had to do a play where I was raped and delivered twins
Literacy 3 was not relevant to other coursework. Teachers were unprepared. Course was vulgar with "fairy tales"
Lots of disorganization, I went through many mentor leaders
Make assignments more realistic to what we experience in the classroom
Math classes stink, except for Mrs. Shivers
Mentor leader involvement. Too many students to advise, not enough personal attention
Mentor leaders actually seeing us teach
More classroom observations. Having a set time each week to meet and discuss problems and issues that arise
More field time, placements were the most beneficial
More input from students about our classes. We would post ideas and thoughts a WebCT but never went over those
More knowledge on how to work with parents in professional manner
More observation in placement by college administration
More organization of mentor leader. We had 3. Not much guidance for us.
More time of mentor leader observation of my teaching and communication with host teachers
Mrs. Adams needs to be more organized. The leadership should re-evaluate itself. Taking classes while full time teaching is too stressful, something will not receive the attention it needs
Needed more praxis preparation
No life in the cohort. We are still regular college students.
No support/concern from mentor leader, not even a good reference, 1 paragraph. Kind of sad. Mentor leader only saw me teach 2 times in 2 years.
Number of students should be considered. The professors do not need to have a huge number for visiting schools
Often times the teachers who team-taught our courses did not get along with each other
One or two classes that I feel I got nothing out of, such as science (junior year). I did not gain anything in this class that prepared me to teach.
Organization (scheduling)
Organization. Often the teachers of the course are unsure of how they want specific assignments done. Often the directions for projects are unclear and the objectives are vague
Placements
Preparation by some instructors, do not change things the week or day before assignment is due
Preparation for Praxis
Professors and mentor leaders that do not treat us with respect as professional teachers entering the profession of teaching
Professors, remember that we are still students. This is our first time being in the cohort. Things are new to us. Do not forget how you would teach your students if you were still in the public school
Requiring seniors during internship to complete assignments when we are responsible for teaching children
Sequence of classes
Some of my professors (mainly one - Adams) have double standards. I feel that we are taught to be one way when some professors are not the way they teach us to be.

Some of the classes should have been scheduled differently. We had to create and analyze assessments before we had a class on assessments.

Some professors or mentor leaders seemed very unaware of how difficult the program was for us.

Some things could be more organized.

Sometimes the mentor was not there. Though through email we were successful.

Standards preparation
Stress. You should not develop all the physical problems that we have in a college class. I myself developed insomnia.

Several problems became chronically depressed and had to go on medication.

Student teachers should not have to worry about assignments while full time teaching.

Take assessment class during junior year.

Teach us how to teach math, science, and social studies. Now I know info about each one, I now have to figure out my own how to teach it.

Teachers reaching courses could work better together and help their students better.

The amount of work that did not prepare me. Some of the activities/assignments seemed to be busy work or did not related to my teaching. Especially the amount of work assigned during student teaching.

The emotional stress I received because of the program was very hard to deal with. Every GCSU instructor felt their class was the only important class we had. I was not allowed to have a life outside of the cohort, which is not healthy or realistic.

The mentor leaders need to screened better. My leader was unprofessional in many different ways and situations. If I am told what I am doing is unprofessional, but the leader is doing the exact same thing now do I know is wrong.

The timing of classes could be worked around different and be managed properly.

There was so much stress laid on my shoulders due to much homework and impossible course requirements.

There were a few classes such as literacy 3 that had little relevance for teaching preparation. Also, science for teachers, the instructors seemed to be uncooperative with each other.

There were a few teachers that I had trouble getting long with.

Too much busy work.

Too much busy work, some assignments had no meaning.

Too much course work during full time student teaching, need one or the other, either teaching or student.

Unrelated course work to placement needs.

Wasting time in class, stretching out things to end of class.

We needed assessment class first semester senior year.

We should have started standards notebook junior year.

