

ANALYSIS OF FOUR STUDENT TEACHER SUPERVISION MODELS IN
PHYSICAL EDUCATION AT VIRGINIA TECH

by

Courtney Meredith Tompkins

Major paper submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
in
Physical Education

APPROVED:



Michael W. Metzler, Chairman

George M. Graham



Mary Ann Lewis

C.2

LD
5635
V851
1995
T667
C.2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
STATEMENT OF PURPOSE	3
STATEMENT FOR PURPOSE OF STUDENT TEACHING	3
STATEMENT FOR PURPOSE OF SUPERVISION	4
DESCRIPTION OF THE VIRGINIA TECH PHYSICAL EDUCATION K-12 TEACHER CERTIFICATION PROGRAM	5
DESCRIPTION OF THE VIRGINIA TECH TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM (SUPERVISION COMPONENT)	5
INTRODUCTION	5
CURRICULUM	5
PLACEMENTS AND QUALIFICATIONS FOR STUDENT TEACHERS	6
GOALS	8
PREPLACEMENT AND REGULAR SEMINARS	9
LENGTH OF PLACEMENT AND TYPE OF SCHOOLS	11
ASSESSMENT AND GRADING	11
SUMMARY	12
COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF SUPERVISION MODELS	14
UNIVERSITY-BASED SUPERVISION MODEL	14
ROLE OF UNIVERSITY SUPERVISOR	15
ROLE OF COOPERATING TEACHER	21
UNIVERSITY-BASED SUPERVISION AS A FACILITATOR OF PROGRAM GOALS	24
UNIVERSITY-BASED SUPERVISION AS AN INHIBITOR OF PROGRAM GOALS	25
SUMMARY OF UNIVERSITY-BASED MODEL OF SUPERVISION.	27

CLINICAL TEACHER MODEL OF SUPERVISION	29
SOURCES OF DATA	30
DATA ANALYSIS	31
CLINICAL TEACHER SUPERVISION AS A FACILITATOR OF PROGRAM GOALS	37
CLINICAL TEACHER SUPERVISION AS AN INHIBITOR OF PROGRAM GOALS	38
SUMMARY OF CLINICAL TEACHER MODEL	41
DISTANT PLACEMENT MODEL OF SUPERVISION	43
ROLE OF UNIVERSITY SUPERVISOR	44
ROLE OF COOPERATING TEACHER	44
SOURCES OF DATA	45
DATA ANALYSIS	45
DISTANT PLACEMENT MODEL AS A FACILITATOR OF PROGRAM GOALS	49
DISTANT PLACEMENT MODEL AS AN INHIBITOR OF PROGRAM GOALS	50
SUMMARY OF DISTANT PLACEMENT MODEL	53
TEAM SUPERVISION MODEL	54
IMPLEMENTATION	54
SOURCES OF DATA	55
ROLE OF SUPERVISORY TEAM	56
DATA ANALYSIS	56
SUMMARY	57
TEAM SUPERVISION MODEL AS A FACILITATOR OF PROGRAM GOALS	58
TEAM SUPERVISION MODEL AS AN INHIBITOR OF PROGRAM GOALS	59
SUMMARY OF TEAM SUPERVISION	60

SUMMARY OF SUPERVISION MODELS	61
REFERENCES	63
APPENDIX A	
APPENDIX B	
APPENDIX C	

Introduction

No other social agent outside the family can claim to have a greater impact on the character and mind of the children in society than its teachers. Teachers socialize and educate, instill standards of shared cultural values, create opportunities for individual growth, and provide the knowledge and perspective needed for future citizens to be able to effectively participate in society. In Reforming Teacher Education: The Impact of the Holmes Group, Jonas F. Soltis states that "the better a teacher is educated, the better an education that teacher can potentially provide (p. 1)." As a corollary - "the better the teaching environment and the resources provided, the better a teacher's chances of success in helping students obtain a worthwhile and meaningful education (Soltis, 1987, p. 1)."

In today's society the need for educational reform is becoming increasingly important. Previous trends of reform have focused on schooling itself, urging changes within the curriculum and graduation requirements. One of the primary issues involved in the current trend is the reform of teacher education (Soltis, 1987).

Evidence of teacher reform is apparent at the university level in the improvement of teacher preparation programs. Equally important to the courses one would take to prepare him/herself for teaching is the practical field

experience gained through the undergraduate program. Students attending Virginia Tech's Physical Education teacher K-12 preparation program in the college of education are afforded many opportunities to gain field experience before student teaching. This experience is gained through the curriculum and instruction courses as well as a practicum - a four credit course representing "sequential phases of increasing professional involvement and responsibility (Woods, 1973, p. xiii)" leading up to the student teaching experience. Any practical experience gained prior to student teaching will work to ensure a more successful experience which in turn makes a better teacher.

To ensure a practical and beneficial student teaching experience, the roles of three individuals (the student teacher, the cooperating teacher, and the university supervisor) should be arranged into a harmonious and cooperative relationship. The duties and responsibilities of each of these individuals must be clearly understood by all those involved in the student teaching process if the preparation program is to be a valuable introduction into the teaching profession. Designing and instilling a valuable and practical internship that meets the needs of students are challenging tasks for institutions of higher learning (Woods, 1973).

Generally student teaching is a low impact experience.

Although it has received high ratings as "the single most beneficial segment of their teacher education program (Houston, 1990)," research gathered from Edith Guyton and D. John McIntyre proves that student teachers do not learn much from their experiences. Student teaching can be effective, but it can also be counterproductive. The ineffectiveness of supervision creates an experience for the student teacher which is counterproductive in achieving the goals of student teaching.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this project is to do a comparative analysis of four student teaching supervision models as they are used in one physical education (K-12) teacher certification program. Identification and description of outcome facilitators and inhibitors of each method of supervision will be thoroughly discussed. This study will not suggest one method of supervision as the best; rather, it will identify various ways of conducting supervision according to the program's available resources.

Statement for Purpose of Student Teaching

The purpose of the Physical Education K-12 student teacher program at Virginia Tech, according to faculty members, students, and cooperating teachers, is to provide students with a culminating experience for their undergraduate program. Student teaching affords seniors

with an opportunity to learn and practice effective teaching skills. This experience of practice teaching engages students in an environment where they can apply new knowledge in a setting beyond the university as an entry into the induction stage of professional development.

Statement for Purpose of Supervision

Most likely, the purpose of supervision in any student teacher program is to facilitate the growth of a future teacher through observation, conferences, information sharing, and evaluation (Henry & Beasley, 1982). In order to carry out the many complex decisions and behaviors of teaching physical education, the primary function of supervision is to assist the student teacher in the acquisition of new pedagogy content for effective instruction (Metzler, 1990).

Description of the Virginia Tech
Physical Education K-12 Teacher Certification Program

Description of the Virginia Tech
Physical Education Teacher Education Program

(Supervision Component)

Introduction

The purpose of the physical education student teacher supervision program at Virginia Tech is to provide future teachers and cooperating teachers with the leadership skills to facilitate the achievement of the goals and objectives of the university's teacher preparation program.

Curriculum

Students entering the physical education K-12 program are required to complete courses in the university's core curriculum as well as those courses in the physical education teacher certification major. The university core requirements include two semesters each of math, English, biology, social science, and humanities, for a total of 32 semester hours. The College and Major courses comprise the remaining 94 semester hours.

Each of the requirements mentioned above for the degree of physical education is offered on the campus of Virginia Tech. Located at Blacksburg, Montgomery County, in southwest Virginia, this land-grant institution strives for excellence in fulfilling three missions: instruction,

research, and public service. The thirteen faculty members within the department aid in achieving this mission, offering Bachelor's degrees in the areas of Exercise Science (Exercise Physiology/Sport Medicine), Sport Management and Physical Education K-12 Teacher Certification (Undergraduate Catalog, 1991-1992).

