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Over the past five years, increased enrollment in student teaching at Portland State University has forced the School of Education to consider its current guidelines and policies for admitting student teachers. School of Education funding and faculty time are being taxed to meet the demands placed on them by increasing enrollment. This study was undertaken to provide data to determine if and how enrollment in student teaching could be limited. To do this, the study examined the existing guidelines for screening and selecting student teachers. The aim of the design was to determine if any of the exist-
ing criteria used in screening correlated with the student's success in student teaching. If the screening criteria did correlate with the student's success, it would be strictly defined. This would then aid in limiting the number of students accepted by the School of Education to student teach. If the screening criteria did not correlate, research could begin from that point. This research could be directed toward finding criteria that did correlate.

The sample selected for this study was made up of 1,409 student teachers at Portland State University from Fall Term 1966 to Spring Term 1969. The qualifications for each of these student teachers, at the time of their screening, were gathered and correlated with the scores each student received for his student teaching experience. The scores used to measure the student's success were taken from the ratings made by the University Supervisor, who was assigned to the student teacher. These scores were concerned with four areas of the student's experience. First, the student's knowledge of his subject matter field. Second, the student's teaching ability. Third, the student's ability to get along with students and colleagues. Fourth, the student's professional and ethical attitudes.

The data was gathered by reviewing and compiling each student's qualifications from records on file in the School of Education. This data was transferred from the file to a data sheet which was specially designed for this study. From the data sheets the findings were grouped and tested.

The general conclusion of the study was that of the current criteria used in screening, none correlated at a statistically signi-
sufficient level with the student's success score. A secondary conclusion was that of the three grade point averages used in screening, the cumulative average correlated at a higher level than the other two. The interview rating used did not correlate at a significant level with the success score. Also, the interview rating did not correlate significantly when used to indicate an unacceptable or outstanding score in student teaching.

From the findings and conclusions several recommendations were made in the study. One was that, the screening criteria used by the School of Education be deleted. In its place, an open enrollment policy should be adopted by the School of Education. To ease the funding and time difficulties, it was recommended that the one to sixteen ratio currently used in supervision be increased. To do this it was suggested that the clustering plan, now being considered by the School of Education be adopted as a plan of action.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This study is designed around several problems currently facing the School of Education at Portland State University. The conditions producing these problems are outlined in this segment of the study. The objective is to introduce these problems and to illustrate their growth and effect on the School of Education.

The first condition has been the rapid increase each year in the number of students applying to enter student teaching. Student teaching at Portland State University, within the School of Education, is required of all students who are seeking a state certificate to teach in the public schools of Oregon. The student teaching experience at Portland State University extends over a full term and applies to most students within the School of Education.

This study uses the student teachers that student taught between Fall Term 1965, and Spring Term 1970, as a sample, to illustrate this growth. Table I, and Table II, were compiled from School of Education records extending over this time period. From Table I, it can be seen, that from Fall Term 1965, to Spring Term 1970, the enrollment had increased from 93 to 217. This is more than a 200 percent increase in the enrollment in student teaching. Table I
TABLE I

GROWTH BY QUARTER OF THE STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM AT PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY, 1965-1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUARTER</th>
<th>ELEM</th>
<th>% INCRES</th>
<th>SEC</th>
<th>% INCRES</th>
<th>E &amp; S TOTAL</th>
<th>% INCRES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F 1965</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 1966</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 1966</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-12.0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1966</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-13.7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-42.3</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>-31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 1967</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 1967</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-35.0</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>-6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1967</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-8.3</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>-19.0</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>-15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 1968</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 1968</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1968</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-31.8</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>-14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 1969</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 1969</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>-10.3</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1969</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>-6.7</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>-27.5</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>-17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 1970</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>-4.6</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 1970</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>-19.6</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>1209</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>2366</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Percent increase of one quarter over the preceding quarter.

2Average percent increase over the five year period.
also shows a steady increase each term during this time period. A percentage rate of increase column was computed to measure the growth of one quarter over the preceding quarter. These percentage rates were totaled and averaged to obtain a percentage rate, which represented the average rate of increase each quarter. The resulting figures illustrate the growth pattern and indicate that the total student teaching program has increased, on the average, at slightly over five percent each quarter from Fall Term 1965, to Spring Term 1970.

These statistics are also broken down into elementary and secondary student teachers. The elementary program has increased from 36 students, Fall Term 1965 to 111 students, Spring Term 1970. This represents a growth pattern where enrollment Spring Term 1970, is three times that of Fall Term 1965. At the secondary level, growth has not been as dramatic; however, it has more than doubled in the same length of time. At the elementary level there have been more quarters, where the enrollment for one quarter has exceeded the following quarter, than at the secondary level. Thus, the average percentage rate of increase on the elementary level exceeds that of the secondary level increase for the same time period. This means over a six percent rate for the elementary increase as opposed to over a four percent rate of increase for secondary majors. The elementary program is increasing at a faster rate. Five out of the last six quarters the elementary enrollment has exceeded the secondary enrollment.

Table II gives further evidence to substantiate and illustrate this growth pattern. Table II shows that the annual increase, as a
TABLE IX

ANNUAL GROWTH OF THE STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM
AT PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY,
1965-1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>ELEM</th>
<th>% INCRE$^1$</th>
<th>SEC</th>
<th>% INCRE$^1$</th>
<th>E &amp; S TOTAL</th>
<th>TOTAL % INCRE$^1$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965-66</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>-4.4</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-67</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-68</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-69</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td>18.8$^2$</td>
<td>1209</td>
<td>7.2$^2$</td>
<td>2366</td>
<td>13.3$^2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Total elementary increase from 1965 to 1970 equals 58.1 percent. Total secondary increase from 1965 to 1970 equals 27.2 percent. Total elementary and secondary increase from 1965 to 1970 equals 44.3 percent.

$^1$Percent increase of one year over the preceding year.

$^2$Average increase per year over five year period.

Percentage rate, for the elementary level is 18.8 percent. This amounts to over twice the percentage rate of increase on the secondary level, 7.2 percent. Thus the past two academic years, 1968-69, and 1969-70; elementary enrollment has exceeded secondary enrollment. On an annual basis the average rate of increase between elementary and secondary is even more revealing. The increase was over 18 percent on the elementary level as opposed to over a seven percent increase on the secondary level. The average percentage rate of increase per year is also helpful in illustrating this growth; as the per quarter increase
averaged slightly over five percent, as opposed to the annual average rate of increase which amounted to almost six percent.

Using these figures for projection purposes, a conservative estimate would place the annual enrollment in student teaching at Portland State University somewhere near 1700 students by 1975.

It should be pointed out that these figures represent only the growth in student teaching. They do, however, reflect similar increases in enrollment within the School of Education's total program of studies.

In summary, this growth pattern for student teaching will be of fundamental importance in establishing the relevancy of this research design. As will be shown the implications and effects of this increased enrollment have caused many areas of the student teaching program to be questioned.

In regard to student teaching, the School of Education has been committed to a student teacher-college supervisor ratio of one supervisor to every sixteen student teachers. This ratio is arrived at through the application of a state wide formula for class load distribution and is based on quarter hour totals and numbers of students per quarter hour.

Due to this commitment, and in the face of these increasing numbers of students applying for student teaching, many questions are being discussed as to the feasibility of the School of Education attempting to maintain this commitment. Several School of Education faculty members have stated that this ratio should be increased. Several other faculty members have made an alternative suggestion,
that the enrollment in student teaching be curtailed and limited by more effective screening of applicants. Under existing guidelines students must apply for admission and be admitted to the Program of Studies in Teacher Education (Appendix A, and Appendix B); and then successfully complete several classes, designed to prepare them for teaching. This must be done before applying for admission to student teaching.

Table III was designed to show the current percentage rate of screening applicants into student teaching. Again, the average number of students not accepted each term was totaled and averaged. This revealed that, on the average, 15.2 percent of the applicants at the secondary level were being screened out of student teaching. Elementary student teachers were being screened out at the rate of 10.6 percent. It also revealed that, on the average, over 12 percent of the applicants for student teaching are not accepted into student teaching. Based on the national survey conducted by Dr. James Johnson\(^2\) in 1966-67, 52 percent of the institutions surveyed denied admission to only two percent or fewer applicants to student teaching. Seven percent of the institutions surveyed admitted all applicants to student teaching. This shows that the School of Education at Portland State University exceeds the majority of institutions across the country in the percentage of applicants to whom it currently denies admission to student teaching.

If enrollment in student teaching is to be limited, there seem to be two logical points for this to occur. First, at the point when a student applies for admission to the School of Education; or second,
TABLE III
NUMBER OF STUDENTS APPLYING FOR STUDENT TEACHING
COMPAARED TO NUMBER OF STUDENTS SELECTED
TO STUDENT TEACH, 1966-1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUARTER</th>
<th>ELEMENTARY</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>SECONDARY</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>ELEM AND SEC</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REQ PLACE</td>
<td>NUM ACC</td>
<td>% NOT ACC</td>
<td>REQ</td>
<td>NUM ACC</td>
<td>% NOT ACC</td>
<td>REQ</td>
<td>NUM ACC</td>
<td>% NOT ACC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1966</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 1967</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 1967</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1967</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 1968</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 1968</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1968</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 1969</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 1969</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1969</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 1970</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 1970</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>1012</td>
<td>8.8(^1)</td>
<td>1188</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>15.1(^1)</td>
<td>2298</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>12.1(^1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>10.6(^2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.2(^2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.7(^2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Percent of total screened.

