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Synopsis 7

Questions Addressed

1. Is the predicted relationship between exposure as a prospective elementary teacher to selected emphases in a preparation program observable in the teaching proficiencies demonstrated by first year teachers? (NOTE: The program emphases investigated were (1) alignment with Oregon’s design for standards-based schools; (2) the connection of teaching and learning through teacher work samples; and (3) the assessment of teacher candidates against clearly articulated performance standards).

2. If expected differences are observable in the performance of 1st year teachers do these differences persist in the second year of teaching? If they do, do they increase or decrease?

Measures Reported and Teacher Sample Involved

Measures
(1) Only the summative evaluation ratings obtained through the observation system described in Research Brief 5 that has been developed for and used in the TEP-2 project to assess the classroom performance of early career elementary teachers, and (2) the rating system used to classify preparation programs on hypothesis related variables.

1st Year Teacher Sample
(1) The TOTAL SAMPLE of Cohort One 1st year teachers receiving classroom observations (N=66); and (2) The INTACT SAMPLE of Cohort One 1st year teachers (those continuing in the project as 2nd year teachers) receiving classroom observations (N=45).

2nd Year Teacher Sample
The INTACT SAMPLE of Cohort One 2nd year teachers receiving classroom observations (N=45).

Key Findings

1st Year Teachers, Cohort One INTACT SAMPLE
✓ A non-varying, stair-step pattern was found to exist for these teachers in the relationship between quality of classroom performance observed and the emphasis given to the selected features of preparation programs investigated in the TEP-2 project. Teachers with LOW exposure to these dimensions of preparation did not do as well as facilitators of standards-based learning as teachers with HIGH exposure, and teachers with HIGH exposure did not do as well as teachers with VERY HIGH exposure. Overall F-tests were statistically significant for four of the seven classroom proficiencies assessed in the first year of the study, as well as the mean value for all proficiencies assessed.

✓ An exception to this pattern was observed for teachers receiving MODERATE exposure to the program characteristics of interest. These teachers performed as well as or better than teachers from HIGH exposure programs on each of the seven classroom proficiencies assessed in the first year of the study.

1st Year Teachers, Cohort One TOTAL SAMPLE
✓ The non-varying, stair-step pattern in the relationship between quality of classroom performance and exposure to selected preparation program emphases found for the INTACT SAMPLE of 1st year teachers also was found in the TOTAL SAMPLE. The differences observed between LOW and VERY HIGH exposure, however, were not as large and significant F’s were found for only two (instead of four) of the seven classroom proficiencies assessed, as well as the mean value for all the proficiencies assessed.

✓ As in the case of the INTACT SAMPLE teachers the TOTAL sample of cohort one 1st year teachers receiving MODERATE exposure to the program characteristics of interest performed as well as or better than teachers from HIGH exposure programs.

✓ The comparability of findings between the TOTAL and INTACT samples of Cohort One 1st year teachers provides confidence in looking to the INTACT sample as representative of the larger sample participating in the first year of the study.
2nd Year Teachers, Cohort One FALL Observation

✓ The predominant stair-step pattern found for first year teachers between quality of classroom performance and exposure to selected preparation program emphases appeared for only a few classroom proficiencies by late Fall in the second year of teaching, and F values did not attain statistical significance for any of the proficiencies. The performance of teachers from LOW exposure programs had essentially caught up with or surpassed that of teachers from HIGH exposure programs, and the gap favoring teachers from VERY HIGH exposure programs had narrowed appreciably.
✓ The quality of performance on the part of teachers receiving MODERATE exposure to the dimensions of preparation being investigated had increased appreciably over their performance as 1st year teachers, so much so in fact that these teachers out-performed all other teacher groupings investigated on all but one of the nine classroom proficiencies assessed.

2nd Year Teachers, Cohort One SPRING Observation

✓ By the end of their second year of teaching the stair-step pattern found in 1st year teachers between quality of classroom performance and selected emphases experienced in their preparation program had disappeared. The performance of teachers from LOW, HIGH, and VERY HIGH exposure programs was essentially the same across all nine classroom proficiencies assessed.
✓ By the end of their 2nd year of teaching the quality of performance on the part of teachers receiving MODERATE exposure to the dimensions of preparation being investigated had appreciably exceeded the performance of every other competing group of teachers on all nine of the classroom proficiencies assessed. Only one of these differences, however, was statistically significant.
✓ It is clear that while the central hypothesis investigated in the TEP-2 study has strong support in the performance of 1st year teachers, and weak support early in the second year of teaching, the hypothesis is without support by the end of the second year of teaching.