Placements and Qualifications for Student Teachers

A full-time faculty member within the physical education K-12 program ensures the achievement of the program's goals and objectives among the various placements for student teachers. According to James M. Cooper (1984) this individual may incorporate the following tasks into his or her student teacher supervision program:

- Developing standards for effective teaching
- Conducting seminar meetings for student teachers
- Conducting observations
- Evaluating programs

At Virginia Tech, the procedures for organizing student teacher placements begin months before the actual semester starts. Students apply for student teaching in the spring prior to their placement. The Criteria for Professional Studies for Physical Education (K-12) lists standards for acceptance into student teaching as:

1. Overall QCA of 2.5 or higher
2. Major's QCA of 2.5 or higher. All EDPE courses

taken will be used to compute Major's QCA

3. Complete the entire College Professional Core, defined as:

- EDCI 3024 Sociological Foundations of Education
- EDCI 3154 Psychological Foundations of Education
- EDPE 2234 Intro to Teaching Physical Education
- EDPE 3714 Teaching Physical Education
- EDPE 4134 Adapted Physical Education
- EDPE 4724 Children's Curriculum and Instruction
- EDPE 4734 Secondary Curriculum and Instruction

- a. Grade average of 2.5 or higher on the Core
- b. No grade lower than "C" on EDPE 2234, 3714, 4134, 4724, 4734

4. Take all parts of the NTE necessary for Virginia Certification PE (K-12), and meet all stated cut-off levels

5. Following application the Physical Education Professional Studies (PEPS) faculty will review all candidates for student teaching for reasons other than 1-4 above, will be identified by this review. This review will be based on the PEPS faculty's overall assessment of a student's preprofessional performance and readiness for student teaching. Students not passing this review will be notified as such in writing. Criteria and conditions for subsequent approval for student teaching will be communicated to the student.

Students already holding a Bachelor's degree must complete the College Core as per #3 above and take the NTE as soon as possible after admission, meeting the standards as per #4 above.

These standards for admission to student teaching went in effect for the start of the 1988-1989 academic year except #4 (1989-1990). Criteria are applied at the time of student teaching is to begin (not application). Failure to meet all criteria will result in withholding of the student teaching placement.

All criteria for student teaching are monitored by the HPER Division, except the reporting/review of NTE scores. Completion of the test, along with notification of student scores is reported by the College of Education to the HPER Division prior to the

start of each semester (p. 3-4).

The university supervisor requests specific placements to the dean's office in the summer prior to student teaching. By the end of the previous summer, students who plan to student teach in the following year should be informed of their assigned placements for the elementary and secondary schools. As stated in the student teaching manual,

after receiving confirmation of the student teaching assignment, the student teacher is to contact the cooperating teacher and arrange a convenient meeting at which time the student teacher can:

- a) observe the cooperating teacher teach at least one class
- b) confer with the cooperating teacher regarding responsibilities and school policies (p. 9)

Depending on the number of student teachers for a given semester, the university supervisor may choose to use graduate students with a background in pedagogy for supervisory assistance. These individuals work closely with the primary supervisor to ensure the achievement of the goals and objectives for student teachers during the sixteen week semester.

Goals

The following is a list of the goals of student teaching for Virginia Tech taken directly from the student teaching manual received by each student:

1. To develop an awareness of the personal and physical

requirements of teaching.

2. To develop an increased knowledge of learners' characteristics (e.g., emotional, physical, mental, cultural, and ethnic), their needs, abilities and interests.

3. To develop an increased ability to engage in self evaluation in assessing strengths as well as areas of need.

4. To provide reexamination of your own goals and values in view of the complex demands of teaching.

5. To further develop knowledge of the relationship of physical education to general education, and to realize the contribution of physical education to the total development of the learner.

6. To provide an opportunity to observe experienced teachers in the field of physical education.

7. To provide an opportunity for actual teaching experiences which will enhance the development and improvement of all aspects and facets of the teaching-learning experiences.

8. To become a teacher who is able to carry out the functions of a professional educator, including competencies in curriculum planning, daily routine evaluation of students, class control and management, rapport development, use of audio-visual materials, and coaching.

9. To analyze and assess characteristics of teachers (e.g., perception of self and others, classroom behaviors, attitudes about children/teenagers and teaching, knowledges and skills), which are deemed prerequisite for becoming a successful teacher.

10. To demonstrate the knowledge, behaviors, and previous experiences for the teacher education program (p. 7-8).

Preplacement and regular seminars

Preplacement meetings are scheduled two or three days before student teachers are to report to their respective

schools. Student teachers are required to attend, as are all assistants to the university supervisor. At this meeting, the student teachers are given a student teaching manual which contains the following sections:

1. Calendar of events during the student teaching placement (i.e., due dates of evaluation forms, seminar meeting times).
2. Letter from university supervisor(s).
3. Description of the K-12 Physical Education student teaching program at Virginia Tech (including goals; policies; responsibilities of the student teacher, cooperating teacher, and university supervisor; guidelines for evaluation; and legal considerations for the physical education student teacher).
4. Guidelines for long term planning.
5. Guidelines for lesson planning.
6. School policies module (questions designed to assist the student teacher in gathering information relative to important school policies).
7. Series of reflection task questions to be completed before the scheduled seminar meetings.
8. Video tape assignment guidelines.
9. Student teaching time log.
10. Copies of evaluation sheets.
11. Final report form to be completed by student teachers.

Student teachers are encouraged to share the information in the manual with their cooperating teacher.

As mentioned in #1 above, student teachers receive a list of scheduled seminar meetings for the semester. All

student teachers are required to attend with the exception of those under the distant placement model of supervision, due to travel time restrictions. Those under the distant placement model are required to attend the last meeting for both the elementary and secondary placements. According to the policies of student teaching in the student teaching manual,

attendance at all scheduled seminars held at the University is required. Conflicts with coaching are not excusable absences. Unexcused misses from scheduled seminars will result in a (-) grade reduction (p. 8).

Length of Placements and Type of Schools

The sixteen week semester of student teaching is comprised of two 8 week placements, one for elementary (grades K-5) and one for secondary (grades 6-12). Each of the suburban and rural schools used for student teaching placements are located within a 50 mile radius of the university. The option to student teach in areas distant from the university (250 miles +) such as Northern Virginia, Richmond, and Tidewater, can also be considered under distant supervision. Generally the schools for these placements are located in suburban/urban areas.

Assessment and Grading

Although the procedures for evaluation are slightly different among the models of supervision, final grades are determined in the same way for each model:

Elementary	45%
Secondary	45%
Coaching	10%

Specific assessment and grading procedures will be discussed in detail for each of the supervision models later.

Summary

The physical education student teacher supervision models at Virginia Tech are designed to provide future teachers and cooperating teachers with the leadership to facilitate the achievement of the goals and objectives of the university's student teacher program. Throughout the semester, students are under close observation by the university supervisor(s) and/or the cooperating teacher. In some circumstances, the cooperating teacher plays a greater role than the supervisor, as will be discussed later. Concluding the 16 week student teaching placements, successful student teachers receive their initial license for physical education grades K-12 in Virginia. Nearly all of them earn an additional endorsement to teach Health.

The following sections in this project describe in more detail each of the physical education student teacher supervision models. Specific to each of these models will be information regarding the purpose, overall structure, organization of visits to placements, seminar meetings, role of cooperating teachers, role of university supervisors, end of placement evaluation, and assessment data gathered from

interviews with university supervisors, cooperating teachers, and student teachers.

The sources used for this comparative analysis were used for all models, however not all sources were applicable to each model. Therefore, completely similar data will not be presented for all four models.

Comparative Analysis of Supervision Models

University-Based Supervision Model

The purpose of the university-based physical education K-12 supervision model at Virginia Tech is to provide physical education student teachers with an opportunity to learn and practice effective teaching skills while under university supervision. This experience of practice teaching engages students in an environment where they can apply new knowledge to a setting beyond the university while maintaining contact with the university through a supervisor and seminar meetings.

The structure of the university-based supervision model is described previously in this project in the Description of the Virginia Tech Physical Education Teacher Education Program. The following pages will describe in more detail the key factors in this model. To conclude, the facilitators and inhibitors relative to the overall goals of Virginia Tech's physical education student teacher program will be discussed.

Each supervisor may be assigned to 2-6 students during a semester. There may be 6-15 student teachers placed in a typical semester. These numbers depend on two variables, the number of student teachers and the number of supervisors available during the semester.

During the initial week of the semester, the assigned

supervisor(s) will visit each of his/her placement schools. It is during this first visit that the supervisor is able to converse with the cooperating teacher to discuss and plan for the upcoming 8 weeks. This is a time when the cooperating teacher may direct questions or comments to the supervisor regarding policies, procedures, etc. Any foreseeable needs can also be addressed at this time.

Role of the University Supervisor

The student teachers return to the university approximately every two weeks for seminars, which are conducted by the university supervisor(s). Each meeting, approximately one hour in length, generally begins with an open discussion of occurrences, either positive and/or negative, which have happened since the previous meeting. This gives the student teachers and their university supervisors an opportunity to interact on actual events that happened in schools.

