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Summary

- The participants were two graduating classes, 2002 and 2003 of students receiving their initial teacher certification.
- The 14 mentor leaders served as advisors for their group of student for both their junior and senior years in most cases. In the case of the two graduate level cohorts, the program was only for one year in secondary education. The mentor leaders also served as instructors for various (but not all) of the courses taken by their assigned students. Five of the mentor leaders were new to the school of education and this was their first cohort.
- The questionnaire had 13 questions related to the stated goals of the school of education in their conceptual framework as well as an overall readiness to begin teaching question. Both groups completed identical versions by circling the Likert scale elements. The forms were matched by student identifying numbers but were otherwise confidential.
- The data analysis used the Spearman Rho to correlate the sets of answers. The results were as expected in that for the most part; the students rated themselves higher than their mentor leader did. Most of the students (98%) rated themselves as Excellent or Good on their overall readiness to begin teaching and on most of the different teaching skills. (This was from all 304 initial teaching candidates surveyed at exit from the program, not just the students in the cohort programs.)
- The mentor leaders also used mostly Excellent or Good (89%) to rate their students (n = 210) as on their overall readiness as beginning teachers. The difference between these two sets of ratings was statistically significant using a Chi Square test collapsed to a two by three cell table. Ratings of poor and fair were collapsed into one cell ($\chi^2 (2) = 20.8, p < .001$). The proportion of their ratings of excellent ratings was much higher for the students than for the mentor leaders, which we expected to find.
- Then the percent of ratings of excellent were calculated for both the students and the mentor leaders for all of the 14 skills listed, actually 13 skills and one overall teaching readiness rating. When these numbers were correlated as a set, the value of the correlation was much higher ($r = .69, n = 14, p = .004$, one-tailed). This means that the agreement between students and mentor leaders of which of their teaching skills was considered excellent is very good.
- For example, the mentor leaders rated 54% of their students as excellent in their knowledge of educational ethics and laws. This was their highest aspect rated. They rated their students lowest in their ability to assess learning in the children (only 25% were rated excellent in this aspect of teaching).
- The data from this study supports the assertion that student self-ratings at exit from the program are valid in regard to comparison with those of their mentor leader (program advisor), although students tend to rate themselves more highly than their professors did.
- Both students and professors agreed on which specific aspects of the conceptual framework resulted in outcomes of perceived strengths and weaknesses in readiness to begin teaching.
- In regards to more accurate self-assessment of specific abilities, the mentor leaders could stress more self-evaluation or collect more data in regards to the lowest correlated skills or abilities as stated in the Conceptual Framework.
The purpose of this study was to investigate whether the self-ratings that the exiting seniors gave themselves on the 13 teaching skills/abilities emphasized in our conceptual framework would be comparable to the ratings given by them to their mentor leaders. It was expected that the seniors would probably rate themselves somewhat higher than their professors would, but that there would be a positive correlation of these ratings.

Methods

Participants

There were a total of 108 students and eight professors participating in the 2002 study. 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 = 27), Health and Physical Education (n = 7), Middle Grades (n = 16), Music (n = 4), Special Education (n = 19), and Secondary Education (n = 15). The Macon cohorts were Early Childhood (n = 10) and Secondary Education (n = 8). The mentor leaders were all professors who served as advisors and course instructors in the major field. The cohorts were students who started their professional education coursework at the start of their junior year and took all their classes together for the two-year period culminating in their student teaching during the spring of their senior year.

There were a total of 127 students and 6 more professors participating in the 2003 study. 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 = 29), Health and Physical Education (n = 9), Middle Grades (n = 9), Special Education (n = 19), and Secondary Education (n = 19). The Macon cohorts were Middle Grades (n = 13) and Secondary Education (n = 7). For 22 of the students, we do not know what cohort they were in because they did not include the last five digits of their social security number, or we could not match the number written by the student with the number given by the mentor leader. Some of these students were nondegree certification in an alternative program and did not have a mentor leader to evaluate them. The mentor leaders were all professors who served as advisors and course instructors in the major field. The cohorts were students who started their professional education coursework at the start of their junior year and took all their classes together for the two-year period culminating in their student teaching during the spring of their senior year.