\(^2\)Average percent screened.
when the student applies for admission to student teaching.

This study is based on the premise that neither of these two positions will be accepted as policy by the School of Education. The findings should prove helpful in aiding the School of Education to determine how it can more effectively screen and select potentially successful student teachers.

Some advantages can be very clearly seen for more effective screening at the admission to program stage, rather than when the student applies for admission to student teaching. If more students were denied admission to student teaching, student teaching would become the control for enrollment in the School of Education. Only the number of students who could be supervised, would be admitted to the program of studies. Otherwise, there would be a large number of students who could not be supervised because supervisors would not be available. More effective screening at this earlier stage would confront the candidate with the prerequisites he must meet, and he would still have time in his academic career to either, prepare himself, or seek another career field. This would seem to be the fairest position to take in light of the student's welfare.

Using the preceding statements as descriptive of the conditions currently facing the School of Education, the following questions represent issues that possibly need to be addressed by the faculty of the School of Education:

1. How can the School of Education and Portland State University continue to provide supervisory staff to maintain the present one to sixteen guidelines?
2. Should the School of Education continue to maintain the one to sixteen guidelines?

3. Should limits be imposed upon the number of students accepted into student teaching each term?

4. How can the School of Education accurately screen potential student teachers?

5. On what data could the curtailment of enrollment in student teaching be validated?

6. What data can most validly indicate a student's potential for success in student teaching?

This study will provide data concerning these issues. It is hoped that the data will be helpful in providing answers to some of these issues. It should be pointed out, however, that this study is not designed to specifically provide data only in relation to these issues. The hypotheses to be stated later in this chapter are the focal point of the data design.

Currently each student who applies for admission to student teaching must meet six prerequisites. For purposes of clarification these are listed below as taken from the Directions for Completing Application for Student Teaching or Internship form (December, 1969) (Appendix C):

1. Admission of students to the Program of Studies in Teacher Education. (Appendix A, Appendix B)

2. A minimum cumulative grade point average of 2.50; a grade point average of 2.50 in professional courses;
and a grade point average of 2.25 in areas of concentration for elementary majors; a 2.50 grade point average in the teaching major for secondary majors.3

3. At least last quarter, junior year standing in college (123 hours or more).

4. Completion of all prerequisites as stated in the Portland State University catalog, including a minimum of thirty hours in residence. (Appendix A, Appendix B)

5. Results of a tuberculosis x-ray or tine test showing absence of communicable tuberculosis.

6. Approval of a faculty interview committee.

Of these criteria, particular attention has been focused on the interview committee segment (number 6 above) of the screening process. Each applicant is required to pass an interview before being granted permission to student teach. Each interview team is composed of three people; a member of the School of Education faculty, a certified employee of the public schools, and a member of the Portland State University faculty in a department other than Education.

The interview has been viewed by many School of Education faculty members as a possible point where the student's potential as a successful student teacher and teacher can be identified. It has also been viewed by several other faculty members as unnecessary. This group feels that any suppositions or predictions based on the interview results are invalid. In fact, the validity of the interview
committee's evaluation of a candidate in predicting his success as a student teacher has not heretofore been tested. This lack of hard data provides no answers and does little but perpetuate already existing doubt and indecision.

Aside from numbers five and six, the other criteria used for screening have previously been defined with strict or loose interpretation depending primarily on the number of students applying for student teaching and the individual student's case. The opportunity for doing this may no longer exist as larger numbers of faculty members are required to meet the demand for supervision of student teachers. The validity of each of the criteria used in screening, is important, as well as predicting whether or not a student is equipped with the minimum potentialities to become a successful student teacher. Along with this, it has become necessary to say that some students on the basis of how their case stands up against the prerequisites to student teach, should not be allowed into student teaching. It goes without saying that substantive data is needed to defend this position.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The intention of this study is not to support either the position of changing the one to sixteen ratio, or the screening of a larger percentage of student teaching applicants, as mentioned earlier. It is designed to draw conclusions about the validity of each of the criteria used to screen student teachers. For this purpose the following six hypotheses were developed as a guide for the direction of the study. These are stated as follows:
1. The interview committee's evaluation of the candidate has a high correlation in predicting the candidate's success in student teaching.

2. The interview committee's evaluation of the candidate has a higher validity than the student's grade point average, (see footnote 3), in predicting the student's probable success in student teaching.

3. Factors that most influence a low score in student teaching are of a non-academic nature, e.g., lack of communication skills, inability to control students, et al.

4. Students with grade point averages below the minimum requirements do not score at the same level in student teaching.

5. Students admitted to student teaching with deficiencies, for which waivers are granted, do not have a corresponding low score in student teaching.

6. The cumulative grade point average of a student has a higher validity in predicting a high score in student teaching success in secondary grades (9-12) than in elementary grades (1-6).

It is projected that from the conclusions drawn about each of these hypotheses, recommendations can be made concerning the previously stated issues facing the School of Education. An example is the intention of this study to determine the validity of each criterion used to screen student teachers. In addition it is proposed that the
study will reveal upon what data students should be denied or given
the opportunity to student teach. The study also hopes to identify
those criteria that do not validly indicate a student's probable
success in student teaching.

The study also has as a purpose, to provide much needed data
to the School of Education. The research and data secured for this
study will provide a base from which other research projects can be
developed and carried out.

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

For accurate analysis purposes, a one year sample was not
considered satisfactory or encompassing enough to provide a cross
section of student teachers. The sample used, as will be defined in
more detail in Chapter II, consisted of 1,409 student teachers at
Portland State University during the period from Fall Term 1966 to
Spring Term 1969. This excludes those people student teaching Summer
Term of 1967, 1968, and 1969. This three year sample included enough
cases to provide for accurate analysis.

The scope of the statistical analysis will reach to eventually
correlating the prerequisites for admission to student teaching
with a rating scale designed to numerically evaluate each student
teacher's success in student teaching (see footnote 4 and footnote 6).

The findings of the study will apply to the School of Education
at Portland State University. No attempt was made to draw into the
research design, data or information from other universities. Quite
possibly, the findings would have implications for other universities; however, the findings were interpreted only as they applied to the issues and hypotheses tested in this design.

From the findings, many possible spin-offs could exist. One such spin-off could be the identification of competencies that seem important to successful student teaching and teaching. It is hoped, but not intended, that this research could aid in these areas. The student's performance in meeting or not meeting the prerequisites to student teaching could indicate some areas of competence that a teacher need or need not exhibit.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study does not include an extensive listing of literature as investigation into available resources revealed that very little research had been done to date in this area. An examination of professional journals also yielded little information that related directly to this study. This lack of outside source material could be considered a weakness in the design; however, a number of factors that could justify this limitation in the study are:

1. That the study focuses on a single institution.
2. That the study is built around a series of issues and hypotheses that pertain to one institution.
3. That no previous research in this area has been undertaken at Portland State University.

Another possible limitation might be the measurement instrument that is used to indicate each student's success in student
teaching. The statistical tests done on this instrument (see page 27) should provide an accurate base from which conclusions can be drawn with reasonable certainty. The quantity of cases involved and the statistical analysis done on the final evaluation form should establish its reliability in indicating one student teacher's success as opposed to another student teacher's success. As the aim of the thesis is to correlate those factors used in screening student teachers, there is a need for some criteria of success in comparing student teachers. This instrument should fill that need.

This study does not attempt to establish reliability for the criteria used to screen student teachers. It does propose to correlate these criteria with some measure of success. The reliability of grade point average and interview scores could easily be the focus of another study.

It is recognized that the broad treatment of the data could make secondary the importance and consideration of individual cases in selecting student teachers. It is however, one intention of the study to provide data to insure a more equitable treatment of students. It would seem that decisions based on accurate statistical analysis of data could better work in the interests of students rather than, in opposition to those interests.

VALUE AND IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

The study will produce data for use in the School of Education in dealing with those problems mentioned earlier.
A large volume of data that has not been available, but needed, will now be available for the School of Education to use.

More effective screening criteria could result from the findings as well as the elimination of invalid screening criteria. Students making application to the School of Education to do student teaching could be assured of a more accurate and fair evaluation of their case.

Directional decisions could be made on the basis of findings in this study that will provide for elimination of those teachers that should not be allowed into teaching.

The study will suggest several areas where further research is needed. It should also provide a basis from which further research can be designed.
CHAPTER II

THE SAMPLE

Fall Term 1966, was selected as the beginning point for this study. Investigation of earlier years revealed that data available prior to that date was incomplete in many areas, and completely missing in others. Extensive data was found to be available from Fall Term 1966. Spring Term 1969, was selected as the terminal point for the sample used in the study. Using this three year time period provided a sample that extended over nine quarters and amounted to 1,409 student teachers.

As shown in Table IV, this divided the sample into 671 elementary majors and 738 secondary majors.

The first step used in statistically analyzing the sample was to code each of the 1,409 cases on a data sheet (Appendix D). The data sheet was systematically developed to provide easy accessibility to the data. The student's name (numerically coded to protect confidentiality), age, term they student taught, and whether they were an elementary or secondary major, was coded for case identification purposes.