As listed in the student teaching manual, the role of the primary university supervisor is described as follows:

- a) to communicate with both cooperating teacher and student teacher on a regular basis regarding satisfactory progress with requirements, problems, and evaluation.
- b) to work with the Assistant Dean, College of Education for planning and putting into operation all aspect of student teaching program deemed appropriate, including assignment of student teachers, completion of travel form, and completion of evaluations.

c) to plan and submit the procedures of the supervisory process, written evidence of analysis of each student teacher's performance, recommendations/suggestions regarding professional preparation and future placements.

d) to provide the student teacher with information regarding plans for instruction (unit and lesson), teaching behavior (teacher-pupil interaction), and ability of student teacher to assess learner achievement through evaluation through each observational visit.

e) to assist the cooperating teacher in understanding the policies and procedures of the university program.

f) to lend assistance, as a helping agent, to the student teacher in every way possible.

g) to assess the student teacher's performance in cooperation with the cooperating teacher, and submit recommendation of final assessment to the Assistant Dean, College of Education.

h) to provide the student teacher with data analysis of his/her teaching in addition to verbal evaluations.

i) to attend and direct student teaching seminars as scheduled during the semester (p. 12).

Each of these responsibilities must be carried out to achieve the goals of the physical education student teacher program.

Based on interviews with previous student teachers, university supervisors, cooperating teachers, and other faculty members within the college of education, the reflective approach used during the seminar meetings at Virginia Tech has been well received. Approximately 20% of the cooperating teachers interviewed suggested that they should be included during the seminar meetings as well. One

cooperating teacher stated that attending the on-campus meetings with the student teachers and their co-ops would give them a better understanding of what everyone is experiencing.

Between seminar meetings, the university supervisor(s) visits the student teachers at their placements. A typical visit lasts for approximately two class periods. This gives the supervisor time to observe the student teacher instruct and then to discuss the lessons afterwards. During the visit, the supervisor may also discuss the progress of the student teacher thus far with the cooperating teacher.

Sources of Data

The sources of data for this comparative analysis came from interviews and evaluations. Interviews were conducted with seven faculty members at Virginia Tech and seven cooperating teachers from the Spring, 1994 within the various physical education supervision models. The information from the interviews was obtained by means of phone calls, personal meetings, or written responses (see appendix for list of questions). Departmental evaluation forms focusing on aspects of cooperating teachers and university supervisors were completed by student teachers at the end of their placements.

Analysis of Data

In regard to a survey question concerning university

supervisors and their visits to student teacher placements, 60% of the cooperating teachers responded positively about the university supervisors from Virginia Tech. The visits are encouraged, and according to the cooperating teachers, supervisors are a link for the student teacher between the university and the placement school. Twenty percent stated that the visits by a university supervisor(s) were not necessary. The remaining twenty percent responded by saying that supervisors simply came by to make sure things were going well and mentioned things which could be done to improve the supervision of student teachers.

At the conclusion of the student teaching experience, student teachers complete an evaluation form, part of which pertains to the university supervisors. The following is a breakdown of the questions and the percentages of 21 student teachers who answered accordingly since the Fall semester of 1993.

1. My supervisor visited/observed me:

Too seldom	4%
Less than I'd like	0%
Almost enough	25%
Just enough	71%

2. During visits he/she usually stayed for:

1 period	19%
1-2 periods	76%
3-4 periods	5%
5-6 periods	0%

3. He/she asked me about the upcoming lesson and/or reviewed plans:

Never	6%
Sometimes	19%
Usually	28%
Always	47%

4. He/she provided me with helpful information before lessons began:

Never	24%
Sometimes	28%
Usually	38%
Always	10%

5. He/she provided me with data-based information about my teaching:

Never	0%
Sometimes	14%
Usually	19%
Always	62%
No answer	5%

6. He/she took lots of notes and shared them after each lesson:

Never	14%
Sometimes	5%
Usually	19%
Always	62%

7. He/she was able to provide feedback after observed lessons, either right away or in a later conversation:

Never	0%
Sometimes	4%
Usually	10%
Always	86%

8. I found his/her comments about my teaching to be accurate and fair:

Never	0%
Sometimes	0%
Usually	17%
Always	83%

9. When my supervisor pointed out deficiencies in my teaching, he/she communicated them to me in a supportive manner:

Never	0%
Sometimes	0%
Usually	5%
Always	95%

10. When my supervisor pointed out deficiencies in my teaching, he/she offered suggestions for improving those areas:

Never	0%
Sometimes	0%
Usually	14%
Always	86%

11. My supervisor discussed aspects of "learning about teaching" which are not related to instruction:

Never	5%
A few times	19%
Often	36%
A lot	26%
No answer	14%

Provide an overall rating of your university supervisor during this placement. (1=poor, 5=average, 10=excellent)

Average = 8.5

Summary of Data

Generally speaking, a majority of the student teachers were satisfied with their university supervisors. During one semester from which then data was collected, a supervisor resigned from Virginia Tech due to unforeseen circumstances. This created an unfortunate situation with some student teachers who may have settled for fewer visits from other supervisors. A reflection of this situation is noticeable in the data presented (i.e., #1, #3, #6, #11).

Inclement weather during another semester forced some student teachers to miss considerable amounts of student teaching time.

Role of Cooperating Teacher

In addition to evaluating university supervisors, the student teacher's cooperating teacher is also evaluated. The following data were collected in the Spring, 1993; Fall, 1993; and Spring 1994 to rate cooperating teachers on various aspects of their supervision in this model.

The scale below was used to rate the various aspects:

- 1 - Not helpful at all
- 2 - A little helpful, but I needed more
- 3 - Extremely helpful

1. Learning my way around the school

1	0%
2	19%
3	81%

2. Learning the school's regulations and policies

1	0%
2	28.5%
3	71.5%

3. Identifying key support personnel in the school

1	0%
2	19%
3	81%

4. Explaining the purpose/goals of his/her program

1	5%
2	19%
3	76%

5. Letting me know what I would be teaching

1	0%
2	28.5%
3	71.5%

6. Explaining how/when I would assume teaching responsibilities

1	0%
2	19%
3	81%

7. Alerting me to unique student-related problems

1	0%
2	9%
3	91%

8. Assisting me with planning before I taught

1	19%
2	14%
3	67%

9. Providing me with "inside tips" about teaching, PE, and schools

1	5%
2	14%
3	81%

10. My cooperating teacher provided me with adequate guidance for planning my classes.

Never	5%
Rarely	10%
Sometimes	14%
Almost Always	24%
Always	47%

11. My cooperating teacher provided comments and/or reviews of classes I taught.

Never	0%
Rarely	0%
Sometimes	24%
Almost Always	33%
Always	43%

12. I found his/her comments about my teaching to be informative and helpful.

Never	0%
Rarely	5%
Sometimes	9%
Almost Always	24%
Always	62%

13. When his/her comments were not positive, he/she provided me with good suggestions for improving my teaching.

Never	0%
Rarely	5%
Sometimes	10%
Almost Always	19%
Always	66%

14. My cooperating teacher interacted with me in a positive supportive manner.

Never	0%
Rarely	5%
Sometimes	5%
Almost Always	19%
Always	71%

15. My cooperating teacher kept in mind that I am a beginning teacher, who has lots to learn about how to teach physical education at this level.

Never	0%
Rarely	9%
Sometimes	5%
Almost Always	19%
Always	62%
No Answer	5%

16. Overall, I would rate my cooperating teacher as:
(1=poor, 5=average, 10=excellent)

Average = 8.7

Summary of Data

At least 70% of the student teachers concluded that their cooperating teacher was extremely helpful overall with one exception. Only 67% acknowledged that their cooperating teacher was extremely helpful in assisting with planning before they taught.

As mentioned in the summary after the university

supervisor data, unforeseen circumstances arose which could have a direct effect on the outcome of some questions.

University-Based Supervision as a Facilitator
of Program Goals

According to the data presented in the preceding pages, communication among student teachers, cooperating teachers, and the supervisor(s) serves as a facilitator for the Teacher Certification program. All of the student teachers interviewed reported that maintaining communication with the university and university supervisor(s) was very important. The communication can be satisfied by means of phone calls, personal visits to the area placements, and seminar meetings. By maintaining continuous communication through the duration of the placement, student teachers can be afforded the opportunity to meet with other student teachers and discuss needs/concerns. In addition, any problems which may arise can be dealt with immediately.

