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A CASE STUDY OF THE DIFFERING PERCEPTIONS OF STAFF AND STUDENTS WHEN EVALUATING A PROGRAMME (3)

Angela F.L. Wong, Joy Chew and Amy Sobrielo

INTRODUCTION

This paper is based on the evaluation of two pre-service programmes in teacher training in Singapore, namely the Certificate in Education (CE) programme and the Diploma in Education (DE) programme. The CE programme is a two-year programme for 'A' level School Certificate holders being trained to teach in primary schools and the DE programme is a one-year programme for university graduates being prepared to teach in secondary schools.

These two pre-service programmes are both based upon the concept of a "Practicum Curriculum" (Appendix 1). The term "Practicum Curriculum" refers to the courses in the programme and the link-up among the courses, all of which are focused on serving the needs of the practicum. The "practicum" are those parts of the programme which involve the student teachers in actual teaching activities either on campus (in micro-teaching) or off campus [in Teaching Practice (TP) in the primary or secondary schools]. The practicum is seen as central to the whole programme, its aim being to prepare the student teachers for the society of the school.

In order to provide a framework for the structure of the whole programme, Sim's pedagogical model (Appendix 2) is used. This involves five omnipresent, interacting elements namely Content, Objectives, Students, Teacher and the Environment. This model is then taken up by all the courses in the programme so that in any course, when dealing with, for example, planning, which is one of the seven basic roles of a teacher, the student teacher is aware that he has to focus initially on the Teacher, Objectives and Content interaction vis-a-vis his own strengths and weaknesses. He also knows that he has next to consider the needs of the Students and the particular, unique situation of the school Environment and even the environment of the wider society outside the school.
Likewise, when dealing with the role of instructing it will be the relationship formed from the three elements of Teacher, Student and Content, i.e., the teacher interacting with his students vis-a-vis Content of the subject he is teaching, with Objectives and Environment also playing important parts in the relationship.

The focussing elements of the programme are the seven roles of the teacher - planning, instructing, managing, evaluating, being an agent of socialisation, organising and learning. These seven roles serve as the common, focussing threads running through all the courses and are meant to promote coherence within the training programme.

In the two pre-service programmes, the student teachers are introduced to the principles underlying these seven roles in the "Principles of Educational Practice" [PEP(E)] course. They are then introduced to the basic skills needed to perform these roles in the "Practice of Educational Principles" [PEP(C)] course. For example, for the managerial role, PEP(E) might discuss such topics as "Authority, Discipline and Punishment in School" and try to answer questions like "Since punishment is likely to alienate our pupils how would this affect the learning situation in a class/school in terms of the interaction necessary between teacher and learner?" PEP(C) takes up the same theme in topics like "Effective Classroom Management Techniques" where, keeping in mind the five omnipresent elements in any teaching situation the various approaches to classroom management are examined and tried out either in micro-teaching or during TP.

Since PEP(C) is the practice side of educational principles an important feature of the course is the experience modules that are built into the course where students have to participate in a planned experience linked to the course topics and are assessed on their performance and written reflections upon the experience. An experience module for the Manager role, for example, could be to try out two classroom management approaches like the Authoritarian Approach and the Behaviour Modification Approach in the school classroom, compare them by observing the results and write a short report on what was learnt from the experience.

The Curriculum Studies (CS) courses are methodology courses where the student teachers learn how to teach the different subjects in the primary/secondary school curriculum. They in turn, take up the seven roles, extending what was practiced in
PEP(C) by adding to the understanding of the principles involved and to the skills required in teaching specific school subjects. The student teachers experiment with these roles to see how they can be implemented at different levels - at lower/upper primary/secondary, with slow learners and the high flyers.

Similarly, the Educational Studies (ES) courses are built upon and take up in more depth, the principles and concepts dealt with in PEP(E) and can be considered to be an extension of PEP(E).

The other area which is important for the overall development of a teacher is the Personal Development area. Here the student teachers take compulsory personal growth courses like the Use of English in Teaching [UET] (for those in the CE programme) and Oral Communication (for those in the DE programme); Moral and Social Issues; Information Technology in Education [ITE] and Managing Extra Curricular Activities [MECA] (for those in the DE programme).