The data sheet was divided into seven numerical sections. The first section (Appendix D, Number 1) consisted of three items, all of which related to the student's admission to student teaching.
TABLE IV
STUDENT TEACHER ENROLLMENT BY QUARTER
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
1966 to 1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>SECONDARY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>ACC. TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F 1966</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 1967</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 1967</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1967</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 1968</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 1968</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1968</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 1969</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>1185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 1969</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>1409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>1409</td>
<td>1409</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item A was sub-divided into two categories. The student teacher was coded as a degree student if he was an undergraduate and had not completed a baccalaureate degree program. This group also included those students that had transferred into Portland State University from a junior college or community college. The student was coded as a certificate student, if he had completed a degree program and wished to enter student teaching for the purpose of obtaining an Oregon State Teaching Certificate. 8

Item B of Section One established a grade point average profile for each case. The grade point averages make up the primary basis
for present screening of student teachers. With this fact in mind, the grade point average for each student teacher applicant was subdivided into four categories for more detailed analysis.

The student's cumulative grade point average (Appendix D), was compiled from all the grades he had received prior to the term for which he applied to student teach. This cumulative grade point average included any work the student may have completed at another university or institution.

The courses that each student is required to complete successfully following his acceptance into the School of Education make up the professional grade point average (Appendix D). This grade point average was compiled and computed for each student teaching applicant.

Elementary education majors are required to have two subject matter areas of concentration, with not less than 30 quarter hours in one and 21 quarter hours in the other. Secondary education majors are required to have one subject matter area of concentration. This area includes not less than 36 quarter hours. These grade point averages were compiled and coded under area grade point average on the data sheet.

Item C of Section One coded if an applicant had met all of the prerequisites satisfactorily. If he did not, he was coded as having a deficiency. The reasons for the deficiency were stated, as well as, whether a waiver was granted for the deficiency.

Section Two of the data sheet coded if the student had passed or failed his student teaching experience. If the student failed a comment was inserted as to the reason given by his University Supervisor for
the failure. In some instances the student teacher was given an in-
complete or an extended experience. This normally occurs if excessive
absenteeism due to illness has been the case. Another instance for an
extended experience would be if any question as to the student’s pass-
ing or failing still remained in the mind of the University Supervisor.
If either of these were the case it was coded on the data sheet under
Item B of Section Two along with the length of the extended experience
or incomplete. If an incomplete was given the conditions were stated
as to how the incomplete could be removed by the student teacher.

Section Three of the data sheet was deleted from the design as it
did not relate to the problems dealt with in the study. A detailed
knowledge of the Block Program and some statistical means of following
the Block student into student teaching would be necessary to give a
fair and objective analysis of this program. As this design does not
deal exclusively with the Block Program this area was deleted from the
study.

Sections Four and Five on the data sheet were taken from the
final evaluation form that is filled out on each student teacher by
his University Supervisor (Appendix E). Section Four consisted of the
University Supervisor’s name. Section Five is made up of four nu-
merical codes that represent the University Supervisor’s assessment of
the student teacher’s abilities and progress during student teaching.
The numerical code developed for statistical purposes was a rating
scale of one to ten (Appendix F). If a ten was coded in one of the
four areas it indicated that the student teacher had received the
highest possible score in that area. A score of one indicated the lowest possible score in that respective category.

The four items within Section Five each code a different competency of the student teacher as a one-to-ten rating. Item One codes the rating given by the University Supervisor on the student teacher's knowledge of subject matter in his field. Item two codes the student teacher's ability to teach. Item three codes the student teacher's ability to get along with other people. Item four codes the student teacher's professional attitude.

The four items in Section Five were totaled and averaged. This average or mean was used in the study to represent a score for each student teacher in student teaching.

Section Six of the data sheet coded the interview form (Appendix G). Each interview session has three members, who are asked to assess each candidate in ten areas. For statistical purposes the ten categories listed on the interview form were numerically coded. A high rating was equivalent to the number three. Average ratings were coded as two, and low ratings were coded as one. If the candidate was judged unacceptable he was coded as zero. The three interviewers' assessments were totaled and the ten areas were totaled. An average or mean was computed which represented the candidate's score on the interview.

In addition, each of the interviewers was asked to rate the applicant on a pass or pass with reservations scale. If the candidate was completely unacceptable, the interviewer checked reject on
the interview form. These three ratings were grouped so that it could be seen whether the candidate was passed, passed with reservation, or rejected by the members of his interview committee.

Section Seven on the data sheet coded the classroom supervisor's evaluation of the student teacher. The classroom teacher is asked to evaluate the student teacher twice during the student's experience, once at midterm (Appendix II), and once again at the end of the student's experience (Appendix I). On the bottom of these evaluations the classroom supervising teacher is requested to rate the student on a continuum from unacceptable to excellent on the midterm form and from unacceptable to outstanding on the final evaluation form. For statistical convenience these categories were numerically coded from zero to four. Four represented outstanding or excellent and zero representing unacceptable.

From these data sheets, groupings were compiled in each category, and the statistical analysis was done with the objective to eventually correlate the data in several categories. This would furnish data to test the hypotheses as stated in the Purpose of the Study in Chapter I.

USE OF THE DATA

A four phase design was developed for the statistical analysis of the data. Phase I was to group the data, and then group this data into more inclusive groupings. Phase I consisted of the following groupings of the data:

1. The total number of degree students.
2. The total number of certificate students.
3. The total number of married students.

4. The total number of single students.

5. The total number of cases.

6. The total number of students that fell into the following age groupings:
   a. 20-23
   b. 24-27
   c. 28-31
   d. 32-35
   e. 36-39
   f. 40-43
   g. 44-47
   h. 48-57

7. The number of students rated by the interview committee within the following score ranges:
   a. 1.21-1.40
   b. 1.41-1.60
   c. 1.61-1.80
   d. 1.81-2.00
   e. 2.01-2.20
   f. 2.21-2.40
   g. 2.41-2.60
   h. 2.61-2.80
   i. 2.81-3.00

8. The total number of students scoring in the following cumulative grade point average score ranges:
   a. 0.00-2.25
   b. 2.26-2.50
   c. 2.51-2.75
   d. 2.76-3.00
   e. 3.01-3.25
   f. 3.26-3.50
   g. 3.51-3.75
   h. 3.76-4.00

9. The total number of students scoring in the following professional grade point average score ranges:
1. The total number of students scoring in the following area grade point average ranges:
   a. 0.00-2.25  e. 3.01-3.25
   b. 2.26-2.50  f. 3.26-3.50
   c. 2.51-2.75  g. 3.51-3.75
   d. 2.76-3.00  h. 3.76-4.00

11. Number of students coded with deficiencies.

12. The total number of students scoring in the following ranges on the final evaluation form:
   a. 1.25-2.00  f. 6.25-7.00
   b. 2.25-3.00  g. 7.25-8.00
   c. 3.25-4.00  h. 8.25-9.00
   d. 4.25-5.00  i. 9.25-10.00
   e. 5.25-6.00

13. The total number of students who had an extended experience.

14. The total number of students who received an incomplete.

15. The total number of students who failed.

16. The total number of students who scored in the following ranges on the school evaluation forms:
    a. 4
    b. 3
    c. 2
17. The total number of students who scored in the following ranges on the subject matter background rating on the Final Evaluation sheet:

- a. 10
- b. 9
- c. 8
- d. 7
- e. 6

18. The total number of students who scored in the following ranges on the teaching ability rating on the Final Evaluation sheet:

- a. 10
- b. 9
- c. 8
- d. 7
- e. 6

19. The total number of students who scored in the following ranges on the teaching ability rating on the Final Evaluation Sheet:

- a. 10
- b. 9
- c. 8
- d. 7
- e. 6
20. The total number of students who scored in the following
ranges on the professional attitude rating on the Final
Evaluation sheet:

a. 10 f. 5
b. 9 g. 4
c. 8 h. 3
d. 7 i. 2
e. 6 j. 1

21. The total number of secondary student teachers grouped
by subject matter area of concentration.

22. The total number of elementary student teachers grouped
by subject matter area of concentration.

Phase II consisted of computing eight statistical figures from
Items 1B, 5, 6, and 7, from the data sheet. For each item the follow-
ing statistics were computed:

1. Mean
2. Median
3. Mode
4. Frequency distribution
5. Standard deviation
6. Quartile range
7. Quartile deviation
8. Coefficient of skewness

Phase III consisted of correlating items 1B, 5, 6, and 7 on the
data sheet and obtaining a coefficient of correlation for each series.
Phase IV was to interpret the findings in light of the six hypotheses originally identified in Chapter I of the study.

VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY OF THE MEASURING INSTRUMENTS

The measuring instruments used in this study were:
1. The cumulative grade point average.
2. The professional grade point average.
3. The area of concentration grade point average.
4. The interview rating sheet.
5. The final evaluation form.
6. The school evaluation forms.

The purpose of this study is to correlate the prerequisites used in the screening of student teachers with the score achieved by the student teacher, in student teaching. With this in mind, the reliability of the cumulative grade point average, the professional grade point average, and the area grade point average will not be considered in this study. Another study would be required for this purpose.

The interview rating sheet, and the school evaluation forms will be correlated with the final evaluation form to establish their validity and reliability.

The final evaluation form will be used as a valid and reliable instrument. The following factors pertaining to the validity and reliability of this instrument:

1. The number of cases used in the sample.
2. The analysis of the final evaluation score distribution in Chapter III.

3. The length of time involved in the sample used in the study.

4. The number of University Supervisors (over 30) involved in the ratings.

5. The fact that the University Supervisors were from the School of Education, other University academic departments, and the public schools.