Communication

Personal visits from a university supervisor aid in achieving one goal of Virginia Tech's Physical Education K-12 student teaching program; to develop an increased ability to engage in self evaluation in assessing strengths as well as areas of need. As mentioned previously, a typical visit from a university supervisor includes time for discussion about the observed lesson. This time of reflection

immediately after instruction allows the student teacher to evaluate him/herself. According to the supervisor evaluation forms from the student teachers, the number of visits by a supervisor to the area placements was just enough for the majority. The four percent that responded with "too seldom" could have had problems with their supervisor that are unknown.

Evaluation

The evaluation of student teachers for the university-based supervision model is ultimately decided upon by the university supervisor. This aspect can prove to be beneficial for the student teacher who has endured a less than satisfactory relationship with his/her cooperating teacher. Unfortunately there have been cases in which student teachers are assigned to a cooperating teacher in which the relationship has affected the performance of the instruction by the student teacher. If a university supervisor clearly sees that a better grade is deserved, adjustments in the evaluation can be made. Rarely has there been a situation when the cooperating teacher assigns a grade to a student teacher when the supervisor believes it should be lower.

University-Based Supervision as an Inhibitor of Program Goals

The amount of time spent by one or a few individuals to

observe student teachers can be costly in terms of time and money. The number of student teachers assigned to a university supervisor(s) will greatly affect the degree to which expenditures become an issue of concern. The typical teaching load for a university faculty member at Virginia Tech is 9 didactic hours. The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, NCATE, guidelines suggest that each student teacher being supervised is equivalent to .75 didactic hours, therefore 12 student teachers would equate to a full didactic load.

Cost

In order to equal a full teaching schedule, at least 12 student teachers need to be assigned to the primary university supervisor. The physical education department at Virginia Tech typically has 6-8 student teachers each semester. This number would require the full-time university faculty member to teach one 3 hour course in addition to the responsibilities required of supervision.

In terms of cost to the university, consider a full-time university faculty member earning a 9-month salary of \$40,000. If a faculty member supervised 12 student teachers during one semester, the cost to the university for that one semester would be estimated as:

- \$20,000 salary, plus benefits (30%)
- 1,000 (est.) miles @ \$0.27 mile = \$270.00

- long distance phone calls from his/her office
- \$100 honorarium paid to each cooperating teacher or school district for each student teacher

On the other hand, if this faculty member were to supervise half that number, 6-8 student teachers, it would then cost the university only \$10,000, plus other expenditures. In addition, the university would also be able to use this supervisor to instruct a course during the semester.

Evaluation of Student Teachers

Cooperating teachers have expressed a strong desire to play a larger role in determining the final grade of their student teachers. At present, cooperating teachers under the university-based supervision model fill out bi-weekly evaluation forms, a mid-placement evaluation form, and a final evaluation form, all of which are the same (see appendix). On the mid-placement evaluation form, cooperating teachers are asked to assign a "mid-placement grade" to the student teacher. The assigned university supervisor meets with the cooperating teacher at the conclusion of the placement to discuss a final grade. The ultimate decision is that of the university supervisor's.

Summary of University-Based Model of Supervision

The university-based model for physical education student teachers at Virginia Tech has been the primary method of supervision. Students express the importance of

contact with the university while student teaching.

Although important to most, visits made by the university supervisor(s) to placements can become very costly (i.e., time and money) to the individual and the university.

Overall, the university-based model of supervision is probably the most widely used of all supervision methods in teacher education programs.

Clinical Teacher Model

The purpose of the clinical teacher model at Virginia Tech is to provide physical education student teachers with an opportunity to learn and practice effective teaching skills while under the total supervision of a cooperating teacher. In 1988 the College of Education at Virginia Tech proposed to the State Council of Higher Education for the initiation of a Clinical Affiliate Student Teacher Program which would continue for 23 months. Committees representing specific school divisions and higher education institutions selected the clinical affiliates for this project.

The Standards for Teacher Education Clinical Faculty (1988) outlines criteria that must be satisfied by the clinical affiliates in order to be considered. They are as follows:

1. possess a valid Virginia Collegiate Professional Certificate
2. be certified to teach the subject(s)/grade levels(s) to which they are assigned
3. preferably possess a master's degree
4. preferably have had an experience with an intern or student teacher
5. have been a successful classroom teacher for a minimum of three years
6. be recognized by peers and supervisors through written recommendations, as an accomplished teacher in at least one (preferably more) model of instruction and as a skilled leader in instructional development

7. be appointed for fixed terms (2-5 years) with regular review by the cooperating school division and the college or university (p. 7-8).

The Framework for Preparation of Clinical Affiliates was outlined in the proposal to the State Department of Education. The framework, divided into three phases (Communicating about Teaching, Analyzing Teaching, and Creating an Environment to Teach), included the content and corresponding activities and the estimated time allotted to each activity. Overall, the time for preparing clinical affiliates was estimated at 4 days.

Completing this program qualifies teachers to serve a dual role for the student teacher, as the cooperating teacher and supervisor. This would ultimately reduce the necessity of the university supervisor from making regular visits to the placement. However, some clinical teachers who continue to receive student teachers from Virginia Tech, request a university supervisor to carry on with regular visits. According to one clinical teacher during an interview, "the university supervisor serves as a link to the university that should not be broken - for the student teacher as well as us (the cooperating teachers)." On the other hand, some clinical teachers would rather not have visits from the university supervisors.

Sources of Data

The sources of data for the Clinical Teacher Model of

this project were evaluation forms from student teachers and interviews. Evaluation forms from the Fall and Spring semesters in 1993 and the Spring semester in 1994 were collected from 4 student teachers. The information gained through interviews with faculty at Virginia Tech and clinical teachers from Montgomery County and Roanoke County was used to analyze this model.

Data Analysis

Role of the University Supervisor

The role of the university supervisor in the clinical teacher model of supervision would be minimal. The purpose of the model is to shift much or all of the responsibility from the university supervisor to selected trained clinical teachers. The university supervisor should serve as a "link" for the student teacher/cooperating teacher to the university if needed. Student teacher evaluation responses are listed below in respect to their university supervisors. For reasons unknown, two students neglected to respond to this section of the evaluation.

1. My supervisor visited/observed me:

Too Seldom	0%
Less Than I'd Like	25%
Almost Enough	25%
Just Enough	50%

2. During visits he/she usually stayed for:

1 period	25%
1-2 periods	50%
3-4 periods	25%
5-6 periods	0%

3. He/she asked me about the upcoming lesson and/or reviewed plans.

Never	25%
Sometimes	25%
Usually	25%
Always	25%

4. He/she provided me with helpful information before lesson plans.

Never	25%
Sometimes	75%
Usually	0%
Always	0%

5. He/she provided me with data-based information about my teaching.

Never	25%
Sometimes	50%
Usually	25%
Always	0%

6. He/she took lots of notes and shared them after each lesson.

Never	0%
Sometimes	25%
Usually	50%
Always	25%

7. He/she was able to provide feedback after observed lessons, either right away or in a later conversation.

Never	0%
Sometimes	25%
Usually	0%
Always	75%

8. I found his/her comments about my teaching to be accurate and fair.

Never	0%
Sometimes	0%
Usually	50%
Always	50%

9. When my supervisor pointed out deficiencies in my teaching, he/she communicated them to me in a supportive manner.

Never	0%
Sometimes	0%
Usually	0%
Always	100%

10. When my supervisor pointed out deficiencies in my teaching, he/she offered suggestions for improving those areas.

Never	0%
Sometimes	0%
Usually	0%
Always	100%

11. My supervisor discussed aspects of "learning about teaching" which are not related to instruction.

Never	0%
A Few Times	0%
Often	100%
A Lot	0%

Please provide an overall rating of your university supervisor during this placement (1=poor, 5=average, 10=excellent).

Average = 7.75

Summary

According to the evaluations by student teachers, the overall rating of the university supervisor in the clinical teacher model was lower than the 8.5 average of the university-based model. This may be attributed to several

factors. The university supervisor plays a more significant role for student teachers in the university-based model than that of the clinical teacher model. Secondly, the number of evaluation forms completed by student teachers was considerably lower in the clinical teacher model than the university-based model, perhaps creating an invalid comparison.

Role of the Cooperating Teacher

A clinical teacher in Virginia Tech's physical education student teacher program plays a unique role in comparison to the cooperating teachers from the other three models. The teachers (cooperating teachers) are in a "partnership" with the university during the entire process. They actually design the experience for the student teacher. Because there is minimal interaction with a university supervisor, the clinical teacher has sole responsibility of the student teacher's experience of practice teaching, thus acquiring a very influential role.