Again, all the seven teacher roles are incorporated into these personal growth courses, although particular roles are given more emphasis depending upon the aims of the specific course. For example, UET which aims at increasing the CE student teacher’s competence in language communication skills, tends to emphasise the instructing role. Similarly, Oral Communication for the DE student teacher stresses primarily, the instructing role. The Moral and Social Issues course is intended to make student teachers more aware of the salient moral and social issues relevant to our society, particularly those which impinge on the school system and the lives of the pupils. It therefore tends to emphasise the role of the teacher as an agent of socialisation. The ITE course exposes the student teachers to the place and application of computers in education. With its aim of helping student teachers understand how technology can be used for dissemination of information or knowledge, it helps student teachers focus especially on their planning and instructing roles whilst also showing them how computers can be used for evaluation (evaluating role). The MECA course, which the DE students take, is designed to provide student teachers with sufficient knowledge and experience to enable them to organise a specific ECA in the secondary school or junior college and so emphasises the managing role.
This study

This paper examines the way the three participating groups in the two programmes (i.e., the planners, the implementers, and the receivers) evaluated the programmes. The planners comprised the Director of the Institute of Education (IE) whose model (the Sim’s model) of the Practicum Curriculum was used as the basis of the programmes, the Deputy Director, the Heads of the two programmes, the Heads of Schools and Departments and the coordinators of the different courses. The implementers comprised the lecturers and tutors of courses, the supervisors of teaching practice, the cooperating teachers and the principals of schools. The receivers were the student teachers – the ‘A’ level School Certificate holders who were following the two-year CE (1987/89) programme and the university graduates who were following the one-year DE (1987/88) programme.

The Planners

The Practicum Curriculum was based on the Sim’s model (1987) (Appendix 1). The Heads of the two programmes saw to the overall programme set-up in which Foundation Studies, Curriculum Studies and Personal Development Studies all centred round the Practicum (TP and micro-teaching). The programme relied upon Heads of Schools and Departments to ensure that coordinators of courses kept to this model when planning the individual courses. Finally, the Board of Studies examined the resulting syllabuses and approved them.

The Implementers

There were different modes of implementation. Some courses used team teaching – mass lectures followed by tutorials (i.e., one person giving the lecture and a team of tutors to conduct tutorials). Others used lectures and workshops with several lecturers each responsible for a group of student teachers and conducting both lecture and workshop but working from a common syllabus. Others relied entirely upon the mass lecture followed by a question-answer session at the end of each lecture and directed readings. For TP, every academic staff member was given some student teachers to supervise. He was responsible for supervising the student teacher in all her teaching, i.e., for the CE student teacher, the supervisor saw her teach the three main primary school subjects, Mathematics, Science and English.
as well as Social Studies and Music or Art. For the DE student teacher, the supervisor saw her teach two secondary school subjects - her main teaching subject and her second teaching subject. Although attempts were made to match supervisor expertise with the student teachers' teaching specialisations, this was not always possible. The cooperating teacher assigned to the student teacher in the school, as well as the school principal, also had supervisory roles. To ensure a common focus based on the Practicum Curriculum, all supervisors and cooperating teachers used a common evaluation form - the Assessment of Performance in Teaching (APT) Instrument which has five categories for evaluating a lesson - planning, inducting, communicating, managing and evaluating - under which all the seven teacher roles (planning, instructing, managing, evaluating, being an agent of socialisation, organising and learning) are subsumed.

The Receivers

Most of the CE student teachers came to the programme direct from Junior Colleges or Pre-university centres where the mode of instruction was different. Lecturers found that they appeared to need more guidance and explicit explanations of principles and concepts and had, on the whole to be helped to find resource materials for library assignments and study projects. In short, they seemed less independent than their DE counterparts. The DE student teachers came straight from universities, were more mature and were used to a formal, academic mode of instruction comprising lectures, directed readings, self-study and some tutorials. They, however, were less familiar with the workshop mode of instruction and some may have considered this to be time-wasting and unnecessary, preferring to be given the theories and principles directly.

EVALUATING THE PRACTICUM CURRICULUM PROGRAMME

From the outset of planning and organising the Practicum Curriculum, a comprehensive evaluation plan was drawn up for the CE and DE Programmes. The two Programme Heads were designated leaders of their respective evaluation committees. Their main task was to coordinate the evaluation process which was aimed at collecting relevant information from the staff and student teachers involved in the new programmes. The overall evaluation
plan provided a time-frame for data collection and a suggested reporting schedule for each part of the evaluation. The DE Programme followed a one-year evaluation time-frame to allow time for coursework to be completed before the last stage of data collection could be undertaken. In the case of the two-year CE Programme, it was necessary to ensure that data be collected at appropriate times before and after the two Teaching Practice sessions held at the primary schools (Appendix 3).