What we did while in those placements.
Early Childhood Cohort
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 19 – Macon (Dr. Hunnicutt) Early Childhood Education Program
2003 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>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>content area</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technology</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manage behavior</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plan lessons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>design units</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assess learning</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diverse learners</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ask questions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>listen &amp; respond</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-evaluate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethics &amp; laws</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluate materials</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leadership role</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Satisfaction with other aspects of the Field-Based Cohort-Only Programs

Figure 20 – 2003 Macon (Dr. Hunnicutt) Early Childhood Program Ratings (n = 15)

Ratings of Good or Excellent

<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>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOE instructors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liscense exam prep</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make connections</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>field experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>host tchr teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>host tchr mentoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>core courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

   - All classes with Dr. Trish Klein. She was professional knowledgeable, organized, helpful, made learning diverse, exciting, and challenging.
   - Amount of time in field placements.
   - Assessment course: this class was very challenging, but the amount of knowledge I gained was tremendous.
   - Being a part of a small cohort was great. We became really close and were a great support for each other.
   - Being able to be in the classroom from the beginning of my junior year. Great experience and I learned a lot.
   - Being able to experience such diversity in students as a result of being in several different schools.
   - Being able to gain experience in different grade levels.
   - Being in a cohort situation provided the support I needed to get through this program.
   - Cohort experience.
   - Cohort members, we were all here for each other.
   - Field experience: I learned the most from being in my placement.
   - Field placement throughout the two years.
   - Field placements.
   - Field placements in the first year is wonderful and puts us a way ahead of other programs.
   - Getting more familiar with the computer.
   - Going through the program as a group is great.
   - Having other cohort members to bond with.
   - Having so many hours of field experience has made the most difference for me.
   - I liked the fact that I was in the public schools from the beginning.
   - I loved being in a cohort.
   - I was glad that I could do the program in Macon.
   - Integrating theory in classroom practices.
   - Knowing that my mentor leader was there to assist me.
   - Learning how to collaborate with others.
   - Learning how to effectively collaborate with other teachers.
   - Learning to develop thematic units.
   - Learning to teach using multiple ... 
   - Literacy II course: again very challenging but really gained a lot from the experience.
   - Most instructors were eager to help and offer advice.
   - Preparation for creating thematic units and incorporating different learning styles multiple disciplines and developmentally appropriate lesson plans.
   - Pre-planning our senior year, I learned a lot.
   - The amount of classroom experience was wonderful. I feel very prepared for next year because of this.
   - The amount of field experience and placements with knowledgeable host teachers helped me gain valuable skills.
   - The amount of time spent at placement schools.
   - The immediate transition into the school system.
   - The use of the cohort program.
   - Useful assignments, creation of a portfolio, thematic unit, reflections, video critiques, etc.
   - Working in field placements.
2. **There were some aspects of the teacher preparation program at GC&SU that could be better.**

   **They were:**
   - A better math program is crucial. The 1st math class we had did not teach us a thing about how to teach children math.
   - A math course that teaches us to teach the children we will be working with. We need to learn to teach concepts so that young children can follow them.
   - Do not leave the work sample for the last semester. We should have done that in the fall.
   - Explanation of assignments: I found that my mentor leader was unable to provide adequate directions for assignments given by the school of education.
   - Give more time for quality work vs. quantity of work.
   - Hardly no support of the mentor leader in the student teaching internship; I was observed only once.
   - I feel that less college class work during the formal student teaching would be ideal. This way it would allow the student teacher to focus more on student teaching and give her students 100%.
   - I signed up for the Macon campus I had to go to Milledgeville too often for no reason.
   - I wish instructors would work more together in order to keep overall workload down. We found ourselves repeating work for several different teachers in different ways or formats.
   - Improve quality of work, not quantity.
   - Less work overall, this way the cohort students could focus on quality not quantity. Many times we had so much to do, we just did our assignments as quick as we could so we could move on to the next thing that was due.
   - Macon campus should be included more in the school of education. Even though we are not on the main campus, we still attend GCSU.

   **Math classes**
   - Math courses: I did learn and again knowledge from these course but we were not taught to learn math.
   - Math teachers.
   - Mentor leader not able to keep up with work turned in. I work hard and want my things back.
   - More quality time in Field Placement.
   - More support from mentor leader.
   - More support from the mentor leader in field placement observations and evaluations.
   - Needs better leaders that can really help us.
   - Online experiences, emails to late at night for change of assignments for the next morning. Tests online were very bad they were scored wrong and were entered wrong.
   - Organization of assignments, expectations should be clearly stated in syllabi and adhered to.
   - Organization of classes.
   - Organization: The Macon cohort was disorganized and we rarely knew things that the cohorts in Milledgeville did.
   - I personally missed a class because my mentor leader did not make me aware of a time change.