The scale below was used to rate the various aspects:

- 1 - Not helpful at all
- 2 - A little helpful, but I needed more
- 3 - Extremely helpful

1. Learning my way around the school	
1	0%
2	0%
3	100%

2. Learning the school's regulations and policies
- | | |
|---|------|
| 1 | 0% |
| 2 | 0% |
| 3 | 100% |
3. Identifying key support personnel in the school
- | | |
|---|------|
| 1 | 0% |
| 2 | 0% |
| 3 | 100% |
4. Explaining the purpose/goals of his/her program
- | | |
|---|------|
| 1 | 0% |
| 2 | 0% |
| 3 | 100% |
5. Letting me know what I would be teaching
- | | |
|---|------|
| 1 | 0% |
| 2 | 0% |
| 3 | 100% |
6. Explaining how/when I would assume teaching responsibilities
- | | |
|---|-----|
| 1 | 0% |
| 2 | 17% |
| 3 | 83% |
7. Alerting me to unique student-related problems
- | | |
|---|------|
| 1 | 0% |
| 2 | 0% |
| 3 | 100% |
8. Assisting me with planning before I taught
- | | |
|---|------|
| 1 | 0% |
| 2 | 0% |
| 3 | 100% |
9. Providing me with "inside tips" about teaching, PE, and schools
- | | |
|---|------|
| 1 | 0% |
| 2 | 0% |
| 3 | 100% |

10. My cooperating teacher provided me with adequate guidance for planning my classes.

Never	0%
Rarely	0%
Sometimes	18%
Almost Always	50%
Always	32%

11. My cooperating teacher provided comments and/or reviews of classes I taught.

Never	0%
Rarely	0%
Sometimes	32%
Almost Always	18%
Always	50%

12. I found his/her comments about my teaching to be informative and helpful.

Never	0%
Rarely	0%
Sometimes	0%
Almost Always	13%
Always	87%

13. When his/her comments were not positive, he/she provided me with good suggestions for improving my teaching.

Never	0%
Rarely	0%
Sometimes	0%
Almost Always	0%
Always	100%

14. My cooperating teacher interacted with me in a positive supportive manner.

Never	0%
Rarely	0%
Sometimes	0%
Almost Always	0%
Always	100%

15. My cooperating teacher kept in mind that I am a beginning teacher, who has lots to learn about how to teach physical education at this level.

Never	0%
Rarely	0%
Sometimes	0%
Almost Always	0%
Always	100%

16. Overall, I would rate my cooperating teacher as (1=poor, 5=average, 10=excellent):

Average = 10

Summary

The data illustrates the student teacher perspective of their clinical teachers. Overall, the response was extremely favorable of the clinical teachers. In comparison with the cooperating teachers in the university-based model who had an overall average rating of 8.7, the clinical teachers performed far better with an overall average rating of 10. Of the factors which could have contributed to the overall discrepancy, the experience and training of a clinical teacher were most likely to be the distinguishing factors.

Clinical Teacher Supervision as a Facilitator of Program Goals

Each of the student teaching goals is achieved in some way by the clinical teacher supervision model at Virginia Tech. One advantage of training teachers to become clinical affiliates is that these individuals become "partners" in

the designing process for the student teacher. In doing so, they tend to have a greater understanding of the university's expectations for their student teachers. Overall, the cooperating teacher will then have more influence during the student teaching experience.

An aspect thought by some as an inhibitor (which is discussed further in the next section) and thought by others as a facilitator is that student teachers will rely totally on a cooperating teacher for guidance rather than several other individuals. The guidance of one individual who is consistent with his/her instruction and opinions tends to alleviate confusion for the student teacher. Additional conflicts of interest can make what should be a very rewarding learning experience lead to what could ultimately be a difficult 8 weeks.

Clinical Teacher Supervision as an Inhibitor
of Program Goals

Implementation

The clinical teacher model of supervision can be a very costly project, in both time and money. An enormous amount of preparation time needed in the beginning for implementation makes this model conducive to a very labor intensive endeavor. The committee requested two years (1988 & 1989) to conduct the program. Following is the timeline proposed by George M. Graham, Professor in the Division of

Health and Physical Education, to the Dr. Margaret Miller
from the State Board of Education:

1988

August 1 - 25 --Identification and selection of
Advisory Board

August 25 - September 15 -- Recruitment of potential
clinical affiliates; application deadline Sept. 15

September 15 - 30 -- Selection of clinical affiliates
by school division-university joint personnel
committees

First week in October -- Full day meeting of clinical
affiliates to begin training (clinical affiliates
provided with substitute teachers)

October 1 - December 15 -- Training of clinical
affiliates (after school/evening sessions) as part of
graduate course at Hollins or Virginia Tech (based on
clinical affiliate choice)

1989

January - May --Clinical affiliates supervise student
teachers; bi-weekly seminars held for clinical
affiliates; ongoing evaluation with student teachers,
clinical affiliates, university supervisors

June 1 - 15 -- Preparation of first year report (based
on process evaluation conducted during Spring Semester,
1989)

First week in July -- Meeting of Advisory Board,
project coordinators to determine any changes for
academic year 1989-90 based on first year evaluation

Last week in August -- Full day workshop to train
clinical affiliates in the process of action research

Fall Semester, 1989 -- Clinical affiliates supervise
student teachers and conduct action research projects;
evaluation continues with student teachers, clinical
affiliates and university supervisors; bi-weekly
meetings for clinical affiliates in regard to
supervision and action research

Spring Semester, 1990 -- Clinical affiliates continue to supervise student teachers and conduct action research; monthly meetings of clinical affiliates and university supervisors; ongoing evaluation continues

May 15 - June 15 -- Evaluation completed and summarized; final report prepared (p. 28)

Cost

The Clinical Faculty Proposal Resource Request Summary Table indicates the expenditures for the personal and nonpersonal services utilized during the two year period. The grand total for Virginia Tech was \$220,890. The personal services included the four faculty members who contributed 25% of their time to facilitate the project and their fringe benefits. The nonpersonal services included contractual services (stipends for clinical affiliates, substitute teachers), supplies and materials, and continuous charges (project communication, copying/printing, and local travel).

Communication

Due to the nature of the clinical teacher model of supervision, it is not necessary for a university supervisor to make frequent visits to area placements. This may serve as an inhibitor to the program goals for student teaching. A typical visit from a university supervisor may aid in initiating reflection to engage in self evaluation of the assessment of strengths as well as areas of need. This usually occurs during discussion after the observed lesson.

Without the feedback from someone other than the cooperating teacher, self evaluation may not occur as often.

The data indicates that only 50% of the student teachers responded with "just enough" regarding the number of times his/her supervisor observed them. The remaining 50% was divided equally by those responding with "less than I'd like" and "almost enough." This may imply that communication between university supervisors and student teachers is important.

Of the cooperating teachers who had been through the clinical teacher program, 50% stated during an interview that they would like for a university supervisor to continue observing the student teachers, although it was not necessary. They claimed the supervisors served as a link to the university that should not be broken. Twenty-five percent of the cooperating teachers responded by stating they were impartial to visits from a university supervisor. The remaining 25% stated they could do without a university supervisor observing the student teacher.

Summary of the Clinical Teacher Model

For various reasons, the training for teachers with a desire to participate in the clinical teacher model of supervision at Virginia Tech has not been continued. The concept has been well received in the physical education program as well as other programs within the college of

education. Most of the cooperating teachers who participated in the program are still active clinical teachers for Virginia Tech. The quality of those individuals is apparent based on the evaluations by the student teachers. Based on the structure and goals of a college/university's teacher preparation program for physical education, the clinical teacher model should be considered.

Distant Placement Model

The purpose of the distant placement supervision model at Virginia Tech is to provide physical education student teachers with an opportunity to learn and practice effective teaching skills while under the direct supervision of a cooperating teacher. The differentiating factor in this model is that student teachers are placed in schools outside the general vicinity of the university, eliminating the opportunity for any visitations by university supervisors.

Students desiring to student teach under the distant placement model generally inform the university supervisor one year prior to the semester of placement. Considerations for distant placements are made for many reasons, however the following are conducive for priority:

- save money for student teachers
- interest in a particular school system by the student teachers
- live at permanent residence

The structure of the distant placement model is somewhat different than those of the three other models described in this project. The following pages will present a analysis of various aspects to this model of supervision. Those described will be the role of the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher, seminar requirements, visits, assessment and grading, and the

factors facilitating and inhibiting program goals.

Role of the University Supervisor

The university supervisor at Virginia Tech plays a minimal role in the supervision of those student teachers placed in schools distant from the university. The main priority of the supervisor for this model is to select a reputable cooperating teacher(s). These teachers are selected based on verbal and written recommendations from individuals within the desired school system(s) such as the Physical Education Supervisor and administrators. The number of cooperating teachers for a given semester is based on the number of students who request to student teach under the distant placement model of supervision.