The reference point of the evaluation plan were the five-fold objectives of the Practicum Curriculum. The objectives were:

(1) developing the skills and understandings related to the seven basic roles of the teacher,
(2) being able to apply educational theory to practice in a variety of teaching situations,
(3) linking learnings across different course components,
(4) promoting desirable professional attitudes and value, and
(5) developing the capacity for reflective learning and self-evaluation.

It was recognised that different course teams led by their course coordinators would have a major part to play in implementing various facets of the new programme. In the process of doing so, they would be likely to negotiate some problems of delivering the content and communicating the philosophy of the Practicum Curriculum. These concerns were reflected in the seven key evaluation questions of the evaluation plan:

* To what extent do staff have a common perspective of the objectives of the CE/DE Programme?
* To what extent were the various objectives achieved?
* Were the course assessment instruments and procedures appropriate to the achievement of aims and objectives?
* What significant problems were faced in pursuing the objectives?
* To what extent did the various course components contribute to the achievement of the objectives?
* To what extent was interconnectedness within the programme achieved?
* What were the main strengths and weaknesses of the programme?
A number of evaluation techniques were employed in the two programmes. While not identical, these techniques sought to tap the perceptions of two categories of people: the Implementers, namely, the lecturing and tutoring staff responsible for the different course components, and the Receivers, i.e., the student teachers. The main instrument was in the form of a standard questionnaire (Appendix 4). It consisted of three sections, two of which were held in common in the questionnaires prepared for the courses evaluated. One section allowed for variations in the questions asked so that differences in the course content and mode of delivery could be taken into account. Given the elaborateness of the evaluation plan and the large student intake, steps were taken to collect data from samples of students rather than the whole intake as this could generate an unnecessarily large amount of information.

For each course component in the Practicum Curriculum, attention was drawn to the specific course objectives. For example, PEP(E), PEP(C), and CS courses had been designed to realise quite different objectives and hence each questionnaire focussed on these. In the first section of each, eighteen statements were given. Student teachers had to indicate their agreement to each on a five-point scale from 'Strongly Agree' to 'Strongly Disagree'. These statements touched on various aspects of the course such as the overall course objectives, the subject matter covered, the mode of delivery and nature of assignments set. The third section comprised four open-ended questions with space provided for student respondents to fill in their views on the main strengths and weaknesses of a particular course. They were also asked to state if they had encountered any problem during the course and give suggestions for course improvement.

In the DE Programme, lecturing staff (planners and implementers) were invited to give their perceptions of the new programme by filling in a separate questionnaire (Appendix 5). They were asked to indicate their perceptions of the relative importance of the seven aims of the Practicum Curriculum and then to assess whether the aims had been realised for each course, based on their working contacts with student teachers and colleagues. Open-ended questions in the last section of the staff questionnaire provided room for staff to state perceived strengths and weaknesses, implementation problems and suggestions to improve the programme.
For both programmes, students were also required to complete anonymously a short feedback questionnaire asking for their opinions of all the courses they had undertaken by the end of the programme. Six pairs of adjectives were used to describe the delivery, usefulness and level of student involvement of the courses. Students were once again asked to jot down any suggestions they had for improving the courses (Appendix 6).

Focused interviews were held with a small number of lecturing or tutoring staff in the CE Programme. Interviews with ten randomly selected students were also conducted after they had completed their second Teaching Practice in Year Two. These interviews yielded an added source of rich feedback information about how staff and students perceived the interconnectedness among courses, the way in which coursework fed into the learning experiences of student teachers at different points of the programme, and their grasp of the basic roles of the teacher.

AREAS OF AGREEMENT AND DISAGREEMENT IN PERCEPTIONS

Using the evaluation instruments stated in the previous section, the planners and implementers of the courses for both programmes felt that the various courses in the programmes contributed to a large extent to the achievement of the first objective while contributing to a smaller extent to the attainment of the second and third objectives of the Practicum Curriculum. This feeling was also shared by the student teachers in both programmes. However, there were also some areas where lecturers and student teachers disagreed in their perceptions of the success of the Practicum Curriculum.