A Restricted Test of the Hypothesis

Early career teachers from an Oregon institution (Western Oregon University) known to have preparation programs that reflected in an exemplary manner the program emphases of interest in the research were looked to as a further means of testing the central hypothesis being investigated. Comparing the classroom performance of graduates from Western’s elementary program with graduates from other VERY HIGH exposure programs, as well as graduates from HIGH, MODERATE, and LOW exposure programs, provides another look at the strength of the hypothesis being tested. Key findings include:
✓ 1st Year Teachers, SPRING. Without exception Western graduates received appreciably higher performance ratings on ALL classroom proficiencies assessed in the first year of teaching than teachers from any other program grouping studied.
✓ 2nd Year Teachers, FALL. Western graduates performed slightly better than teachers from HIGH and LOW exposure programs, but not as well as other teachers from VERY HIGH exposure programs or teachers from MODERATE exposure programs.
✓ 2nd Year Teachers, SPRING. Western graduates did not perform as well as teachers in any other program grouping, with large differences separating their performance from that of graduates from other VERY HIGH and MODERATE exposure programs.
✓ We take the 1st year findings reported above as additional support for the hypothesis being tested in the study.
✓ We take the 2nd year findings as support for subsequent analyses which will let us know much more than we do through the present two-variable analyses about factors affecting the classroom performance of early career teachers.

Potential Implications for CONTINUING Licensure

1. There is likely to be little or no relationship between the preparation program an elementary teacher experiences and his or her level of classroom performance by the time a continuing license to teach is pursued. The task confronting an individual teacher in demonstrating classroom proficiencies required for continuing licensure probably will be idiosyncratic to that teacher and the particular classroom and school context in which she or he is working.
2. Teachers receiving their initial preparation in programs outside of Oregon (in the present study largely those making up the LOW and MODERATE exposure groups) are not likely to experience any greater
difficulty in demonstrating the level of classroom proficiency required for a continuing license to teach
than teachers prepared in Oregon.

**Potential Implications for INITIAL Licensure**

1. Preparation program emphases investigated in the TEP-2 study have a demonstrable and sizeable impact on the
classroom performance of 1st year teachers. This impact extends to a lesser degree into the 2nd year of teaching,
but even so it appears safe to say that the policy and program design directions taken by the teacher education
community in Oregon over the past decade make an important difference in the quality of education elementary
students receive from 1st year teachers. These policy and program directions probably should be continued, and,
where needed, enhanced.

2. Elements of the teacher selection and preparation process beyond those investigated in the present study
obviously affect the quality of early career elementary teachers as facilitators of learning, and more research of the
kind pursued through the TEP-2 project needs to be undertaken on the nature and influence of these variables.

3. Insight into the nature of other factors influencing the classroom performance of early career teachers, and their
interaction with the program emphases investigated in the present study, should be forthcoming from the more
complex multivariate analyses planned for the full range of data collected through the TEP-2 project.
Introduction

This brief is the first of three in this round of TEP-2 research reports that involve two-variable analyses highlighting the classroom observation data described in Brief 6:

✓ BRIEF 7 looks at the relationship between selected features of preparation programs and observed proficiency as a 1st and 2nd year teacher;
✓ BRIEF 8 looks at the relationship between type of institution attended and observed proficiency as a 1st and 2nd year teacher; and
✓ BRIEF 9 looks at the relationship between type and amount of mentoring received and observed proficiency as a 1st and 2nd year teacher.

In all of these analyses the classroom performance data reported consist of mean scores for the various proficiencies assessed through the classroom observation system described in Research Brief 5. Findings are presented for both the INTACT and TOTAL samples of 1st year teachers (the intact sample involves teachers taking part in both the first and second years of the study), and for the INTACT sample of 2nd year teachers that comprise our first cohort of early career teachers. As such findings presented in this brief need to be viewed as preliminary as well as limited.

Subsequent analyses and TEP-2 research reports to the CTL Design Team will connect other variables to classroom performance, such as additional classroom and school context variables, and will connect classroom performance to evidence of impact on student learning. In this brief, however, we look only at the connection between selected features of the preparation programs in which our participating teachers were enrolled and their performance as facilitators of standards-based learning.