In recent past semesters, contact made to student teachers by the university supervisor during the placement was satisfied by means of phone calls, faxed documents, and three scheduled mandatory seminar meetings. Communication among the student teachers, university supervisor, and the cooperating teacher will be discussed further in the section on facilitating and inhibiting factors relating to program goals.

Role of the Cooperating Teacher

The cooperating teacher for a student teacher in the distant placement model of supervision serves as a mentor and supervisor. This individual assumes the combined

responsibilities as the cooperating teachers in the other models, and those of the university supervisor. Unlike the cooperating teachers in the clinical teacher model, those in the distant model are not trained. The following is a portion of the list of responsibilities of the university supervisor from the student teaching handbook in which the cooperating teacher is responsible:

1. To plan and submit...written evidence of analysis of each student teacher's performance, recommendations/suggestions regarding professional preparation and future placements.
2. To provide the student teacher with information regarding plans for instruction (unit and lesson), teaching behavior (teacher-pupil interaction), and ability of student teacher to assess learner achievement.
3. To assess student teacher's performance...and submit recommendation of final assessment to the Assistant Dean, College of Education.
4. To provide student teacher with data analysis of his/her teaching in addition to verbal evaluations (p. 12).

Sources of Data

The data collected for this model of supervision was taken from the evaluation forms completed by distant student teachers since the Spring of 1993.

Data Analysis

The following data about cooperating teachers at distant placements was gathered from six student teacher evaluations at the conclusion of their elementary and

secondary assignments:

The scale below was used to rate the various aspects:

- 1 - Not helpful at all
- 2 - A little helpful, but I needed more
- 3 - Extremely helpful

1. Learning my way around the school

1	0%
2	40%
3	60%

2. Learning the school's regulations and policies

1	0%
2	60%
3	40%

3. Identifying key support personnel in the school

1	0%
2	0%
3	100%

4. Explaining the purpose/goals of his/her program

1	0%
2	40%
3	60%

5. Letting me know what I would be teaching

1	0%
2	20%
3	80%

6. Explain how and when I would assume teaching responsibilities

1	0%
2	0%
3	100%

7. Alerting me to unique student-related problems

1	0%
2	40%
3	60%

8. Assisting me with planning before I taught

1	0%
2	20%
3	80%

9. Providing me with "inside tips" about teaching, PE, and schools

1	0%
2	0%
3	100%

10. My cooperating teacher provided me with adequate guidance for planning my classes.

Never	0%
Rarely	0%
Sometimes	20%
Almost Always	40%
Always	40%

11. My cooperating teacher provided comments and/or review of classes I taught.

Never	0%
Rarely	0%
Sometimes	0%
Almost Always	40%
Always	60%

12. I found his/her comments about my teaching to be informative and helpful.

Never	0%
Rarely	0%
Sometimes	40%
Almost Always	0%
Always	60%

13. When his/her comments were not positive, he/she provided me with good suggestions for improving my teaching.

Never	0%
Rarely	0%
Sometimes	0%
Almost Always	20%
Always	80%

14. My cooperating teacher interacted with me in a positive supportive manner.

Never	0%
Rarely	0%
Sometimes	20%
Almost Always	20%
Always	60%

15. My cooperating teacher kept in mind that I am a beginning teacher, who has lots to learn about how to teach physical education at this level.

Never	0%
Rarely	0%
Sometimes	20%
Almost Always	0%
Always	80%

Overall, I would rate my cooperating teacher as (1=poor, 5=average, 10=excellent)

Average = 8.8

Seminars

As mentioned previously, regularly scheduled seminar meetings occur approximately every two weeks. It would be unreasonable to ask student teachers under this supervision model to return to campus so frequently. It is mandatory however for student teacher(s) to attend the preplacement meeting and the seminars concluding the elementary and secondary placements.

Visits

The distance between the university and the distant placement, typically averaging 300 miles, precluded a university supervisor from making on-site visits. The university supervisor will rely on phone calls from the

cooperating teacher and student teacher if problems arise. The student teacher is strongly recommended, if not required, to videotape several class periods of instruction and send them back to the university supervisor during the placement.

Assessment and Grading

Unlike the other models of supervision, cooperating teachers in this model are entirely responsible for assigning the final grade. Bi-weekly evaluation forms are sent to the university supervisor during the course of the placement. Concluding the 8 week period, the cooperating teacher uses an evaluation form that is used throughout the College of Education (see appendix). On the back of this form, the cooperating teacher is asked to assign a written grade. This form is then to be returned to the university supervisor in a sealed envelope, and then to be classified as confidential information.

Distant Placement Model of Supervision as a Facilitator of Program Goals

Students who choose to student teach in an area distant from the university campus typically do so for several reasons as mentioned previously. The school system in which they student teach is one where they hope to become employed. The school systems grouped in the university-based supervision model of student teaching are typically

rural schools. The average physical education class contains approximately 20-25 students. In popular suburban/urban areas such as northern Virginia or Tidewater, class sizes generally range from 35-40 students.

Student teaching in an environment similar to one in which employment is preferred, aids in achieving most, if not all, of the program goals. Student teachers will develop an awareness of the personal and physical requirements of teaching specific to the desired locale. The demands placed on an individual in this environment may be different than if that person student taught under the university-based model of supervision.

Developing an increased knowledge of learners' characteristics (e.g., emotional, physical, mental, cultural and ethnic)...is another goal that is achieved through the distant placement. Schools located in the counties surrounding Virginia Tech are predominantly Caucasian with little diversity. School systems in the eastern half of the state tend to be more diverse in their student population. School systems such as these are in search of teachers who have had experience teaching in a similar environment.

Distant Placement Model of Supervision
as an Inhibitor of Program Goals

The data presented pertaining to the supervision of the cooperating teachers in this model revealed interesting

results. One hundred percent of the student teachers agreed to the fact that their cooperating teachers were "extremely helpful" in regard to the three following aspects of their supervision.

- Identifying key support personnel in the school
- Explaining how/when I would assume teaching responsibilities
- Providing me with "inside tips" about teaching, PE, and schools

These results are much different from the clinical teacher model of supervision. One hundred percent of the student teachers in the clinical model agreed that their cooperating teachers were "extremely helpful" in regard to 11 of the 15 items evaluated.

Communication

The evaluation form for the student teachers listed 15 aspects pertaining to their cooperating teacher's supervision. As mentioned previously, the results for distant placement supervision did not favorably compare to other models of supervision. Ironically, each of those aspects directly or indirectly related to the concept of communication.

Based on opinions gathered from student teachers in regard to the distant placement model, a considerable number were not satisfied with the level of communication with

their cooperating teachers and or university supervisor.

According to one student teacher:

The communication was not enough [with the university supervisor]. I was only contacted one time throughout my student teaching. My elementary cooperating teacher was not contacted one time. I do not believe there has to be a great deal of contact, but every once in a while would have helped me make sure I was on the right track.

An interview question directed to a cooperating teacher in this model regarding the level of communication with the university was answered similarly. The concern displayed by this individual aggregated to the point that if problems were to arise with the student teacher, what would the university supervisor recommend.

Familiarity with the Virginia Tech PE program

Cooperating teachers from schools systems within the general vicinity of the university are very familiar with Virginia Tech's physical education program and its expectations. On the other hand, those who are in different locations of the state are not familiar with this program, but more so with Old Dominion University or George Mason where their student teachers may typically come from. This may be supported by the question for student teachers: "my cooperating teacher interacted with me in a positive supportive manner." Forty percent of the student teachers responded with an answer other than "always."

Evaluation of Student Teachers

Due to the unfamiliarity of the physical education program at Virginia Tech, some of the cooperating teachers may have had difficulty with evaluation. Under the other models of supervision, if a problem were to arise, the university supervisor would be available to detect it, then correct it if need be. In a placement located hundreds of miles away from the university, a "backup" opinion of the student teacher's performance is not available. The responsibility of evaluation relies entirely upon the cooperating teacher with no input from the university.

Summary of the Distant Placement Model

The concept behind the distant placement model of supervision is a valid one. This provides student teachers with an opportunity to practice their teaching in an area in which they hope to reside and gain employment. Information gained from interviews and evaluations show that the success of this model at Virginia Tech depends to a certain extent upon the degree of communication with student teachers and cooperating teachers.