Each one of these factors should eliminate variables that could make the final evaluation form invalid and unreliable. Taking all of these factors into consideration this study will use the final evaluation form as a measure of how one student teacher scored in student teaching as opposed to another student teacher.

The question as to whether this form does measure abilities of importance; and what specific abilities are important in student teaching, is considered a possible research project that could be carried on from the data secured in this study.
CHAPTER III

THE FINDINGS

The findings will be described in four sections. The sections will correspond to the four phases of the data analysis design used in the study.

PHASE I

Phase I was the first statistical treatment of the data following its computation. The objectives for Phase I were threefold:

1. To obtain numerical tallies in all the areas listed on the data sheet.
2. To group the data for ease in statistically analyzing it.
3. To group the data and develop a design for testing each hypothesis.

The total sample consisted of 1,409 cases. In some categories fewer cases were available due to incomplete data. One example was that during Fall Term and Winter Term of the 1966-67 academic year a different interview system was used for screening. This reduced the number of cases that could be used when the interview was correlated. In a few other instances the data was not available due to incomplete files. The number of cases used in each statistical computation was the largest number of cases available with complete data.

The data as gathered in Phase I showed that there were 936
students, who were enrolled as degree students, as opposed to 200 students enrolled as certificate students. A total of 537 students were married, and 496 were single.

In the area of age, the groupings revealed that the mean age of a student teacher at Portland State University was 25.714 years. The age breakdown is shown in Table V below.

**TABLE V**

STUDENT TEACHERS GROUPED BY AGE  
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY,  
1966-69

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUP</th>
<th>NUMBER OF STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-23</td>
<td>603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-27</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-31</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-39</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-43</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44-47</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48-57</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 25.714

The information in Table V will be helpful, in that, the mean age of student teachers at Portland State University seems to be higher than one would expect in a School of Education. This could be significant when viewed in such areas as the student's ability to get along with other people. It might also be significant in the area of professional
attitudes.

When the students were grouped by interview scores the numerical totals were shown in Table VI.

TABLE VI

NUMBER OF STUDENTS SCORING IN GROUPED INTERVIEW SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERVIEW SCORE</th>
<th>NUMBER OF STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.21-1.40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.41-1.60</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.61-1.80</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.81-2.00</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.01-2.20</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21-2.40</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.41-2.60</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.61-2.80</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.81-3.00</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table VII shows the findings when the students were grouped by grade point averages. Table VII includes all three areas of the grade point average that were used in this study.
TABLE VII  
GRADE POINT AVERAGE GROUPINGS OF  
STUDENT TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUPED GRADE POINT AVERAGE</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE # OF STUDENTS</th>
<th>PROFESSIONAL # OF STUDENTS</th>
<th>AREA # OF STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00-2.25</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.26-2.50</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-2.75</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.76-3.00</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.01-3.25</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.26-3.50</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.51-3.75</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.76-4.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table VII shows the findings when the student teachers were grouped by their scores on the final evaluation form.
TABLE VIII
GROUPED STUDENT TEACHER SCORES ON FINAL EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUPED SCORES ON FINAL EVALUATION</th>
<th>NUMBER OF STUDENTS SCORING IN EACH GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.25-2.00</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25-3.00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.25-4.00</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.25-5.00</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.25-6.00</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.25-7.00</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.25-8.00</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.25-9.00</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.25-10.00</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table IX shows how the student teachers scored on each of the four categories that were shown on the final evaluation form.
### TABLE IX

**HOW STUDENT TEACHERS SCORED ON FINAL EVALUATION FORM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>SUBJECT MATER</th>
<th>TEACHING ABILITY</th>
<th>ABILITY TO GET ALONG</th>
<th>PROFESSIONAL ATTITUDES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table X shows how the student teachers scored on the school final evaluation form.
### TABLE X

**SCORES OF STUDENT TEACHERS ON SCHOOL FINAL EVALUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>MIDTERM&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>FINAL&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>1048</strong></td>
<td><strong>1048</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup>Mean = 3.32  
<sup>2</sup>Mean = 3.44

Table XI shows the subject matter areas of the student teachers included in the study. Special notice should be given that Table XI is not complete and that its value should be limited to proportional comparisons and not totals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECONDARY AREA</th>
<th>NUMBER OF STUDENTS</th>
<th>ELEMENTARY AREA</th>
<th>NUMBER OF STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Science</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>710</strong></td>
<td><strong>914</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Not complete statistics.

2. Two areas required were combined. Total number of teachers is equal to 457.
It was also found that 15 students were given an extended student teaching experience during this three year period. One hundred twenty-three students were allowed to student teach with a deficiency of one type or another. A total of 22 students failed their student teaching experience.

PHASE II

Phase II consisted of computing from items 1B, 5, 6, and 7 on the data sheet the following statistics:

1. Mean
2. Median
3. Mode
4. Frequency distribution
5. Standard deviation
6. Quartile ranges
7. Quartile deviations
8. Coefficient of skewness

Table XII shows the first three of these statistics for each of the items used on the data sheet.
TABLE XII
MEANS, MEDIANs, AND MODES OF ITEMS USED IN DATA DESIGN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>$O$ OF CASES</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>MEDIAN</th>
<th>MODE</th>
<th>RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area Grade Point Average</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>2.707</td>
<td>2.797</td>
<td>2.977</td>
<td>0-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Grade Point Average</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>3.053</td>
<td>3.028</td>
<td>2.978</td>
<td>0-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Grade Point Average</td>
<td>1119</td>
<td>2.712</td>
<td>2.784</td>
<td>2.938</td>
<td>0-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Evaluation Form</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>7.832</td>
<td>8.256</td>
<td>9.104</td>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Matter</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>7.5605</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Ability</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>7.4167</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Get Along</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>7.8221</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Attitude</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>7.7759</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>2.4793</td>
<td>2.494</td>
<td>2.524</td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Midterm Evaluation</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Final Evaluation</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Not computed as data was not necessary.

Frequency distributions were done on each of the items used on the data sheets. These are shown in Figures one through ten.
Figure 1: Frequency distribution for area grade point average. Black line represents trend.
Figure 2: Frequency distribution for professional grade point average. Black line represents trend.
Figure 3: Frequency distribution for cumulative grade point average.
Black line represents trend.
Figure 4: Frequency distribution for final evaluation score. Black line represents trend.
Figure 6: Frequency distribution for teaching ability score. Black line represents trend.
Figure 7: Frequency distribution for ability to get along score. Black line represents trend.
Figure 8: Frequency distribution for professional attitude score. Black line represents trend.
Figure 9: Frequency distribution for interview score. 
Black line represents trend.
Figure 10: Frequency distribution for midterm and final school evaluation score.
Table XIII shows the findings for the remaining items used in Phase II of the data design.

**TABLE XIII**

STANDARD DEVIATION, QUARTILE RANGES, QUARTILE DEVIATION, AND COEFFICIENT OF SKEWNESS FOR ITEMS 1B, 5, 6, and 7 ON THE DATA SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>QD</th>
<th>C. SK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area Grade Point Average</td>
<td>.6322</td>
<td>2.488</td>
<td>2.797</td>
<td>3.076</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>-.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Grade Point Average</td>
<td>.6508</td>
<td>2.776</td>
<td>3.028</td>
<td>3.432</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Grade Point Average</td>
<td>.5842</td>
<td>2.473</td>
<td>2.784</td>
<td>3.044</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>-.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Evaluation</td>
<td>1.484</td>
<td>6.969</td>
<td>8.256</td>
<td>8.809</td>
<td>.920</td>
<td>-.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>.3178</td>
<td>2.347</td>
<td>2.479</td>
<td>2.735</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>-.142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PHASE III**

Phase III consisted of correlating the following items:

1. The area grade point average.
2. The professional grade point average.
3. The cumulative grade point average.
4. The final evaluation score.
5. The interview score.

Table XIV includes a correlation matrix of these items. Also included in Phase III were correlations of selected samples of scores.
on the interview and final evaluation form. This was done to see if
the interview correlated with success in student teaching on a high-
low basis.

TABLE XIV
CORRELATION MATRIX FOR ITEMS
USED IN PHASE II OF
DATA DESIGN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA GPA</th>
<th>PROF GPA</th>
<th>CUM GPA</th>
<th>FINAL EVALUATION</th>
<th>INTERVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.2643</td>
<td>0.1805</td>
<td>-0.0156</td>
<td>0.0045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2643</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.5873</td>
<td>0.0797</td>
<td>0.1863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1805</td>
<td>0.5873</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.1173</td>
<td>0.2080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.0156</td>
<td>0.0797</td>
<td>0.1173</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.0646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0045</td>
<td>0.1863</td>
<td>0.2080</td>
<td>0.0646</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of cases = 868

PHASE IV

The purpose of this phase of the data design was to interpret
the findings. Chapter IV does this and also includes the recommen-
dations and conclusions. Since this is the case no explanation of
the findings of Phase IV of the data design will be given in this
chapter.
CHAPTER IV

INTERPRETATION OF THE FINDINGS

This chapter will be divided into six sections. The sections will show the analysis and findings in relationship to each of the six hypotheses that were stated in Chapter I. Along with the findings will be the conclusions made from the findings about each of the hypotheses. Chapter V will include the recommendations that resulted from the conclusions drawn in this chapter.