Concurring Perceptions

The lecturers reported that the Practicum Curriculum helped to bring about a more purposeful integration of educational theory and practice, so the student teachers had a better understanding and a wider perspective of teaching and learning. As supervisors of the DE student teachers, the lecturers also received feedback from their supervisees that they valued the content centred instruction in CS supported by PEP(C) and TP. They felt that the current move towards content emphasis in teacher education is an indication that student teachers regard knowledge of content and how to present this knowledge as the most important aspect of their training.
Interview data with the CE student teachers indicated that most of the course components had the desired effect of enabling the student teachers to first understand the basic roles of a teacher and then to begin practising some educational principles during the TP period. As one of them put it:

"Though we heard about the various roles during the lectures, especially PEP(E) and PEP(C), we really got to experience it only during TP. This is the time we really understood what they were talking about during lectures. TP helped us to understand these two roles as a manager and a planner. How do we plan lessons, how do we manage classrooms ....when you actually do conduct your lessons, then from there you actually know the planning role, whether it has been successful. And also for example, managing, we learn theories of how to manage classes. But during TP you really put them into practice."

Where ES1 courses were concerned, two student teachers found the course offered in Year One of the CE programme helped them to identify and deal appropriately with very weak pupils in their primary classes, like providing remedial work or using different teaching strategies.

With regards to the linkages between courses to achieve a degree of interconnectedness within each of the programmes, the CE lecturers who were interviewed felt that there was a satisfactory amount of, and also an awareness of the need for their interconnectedness. They said:

"A fair amount of interconnectedness. Student teachers may not be aware of this but when we question them on certain things they have done or not done when teaching (for TP), from their answers we can see that there has been a good extent of interconnectedness."

"In a sense the courses do complement each other. But practically speaking, whether the student teachers are able to apply what they have learnt is another matter."

"We try to achieve a kind of integration within the PEP(E) course, as well as across other courses. ES2, theoretically speaking, is a course which derives from PEP(E). Areas covered in PEP(E) are taken further in ES2 in terms of depth, coverage and width."
From the DE lecturers we have:
"Student teachers are aware of the connection of the practicum to their CSs."
"Staff work very hard to ensure that courses relate closely to teaching practice."

From the student teachers' viewpoint, all the CE student teachers interviewed said that they could see the links between courses. They realised that both PEP(E) and PEP(C) were organised around the seven basic roles of the teacher. The assignments, experience modules for these two courses, as well as the electives for ES2 sprang from the basic roles discussed at different points of the course content in PEP(E) and PEP(C). Similarly, in the other CS courses, although their CS lecturers did not refer to any of the basic roles by the terms that were introduced in PEP(E) and PEP(C) lectures, it would appear that they did see the interconnectedness of the facets of activities discussed by CS lecturers and other course lecturers. As one student teacher put it:

"For example, Mathematics. They don't specify that this is planning. They just go into the content and the different methods that can be used to arouse interest. The lecturer doesn't stress the roles but we can see the different roles. It is up to you....somehow or other you know it is planning or evaluating."

From the interviews it was inferred that the student teachers did not always see the interconnectedness among the courses in their first year of study. But when asked to think about the links, they could make the connection between concepts and skills practised. An excerpt from an interview shows the way it dawned on one student teacher:

Q: You are coming to the end of your stay at IE. You said at the beginning you could not see the links. Now looking back, can you see the links between PEP(E) and PEP(C)?
A: Now that we have gone into TP1, I would say in a way 'yes', we can see the links. But in Year 1, I don't think so. We know it is connected, but the way the lectures are being carried out, it is like two separate things... this one is theory and that one is practical. But when you sit back and think about it, I guess there is some kind of linkage."
It was very encouraging to find that the Practicum Curriculum had succeeded in many aspects as perceived by the lecturers and the student teachers of both programmes. They appreciated the theory-practice linkages and the interconnectedness among theory courses. However as in any newly developed programme, there is bound to be some shortcomings, and the Practicum Curriculum is no exception.