Team Supervision Model

The purpose of the team supervision model at Virginia Tech is to provide physical education student teachers with an opportunity to learn and practice effective teaching skills while under university supervision. Similar to the university-based model, this model engages students in an environment where they can apply new knowledge to a setting beyond the university through a team of supervisors, rather than one individual.

Implementation

The team supervision model was used at Virginia Tech for physical education for the first time in the Spring of 1994 on a trial basis. The idea was proposed to the supervisory team approximately 1 month before it was implemented. Following the secondary placement, the team supervision model was to go into effect at the beginning of the elementary placement. All members agreed that if this did not work and/or problems arose under this model of supervision, the team concept would cease and supervision would resume as before under the university-based model.

The supervisory team consisted of four individuals; the university supervisor and three graduate students in physical education, two doctoral students and one masters student. The primary supervisor, also referred to as the university supervisor, had extensive supervisory experience.

One of the doctoral students had minimal supervisory experience. The other two graduate students had no previous experience prior to the Spring semester.

The overall structure of this model is the same as the university-based with several exceptions. At implementation, six student teachers were placed in area elementary schools and each of the cooperating teachers were notified of the supervisory team. The team members would rotate among the schools to observe. Every Monday the team would meet to discuss observations from the previous week and to assign observations for the current week. Aside from the mentioned exceptions, everything else remains the same.

The following pages will describe in more detail the key factors in this model. To conclude, the facilitators and inhibitors of the Team Supervision Model relative to the overall goals of Virginia Tech's physical education student teacher program will be discussed.

Sources of Data

The source of data for this model came from interviews with cooperating teachers, faculty from Virginia Tech, student teachers, and members of the supervisory team. Evaluation forms which are normally completed by the student teachers at the end of their placements, were not completed after the elementary placement of the Spring semester.

Role of the Supervisory Team

The members of the team met every Monday for eight weeks to discuss the previous week and to make observation assignments for the remainder of the week. Generally speaking, the meetings were relatively short, for there were no problems to speak of with the student teachers, their cooperating teachers, or the placements. Team members shared thoughts from observations to inform the group how each student teacher was progressing. Before departing from the meeting, members agreed upon observation assignments for the week. By rotating from placement to placement, each team member had an opportunity to see every student teacher at least once during the elementary placement.

Data Analysis

The questions below were given to 6 student teachers at the end of their elementary placement. Some of the responses follow:

1. Over the past 16 weeks, you have been supervised by one individual and also by a "team." Reflect back on both experiences and describe which method of supervision worked best for you and why.

I don't feel that one way worked better than any other but with the "team" supervision, you have the added benefit of more opinions, more ideas, more constructive criticism from a few different people rather than just one.

Both ways of supervision were fine with me. With the team though, I received more supervision because at least one supervisor came out every week or so.

2. Generally speaking, each of you had positive experiences with your elementary placement. IF you had been experiencing an ongoing problem with anything related to this placement, would a team of supervisors ultimately "complicated things?" Why or why not?

No because maybe if there is a problem, at least one of the supervisors can get through to the co-op (hopefully) rather than just one person trying to.

No because I feel if we had told any of the supervisors that they were complicating things, they would have rectified the problem.

3. Please describe the reactions of your cooperating teacher as three or four different supervisors observed you during your placement. Were they positive, negative, or indifferent?

Very positive. He felt like it reflected a quality program.

Mostly indifferent but she was a little mad about them always asking her what else I would be teaching after line dancing.

They were positive. I think the more people that came to see my co-op's program made her happy. She could brag!

4. Is there anything different the supervising team could have accommodated you with which was lacking?

I cannot think of anything else they could have done.

No - If I needed anything, all I had to do was ask.

Summary

Overall, the comments in response to the team supervision were positive. The indifferent response for question three according to one student teacher was made for one reason. The cooperating teacher at that placement had the student teacher teach a unit of line dancing the entire

8 weeks. When the four supervisors observed at different times, each had asked how much longer that unit would continue. Although the concept was new, it appears the student teachers had confidence in their supervisory team during the placement.

Team Supervision Model as a Facilitator
of Program Goals

The distinct similarities of this model to the university-based indicate that many, if not all, of the program goals are met through this supervision process. The student teacher handbook outlines the responsibilities of the university supervisor. One of these is to

communicate with both cooperating teacher and student teacher on a regular basis regarding satisfactory progress with requirements, problems, and evaluation.

According to one student teacher, the team approach to supervision actually enhanced the number of visits to placements, thus satisfying the "communication...on a regular basis" mentioned above.

Traveling

In the university-based model of supervision, schools within a 50 mile radius are considered for placements. Rotating placement assignments among a team of supervisors reduces the total mileage traveled by one individual. Ordinarily supervisors would be specifically assigned to student teachers for the entire placement. So if those

student teachers were placed 40 miles away from the university, that supervisor could ultimately travel 640 miles (one visit per week) during the 8 week placement for one student teacher.

Feedback

During an interview, a student teacher stated that being supervised by a team was more beneficial. There was a better opportunity for more constructive criticism and more opinions rather than from just one supervisor. Different perspectives may stimulate self-evaluation for the student teacher.

Team Supervision Model as an Inhibitor of Program Goals

On the contrary to what was mentioned in regard to the facilitation of program goals through communication of supervisors within the team model, this could serve as an inhibiting factor as well. In the Spring semester of 1994, six student teachers were placed in elementary schools and were supervised by a team of 4 members. The ratio of supervisors to student teachers was excellent. During that semester, there were no problems to speak of with the student teachers or the cooperating teachers.

If this had been a semester with a larger number of student teachers were placed, the team could have experienced complications such as communication and

evaluation. Fortunately no complications had been encountered upon completion of the elementary placement under the team model of supervision.

Summary of Team Supervision Model

The team model of supervision was successful during the elementary placement of the Spring semester, 1994. The ratio of supervisors to student teachers established a positive working relationship among cooperating teachers, student teachers, and the members of the supervisory team. Whether or not there would have been complications under different circumstances is left to be discovered. Although it is relatively new, this approach to supervising student teachers in physical education should be encouraged.

Summary of Supervision Models

The models of student teacher supervision in physical education have been described as they apply to the Virginia Tech Physical Education K-12 Teacher Certification program. Each model shows varying degrees of potential to promote the program. The facilitating and inhibiting factors of each model should be taken into account when determining which method of supervision to use for student teachers in physical education. Considerations should be made based on the available resources such as the number of supervisors and potential funds.

Direct communication is a key factor in the success of each supervision model. Perhaps the distant model of supervision could be enhanced through electronic mail and conference calls. Regardless of the model, the data suggests a need for a mechanism of direct and regular communication among student teachers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors.

It appears the training of the clinical teachers enhanced the student teaching experience for the students from Virginia Tech. The overall rating of clinical teachers was excellent according to the evaluations from student teachers. The cooperating teachers in each of the models could possibly benefit from the training in a clinical teacher model.

Recent restructuring within the College of Education at Virginia Tech has created an environment in the physical education department that is susceptible to change. Perhaps this is an opportunity to enhance the teacher certification program by persuing each supervision model systematically. This project could be extended, enabling those involved, to look at the models of supervision described as an alternative to the standard university-based supervision model.

Supervision of Physical Education Student Teachers

	Facilitators	Inhibitors
University-Based Supervision Model	Communication. Evaluation.	Cost to University. Evaluation.
Clinical Teacher Model of Supervision	Cooperating teachers become "partners" in designing process. Student teachers rely on one individual for guidance.	Implementation (Cost and Time). Communication.
Distant Placement Model of Supervision	Student teachers can practice teaching in an environment similar to one which they hope to become employed.	Communication. Unfamiliarity with Tech's program for the cooperating teachers. Evaluation.
Team Supervision Model	Traveling. Feedback.	Not evident from findings.

References

- College of Education, Virginia Tech. (1988). A request for funding proposal to the Virginia State Council of Higher Education. Principle investigator, George M. Graham.
- Cooper, J. M. (Ed.). (1984). Developing skills for instructional supervision. New York: Longman.
- Henry, M. A., & Beasley, W. W. (1982). Supervising student teachers the professional way (3rd ed.). Indiana: Sycamore Press.
- Houston, R. W. (Ed.). (1990). Handbook of research on teacher education. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Metzler, M. W. (1990). Instructional supervision for physical education. Illinois: Human Kinetics Books.
- Physical Education K-12 Criteria for Professional Studies. (No date). Division of Health and Physical Education, Virginia Tech.
- Physical Education K-12 Student Teacher Handbook. (No date). Division of Health and Physical Education, Virginia Tech.
- Soltis, J. (Ed.). (1987). Reforming teacher education: The impact of the Holmes Group report. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Woods, J. B., Dick, B. V., & Mauries, T. J. (1973). Student teaching: the entrance to professional physical education. New York: Academic Press.