   **Praxis II wants to know how we will teach math. Model these concepts.**
   - Preparation of some instructors/mentor leaders.
   - Professors should communicate within department so that there are no duplications of work. Math courses need to be more relevant to the field of education.
   - The amount of assignments that had to be done. While completing full time student teaching.
   - The classes we took should focus more on teaching us how to teach. Professors need to model for us. Out of 3 math classes, we were never taught how to teach math.

   **The length of classes**
   - The mentor leader was unorganized, unprofessional, not available, late or did not show up, lost assignments, changed syllabus 4 times, changes due dates, observed in placement twice.

   **The number of observations done while at placement**
   - The organization of mentor leaders needs improvement. No preparation at all for preparing math lessons for your placements hardly at all, need more modeling of how to teach math instead of core courses in math.
   - The technology course needs someone more qualified. I could have taught the course.
   - The workload should be cut down. There were too many assignments for me to be able to put 1005 into each.
   - Assignments should be meaningful, not busy work.
   - The workload was almost unbearable and contained a lot of busy work. GCSU needs to focus on the most important areas of teaching and do more modeling of correct teaching practices in the classroom.

   **There are needs to be a math class that helps prepare pre-service teachers to teach math**
   - There were some irrelevant assignments.
   - Too much work to be done during student teaching. It was impossible to give 100% to either placement work or college work. Please teach assessment and tech in first year.
   - Too many trips (unexpected) to Milledgeville, during the first semester at GCSU.
   - Too much busy work. We need assignments that will benefit us when we get our own classrooms.
   - We were not properly taught to teach math. By taking college math courses, we are not learning methods of teaching.
Middle Grades Milledgeville Cohort
The cohort (n = 9) 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. Mizelle) Middle Grades Education Program**

**2003 Cohort Ratings of How would you Rate Your Skills as a Beginning Teacher Right Now?**

![Bar chart showing ratings of Good or Excellent for various skills](chart.png)

Details:

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

Figure 22 – 2003 Milledgeville (Dr. Mizelle) Middle Grades Education Program Ratings (n = 10)

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></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOE instructors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liscense exam prep</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make connections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>field experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>host tchr teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>host tchr mentoring</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>core courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dr. Mizelle’s Middle Grades Education Cohort

Respondents Responses to Open-Ended Questions

1. There were some really good aspects of my teacher preparation program at GC&SU. They were:
   - All encompassing good relevance to courses and fieldwork
   - Being part of a cohort created a comfortable environment that I enjoyed growing in
   - Fellow students helped each other and without this support some would not have made it through
   - I enjoyed working with different host teachers because I gained a great deal of knowledge from them
   - I liked how the cohort felt like a family unit. It was very helpful during stressful times
   - Learning about adolescence growth
   - Learning different strategies and then being responsible for teaching them in the field really helped me make connections
   - Lots of experience in the field and many hours of real teaching
   - So much field experience helped me to build confidence and bring this confidence into my student teaching.
   - Support of the staff; they truly want us to succeed
   - The amount of field experience we were provided with was the best preparation out of everything
   - The amount of time offered in the field experiences
   - The amount of time spent in a classroom setting
   - The amount of time spent out in the field
   - The connections made between the theory and practice of education
   - The constant support of mentor leaders and professors in the SOE
   - The field experience that I obtained through the program because of it I feel prepared and confident in my teaching skills
   - The field experiences were the best part of my cohort program because I feel very prepared for my first year of teaching
   - The flexibility provided by our mentor leader
   - The in-depth field experiences that we had
   - The support of a cohort mentor leader is the only way I got through this program sane
   - The support offered by my mentor leader and peers in the cohort
   - The variations of placements that I was able to be a part of I was able to view many strategies and styles of teaching
   - Working closely and collaborating with a group of peers (cohort itself)
   - Working closely with a small group of people over the span of two years