Differing Perceptions

From the DE evaluation questionnaires for both the lecturers and student teachers, disagreements in perceptions in a number of areas emerged. Some respondents remarked that there was a lack of linkage between courses like PEP(E) and PEP(C), PEP(E) and ES, PEP(C) and CS, theory courses and TP. Where the different course lecturers may have tried to reiterate and reinforce concepts taught in other courses in order to make a linkage, many student teachers perceived it as "repetition of materials" and even suggested that "more coordination is needed to avoid overlapping of content". As one lecturer put it:

"There is insufficient time in CS courses to do indepth work on generic skills that PEP(C) has touched upon in broad concepts. Student teachers tend to feel we are repeating/overlapping in course content even when we go into subject specific skills, as they have 'heard' about them in PEP(C)."

Among the CS courses and between the CS courses and micro-teaching, some lecturers and student teachers also complained of overlapping of content. They failed to see that there was a necessity for the "overlap" and this "overlap" was a way of making links.

Another area of discrepancy lay in the sequencing of topics in the courses. For example, the PEP(E) and PEP(C) course coordinators and planners tried to sequence the topics in such a manner that the lectures on the principles of say, 'educational testing', would be covered in the PEP(E) course followed soon after by lectures on the practices, in this case, 'how to construct tests', in the PEP(C) course. However this theory-practice linkage that the planners strived so hard to maintain was somehow not appreciated by many student teachers as such. They even felt that there was "discontinuity of topics covered" and that "practices [PEP(C)] did not coincide with the principles [PEP(E)]".
Besides the PEP(E)-PEP(C) linkage problem, there arose the PEP(E)-ES and the PEP(C)-CS linkage problems too in terms of sequencing of topics. The planners thought it educationally sound to sequence the topics in PEP(C) and CS along the same lines since the latter course is an extension of the former in specific subject areas. This would allow the CS lecturers to elaborate on the PEP(C) generic concepts soon after they are taught. However, in practice the sequence of topics failed to "mesh in well" and got out of sync after a while. So the CS lecturers raised the following concerns:

"The sequence of topics presented in PEP(E) and PEP(C) does not match the sequence of topics presented in CS1 and CS2 giving rise to the problem of deciding whether to teach the topic ourselves or to wait for it to be completed in PEP(E) and PEP(C)."

"PEP(E) and PEP(C) should work together with CS1 and CS2 to ensure that they complement one another well."

Similarly, the ES courses are built upon and take up in greater depth the principles and concepts dealt with in PEP(E) and can be considered an extension of PEP(E). However, some student teachers did not see it as such. They found that some of the ES courses were "too general, without specific focus and therefore seem to duplicate what is already covered in PEP(E) and PEP(C)."

In terms of the experience modules given to the student teachers at the end of a series of lectures for each 'role', to consolidate and apply what they have learnt, some student teachers found them "rather meaningless and fragmented as they were not linked to each other". Similarly, with micro-teaching, planners and implementers had meant for it to be beneficial for student teachers to practise and polish specific teaching skills in a simulated small group setting before going out for TP. But some student teachers found it "unrealistic".

In the TP area, cooperating teachers (CTs) were assigned to the student teachers in the school to help them consolidate the concepts learnt in IE. All lecturers who were supervisors and CTs were invited for a briefing on the objectives and practices of TP and the Practicum Curriculum, and their roles as supervisors/CTs. New supervisors and CTs were also invited to attend a workshop on the use of the evaluation instrument (the APT). These steps were taken to ensure that there was a
common focus based on the Practicum Curriculum. However again, this did not always work out as planned. Some student teachers found their supervisors and CTs wanting. They said that their CTs "did not understand their roles" and that "IE should give CTs a better picture of this practice (of having the CT scheme)". As for the supervisor, some student teachers complained that their supervisors were not properly briefed about TP. Likewise the supervisors found some CTs lacking in motivation, awareness and cooperation.

Besides the problems with the implementers of TP (the CTs and supervisors), there was also the problem of the theory-practice linkage, i.e., getting the student teachers to put into practice the theories they had acquired at IE in their TP. Some student teachers wanted the theory to be "practice-oriented" and to have "real-life experiences and situations present in the school" brought into the lectures instead of listening to "ideal principles and situations". With only limited examples given in the lectures, they found difficulty applying their theories in the classroom. It is therefore not surprising that some lecturers reported that their student teachers "did not apply learning theories to practical situations very much".