Appendix A

BI-WEEKLY EVALUATION

(Student Teacher)

(Date)

(Name of School)

(Name)

Check one:

Cooperating Teacher

Clinical Teacher

Supervisor

	More Than Satis- factory	Satis- factory	Less Than Satis- factory	Not Observed	Addi- tional Comments (See back)
SUBJECT KNOWLEDGE					
1. Designs learning tasks at appropriate levels					
2. Provides suggestions which aid in skill improvement					
3. Teaches in an organized skill progression					
4. Answers student questions adequately					
COMMUNICATIVE SKILLS					
1. Provides clear, concise instructions					
2. Provides understandable description of task					
3. Lesson objectives are clearly stated					
4. Feedback is specific to task being performed					
USE OF CLASS TIME					
1. Allows sufficient time for improvement					
2. Evaluates class outcome (asks questions, pre & post test, etc.)					
3. Keeps management time to a minimum					
4. Smooth transition between task					
EVALUATION OF STUDENTS					
1. Able to identify students' ability level					
2. Sets goals relative to student skill levels					
3. Able to recognize students' needs					
4. Devises ways to evaluate students' progress					
5. Makes tasks challenging and interesting					
SELF EVALUATION					
1. Open to constructive criticism					
2. Asks often for Co-Op evaluation of performance					

	More Than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Less Than Satisfactory	Not Observed	Additional Comments (See back)
3. Listens carefully to students' comments during and after class					
4. Reflects on class after teaching and adapts if necessary					
5. Recognizes when activity or tasks need to be changed					
PLANNING/PREPARATION					
1. Has equipment ready before class begins					
2. Lessons are prepared using available equipment and facilities					
3. Is able to adapt if conditions deem necessary (weather, special programs in gym, etc.)					
4. Able to vary teaching style according to lesson content and grade level					
5. Able to use complete class time (never runs out of activities before class ends).					
6. Lesson plans prepared for each day and presented for review					
7. Activities are smooth in transition and management					
8. Has very little waiting time for students					
KNOWLEDGE OF ADMINISTRATIVE RESOURCES					
1. Knows where to find student records					
2. Has knowledge of school, district, and state policies					
3. Has knowledge of all rules applied in the gymnasium					
FACULTY RELATIONS					
1. Gets along well with other members of the staff					
2. Demonstrates eagerness to work with other staff members					
3. Is well liked by other members of school staff					
4. Seems to like other members of school staff					
5. Takes advice well when offered by Co-Op and other faculty personnel					
TEACHER/STUDENT INTERACTION					
<i>in class</i>					
1. Is receptive to student suggestions					
2. Shows interest in answering student questions					
3. Liked by students					
4. Seems to like students					
<i>other than during class</i>					
1. Willing to listen to student problems					
2. Available for additional help (class related)					

	More Than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Less Than Satisfactory	Not Observed	Additional Comments (See back)
CLASS CLIMATE					
1. Positive attitude demonstrated by students during class					
2. Student eager to try new activities					
3. Teacher demonstrates positive attitude during class					
4. Encourages students to try new tasks					
5. Students are held responsible for own actions					
CLASS MANAGEMENT					
1. Takes preventive measures in handling class behavior					
2. Uses transitions which avoid waiting time					
3. Offers skills at various levels to keep activity challenging					
4. Uses a variety of teaching styles to keep students interested					
5. Holds students accountable in class					
DISCIPLINE					
1. States rules and consequences at beginning of class					
2. Ensures rules and consequences understood by all students					
3. Enforces rules the same for all students					
4. Listens to student explanation before deciding disciplinary action					
5. Consequences are matched with severity of misbehavior					
6. Rules are applicable to tasks/activity being taught					
7. Clearly points out to student what was wrong with their action					
PROFESSIONAL ATTRIBUTES					
1. Initiative and creativity					
2. Comes to class prepared					
3. Willing to try Co-Op and Supervising teachers' suggestions					
4. Punctual in beginning and ending class					
5. Seems to like teaching					
6. Seems dedicated to physical education as a profession					
7. Attempts to improve teaching abilities					
8. Use of English					
9. Enthusiasm					

	More Than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Less Than Satisfactory	Not Observed	Additional Comments (See back)
PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES					
1. Personal appearance					
2. Self-confidence					
3. Voice					
4. Demonstrates proper professional judgments					

Other Comments:

(signed)

Student Teacher

(signed)

Cooperating/Clinical Teacher

Appendix B

Student Teacher Evaluation

Student Teacher _____ Quarter _____ Year _____
(Last Name) (First Name)

Grade of Subject _____ Cooperating Teacher _____
(Name)

Cooperating School _____ Cooperating Principal _____
(Building) (City) (Name)

University Supervisor _____ Report completed by (X one): _____
(Name)

- a. Cooperating teacher _____
- b. University Supervisor _____
- c. Student teacher _____

- I. Please indicate the approximate number of times your student attended:
- | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Faculty meetings _____ | Parent-Teacher conferences _____ |
| PTA meetings _____ | School activities after 4:00 _____ |
| Professional meetings _____ | Plays, programs, assemblies _____ |
- Others (List) _____
- II. Please rate your student teacher in the following areas. A rating of "1" indicates great strength, 5 indicates a definite weakness in the area.

A. Personality		1	2	3	4	5
Demonstrates Enthusiasm	Interest in teaching					
	Energetic					
	Enjoys working with students					
Appearance	Dress and grooming are appropriate					
Courtesy	Is tactful & sensitive to feelings of others					
Poise	Emotional stability and self-control is demonstrated					
Dependability	Meets obligations					
	Is punctual					
	Follows through on appropriate suggestions by other professionals					
Ability to Reason	Demonstrates common sense					
	Selects appropriate courses of action after consideration of alternatives					
B. Instructional Skills						
Planning	Places instructional events in logical and useful sequence					
	Specifies the provisions for individual differences					
Motivation	Uses reinforcement to achieve goals					
	Provides opportunities for students to explore					
Management	Provides experiences designed to meet objectives					
	Handles routine assignments easily					
	Keeps accurate records					
Evaluation	Organizes materials efficiently					
	Organizes materials effectively					
	Demonstrates skills in identifying measurable behavior					
Verbal Discussion	Attempts to determine students' attitudes and beliefs					
	Modifies teaching procedure in response to feedback data					
Guidance	Demonstrates skills in phrasing stimulating questions					
	Is alert to and uses students' ideas					
Guidance	Assists students in developing self control					
	Assists students in developing cooperative group responsibility					
	Identifies and takes appropriate action to problem situations					

Comments: _____

SIGNATURE OF:
Circle one: Cooperating Teacher
University Supervisor
Student Teacher

**CONFIDENTIAL SUMMARY RATING
OF STUDENT TEACHER**

Student's Name _____

Social Security Number _____

At the completion of the student teaching experience, the teacher demonstrated those qualities and competencies that would lead one to believe that

- he will likely be a truly outstanding teacher.
- he will likely be a superior teacher and after appropriate experience may develop into an outstanding teacher.
- he will likely be average or better as a teacher, but he may never be truly outstanding.
- he should become a full-time teacher only after certain rather serious personal or professional inadequacies are eliminated.
- under no condition should he consider making a career in the *teaching* profession.

Additional Comments: _____

University Supervisor (Signature)

Appendix C

Questions:

What is your current involvement in the physical education student teacher program? List and describe any other ways you have been involved in the program.

What do you see as the purpose of the K-12 student teacher program for physical education students at Virginia Tech?

Would you consider yourself in total agreement with the purpose described above? If not, what would you consider the "ideal" purpose of a physical education student teacher program?

How do you compare this program with other physical education student teacher programs throughout the Commonwealth (or other states) that you are aware of?

How do you compare this program with other student teacher programs throughout the college of education if known?

Students who graduate from Virginia Tech with a degree in physical education are certified K-12, after student teaching for 16 weeks in the elementary and secondary schools combined. Based on your purpose of student teaching, is the current time allotment adequate for preparing beginning teachers? If not, what would it look like?

What would you like to see this program doing differently in 5 years to better meet its purpose?

Based on your knowledge of the program, explain how you would rate it overall in terms of achieving the purpose on a scale of 1-10 (1=poor, 5=average, 10=excellent).

During the interview, please mention anything of importance to you that may not have been asked in this set of questions.