The Hypothesis of Central Interest in the Research

As discussed in the opening paragraphs of Research Brief 6 a major purpose of the TEP-2 project is to test the hypothesis that there will be observable differences in the practices of teachers prepared in programs that emphasize features consistent with Oregon’s design for K-12 schooling and teachers prepared in programs having less emphasis on such features. As an ex post facto causal-comparative study we wanted to investigate the effects on teacher candidates experiencing differing “exposure levels” pertaining to standards-based teaching and learning in their preparation, and see how these differing conditions translate into early career practice.

In addition to the consequences of program effects on the performance of 1st year teachers we wanted to investigate these effects across time. Would any effects observed in year 1 continue into years 2 and 3? Or, would they be magnified or reduced over time?

Classifying Preparation Programs on Hypothesis Related Variables

Three features of most if not all teacher preparation programs in Oregon which reflect an orientation to standards-based teaching and learning were selected as the basis for determining the “exposure level” of any particular program. These were:

✓ Clear and consistent alignment with Oregon’s standards-based design for schools;
✓ Clear and consistent focus on the explicit connection of teaching to learning through the use of teacher work sampling;
✓ On-going, developmental assessment of teacher candidates against clearly articulated and publicly shared content and performance standards that model for prospective teachers the kind of educational environments encountered by K-12 students.

To arrive at an “exposure level” to these three dimensions of a preparation program’s design the extent to which each of these features was reflected in a particular program was rated on a three point scale by the TSPC staff member responsible for program site reviews, and verified by TEP-2 personnel on the basis of information contained in TSPC approved program descriptions. Scale values
ranged from low (1) through moderate (2) to high (3), with a total exposure level ranging from 3 to 9 across the three program characteristics rated.

Summed ratings were categorized as follows:

9 = Very High;
7 or 8 = High;
5 or 6 = Moderate;
3 or 4 = Low.

First year teachers working in Oregon schools who were prepared in other states were recruited for participation in the project because of our assumption that low exposure to the three program variables listed above would be hard to find in TSPC approved programs. Using both program provided information and information provided by the graduates from these programs similar ratings were made on the preparation variables of interest by TEP-2 personnel for the out-of-state programs in which these teachers were prepared.

**Institutional Representation in the Study**

Fifteen of the sixteen institutions approved to offer Oregon Initial Teaching License programs had participants in the study. Numbers of first year participants from these programs range from 1 to 12. Participants from out-of-state were primarily from institutions in the west, and in all cases represented the only graduate from their institution.

**Looking for Predicted Relationships in First Year Teachers**

**Sample size.** Of the 75 1st year teachers engaged in our first cohort of early career teachers classroom observations were completed for 66 in the Spring of their 1st year of teaching. Observational data for 45 of these 66 were available for both the Fall and Spring observations in their second year of teaching (our INTACT SAMPLE of 1st and 2nd year teachers in the data presented here). The distribution of these two sets of teachers by the “exposure levels” they experienced in their teacher preparation programs on the variables of interest is shown in Table 7.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposure Level</th>
<th>Sample (1st yr Ters)</th>
<th>INTACT Sample (1st &amp; 2nd Yr Ters)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY HIGH</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATE</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis.** Each of the figures which follow report the performance of these two sets of 1st year teachers on one of the seven proficiencies assessed through the version of the observation system used in the first year of the study (see Research Brief 5 for related information). In reviewing these data two important considerations need to be kept in mind.

- The data reported are mean scores summed for two instructional periods observed during each site visits.
- The data reported are only two-dimensional in nature: the level of exposure to the three program dimensions combined and the mean scores for proficiency demonstration.

Adjusted mean values are reported in all cases.

Considered by themselves these two-dimensional analyses take no intervening or interacting variables into account, for example, the personal traits and characteristics a teacher brings to a classroom, the classroom and school contexts in which teaching occurs, or the learning progress made by students as a consequence of one’s teaching. These variables will be considered in subsequent analyses to obtain a full understanding of preparation program effects on proficiency demonstration. Two-dimensional analyses, however, have a level of clarity and simplicity about them that make them useful in seeing potential relationships that are likely to be found in more complex analyses.

**Findings for 1st Year Teachers, INTACT SAMPLE.** Findings for this set of 1st year teachers will be
discussed first since they constitute the Cohort One samples that will be the focus of performance and change across time. The longitudinal design of the research places a premium on an INTACT sample over the duration of the project rather than the TOTAL sample at any particular point within the project.