THE FINDINGS ON HYPOTHESIS I

This hypothesis stated that the interview committee's evaluation of the student teaching candidate had a high correlation with the student teacher's score in student teaching.

To test this hypothesis the total group of scores were correlated rather than a random sample. The results indicated a correlation between the interview and the final evaluation score of .0646. This is a low correlation and it indicates that there is no significant correlation between the two variables.

The coefficient of skewness for both variables indicated a skewness to the left. The interview score coefficient of skewness was equal to -.142 and the final evaluation score coefficient of skewness was equal to -.857. This indicated that both distributions
were skewed in the same direction and that this was a common characteristic for both distributions.

The quartile deviation of .194, for the interview, and .920 for the final evaluation, indicated that both variables were similar in this characteristic. The standard deviation of 1.484 for the final evaluation, was greater than the .3178 for the interview. This was also true for the quartile deviations and coefficients of skewness. An explanation for this is that the range for the interview of 0-3 was significantly smaller than the 1-10 range for the final evaluation. This would account for these differences. Both distributions had the same characteristics. Thus, if the two variables were compared to a normal curve there would be a resulting abnormally high number of high ratings. This indicates a general reluctance on the part of the interviewers and the student teaching supervisors to give low scores. In order for a student teacher to be within the average quartile on the final evaluation he must score at least 6.348 on the final evaluation. With the range of scores from 1 to 10 on the final evaluation it would seem that the 6.348 score, which is equivalent to the lowest score in the second quartile, is significantly different than what would be the score for the second quartile, if the middle score on the range of scores of 5, was actually the middle score in the distribution. To obtain the same results in the interview a student must score at least 2.1615. Again with the range of 0 to 3, the midpoint should be 1.5, if this were a normal distribution.

The conclusions appear to be conclusive. There is no evidence
to support a significant correlation between the interview score and the final evaluation score. This would mean that a student’s score in the interview cannot be indicative of his success in student teaching. The sample of 868 cases supplies an adequate cross-section to substantiate this conclusion.

Since there was no evidence to support any correlation in this area it was suspected that possibly there could be a correlation between the interview and the final evaluation for student teachers on either end of the distribution. To test this possibility a product moment correlation was run on two sample groups. The first sample included 118 cases. Each case that was selected showed a score somewhere between 1.81 and 2.40 on the interview. The assumption was that this score on the interview should indicate a corresponding score in student teaching. The evidence indicated a correlation coefficient of -.1037. This again is not a significant correlation level. The conclusion is that the student who has scored low on the interview is not necessarily going to score low in student teaching. An explanation for this is that the abilities rated in the interview do not correlate with the skills and abilities needed to successfully student teach.

Table XV shows the computations made to test this assumption.
TABLE XV
CORRELATION OF FINAL EVALUATION AND LOW INTERVIEW SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f-d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f-d^2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>2107</td>
<td>896</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.40 2.305 3 23 115 575 10 40 75 120 245 240 730
2.20 2.105 4 80 320 1280 4 16 24 80 260 528 840 160 1912
2.00 1.905 3 15 45 135 6 3 45 6 126 72 258
Total 118 480 1990 2900

r = -.1037
The second sample was selected to test the assumption that a low score on student teaching should correlate with a low score on the interview. All cases were selected in the same sample with a score between 1.25 and 6.00 on the final evaluation form. This resulted in a sample of 99 cases. These 99 cases and their scores were correlated with the corresponding score on the interview. Table XVI shows the computations made to test this assumption.
TABLE XVI
CORRELATION OF LOW FINAL EVALUATION SCORE AND INTERVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>4.00</th>
<th>5.00</th>
<th>6.00</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>327</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£d^2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>1277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>3158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1789</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

r = .130

The correlation coefficient of .130 indicated there was no significant correlation to support this assumption.

In summary, there is no evidence to support the hypothesis. Rather, there seems to be a significant lack of evidence. This would indicate that possible danger could exist if the interview score was...
used to predict how a student was going to score in his student teaching experience.

There is also no evidence to support the position that the interview can indicate a student who will score low or high in student teaching.

FINDINGS ON HYPOTHESIS II

This hypothesis stated that the interview committee's rating of the student teacher is a better predictor than the student's grade point average in indicating his probable success in student teaching. The evidence indicates that this hypothesis cannot be statistically supported in all areas.

The correlation coefficient between the interview and the score in student teaching was .0646, whereas, the correlation coefficient between the cumulative grade point average and the student teaching score was .5873. The correlation coefficient between the professional grade point average and the student teaching score was .0797, which is higher than the .0646 interview final evaluation correlation. An exception to this is the area grade point average and the student teaching score correlation of -.0156, which is lower than the interview correlation of .0646. Based on this evidence the cumulative grade point average and the professional grade point average have a higher correlation with the student teaching score than does the interview. The area grade point average does not. It should be noted that the only significant differences would be between the cumulative grade point average and the interview.
The conclusion would be that the cumulative grade point average does have a significantly higher correlation with the student teaching score than does the interview. The significance of the cumulative grade point average as a predictor of success in student teaching is still questionable as the .5873 correlation coefficient is still not statistically significant. The interview does not have a significantly higher or lower correlation with the score in student teaching than do the area grade point average and/or the professional grade point average.

FINDINGS ON HYPOTHESIS III

This hypothesis stated that the reason for failure in student teaching was of a non-academic nature. The findings indicated that 37 students had either failed student teaching or been given an extended experience in student teaching. The causes for either the failure or extended experience were found to be:

1. Could not control class. 14
2. Could not communicate 9
3. Had no self-confidence 7
4. Could not relate to students. 3
5. Did not know subject matter 2
6. Family pressures 1
7. Was unrealistic 1

The conclusion would be that the majority of failures in student teaching are due to factors of a non-academic nature. This conclusion is consistent with another study that was carried out on a national
basis in 1966-67 by Dr. James A. Johnson. The findings of this study indicated that the major reasons for failure of student teaching were:

1. Inability to control students.
2. Unwillingness to work.
3. Poor knowledge of teaching methodology.
4. Inability to get along with other teachers.
5. Poor subject matter background.
6. Other.

FINDINGS OF HYPOTHESIS IV AND HYPOTHESIS V

Investigation of the data revealed that the majority of deficiencies were low grade point average scores by students. Since this was the case, Hypothesis IV and Hypothesis V were combined. The hypothesis tested was that students, who were admitted to student teaching with deficiencies, did not score significantly less than normally admitted students.

To test the hypothesis the students with deficiencies were identified. Their scores were totaled and a mean was computed. This sample consisted of 123 cases. The means of this group were compared to means for the total sample and the results are shown in Table XVI.

The assumption made in the hypothesis is that a student, who was admitted to student teaching with a deficiency, should score lower in student teaching than a regular student. The findings indicated that in three areas on the final evaluation score the mean for the
deficiency group was above that of the regular group. In the other area on the final evaluation form the score of the deficiency group was at least within one standard deviation of the mean of the total sample. This was also the case for the means of both groups on the score achieved on the final evaluation form. Since the means of the deficiency group are either above or within one standard deviation of the means of the total sample in all of the categories, there is no significant difference in the level of the scores.

On the school midterm and final evaluation form the deficiency group had a mean score which was higher than that achieved by the total group.

The conclusion drawn is that there is no significant difference in the scores achieved by students with deficiencies and regular
FINDINGS ON HYPOTHESIS VI

This hypothesis was changed to omit a division between elementary and secondary majors in education. This was done to limit the statistical analysis necessary by deleting this division.

The findings on this hypothesis failed to relate to the directional design of this study. The study did indicate that of the three areas of the grade point average, which was a consideration in this hypothesis, the cumulative grade point average had the highest correlation with the score achieved in student teaching.
CHAPTER V

RECOMMENDATIONS

The tests done on each of the hypotheses used in this study have provided information from which these recommendations are made. These recommendations should assist the School of Education in dealing with most of the issues listed in Chapter I.

HYPOTHESIS I

In regard to Hypothesis I, a high interview score did not correlate with a high score in student teaching. The reverse was also true, in that, a low interview score did not correlate with a low score in student teaching. As the conclusion in Chapter IV stated, the student's interview score did not correlate at any statistically significant level, with the student's score in student teaching. This lack of evidence is valuable in that it forms the basis for these recommendations:

1. That a student's score in the interview not be grounds for denying him admission into student teaching.
2. That a student's score in the interview not be used to predict how the student might achieve in student teaching.
3. That what the interview purports to identify in each candidate be looked at critically. A revamping of the qualities and characteristics rated in the interview could
produce an instrument that would correlate with a student's score in student teaching.

4. That the interview should be examined carefully as its role in the screening of student teachers is highly questionable.

5. That each student should not be required to take the interview.

6. That further research be conducted to identify those behaviors and characteristics a student should exhibit to indicate that he will be successful in student teaching.

HYPOTHESIS II

With regard to Hypothesis II, a similar lack of statistically supportable evidence was found. The interview has already been stated as unreliable in predicting how a student should score in student teaching. Similar statements can be made about the grade point average prerequisites used to screen student teachers. The area, and professional grade point averages did not correlate with any degree of significance. The cumulative grade point average correlated higher; however, it did not correlate at a level where any statistical reliability could be placed on it. Since there is no apparent correlation the recommendations are that:

1. The grade point average not be used in the screening of student teachers.

2. That a student be allowed to student teach, unless his cumulative grade point average is below that required to maintain his enrollment at Portland State University.
HYPOTHESIS III

Regarding Hypothesis III, the conclusion stated in Chapter IV was that the majority of students, 94 percent at Portland State University, fail student teaching because of difficulties other than a lack of subject matter background. The recommendations are that:

1. Additional requirements be inserted into the School of Education's pre-student teaching program that are of a communication nature, e.g., Interpersonal Relationship Training, Group Dynamics.