2. There were some aspects of the teacher preparation program at GC&SU that could be better. They were:
   - A focus on quantity of work as opposed to quality of work, we have been exposed to many different areas of teaching which is good, however, I feel that quantity could before quality at times
   - I would have also liked to have finished most major projects such as action research, TWS, and begun my assessment portfolio first semester of my senior year, so I could have had more time to focus on student teaching
   - More observation time in different content area classrooms
   - Need more concentration on classes (core) such as science classes. We need more background classes in our core, science especially (a little less language arts)
   - Often times we had so much extra work to do in our student teaching that we could not focus 100% on curriculum
   - Only do student teaching, do not put any other work on student
   - So much to do in the student teaching experience that all my effort could not be placed on my students or my lessons.
   - Spreading out assignments that needed to be turned in
   - The amount of work was too high. The quality of my work was poor, because I was just trying to get it all done. I did not learn as much as I could if I could have focused on each assignment
   - The amounts of work, in that too many huge assignments are due at close dates
The tremendous workload in the second semester of the senior year. The last semester should focus on the
student teaching and exit requirements. Is there any way to work the actual college courses into another
semester of the program?
The worst part about my program was going to placement half a day and then going to class because I felt that I
could have taken in more if I would have went to one or the other.
To cover topics/concepts in more depth
To work at slower pace, if possible
Work-study do not do last semester
Special Education Milledgeville Cohort
The cohort (n = 19) 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 23 – Milledgeville (Dr. Childre) Special Education Program

2003 Cohort Ratings of How would you Rate Your Skills as a Beginning Teacher Right Now?

Ratings of Good or Excellent

Details:

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

Figure 24 – 2003 Milledgeville (Dr. Childre) Special Education Program Ratings (n = 18)

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>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOE instructors</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liscense exam prep</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make connections</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>field experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>host tchr teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>host tchr mentoring</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>core courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. There were some really good aspects of my teacher preparation program at GC&SU. They were:

An incredible amount of experience in the field such experiences prepared me for teaching in ways that I could never learn in a book
Being able to actually have field experience with teaching
Being able to make the connection of what was taught in the classroom to my field experience
Collaboration with early childhood cohort members
Dr. Childre's help with any area of education I had questions in i.e. graduate program, resumes, and professionalism
Dr. Smith's and Mr. Moncrief's behavior management and EBD classes
Field experience
Gave me confidence in knowing I am in the right place
Good placements
Hands-on activities, teaching lessons to peers in the cohort
Having the opportunity to experience various disabilities in grades k-12
I learned to work and function as a professional educator through my diverse experience
I was able to be successful on my Praxis II test after my junior year
I was able to see a variety of different classrooms and work with a diverse group of teachers and students
Knowledge by mentor of content
Learning has to incorporate cooperation/collaboration into a classroom setting
Lost of experience and learn about a wide range of disabilities and age groups
Made lasting friendships through the intense program
My culture and language course. The teachers gave a good example of collaboration
My host teachers. This is where I truly learned the most about being an effective teacher
My student teaching and the opportunities I had at that school
Opportunities to present at CEC conference
Placements over a variety of grades and disability areas
Strong host teachers
Taught me how to work under pressure and still get the job done
The amount of hours spent in the school systems. This helps build confidence for the first year of teaching
The content covered in the law and disabilities classes was very thorough and beneficial
The content knowledge of legal issues
The content knowledge required to develop curriculum
The expectations made me work harder to achieve them
The experiences in the classroom with students
The fact that I was in a variety of different placements giving me a diverse view of what teaching will be like
The faculty and staff were ready and able to help me with anything at all times
The field experience, in particular my student teaching experience. I had many opportunities to incorporate innovative ideas into teaching
The field experiences I was able to participate in
The opportunities for professional growth
The other cohort students that provided support when the mentor leader did not
The relationship I have with my cohort
The schedule for spring of senior year should be revised, too much to do in such a short amount of time
The special education department. Each individual I came into contact with had superior knowledge regarding special ed. and related issues
The support from majority of my instructors
The support of Dr. Smith when concerns were brought to him
The support of my fellow cohort students
The support of the cohort and many of the faculty was what I needed to succeed
The varying experiences gained from the different placements, ex: disability areas, grade levels and classroom settings
To provide me with numerous opportunities in the field, allowing us to have a variety of placements
To provide me with the appropriate knowledge in order to become an effective teacher
2. There were some aspects of the teacher preparation program at GC&SU that could be better.