The relationships that emerged between exposure to the dimensions of preparation highlighted in the hypothesis being investigated in the research and performance around each of the seven proficiencies assessed through classroom observation in the first year of the study are shown in the left half of Figures 7.1 through 7.8 on this and the following pages. The language used in describing these proficiencies, and the rating scale used in their evaluation during the second and third years of the project, are provided on page 7.11. (NOTE: See Research Brief 5 for a description of the rating scale used in the first year of the study, and the transformation table used in equating 1st and 2nd year ratings.)

How do the data presented for our intact sample of 1st year teachers square with the hypothesis guiding the study? Very well, but with one oddity mentioned previously for the intact sample.

- A non-varying, stair-step pattern exists for these teachers in the relationship between quality of classroom performance observed and the emphasis given to the selected features of preparation programs investigated in the TEP-2 study. Teachers with LOW exposure to these dimensions of preparation did not do as well as facilitators of standards-based learning as teachers with HIGH exposure, and teachers with HIGH exposure did not do as well as teachers with VERY HIGH exposure.

- The differences observed between LOW and VERY HIGH exposure teachers were statistically significant for four of the seven classroom proficiencies assessed in the first year of the study, as well as the mean value for all proficiencies assessed. Given the size of the sample involved observed differences need to be quite large for statistically significant differences to occur.

- An exception to the pattern of relationships cited thus far was observed for teachers receiving MODERATE exposure to the program emphases of interest. These teachers performed as well as or better than teachers from HIGH exposure programs on each of the seven classroom proficiencies assessed in the first year of the study. We will return to this oddity in otherwise clearly patterned data after related information is reviewed from other analyses.

Overall F-test was statistically significant at or beyond the .05 level for both the Intact and Total Groups.
Findings for 1st Year Teachers, TOTAL SAMPLE. Findings for this set of teachers, which parallel...
those just reviewed for the INTACT SAMPLE, are found in the right half of Figures 7.1 through 7.8. The total sample size for 1st year Cohort One teachers is nearly half again that of the intact sample (see Table 7.1), so comparing the pattern of relationships found across the two sets of teachers provides an important validation check for the findings of the considerably smaller but far more important intact sample from the longitudinal perspective of the TEP-2 project.

How do the data presented for our total sample of Cohort One 1st year teachers compare to the data presented for the intact sample? Again, very well, but with the same oddity.

- Though slightly less clear cut the same, non-varying stair-step pattern in the relationship between quality of classroom performance and exposure to selected preparation program emphases found for the intact sample of 1st year teachers also is found in the total sample. The differences observed between LOW and VERY HIGH exposure teachers, however, are statistically significant for only two (instead of four) of the seven classroom proficiencies assessed, as well as the mean value for all proficiencies assessed.

- The oddity: As in the case of the intact sample teachers receiving MODERATE exposure to the program characteristics of interest performed as well as or better than teachers from HIGH exposure programs.

- The comparability of findings between the total and intact samples of Cohort One 1st year teachers provides some confidence in looking to the intact sample as representative of the larger sample participating in the first year of the study.

**Looking For Predicted Relationships in Second Year Teachers**

In crafting the hypothesis explored in the study we were unsure how to think about the relationship predicted between teacher preparation program characteristics and classroom performance beyond the first year of teaching. One view was that the relationship would diminish over time: Factors beyond the formative effects of initial preparation would gradually come to dominate performance to the point where initial preparation effects essentially disappear. A contrary view was that the impact of initial preparation would increase over time: The foundation laid in the pre-service years would interact with subsequent experience and circumstance in such a way that the initial direction set through preparation would expand and color all that follows.

To determine which of these patterns might prevail all 2nd year teachers in our INTACT Cohort One sample were observed early and late in their second year of teaching. The refined and extended version of the classroom observation system described in Research Brief 5 was used for both observations. The classroom proficiencies assessed in this version of the system, and the rating scale used in their assessment, are described on page 7.11.

**Findings for 2nd Year Teachers, FALL Observation.**

The relationships that emerged between exposure to the dimensions of preparation highlighted in the hypothesis being investigated in the research and performance around each of the nine classroom proficiencies assessed through the observation system used in the second year of the study are shown in Figures 7.9 through 7.18. Data pertaining to performance early in the year is presented in the left half of these Figures.

How do these data inform the extension of the hypothesis guiding the study to the performance of 2nd and 3rd year teachers? It is unclear, but the oddities observed in Year 1 data magnified.

- The predominant stair-step pattern found for 1st year teachers between quality of classroom performance and exposure to selected preparation program emphases appears for only a few teaching proficiencies, and none of the differences observed are statistically significant.