On the other hand, the CE lecturers and student teachers who were interviewed did not share the concerns of their DE counterparts in toto. For instance, they thought that there was no overlapping of course content in the programme. It would seem that the course coordinators and planners of the CE programme were more successful in sequencing and linking topics in the various courses. The student teachers also claimed that they had learnt much from observing their CTs and getting feedback on their teaching from their supervisors. This seems to imply that the CTs and supervisors of the CE programme knew their roles and duties better. The student teachers also said that they felt quite equipped to try out innovative methods of teaching which they had studied at IE. However, with regards to micro-teaching, it was negatively evaluated, as in the case for the DE student teachers, as being "artificial and of limited use for acquiring basic teaching skills".
Possible Causes for the Differing Perceptions

It is interesting to note that the responses obtained from the CE lecturers and student teachers were more positive than from their DE counterparts. One wonders if this could be due to the difference in the duration of the two programmes. The DE student teachers have only one year at the IE so that their programme is very intensive and comes close to becoming a "crash course" as one student put it. Both lecturers and student teachers express feelings that it is a big rush, that the programme tries to achieve too much in too short a time leaving no time for reflection or consolidation. Furthermore, the student teachers are university graduates and thus more mature and perhaps more critical. The CE student teachers, on the other hand have two years in IE and therefore undergo a more spread out programme. They have more time to reflect on their coursework and consolidate their learning, enabling them, perhaps, to see things in a more positive light.

The entry educational level of the student teachers (see page 1) could also have affected the running of the programme. Lecturers in the CE programme found that their student teachers, coming straight from school appeared to require more guidance and explicit explanations of principles and concepts. They also had to be helped in their search for resource materials for the library assignments and study projects. In short they seemed more dependent than their DE counterparts. Consequently, the CE lecturers had to be more thorough in their lectures and tutorials and took nothing for granted, whereas the DE lecturers being faced with student teachers who came from universities, took it for granted that these were already familiar with basic concepts and with the formal academic mode of instruction comprising lectures, directed readings, self study and tutorials. The DE student teachers were more mature and independent and were considered capable of being left to read up on their own. Apparently, this has not worked out well and has left the DE student teachers with the impression of non-cohesiveness, poor theory-practice linkages and general inefficient and ineffective running of the programme. This could account for the more negative rating of the DE programme as compared with the more positive rating of the CE programme.
The CE programme also had the advantage that the Practicum Curriculum was piloted with the DE programme first. Thus the former could learn from the mistakes of the latter in the planning and implementation of the programme. In addition, the CE programme was spread over two years (1987-1989), thus the team of lecturers involved could make formative changes to the ongoing programme during this span of time, whereas the DE team had to do everything in one year (1987-1988), leaving little or no time for formative changes along the way.

Finally, there were disagreements in perceptions between planners and implementers and between implementers and receivers in both programmes. This may have stemmed from having too many implementers in the programme, resulting in the programme and course objectives getting diffused and unfocussed when interpreted by too many implementers.

CONCLUSION: LESSONS LEARNT

After going through two full cycles of the Practicum Curriculum with the DE student teachers of 1986/87 and 1987/88 intakes, and one full cycle with the 1987/89 CE student teachers, several lessons have emerged.

First, time is a very important factor, especially if the curriculum covers a lot of ground. Too much in too short a time does not allow participants time to reflect and make necessary connections between courses and between theory and practice. Spreading the courses out over a longer period of time allows for formative mid-course evaluations of the programme. Then, problems arising from an earlier stage of implementation can be minimised as much as possible in succeeding stages. If time is a fixed factor and cannot be extended, then the planners may have to rethink the coverage of the curriculum. What is important is to provide quality rather than quantity, in the content taught.

Secondly, the number of implementers should also be kept to a minimum so as to prevent dilution of and deviation from programme and course objectives. If the number of implementers has to be relatively large, then the planners must make sure that they are adequately briefed about their roles and the course and programme objectives.
Besides keeping the implementers well informed, the student teachers should also be well briefed on the objectives of the programme and of each course. It may even be necessary to remind them of these objectives from time to time. To foster better linkages between courses, more cross-references to past and future lectures/courses, without too much overlap in content, should be practised.

Thirdly, no matter how high the entry educational level of the student teachers are, one cannot assume they have prior knowledge of basic concepts and principles. This is because the university undergraduates (from the local university) have not been exposed to courses in education before. They are therefore, just as new to educational concepts and theories as the non-graduates and will need to have these explained to them.