Instrumentation

One-page questionnaires were used. See Appendix. The professors were instructed to rate each student in their group (cohort) at the end of his/her student teaching. “How would you rate his/her present abilities as a beginning teacher?” The students were asked “How would you rate your skills as a beginning teacher right now?” The 13 teaching skills were described and the rating scale was excellent, good, fair, or poor. There was an additional question (which was actually question one) in which the person was asked to rate their ability to “begin teaching overall”. The last five digits of the students’ social security numbers were used to match the questionnaires for data analysis.

Procedures

The students were given the one page questionnaire during a session in which they all met with the SOE certification officer to complete their paperwork for applying for teacher certification during their last month at GC&SU. The mentor leaders were given a comparable version of the form at about the same time and asked to rate each of their graduating seniors using the same rating scale. The instructions on the forms stated that the participants were to base their ratings or self-ratings on their skills/abilities as a beginning teacher.
Data Analysis

This was a descriptive study and Spearman Rho correlations were used. Data were analyzed as a whole and then cohort-by-cohort for both graduates in 2002 and graduates in 2003.

Results

Most of the students (98%) rated themselves as Excellent or Good on their overall readiness to begin teaching and on most of the different teaching skills. (This was from all 304 initial teaching candidates surveyed at exit from the program, not just the students in the cohort programs.) The mentor leaders also used mostly Excellent or Good (89%) to rate their students (n = 210) as on their overall readiness as beginning teachers. The proportion of their ratings of excellent ratings was much higher for the students than for the mentor leaders, which we expected to find. The difference between these two sets of ratings was statistically significant using a Chi Square test collapsed to a two by three cell table. Ratings of poor and fair were collapsed into one cell ($X^2 (2) = 20.8, p < .001$).

Figure 1 - Comparison of Ratings of Overall Ability to Begin Teaching

There were some positive and statistically significant correlations of the student and mentor leader ratings on about one third of the skills rated. This is where the preservice teachers and their mentor leaders agreed most on their abilities. Highest correlated were the ratings for managing behavior, the use of technology, and designing units of study. These ratings were statistically significant at the $p < .01$ levels. The actual Spearman Rho correlation coefficients were quite low (Rho = .22 was the highest). This is probably due to the restriction in range of the ratings (dependent variables) since most of the ratings were either a 3 (good) or a 4 (excellent). However the three skills correlated the highest are skills that are relatively easy to observe in performance or written products.
Then the percent of ratings of excellent were calculated for both the students and the mentor leaders for all of the 14 skills listed, actually 13 skills and one overall teaching readiness rating. When these numbers were correlated as a set, the value of the correlation was much higher \( r = .69 \) \( n = 14 \), \( p = .004 \), one-tailed). This means that the agreement between students and mentor leaders of which of their teaching skills was considered excellent is very good. For example, the mentor leaders rated 54\% of their students as excellent in their knowledge of educational ethics and laws. This was their highest aspect rated. They rated their students lowest in their ability to assess learning in the children (only 25\% were rated excellent in this aspect of teaching).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mentor Leaders</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Knowledge of Ethics &amp; Laws</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Teach Diverse Students</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Listen &amp; Respond</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ask Questions</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Begin Teaching Overall</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Design Units of Study</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Evaluate Materials</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Plan Lessons Day to Day</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Self-Evaluate</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Knowledge of Content Areas</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Leadership Role</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Use of Technology</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Manage Behavior</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Assess Learning</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scatter plots are included in this report, both for the dataset as a whole and individually by cohorts that illustrate the aspects of teaching where the agreements and disagreements are by quadrants. As expected the mentor leaders’ ratings are lower than the students’ self-ratings in most aspects, including their overall readiness to begin teacher.

Then the difference between the mentor leaders’ and students’ ratings of excellent in percents was calculated. A set of bar charts accompanies each scatterplot and shows the discrepancies, which are mostly over ratings by the students.