- The performance of teachers from LOW exposure programs has essentially caught up with or surpassed that of teachers from HIGH exposure programs, and the 1st year gap favoring teachers from VERY HIGH exposure programs has narrowed appreciably.
The quality of performance on the part of teachers receiving MODERATE exposure to the dimensions of preparation being investigated increased appreciably over their performance as 1st year teachers. This increase was sufficiently great that teachers with moderate exposure to the preparation program emphases of interest out-performed all other teacher groupings investigated on all but one of the nine classroom proficiencies assessed! None of the differences observed, however, were statistically significant.
Emergent patterns in the second year of teaching press hard for explanation in light of the patterns reported previously for 1st year teachers. Some of the differences reported in teacher performance between first and second year teaching may be attributable to observation system changes (see Research Brief 5), but there is no reason to believe that these changes would be reflected in the performance of one or two teacher groups and not others.

Findings for 2nd Year Teachers, SPRING Observations. Given the shifts in performance patterns among teacher groups between late Spring in their 1st year of teaching, and late Fall in their second, further shifts between Fall and Spring in their second year of teaching seemed probable. As the performance patterns reported in the right half
of Figures 7.9 through 7.18 show, this is in fact the case.

- By the end of their second year of teaching the stair-step pattern found in 1st year teachers between quality of classroom performance and selected emphases experienced in their preparation programs had disappeared. The performance of teachers from LOW, HIGH, and VERY HIGH exposure programs was essentially the same across all nine classroom proficiencies assessed.

- By the end of their 2nd year of teaching the quality of performance on the part of teachers receiving MODERATE exposure to the dimensions of preparation being investigated had appreciably exceed the performance of every other competing group of teachers on all nine of the classroom proficiencies assessed. Only one of these differences, however, was statistically significant.

It is clear that while the central hypothesis investigated in the TEP-2 study has strong support in the performance of 1st year teachers, it has only weak support early in the second year of teaching, the hypothesis is without support by the end of year two. For whatever reasons the impact of the characteristics of teacher preparation programs that seem to advantage teachers in their first year of teaching (those characteristics highlighted in the hypothesis being tested) do not appear to maintain their impact through the second year of teaching.

A Restricted Test of the Hypothesis

The TEP-2 project was a direct outgrowth of a three-year National Advisory Panel review of Western Oregon’s approach to teacher work sampling. The NAP (TEP-I) study was funded by the Atlantic Philanthropic Foundation, and led to the recommendation by the Advisory Panel that the approach taken by Western to connecting teaching and learning for purposes of licensure in the redesign of its teacher preparation programs be studied empirically for its effects on the performance of early career teachers, including their impact on learning.

This recommendation led to a request from the Foundation study for a proposal to implement the Advisory Panel’s recommendation. The proposal submitted led to the TEP-2 project, as described in Research Brief 1.

The design of what we have labeled here as a “restricted test” of the core hypothesis being investigated in the TEP-2 project is reasonably straightforward and uncomplicated. It calls simply for a series of analyses which compares the performance of graduates from Western’s elementary teacher preparation program to the performance of graduates from other elementary programs whose exposure to the preparation emphases being investigated varies from LOW to VERY HIGH. The rationale underlying these analyses is that they will provide a particularly good, though restricted, test of the hypothesis being investigated in the TEP-2 project because it will focus clearly on early career teachers from an institution known to have preparation programs that reflect in an exemplary manner the program emphases of interest in the research.

Using teachers in the INTACT sample of Cohort One teachers the sample size for these restricted analyses is

- WOU graduates, 7;
- graduates from other VERY HIGH exposure programs, 12;
- graduates from HIGH exposure programs, 11;
- graduates from MODERATE exposure programs, 8;
- graduates from LOW exposure programs, 5.

The results of the analyses are reported in Table 7.2 on the following page.

Findings.

- FOR 1ST YEAR TEACHERS, SPRING
  Without exception Western graduates received appreciably higher performance ratings on all classroom proficiencies assessed in the first year of teaching than teachers from any other program grouping studied.

- FOR 2ND YEAR TEACHERS, FALL
  Western graduates performed slightly better
than teachers from HIGH and LOW exposure programs, but not as well as teachers from OTHER VERY HIGH or MODERATE exposure programs.

✔ FOR 2ND YEAR TEACHERS, SPRING
Western graduates did not perform as well as teachers in any other program grouping, with large differences separating their performance from that of graduates from OTHER VERY HIGH and MODERATE exposure programs.