In conclusion, in carrying out this evaluation, it became obvious to the researchers that had the feedback been limited to just one of the three groups involved in the programmes, or just two, the review of the two programmes would not have been as clear. A truer picture can only be obtained if the views of all three interested groups are taken into consideration. This paper therefore puts this point forward as a consideration for any one planning to evaluate a programme.
A PEDAGOGICAL MODEL
# Evaluation Plan

## The Overall Programme

### Programme Objectives

1. To develop skills and understandings related to the basic roles of a teacher;

2. To promote student application of educational theory to practice in a variety of teaching situations;

3. To link learnings across different course components with the practicum at the centre;

4. To promote desirable professional attitudes and values;

5. To promote reflective learning and self-evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Target Group(s)</th>
<th>Evaluation Techniques</th>
<th>Timing of Data Collection</th>
<th>Reporting Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent do staff have a common perception of the objectives of the Cert. Ed. Programme?</td>
<td>Staff Students</td>
<td>Questionnaire*</td>
<td>After TP1</td>
<td>July 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent were the various objectives achieved?</td>
<td>Staff Students</td>
<td>Questionnaire &amp; feedback from courses</td>
<td>After TP2</td>
<td>July 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Were the course assessment instruments/procedures appropriate to the achievement of aims and objectives?</td>
<td>Staff Students</td>
<td>Questionnaire &amp; feedback from courses</td>
<td>After TP2</td>
<td>July 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What significant problems were faced in pursuing the objectives?</td>
<td>Staff Students</td>
<td>Questionnaire &amp; feedback from courses</td>
<td>After TP2</td>
<td>July 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To what extent did the various course components contribute to the achievement of the objectives?</td>
<td>Staff Students</td>
<td>Questionnaire &amp; feedback from courses</td>
<td>After TP2</td>
<td>July 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To what extent was interconnectedness within the programme achieved?</td>
<td>Staff Students</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>After TP2</td>
<td>July 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. What were the main strengths and weaknesses of the programme?</td>
<td>Staff Students</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>After TP2</td>
<td>July 1989</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation Committee: Main Committee
Leader: Head of Programme

Notes: 1. Staff refers to those teaching the Cert. Ed. Programme
2. Questions will be incorporated into a single questionnaire.
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

DIPLOMA IN EDUCATION PROGRAMME 1987/88

COURSE EVALUATION FORM

(Insert Course Title)

1. The purpose of this form is to obtain feedback from you on the course so as to help us make improvements in our future courses.

2. Please complete this form by giving your responses frankly and objectively.

3. There is no need to write your name.

4. THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE.

Part A

Please indicate your response by putting a tick in the relevant box for items 1 - 18.

SA = Strongly Agree
A = Agree
N = Neutral
D = Disagree
SD = Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1. The objectives and requirements of the course were made clear to us.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2. The overall objectives of the course have been achieved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3. The subject matter covered in the course was adequately treated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4. The subject matter covered in the course was up-to-date.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5. I gained new perceptions and understanding from this course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6. The knowledge and skills I have gained are relevant and applicable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7. The balance and emphases given to the different components of the course was appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A 8. The lecturers concerned were approachable and helpful.

A 9. The lecturers made use of a range of methods in teaching the course.

A10. The methods/modes of instruction used by the lecturers were appropriate.

A11. The lecturers made effective use of media and materials.

A12. The resources provided for this course were adequate.

A13. The handouts were appropriate and useful.

A14. The reading references were adequate.

A15. The topics for the course assignments/projects were relevant.

A16. The course assignments/projects were stimulating.

A17. The course assignments/projects were
   Too difficult [ ] About right [ ] Too easy [ ]

A18. The amount of coursework/assignments/projects required for this course was
   Too much [ ] About right [ ] Too little [ ]

Part B

(Insert instructions and items that pertain specifically to your course, e.g. modes of assessment, venue, use of laboratory. Begin with item No. B1.)
Part C
Answer the following questions. If more spaces is needed, use back of page.

C1. What were the main strengths of the course?


C2. What were the main weaknesses of the course?


C3. What problems (if any) did you encounter during the course?


C4. What are your suggestions for improving the course?


C5. On a scale of 1 - 5, how would you rate this course?  