They were:
Better-arranged classes (a few classes were pointless)
Clear explanations of assignments and what is expected
Could away with classes such as world geography where it is a waste of time and lost of busy work
Could have received more support from my mentor leader in the classroom
Designing a better technology course
Mentor leader should be in office or be able to be contacted when stated they would
More classroom visits from mentor leader so she could be aware of my teaching ability, even if she thought I was doing fine
More collaboration with middle grades cohort members
More contact by my mentor leader with my host teacher. We need more content area instruction in the special education program
More encouragement rather than criticism should be given, often students feel as if their best is never enough
More enthusiastic professors teachers who are excited about what they are doing and who want to be here
More in-depth content classes
More in-depth explanations of key words used in education early on my education classes
More observation of me teaching in a classroom by my mentor teacher. I was observed two times in two years
More positive feedback from my mentor leader. Criticism can be presented in a positive manner
More positive feedback from mentor leader
More support from my mentor leader
More visitations to placement to be observed
Not receiving assignments and grades back in a timely manner
Observation of me during my required unit, so I could benefit from constructive criticism
Professors and instructors should collaborate more to make work less repetitive and stressful
Professors should treat all students equally (not show favoritism)
Professors understanding that students have lives outside of GCSU
Program could be more consistent across teachers and more organized
Scheduling amongst the classes. In a stressful program things should be more spread out to ensure we could spend the needed amount of time on each assignment
Some of the college classes were too rushed
Some of the work and projects felt like busy work and not relevant to teaching
Some placement teachers should be re-evaluated to see if they will truly benefit the cohort. Some are unsupportive.
Strict office hours for staff
Support and encouragement from faculty members, mentor leaders
Support for all members of the cohort
Supporting the cohort’s students at all times
The amount of time required to be in class at one time. I am certain research supports that after a certain amount of instructional you begin to lose your attention span. In fact, this time constraints can be a real shock and cause of much stress to cohort students. Classes should be shorter, so that students will be able to have the time they need to complete all of the assignments given
The assignments that haven no purpose other than consuming valuable time. We need to sleep too
The availability of mentor leaders and professors
The flexibility to work with student's schedules. We enter the program understanding the amount of time required, but that doesn't change my financial status. If we need to hold a job that is of equal priority for financial reasons, it is extremely difficult to manage time. But it can be done
The policy about working (the cohort always wants money, but you are not supposed to work)
The science class was a big mess and not very helpful
To lessen the amount of schoolwork during student teaching so we can actually teach...(research project, service teaching project, IEP write ups, unit, etc)
To make course work meaningful during the senior year. It felt like wasted time
To provide mentor leaders that are supportive and do not show favoritism or bias
Trying to be fair to all cohort students
Health & Physical Education Milledgeville Cohort

The cohort (n = 9) 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 25 – Milledgeville (Dr. Block’s) Health & Physical Education Program

2003 Cohort Ratings of How would you Rate Your Skills as a Beginning Teacher Right Now?

Ratings of Good or Excellent

![Bar chart showing ratings of skills as a beginning teacher.]

Details:

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

Figure 26 – 2003 Milledgeville (Dr. Block) Middle Grades Education Program Ratings (n = 9)

Details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mentor leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOE instructors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liscense exam prep</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make connections</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>field experiences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>host tchr teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>host tchr mentoring</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>core courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dr. Block’s Health & Physical Education Cohort
Respondents Responses to Open-Ended Questions

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

- Being out in the field each semester
- Dr. Block was absolutely awesome. She bent over backwards to see that we were all prepared to be successful
- Having hands on experiences
- I am just overall well prepared
- I learned about classroom discipline
- I learned about physical ed., I learned the five motor skills and how to improve a child's ability to participate in sports
- I learned how to do lesson plans
- Learning from excellent instructors
- My professor was knowledgeable in the subjects they taught, and they were also able to share teaching wisdom with me
- Seeing a variety of real life situations
- Teaching across the curriculum
- Teaching with good host teachers
- The ability to go to different schools and see how other teachers conduct and plan their classes
- The actual fieldwork was a good aspect of preparation because it gave us all kinds of different situations
- The constant feedback and help received from the professors and graduate assistants
- The experience with different age groups in order to know what level you want to teach
- The field based experience, I learned more there than I could in a classroom
- The variety of school settings I student taught in. (elem, middle, high, special ed.)
- The way we applied work in the classroom to the classroom setting

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

- Better field placements especially in the high school area
- Choice of reading instructor
- I believe everything in my teaching preparation program was great. I had a wonderful experience.
- Scheduling
- Some of the host teachers do not give feedback to student teachers to help learn and correct our mistakes
- The locations of some of the field placements
- The outdoor ed. class was not relevant to our field.
- Their should be an underground course option on Macon campus, the work required is 100% more than education classes I have had at other schools
- Time management
- Way too much work in the curriculum class especially since a lot of people work full time