We take the 1st year findings reported above as additional support for the hypothesis being investigated in the research study. We take the second year findings, however, as support for needing to know much more than we do through the present two-variable analyses conducted thus far of factors affecting the classroom performance of early career teachers in Oregon’s standards-based schools. Clearly factors other than the preparation program characteristics of interest in the current project need to be looked to in understanding the classroom performance of early career teachers.

Discussion, Explanatory Hypotheses, and Further Analyses Planned

What is going on in the lives of beginning teachers to so dramatically reduce the predicted and clearly patterned relationships between preparation and performance found for the 1st year of teaching? What might account for the variation that occurs in this observed pattern by teachers from preparation programs providing only moderate exposure to the variables that do the predicting?

Some answers to these and related issues may come through subsequent analyses where multiple, data sets will be involved. These analyses will take personal and contextual variables into account while looking at the two-variable relationships that have been presented here. Other analyses will involve essentially a “case study” approach where the performance and circumstance of individual teachers will be tracked across time. All subsequent analyses will also look at data collected across the first three years of teaching, rather than two, and involve two cohorts of 1st and 2nd year teachers rather than one.

Given the limited and preliminary status of our analyses to date, and the questions that accompany them, a number of exploratory hypotheses will be pursued in the course of subsequent analyses:

✔ Preparation program effects are clearly traceable only through the 1st year of teaching; they fade in the second year, and are not identifiable after the 3rd year of teaching.

✔ Two dimensions of preparation not addressed fully in the present research (the personal attributes and academic background widely believed to accompany graduates of liberal arts colleges and research universities) could account for the findings reported here for teachers with MODERATE exposure to the preparation variables of interest in the present research.

✔ Regardless of findings pertaining to the first two hypotheses, the classroom performance of early career teachers will be demonstrably influenced as much by contextual factors as by either personal characteristics or emphases within their preparation programs.
Table 7.2 Differences in Total Mean Values for Proficiencies Demonstrated by Western Graduates as 1st and 2nd Year Teachers and Graduates from Other Preparation Programs Represented in the Study

Sub Groups Varying in Exposure to Preparation Emphases of Interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>WOU</th>
<th>Other Very High</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1, Spring, 2000</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2, Fall, 2000</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2, Spring, 2001</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE 1: Observers making classroom observations were given no background information about the 1st year teachers they were observing, including the institution from which they graduated. To the extent possible, observers were rotated across the teachers observed with the aim of having at least two different observers contributing to the pooled observation data for each teacher. For details about the observation system and its use, see Research Brief 5.

NOTE 2: No special efforts were made in recruiting WOU graduates for participation in the project. Of the 15 registering an initial interest in participation, 12 participated as 1st year teachers, and 7 participated as 2nd year teachers.
Part 2: Summative Ratings

Based on your observations, please provide a summative rating on each of the dimensions listed below by circling the appropriate number on the scale provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Observed</th>
<th>Emerging 1</th>
<th>Emerging 2</th>
<th>Novice 3</th>
<th>Novice 4</th>
<th>Advanced 5</th>
<th>Advanced 6</th>
<th>Distinguished 7</th>
<th>Distinguished 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1-2  Appears to be aware of good teaching practice, and what students are expected to know and be able to do, but limited in ability to connect the two.

3-4  Clearly knows what to do, and attempts to implement, but is inconsistent across students and situations in both practice and results achieved.

5-6  Has a strong knowledge and skill base, with consistent implementation and good results for most students in most situations.

7-8  Has a thorough knowledge and skill base, and is exemplary as a model of implementation and effectiveness with almost all students in almost all situations.

*Performance at the level represented by a 3, with some accompanying 4’s, is the performance level expected for INITIAL licensure. Performance at the level of 5, with some accompanying 6’s, is the level expected for CONTINUING licensure.*

How well did this teacher communicate to students what was to be learned (outcomes expected from the lesson or activity)?

How well did this teacher align instruction and activities with communicated outcomes?

How well did this teacher vary activities and/or material for students?

*How well did this teacher promote understanding and exploration of meaning within or across disciplines?*

*How well, in a holistic view of the classroom, did this teacher generate student interest in content?*

How well did this teacher engage students in learning activities generally?

How well did this teacher assess/monitor student progress in learning, and adapt instruction accordingly?

How well did this teacher provide feedback to students about their work?

How well did this teacher manage the classroom to maximize learning?

*Not included in the first year observation system
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