1 = Poor, 2 = Satisfactory, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
Dear Colleague,

1. We shall be grateful if you will take some time in completing this questionnaire on the Diploma in Education Programme.

2. Your views would be of significant help to us in the planning of the Diploma in Education Programme.

3. This questionnaire consists of five sections as follows:
   (A) Background Information.
   (B) The Importance of the Aims of the Practicum Curriculum.
   (C) The Degree of Attainment of the Aims of the Practicum Curriculum.
   (D) The Contribution of Various Course Components to the Attainment of the Aims.
   (E) Open-ended Questions.

4. Please answer all questions frankly. Read the instructions carefully and respond by circling, filling or writing; where appropriate.

5. Please return your completed questionnaire to the SSV Office c/o Miss Rosalind Ong by Saturday, 28 May 88.

Thank you for your cooperation.

CHONG TIAN HOO (DR)
Leader
ERU Project ITO2 : Programme Evaluation
SECTION A

Background Information

A1. Department/School ________________________________

A2. Involvement in the Practicum Curriculum:
(Please circle only one code.)

1. As Tutor, Lecturer and Supervisor
2. As Tutor and Lecturer only
3. As Tutor and Supervisor only
4. As Lecturer and Supervisor only
5. As Tutor only
6. As Lecturer only
7. As Supervisor only
8. Not involved at present

A3. No. of Years of experience in teacher education
SECTION B

The Importance of the Aims of the Practicum Curriculum (PC)

Listed below are the stated aims of the PC. Use the code (5,4,3;2,1) to indicate the perceived importance of each aim of the PC. Enter the appropriate number in each box.

**Code**

1. Very important
2. Of much importance
3. Of some importance
4. Of slight importance
5. Not important at all

B1. To acquire an understanding of the basic teacher roles

B2. To develop skills related to the basic teacher roles

B3. To promote student application of relevant educational theory in practice

B4. To correlate the learnings across different course components with the practicum at the centre

B5. To promote desirable professional attitudes and values

B6. To promote reflective learning

B7. To promote self-evaluation
SECTION C

The degree of attainment of the aims of the Practicum Curriculum (PC)

This section attempts to find out your perceptions of the extent to which you think the PC has achieved its aims at this point in time.

For each item, enter a code (5, 4, 3, 2, or 1) in the box provided to indicate the extent of attainment of the aim by the PC.

Code

5 .... To a very large extent
4 .... To a large extent
3 .... To some extent
2 .... To a little extent
1 .... Not at all

C1. To acquire an understanding of the basic teacher roles

C2. To develop skills related to the basic teacher roles

C3. To promote student application of relevant educational theory in practice

C4. To correlate the learnings across different course components with the practicum at the centre

C5. To promote desirable professional attitudes and values

C6. To promote reflective learning

C7. To promote self-evaluation
SECTION D

The contribution of various components to the attainment of the aims

For each course component, enter a code (5, 4, 3, 2, or 1) in the appropriate box to indicate the extent the course component contributes to the attainment of the aim. Please respond to those course components that you are involved in only.

**Code**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>To a very large extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>To a large extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>To some extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>To a little extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Aim</th>
<th>Practicum (SE &amp; TP)</th>
<th>Micro teaching</th>
<th>PEP(E)</th>
<th>PEP(C)</th>
<th>CS01</th>
<th>CS02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1. To acquire an understanding of the basic teacher roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2. To develop skills related to the basic teacher roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3. To promote student application of relevant educational theory in practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4. To correlate the learnings across different course components with the practicum at the centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5. To promote desirable professional attitudes and values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6. To promote reflective learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7. To promote self-evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION E

This section consists of some open-ended questions for your consideration. Please answer by listing your points.

E1. What were the main strengths of the programme?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

E2. What were the main weaknesses of the programme?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
E3. What problems (if any) did you encounter in the implementation of the programme?

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

E4. What are your suggestions for improving the programme?

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Any Suggestions for Improvement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teaching Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Microteaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 PEP(E) Lectures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 PEP(E) Tutorials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 PEP(C) Lectures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 PEP(C) Tutorials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ESE -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. CS01 -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. CS02 -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. MECA (Non Sports) -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. MECA (Sports) -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Oral Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Information Tech in Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Social &amp; Moral Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Civil Defence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>