**Discussion and Conclusions**

This study validated (for the most part) the self-ratings of the teacher education candidates and the mentor leaders. The JHL-SOE produces mostly excellent or good beginning teachers. This was also the finding in all of the employer surveys conducted. Our program has a unique conceptual framework for teacher education with a large field-based component and many other additional requirements designed to enhance the ability of these students to work cooperatively with others and develop their liberal arts skills; especially skills in communication, problem solving, leadership, and self-evaluation.
In 2003, there were two exceptions. Both the middle grades Milledgeville and the MAT Macon cohort leaders actually rated their students higher than their students rated themselves.
The biggest discrepancy was that 23% of the students rated themselves excellent in planning lessons, but were actually rated lower by their mentor leaders. However when the ratings of excellent for the students and the mentor leaders are correlated for each aspect listed above, the correlation between these ratings is high ($r = .69$, $n = 14$, $p = .004$ one-tailed).
The most discrepancies are in the upper left quadrant. The upper left quadrant has aspects where the students’ self-ratings were much higher than the mentor leaders’ ratings. Points closest to the regression line are the most highly correlated with each other.
However when the percent of ratings of excellent for the students and the mentor leader are correlated, the correlation between these ratings is not significantly different from chance ($r = .38, n = 14, p = .09$ one-tailed). See Scatterplot below.

The most discrepancies are in the upper left and lower right quadrants above, also see discrepancy chart below.
Early Childhood Cohort from Milledgeville 2003 (n=29)

However when the percent of ratings of excellent for the students and the mentor leader are correlated, the correlation between these ratings is not significantly different from chance ($r = .04$, $n = 14$, $p = .68$ one-tailed). See Scatterplot below.

Many more of these students rated themselves excellent than their mentor leader did. For example, none were rated excellent in use of technology or ability to assess learning. Also see discrepancy chart below.
Early Childhood Cohort from Macon 2003 (n = 13)

However when the percent of ratings of excellent for the students and the mentor leader are correlated, the correlation between these ratings is not significantly different from chance ($r = .41$, n = 14, $p = .07$ one-tailed). See Scatterplot below.

These students rated themselves higher in behavior management and lower in content area than their mentor leaders did. See discrepancy chart below.
Middle Grades Cohort from Macon 2002 (n = 10)

However when the percent of ratings of excellent for the students and the mentor leader are correlated, the correlation between these ratings is moderate and statistically significant ($r = .52$, $n = 14$, $p = .03$, one-tailed). See Scatterplot below.

**MENTOR**

The most discrepancies are in the upper left and lower right quadrants above, also see below for discrepancy chart.
Middle Grades Cohort from Milledgeville 2002 (n = 16)

However when the percent of ratings of excellent for the students and the mentor leader are correlated, the correlation between these ratings is not significantly different from chance ($r = .36$, $n = 14$, $p = .10$, one-tailed). See Scatterplot below.

The most discrepancies are in the upper left quadrant above; also see below for discrepancy chart. All of the ratings of the mentor leader are below those of this cohort.
However when the percent of ratings of excellent for the students and the mentor leader are correlated, the correlation between these ratings is not significantly different from chance ($r = .16, n = 14, p = .29$, one-tailed). See Scatterplot below.

This cohort and their leader rated themselves quite differently. They were farthest apart on their ability to self-evaluate and to ask questions. They were most in agreement on their ability to design units of study. Also see discrepancy chart below.
M. A. T. Cohort from Milledgeville 2002 (n = 15)

However when the percent of ratings of excellent for the students and the mentor leader are correlated, the correlation between these ratings is not significantly different from chance ($r = .19$, $n = 14$, $p = .25$, one-tailed). See Scatterplot below.

These students and their mentor leader perceived their abilities somewhat differently, also see below for discrepancy chart. The biggest differences were in content area and ability to teach diverse learners.
M. A. T. Cohort from Milledgeville 2003 (n = 19)

However when the percent of ratings of excellent for the students and the mentor leader are correlated, the correlation between these ratings is not significantly different from chance (r = .43, n = 14, p = .06, one-tailed). See Scatterplot below.