2. That the supervisory staff used to supervise student teachers not be selected on subject matter proficiency alone. Rather, that the supervisor be able to use communication skills and have in his background some communication training that he can transfer to his student teachers.

HYPOTHESIS IV AND HYPOTHESIS V

In regard to Hypothesis IV, and Hypothesis V, no recommendations are made, since it has been previously recommended that the interview and grade point average clearances be deleted as screening instruments for student teaching.

HYPOTHESIS VI

In regard to Hypothesis VI, no recommendations are made, since it has been previously recommended that the grade point averages be deleted as screening instruments for student teaching.
ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

An additional recommendation is that the student teaching phase of the School of Education's program be subject to open enrollment. This results from the fact that there is no evidence to support any correlation between present screening procedures and success in student teaching. It is also recommended that an interview be held with each candidate when he applies for admission to student teaching. This interview should be held for the following purposes:

1. To secure information, about the applicant, that will aid in placing him with a classroom teacher, and supervisor. The student teacher should be placed in a situation that is consistent as possible with his philosophy of education and life style.

2. To ascertain if the applicant has any outward psychological or behavioral difficulties that could affect his performance in the classroom. Possible examples could be a speech problem, or extreme erratic behavior.

One purpose of this paper was to provide data with which the School of Education could address those issues listed in Chapter I. Some possible applications of this research and its findings to these issues are:

1. That to maintain the one to sixteen student teacher-supervisor ratio; the School of Education might employ as many supervisors as necessary. This number to be determined
by enrollment.

2. That the School of Education develop a research program designed to produce data as to how many student teachers a supervisor can effectively work with under a variety of conditions, e.g., Clinical Professor Program, a program with more responsibility for supervision placed on the classroom teacher, a program with the University Supervisor's role more advisory than supervisory.

3. That due to a lack of reliable measures to determine how students will succeed in student teaching, no limits be placed on student teaching enrollment. To meet the increased FTE\(^{11}\) required the best available route is to increase the student teacher-supervisor ratio. The clustering of student teachers and the development of student teaching centers would eliminate the time currently spent by supervisors in travel between schools.

4. That if limits are necessary they be imposed at the Admission to Program stage, and not upon the student's application into student teaching.

5. That in using present measures for screening there appears to be no way the School of Education can accurately screen student teachers. Research is needed to determine what data can be used to accurately predict a student's probability of success in student teaching.

The last recommendations made in this study are that:
1. Further research is needed into the area of what a student teacher does and how those characteristics can be measured.

2. These findings be correlated with the student's pre-student teaching qualifications, e.g., grade point averages, behavior patterns, communication abilities. The results would yield data with which the School of Education could limit its enrollment in student teaching.

CONCLUSION

This study has only penetrated the area opened by the data gathered in this design. Numerous spin-offs have been mentioned in the study as being ways in which this data could be used for further research. This study has simply opened the door. It is hoped that it may help lead to better ways and means of improving the education provided to our children by improving the quality of the teacher in the classroom.
FOOTNOTES

1 Elementary student teachers are defined in this study as having student taught in grades one to six. Any other grade level is considered as secondary in this study.


3 Within this study the term grade point average, unless otherwise specified will refer to the student's grade point average in three areas:

a. Cumulative grade point average is the numerical average for all of the student's college work.

b. Professional grade point average is the numerical average of the student's grades in all professional courses taken prior to student teaching (Appendix A, page 4).

c. Area of concentration grade point average is the numerical average achieved by the student in the academic areas that make up his area or areas of concentration. Two areas of concentration are required for elementary majors. One area of concentration is required for secondary majors.

4 A numerical score was computed from the final evaluation form. A low score was determined from the quartile deviations. Thus a low score fell within the range from zero to six on the final evaluation.

5 These students are admitted to the student teaching program by petitioning the Selection and Retention Committee. If this committee approves the student's application he is given a waiver and allowed to student teach.

6 Common deficiencies other than low grade point averages are: substitution of courses for required courses, students did not complete all the prerequisites prior to applying for admission to student teaching, and failure of the student to complete a methods course prior to student teaching.

7 A high score is defined as falling between eight and ten on the final evaluation score.
The equivalency program consists of those students who have already been awarded a baccalaureate degree from an accredited institution prior to their applying for student teaching.

This category is interpreted in two different ways by most supervisors. Some students are rated on their ability to do managerial tasks in the classroom. Other students are rated on their knowledge of methodology.


Full Time Equivalent (FTE) is the terminology used to define a faculty member's time. If a faculty member's job description includes .50 FTE responsibility to supervision, he would spend 50 percent of his time in supervision. FTE is also used to determine departmental salary costs. If the Office of Supervised Teaching has been allocated 14.5 FTE for supervision, this would mean a total of 14.5 FTE in faculty time could be used for supervision.
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APPENDIX A

ELEMENTARY APPLICATION

INFORMATION AND DIRECTIONS FOR COMPLETING APPLICATION FOR ADMISSION TO PROGRAM OF STUDIES IN TEACHER EDUCATION

All students who wish to secure a teaching credential or graduate from a Portland State University Program of Teacher Education must apply for admission to the School of Education before proceeding with professional courses. Admission is contingent on the following pre-requisites.

1. Admission to Portland State University.

2. Completion of 75 quarter hours of college course work including 15 quarter hours at Portland State University with a minimum 2.50 cumulative gpa.

3. Completion of the attached application form including the required number of hours in subject matter areas as listed on page one.

4. Completion of a planned program of studies with an adviser. Students in elementary education are advised at the Advisement Center (262 or 263 Old Main).

5. Submission of a valid TB chest x-ray or tine test with this completed application.

Admission to the program of studies in teacher education is subject to the approval of the Teacher Education Selection and Retention Committee. Students approved for admission will be mailed an admission card. This card must be presented at registration each term in order to enroll in professional courses.

Under unusual circumstances waivers may be issued by the Dean of the School of Education which give temporary permission to take professional courses. These waivers are not given until after the first day of registration and unless there is evidence to indicate that every effort is being made to meet admission requirements at the earliest possible date.
A separate application for admission to student teaching can be obtained in the Office of Supervised Teaching (201 Old Main). This application must be completed and turned in before the deadline date which is the first Friday of the regular academic term preceding the term of student teaching, (fall term student teaching applicants must file by the end of the first week of spring term).
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APPLICATION FOR ADMISSION TO THE PROGRAM OF STUDIES IN TEACHER EDUCATION

Date: ____________________________  Elementary (1) ____________________ (2) ____________________
Areas of Concentration

I.D. No. ____________________________ Junior High (1) ____________________ (2) ____________________
Teaching Field(s)

Date Admitted to (PSU) ____________ Senior High ______________________________
Teaching Field

Mr. ________________________________ Mrs. ________________________________ Date of birth: ____________________________
Miss (First) (Middle) (Last)

Address: ____________________________ (Street) (City, State, Zip Code) (Phone)

Other Colleges Attended:

College ______________________________ Dates ______________________________
College ______________________________ Dates ______________________________

Do you hold a degree? Yes___ No___ If yes, what degree? ______ Year ______

Name of institution granting degree ______________________________ Major ____________

Quarter hours of college work completed? ______ Cumulative GPA at this time? ______
Quarter hours completed at PSU ______ Cumulative GPA at PSU? ______

Have you ever been convicted of a crime other than a minor traffic violation? Yes___ No___ If yes, attach full particulars on separate sheet.

Have you a physical deficiency which would limit engaging in normal teaching activities? Yes___ No___ If yes, explain on separate sheet or see Coordinator of Supervised Teaching.

Have you been under constant medication and/or treatment for any long period of time? Yes___ No___ If yes, explain on separate sheet or see Coordinator of Supervised Teaching.

Are you now or have you been under psychiatric treatment? Yes___ No___
If yes, explain on separate sheet or see Coordinator of Supervised Teaching.

Indicate below the number of quarter hours that you have completed successfully in each of the following areas:
Students who take no college Speech courses will be required to pass a speech clearance test (available only to graduate students).

Signed ____________________________________________

PERSONAL HISTORY FORM

Name ____________________________________________ Date ____________________________

DIRECTIONS: Write a short autobiographical sketch of your life telling where you grew up, schools attended, activities in school, hobbies, interests, experiences with children, when and why you chose teaching as a career and other things you think a professional educator might find of interest in considering you as a prospective teacher. This account is to be handwritten with pen and ink. Check spelling, grammar, and general organization because this will be read by many people. Additional sheets may be attached.
### ELEMENTARY

**NAME** ___________________________________________  **I.D. NO.** ____________  **PHONE** ____________  **DEGREE** ____________

**ADDRESS** ___________________________________________  **PSC STUDENT?** ____________  **TRANSFER STUDENT?** ____________

**CATALOG** _____________________  **GRADE LEVEL** _____________________  **DATE** ____________  **TOTAL NO. HRS (186)** ____________

**NO UPPER DIVISION HOURS (62)** ____________

#### PROFESSIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR ALL STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psy 311</td>
<td>Human Development</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ed 312</td>
<td>Ed Psychology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib 490</td>
<td>Child, Lit. &amp; Lib.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed 415</td>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#Ed 407</td>
<td>Lang. Arts &amp; Rdg.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#Ed 446</td>
<td>Philosophy of Ed.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed 356</td>
<td>Reading Methods</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed 358</td>
<td>Lang. Arts &amp; Soc. Sci.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed 370</td>
<td>P.E. &amp; Health Methods</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed 350</td>
<td>Elem Professional Quarter</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Includes above methods as Block plus Ed 312 or Ed 406)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### GENERAL REQUISITE REQUIREMENTS FOR ALL STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Hours in Subject Areas:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arts &amp; Letters (18)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Science (18)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Science (both Bio. &amp; Phys. Sci.) (18)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mathematics (6)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Composition</th>
<th>101, 202, 303</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>201, 202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>201, one other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>381, 383, 383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>311, 312, 313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>(any course) 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>(any course) 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### AREAS OF CONCENTRATION: (Must have one 21 hour area and one 30 hour area.)

21 Hours in one Subject Area: (9 upper division hours)

30 Hours in one Division: (12 upper division hours)

_______ Taken from: Foreign Languages, Fine Arts (art & Music,)
_______ Science, Health, P.E., Social Science, Language Arts,
_______ (English, Foreign Languages, Speech, and Theater Arts).

NOTES: *Taken separately or with Ed 350; † To be taken after
Student Teaching; ++ Areas must not overlap.

Checked Through F____ W____ S____ SS____ 19____ Advisor's Signature__________
Appendix B

Secondary Application

Information and Directions for Completing Application for Admission to Program of Studies in Teacher Education

All students who wish to secure a teaching credential or graduate from a Portland State University Program of Teacher Education must apply for admission to the School of Education before proceeding with professional courses. Admission is contingent on the following prerequisites:

1. Admission to Portland State University.

2. Completion of 75 quarter hours of college course work including 15 quarter hours at Portland State University with a minimum 2.50 cumulative gpa.

3. Completion of the attached application form including the required number of hours in subject matter areas as listed on page one.

4. Completion of a planned program of studies with an adviser. Students in secondary education are advised in the academic department which offers their teaching field (see PSU catalog for teaching fields and advisers).

5. Submission of a valid TB chest x-ray or tine test with this completed application.

Admission to the program of studies in teacher education is subject to the approval of the Teacher Education Selection and Retention Committee. Students approved for admission will be mailed an admission card. This card must be presented at registration each term in order to enroll in professional courses.

Under unusual circumstances waivers may be issued by the Dean of the School of Education which give temporary permission to take professional courses. These waivers are not given until after the first day of registration and unless there is evidence to indicate that
every effort is being made to meet admission requirements at the earliest possible date.

A separate application for admission to student teaching can be obtained in the Office of Supervised Teaching (201 Old Main). This application must be completed and turned in before the deadline date which is the first Friday of the regular academic term preceding the term of student teaching, (fall term student teaching applicants must file by the end of the first week of spring term).
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APPLICATION FOR ADMISSION TO THE PROGRAM OF STUDIES IN TEACHER EDUCATION

Date: _______________  Elementary (1)_________ (2)_________ Areas of Concentration
I.D. No. ___________________  Junior High (1)_________ (2)_________ Teaching Field(s)
Date Admitted to PSU ________  Senior High_________ Teach Field

Mr.  
Mrs. ___________________________ Date of birth: ___________________________
Miss (First) (Middle) (Last)

Address: _______________________________ (City, State, Zip Code) (Phone)
(Street)

Other Colleges Attended:
College_____________________________ Dates_____________________________
College_____________________________ Dates_____________________________

Do you hold a degree? Yes ___ No ___ If yes, what degree? ______ Year ______
Name of institution granting degree_________________________ Major_________
Quarter hours of college work completed? ______ Cumulative GPA at this Time? ______
Quarter hours completed at PSU? ______ Cumulative GPA at PSU? ______

Have you ever been convicted of a crime other than a minor traffic violation? Yes ___ No ___ If yes, attach full particulars on separate sheet.

Have you a physical deficiency which would limit engaging in normal teaching activities? Yes ___ No ___ If yes, explain on separate sheet or see Coordinator of Supervised Teaching.

Have you been under constant medication and/or treatment for any long period of time? Yes ___ No ___ If yes, explain on separate sheet or see Coordinator of Supervised Teaching.

Are you now or have you been under psychiatric treatment? Yes ___ No ___
If yes, explain on separate sheet or see Coordinator of Supervised Teaching.

Indicate below the number of quarter hours that you have completed successfully in each of the following areas:
Required | Completed
--- | ---
English Composition | 3-6
General Psychology | 3
Human Development | 3
*Speech | 3

*Students who take no college Speech courses will be required to pass a speech clearance test (available only to graduate students).

Signed

PERSONAL HISTORY FORM

Name ___________________________ Date ___________________________

DIRECTIONS: Write a short autobiographical sketch of your life telling where you grew up, schools attended, activities in school, hobbies, interests, experiences with children, when and why you chose teaching as a career and other things you think a professional educator might find of interest in considering you as a prospective teacher. This account is to be handwritten with pen and ink. Check spelling, grammar, and general organization because this will be read by many people. Additional sheets may be attached.
For the Advisor: (After completion, this page will not be available to the student.)

1. Has this student consulted with you as often as seemed desirable?
   On entrance to college
   Changing major
   To plan each year's program
   To consult on changes in planned program
   Other

2. Do you know this student?
   Had student in class
   Had an out-of-class contact in
   None

3. Is this student having academic difficulties?
   Bankrupt
   On probation
   Low in major or area of concentration

4. Would you comment, in a sentence or two, on your impression of this student as a teacher candidate at this time in his preparation.

Name __________________________ Date __________________________

After giving the student the cover sheet and the last sheet, remove page 5 for your files. Please place the remaining four sheets of this application in interdepartmental mail addressed to: Dr. R. Allan Spanjer, School of Education, 201 Old Main.
SECONDARY

NAME____________________ I.D. NO________________ PHONE____________ DEGREE______

ADDRESS_________________ PSU STUDENT________________ TRANSFER STUDENT______

CATALOG__________________ GRADE LEVEL____________ DATE____________ TOTAL NO. HRS. (186)______

NO. UPPER DIVISION HOURS (62)________

PROFESSIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR ALL STUDENTS

Prerequisite to Student Teaching:

Pay 311 Human Development 3 Ed 416 Student Teaching 15
Ed 312 Ed Psychology 3 Ed 446 Philosophy of
Ed 314 Prin. of Sec. Teach, OR Education 3
Ed 408 Special Sec. Methods, OR Ed 469 Developmental
Dept. Spec. Methods 3 Reading 3
(Required for Junior
High and English,
recommended for all
others)

PROGRAM OF STUDIES

List the present program, and the proposed program for the next 7
terms. Use pencil so changes can easily be made.

Present Term 19__
(Circle one: F,W,S,
SS) Course Number:

Next Term 19__
(F,W,S,SS) Course Number:

3rd Term 19__
(F,W,S,SS) Course Number:

4th Term 19__
(F,W,
S,SS) Course Number:

5th Term 19__
(F,W,S,SS) Course Number:

6th Term 19__
(F,W,S,SS) Course Number:

7th Term 19__
(F,W,S,SS) Course No.

8th Term 19__
(F,W,
S,SS) Course Num-
ber:

Checked through: F____ W____ S____ SS____ 19____; Advisor's Signature________
APPENDIX C

APPLICATION FOR STUDENT TEACHING OR INTERNSHIP

DIRECTIONS FOR COMPLETING APPLICATION FOR STUDENT TEACHING OR INTERNSHIP

A. General Instruction

1. Return the completed application to the Supervised Teaching Office, Room 201 O.M., before the deadline date for the term in which you wish to teach. Applications received after this deadline will be placed on the waiting list. These deadlines are the first Friday of the regular academic term preceding the term of student teaching (fall term student teaching applicants must file by the end of the first week of spring term).

2. Applicants should carefully check the Program of Studies for Teacher Education as outlined in the Portland State University catalog. If you have questions about your eligibility for student teaching, please see your advisor.

3. Prerequisites which must be met before admission to student teaching:

   a. Admission to the Program of Studies in Teacher Education

   b. A minimum cumulative GPA of 2.50; a GPA of 2.50 in professional courses; and a GPA of 2.25 in areas of concentration for elementary majors; a 2.50 GPA in teaching major for secondary majors.

   c. Completion of all prerequisites as stated in the PSU catalog, including a minimum of 30 hours in residence.

   d. At least last quarter, junior year standing in college (123 hours or more)

   e. Results of a TB x-ray or time test showing absence of communicable Tuberculosis. T.B. clearance is good for only one year from the date it is read and must be valid during the period of student teaching.

   f. Approval of a faculty interview committee.
B. Information

1. Following your interview, the Selection and Retention Committee will review your complete file and will notify you in writing of the action taken on your application.