This group of students rated themselves much higher than their GC&SU Mentor Leader. They agree most on their overall ability to begin teaching. See discrepancy chart below.
M. A. T. Cohort from Macon 2002 (n = 8)

However when the percent of ratings of excellent for the students and the mentor leader are correlated, the correlation between these ratings is extremely high and statistically significant. \((r = .70, n = 14, p = .003, \text{ one-tailed})\). See Scatterplot below.

The few discrepancies are in the upper left and lower right quadrants above, also see below for discrepancy chart.
**M. A. T. Cohort from Macon 2003 (n = 7)**

However, when the percent of ratings of excellent for the students and the mentor leader are correlated, the correlation between these ratings is extremely high and statistically significant. ($r = .09$, $n = 14$, $p = .38$, one-tailed). See Scatterplot below.

![Scatterplot](image)

This small group differed from their mentor leaders least in their ability to plan lessons, ask questions and content area knowledge. See discrepancy chart below.
Special Education Cohort 2002 (n = 19)

However when the percent of ratings of excellent for the students and the mentor leader are correlated, the correlation between these ratings is moderately good and statistically significant. \( r = .50, n = 14, p = .04, \) one-tailed. See Scatterplot below.

The few discrepancies are in the lower right quadrant above; also see below for discrepancy chart.
Special Education Cohort 2003 (n = 19)

However when the percent of ratings of excellent for the students and the mentor leader are correlated, the correlation between these ratings is moderately good and statistically significant. ($r = .45$, $n = 14$, $p = .05$, one-tailed). See Scatterplot below.

These students and their mentor leader agreed most on their ability to manage behavior, design units, evaluate teaching materials, and their knowledge of content area. See discrepancy chart below.
Education & Physical Education Cohort 2002 (n = 7)

However when the percent of ratings of excellent for the students and the mentor leader are correlated, the correlation Health between these ratings is negative and approaches statistical significance ($r = -.46$, $n = 14$, $p = .05$, one-tailed). See Scatterplot below.

The discrepancies are in the upper left and lower right quadrant above, also see below for discrepancy chart. The magnitude of these differences is rather large. This was a very small cohort (n = 7).
However when the percent of ratings of excellent for the students and the mentor leader are correlated, the correlation is moderate and statistically significant ($r = .47$, $n = 14$, $p = .04$, one-tailed). See Scatterplot below.

This mentor leader rated all students as excellent in many aspects, the students were not so sure of their abilities. They agreed most on their ability to take a leadership role and design teaching units.
Music Education Cohort 2002 (n = 4)

However when the percent of ratings of excellent for the students and the mentor leader are correlated, the correlation between these ratings is moderate and approaches statistical significance ($r = .46, n = 14, p = .05$, one-tailed). See Scatterplot below.

The discrepancies are in the upper left and lower right quadrant above, also see below for discrepancy chart. The magnitude of these differences is rather large. This was a very small cohort (n = 4). Thus a difference of 25% indicates one student.
Appendix

The first form is the mentor leader version. This is followed by the instructions.

The second form is two pages that were submitted separately. Only the first page was used for this study.
Please rate each student in your cohort at the end of her/his student teaching.

Student SSN ________________

How would you rate his/her present abilities as a beginning teacher? (Please circle your answer)

1. begin teaching overall ___________________________ Excellent  Good  Fair  Poor

2. develop his/her content area knowledge (reading, math, science, etc.) ____________ Excellent  Good  Fair  Poor

3. use technology in his/her new teaching job. ________________________________ Excellent  Good  Fair  Poor

4. manage classroom behavior of students. ________________________________ Excellent  Good  Fair  Poor

5. plan day to day lessons. ________________________________ Excellent  Good  Fair  Poor

6. design teaching units. ________________________________ Excellent  Good  Fair  Poor

7. assess the learning of their students (teaching effectiveness). ____________ Excellent  Good  Fair  Poor

8. understand diverse learners and find the strengths in each student. ____________ Excellent  Good  Fair  Poor

9. tactfully ask the right questions to get information from students, parents, coworkers and supervisors. ____________ Excellent  Good  Fair  Poor