2. Although requests for specific student teaching placement will be taken into consideration, the number of applicants, public school requirements, and supervisory factors dictate final decisions in regard to assignment of terms and teaching locations. These must be made by the Supervised Teaching Office in cooperation with the school districts where agreements have been established.
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APPLICATION FOR ADMISSION TO STUDENT TEACHING OR INTERNSHIP

Secondary Teaching Field_________________________Student Teaching__________

Elementary Areas (1)________ (2)_________________Internship________________

Mr. 
Mrs. 
Miss (first) (middle) (last) Phone ________________________________

Present Address________________ City____ State____ Zip Code __________

Permanent Address________________ City____ State____ Zip Code __________

Alternate Phone where someone will know how to reach you__________________

Please respond with checks of appropriate information:
Do you plan to graduate from PSU? Yes__ No___. If "Yes", give date________
Do you hold a degree? Yes__ No___. If "Yes", give college, degree and date.

Are you now enrolled in PSY? Yes__ No___. Date of Admission to PSU________
Note: Enrollment in evening or summer classes does not constitute admission to PSU.

Term preferred for student teaching: F__ W__ Sp__, 197__
Year preferred for internship: 197__

Grade level preferred (number your choices 1st, 2nd, and 3rd):

Elementary 1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__ 8__
Secondary 7__ 8__ 9__ 10__ 11__ 12__

Type of experience preferred (number your choices 1st, 2nd, and 3rd or No preference)

Self-contained classroom__, Flexible scheduling__, Team teaching__,
Special programs (individual instruction)__, Diagnostic teaching__,
Integrated subject matter__, Inquiry__, Other__________________________,
No preference__

School District preferred (number your choices 1st, 2nd, and 3rd or No preference):
Portland NE__ N__ NW__ SE__ SW__, No preference__, Beaverton__, 
David Douglas__, Gresham__, Lake Oswego__, Milwaukie__, 
Tigard__, Parkrose__, Reynolds, Other_________________, No 
Preference___. (School District)

Type of transportation: Car____ Bus____

I understand that Student Teaching or Internship is a planned program 
requiring the student's full attention and effort. Any regular 
outside commitment such as another course or job responsibility is 
discouraged. If I feel it a necessity, before entering into such a 
commitment, I shall discuss the matter with the Office of Supervised 
Teaching.

__________________________
(Signature)

Supplement to Application for Student Teaching or Internship (This 
form should be completed as carefully as a job application as it will 
be sent to your school to assist in placement).

Name____________________________________ Phone________________________
Address__________________________________ Zip_________________________

Male________ Female________ Married________ Single________

Name and ages of siblings under 17_______________________________________

What schools do they attend?_____________________________________________

Places lived outside of Multnomah County___________________________________

Work experience________________________________________________________

Grade and high school attended__________________________________________

Colleges attended_______________________________________________________

Areas in which I feel most competent to teach_____________________________

Foreign languages spoken_______________________________________________
Musical instruments I can play

Arts and handicrafts I can supervise

Sports I can coach

Travel experiences

Clubs and organizations (past and present). Indicate any offices held.

Direct experiences with children (include observation, teaching, supervision. Mention age level, size of group, duration of experience. BE SPECIFIC).

Reasons for becoming a teacher and professional goals:
APPENDIX D

Name____________________ Age_________________ Term______ Year______

1. Admission Information:
   A. ______ Degree  B. GPA: ______ Area  C. Deficiency:
      ______ Cert.        ______ Area       ______ (reason)
      ______ Prof.        ______ Area       ______
      ______ Cum.         ______ Area       ______
      Waiver yes no

2. Completion of Experience:
   A. ______ Pass
      ______ Fail
   B. Extended Exp
      How Long?
      Reason:

3. Block Program yes
      no

4. College Supervisor:

5. Final Evaluation Sheet:
   1
   2
   3
   4

   Total____________________
   Mean____________________
   Pass____________________
   Pass W Reserv.
   Rej____________________

   Comments:_________________
7. School Final Evaluation Form:

   4
   3
   2
   1
   0

M   F

Comments:
APPENDIX E

STUDENT TEACHING EVALUATION

Portland State University Placement Service
PO Box 751
Portland, Oregon 97207

Student Teacher_________________________College Supervisor_________________________

Assignment_________________________Term and Year_________________________

(grade, subject, and school)

(School District)_____________________(City and State)

This evaluation may be done either by the supervisor or cooperatively by the supervisor and the student teacher upon satisfactory completion of the student teaching experience. It is based upon performance that can reasonably be expected of students in their first teaching situation. The student has access to this evaluation.

KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT MATTER:

Superior Well prepared Adequate

TEACHING ABILITY: response to pupils, class organization, room management, etc.

Outstanding Above average Adequate

ABILITY TO GET ALONG WITH OTHERS:

Especially proficient Gets along reasonably well

PROFESSIONAL ATTITUDES:

Highly professional Commendable Meets minimum standards

COMMENT ON PERSONAL QUALIFICATIONS such as appearance, poise, tact, dedication, potential, etc.

Signed______________________________
APPENDIX F

SCORING SCALE USED TO DETERMINE
STUDENT TEACHER'S SCORE ON
FINAL EVALUATION FORM

KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT MATTER:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Well prepared</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TEACHING ABILITY: response to pupils, class organization, room management, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Above average</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ABILITY TO GET ALONG WITH OTHERS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Especially proficient</td>
<td>Gets along reasonably well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROFESSIONAL ATTITUDES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High professional</td>
<td>Commendable</td>
<td>Meets minimum standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

INTERVIEW FORM

STUDENT'S NAME ___________________________ DATE ___________________________

Each student is screened in the Education Office for completion of minimum course and G.P.A. requirements. For purposes of the interview please make a judgment about the candidate by rating each of the following traits as high, average, or low, underlining particular characteristics, writing comments, etc.

1. APPEARANCE. What sort of first impression does he make? Does he look like a healthy and energetic person? Has he bodily or facial characteristics which might seriously hamper him? Is he well-groomed or slovenly? Attractive or unattractive in appearance?

2. CORRECTNESS OF SPEECH. Does he speak grammatically correct English or does he make frequent grammatical errors? Is his choice of words accurate?

3. VOICE. Is the applicant's voice irritating or pleasant? Can you easily hear what he says? Does he mumble or talk with an accent which offends or baffles the listener? Is his speech clear and distinct, his voice so well-modulated that it is a valuable asset?

4. ABILITY TO PRESENT IDEAS. Does he speak logically and convincingly? Or does he tend to be vague, confused, or illogical?

5. ALERTNESS. How readily does he grasp the meaning of a question? Is he slow to comprehend obvious points? Does he understand quickly, even though the idea is new, involved, or difficult?

6. JUDGMENT. Does he impress you as a person whose judgment would be dependable even under stress? Is he hasty, erratic, or emotional? Is he biased?

7. EMOTIONAL STABILITY. How well poised is he? Does he seem touchy, sensitive to criticism, easily upset? Is he easily irritated? Is he impatient?
8. SELF-CONFIDENCE. Does he seem to be uncertain of himself, hesitant, lacking in assurance? Is he self-confident and assured?

9. FRIENDLINESS. Is he a friendly, likeable person? Will his colleagues and students be drawn to him? Is he retiring or unfriendly?

10. PERSONAL FITNESS FOR STUDENT TEACHING. On the basis of this interview, how do you rate this candidate's interest in teaching and suitability for student teaching?

_____ PASS (Comment would be helpful)

_____ PASS WITH RESERVATIONS (Comment required)

_____ REJECT (Comment required)

COMMENTS:

Signature_________________
APPENDIX H

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SUPERVISED TEACHING

Mid-Term Student Teacher Report

Name of Student_________________________________________ School _____________________________

Grade or Subject_______________________________________

Please review your evaluation with the student and return this sheet to the supervisor no later than ____________________________

We believe that every student has some strengths and some weaknesses as an individual and that it is only through his knowledge and understanding of his personal strengths and weaknesses that he is able to grow as a teacher. Parts A and B refer to the student as an individual. Parts C and D refer to whatever standard you feel any student must attain before beginning teaching on his own.

A. Please comment on this student's strengths as a prospective teacher.

B. Please comment on this student's weaknesses as a prospective teacher.

C. Please make a judgment at this time as to this student's readiness for beginning teaching on his own.

_____ Seems capable, should be ready by the conclusion of the student teaching experience.

_____ May need an extended student teaching experience.

_____ It is doubtful if this student will be able to develop the qualities necessary to begin teaching and should be withdrawn.
D. Please make a judgment at this time as to the student's probable success as a teacher. (x)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Date ______________________ Supervising Teacher ______________________
APPENDIX I

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SUPERVISED TEACHING

Final Student Teacher Report

Name of Student_________________________ School_________________________

Grade or Subject__________________________

Please return this sheet no later than______________________________________

We believe that every student has some strengths and some weaknesses as an individual and that it is only through his knowledge and understanding of his personal strengths and weaknesses that he is able to grow as a teacher. Parts A and B refer to the student as an individual. Parts C and D refer to whatever standard you feel any student must attain before beginning teaching on his own.

A. Please comment on this student’s strengths as a prospective teacher.

B. Please comment on this student’s weaknesses as a prospective teacher.

C. Please make a judgment at this time as to the student’s readiness for beginning teaching on his own.

_____ Ready at this time.

_____ Needs an extended student teaching experience in_______

______________________________________________________________

_____ It is doubtful if this student will be able to develop the qualities necessary to begin teaching and should not pass.
D. Please make a judgment at this time as to the student's probable success as a teacher.

____ Outstanding ______ Good ______ Average ______ Below Average ______ Unacceptable

____________________________________________________________________

Supervising Teacher ___________________ Date ____________________