10. listen and respond professionally to parents, students, and coworkers. ____________ Excellent  Good  Fair  Poor

11. self-evaluate his/her work and decide how to improve next time. ____________ Excellent  Good  Fair  Poor

12. understand and comply with professional ethics and educational laws. ____________ Excellent  Good  Fair  Poor

13. evaluate and find good teaching materials and resources. ____________ Excellent  Good  Fair  Poor

14. play a leadership role in his/her school or community. ____________ Excellent  Good  Fair  Poor

Thank you for helping in this study. Please give all of these evaluations in a batch to Sharie Smoot with your name, total number of students, with major and campus.
March 18, 2002

From: Sharie Smoot & Program/Assessment Committee

To: Mentor Leaders of Exiting Seniors and M.A.T. Initial Preparation Programs

Re: Validity Study of the Exit Survey

This year only, we are going to compare the student’s self-ratings on the various aspects of our conceptual framework with the mentor Leader’s evaluation of that same student. Some time in April, please complete one of these rating forms for each student. Just put the student’s social security number on the top and circle your rating for each student. Keep in mind that we have asked them to rate their skills as a beginning teacher on a form identical to this one.

We expect to find a positive correlation between your ratings and their self-ratings of their skills as a beginning teacher. Please be honest and just circle Excellent, Good, Fair (OK) or Poor for each question in regard to that particular student.

Don Jackson will be giving this same survey along with a satisfaction survey (that part will be anonymous) when he gets the students together for doing their certification paperwork.

When you are finished, please bring your forms/surveys all together as a batch and give them to me with your name, total number of students, with major and campus.
How would you rate your skills as a beginning teacher right now?

(Please circle your answer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ready to begin teaching overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your content area knowledge (reading, math, science, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>using technology in your teaching job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>managing classroom behavior of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planning day to day lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designing teaching units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessing the learning of your students (your teaching effectiveness)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understand diverse learners and finding the strengths in each student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tactfully asking the right questions to get information from students, parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coworkers and supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>listening and responding professionally to parents, students, and coworkers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-evaluating your work and deciding how to improve next time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understanding and complying with professional ethics and educational laws</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluating and finding good teaching materials and resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>playing a leadership role in your school or community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your answers will be kept confidential, but we want to be able to analyze your answers in various ways to help improve our program. By giving us the last five digits of you social security number, it saves us from asking you a lot more questions.

The last five digits of my SSN are XXX – X_ -- ___ ___ ___

(Please go on to the next page, when you are done, tear these two pages apart and turn them in separately so that the next part can be anonymous)
This part is about the field-based, cohort process that you participated in. Please rate:

15. The support you received from your cohort (mentor) leader. Excellent  Good  Fair  Poor

16. The professional & theoretical knowledge of your instructors here. Excellent  Good  Fair  Poor

17. The preparation you received for the Praxis II (licensing) exams. Excellent  Good  Fair  Poor

18. The way your instructors helped you make connections between your classwork and your fieldwork. Excellent  Good  Fair  Poor

19. Most of your field experiences in the local public school classrooms. Excellent  Good  Fair  Poor

20. The teaching ability of most of your field placement (host) teachers. Excellent  Good  Fair  Poor

21. Overall, you host teachers’ ability to help you improve your teaching. Excellent  Good  Fair  Poor

22. The core courses you took at GC&SU (leave blank if you transferred here). Excellent  Good  Fair  Poor

23. My cohort was Middle Grades Early Childhood Special Education M.A.T.

Music Health/Physical Education

24. The campus I attended was Macon Milledgeville

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

1. _________________________________________________________________________________

2. _________________________________________________________________________________

3. _________________________________________________________________________________

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

1. _________________________________________________________________________________

2. _________________________________________________________________________________

3. _________________________________________________________________________________

4. _________________________________________________________________________________

Thank you very much. We appreciate the continued involvement of our graduates. Without hearing from you and our alumni, GC&SU would not be the quality teacher preparation program that we feel it is today. Best wishes in all aspects of your life!