

# Teaching Practice: Is There any Relationship Between Academic Supervisors' and School Supervisors' Assessment of Students?

Jane Kembo

School of Education, Rongo University, P.O Box 103, 40404, Rongo, Kenya

## Abstract

Teaching Practice (TP) is an essential part of all teacher training processes. It is both a practice that all teacher trainees go through, but is also an examination. The world over, who mans the education sectors is critical to national development. Who is approved to be a teacher is a critical question then, and how assessments are done, of interest to all stakeholders. In the study, we examined the following: i. the nature of assessments school administrations and/or cooperating teachers made of practicing teachers, ii. Academic supervisors' assessments of students iii. tested relationships between lecturer scores and school supervisor scores, and iv. differences between the performance of Diploma and Bachelors students. The study utilized reports made on each student at the end of the three months of Teaching Practice (TP) by both in-school supervisors (heads and/or cooperating teachers) and lecturers. Students in the study were visited at least three times by their academic supervisors and all their scores on each occasion were then converted to just one aggregate mark, as is done, because the practicum is considered as one examination. The study wanted to establish whether students who did well in their teaching also did well according the heads of schools and cooperating teachers in other measures. On-TP student teachers were assessed on: preparation (scheming, planning, writing of focused objectives;) and actual teaching: introduction, development, and closure of lessons, in addition to their rapport with learners, mastery of subject matter, use of teaching materials and aids as well as body language and appropriate dressing. At the end of the three months the heads of schools also assessed them using a short questionnaire. A total of 113 students were randomly selected using from each group for the study (41 diploma, 72 bachelors). Confidential school assessments ranging between '3' (average) and '5' (excellent), and lecturer ratings ranging between 41% and 86% were used for comparison. The results of the study show that on all aspects, there were no significant differences in the scores of diploma and bachelors students. However, the degree trainees had significantly better mastery of content than their diploma counterparts even though it did not translate into better performance in other measures of actual teaching.

**Keywords:** teaching practice, assessment, supervisor, performance, mastery

## 1. Introduction

Student Teacher Trainees who are registered into schools of education have completed their O'Level and scored a minimum of C+ aggregate grade. Due to the huge number of candidates who desire to do degree work, often the scores are much higher. Teacher training takes four (4) academic years of two semesters each for bachelors and two years for diploma students. Within this period student teachers will be introduced to educational foundations: philosophy, psychology, management and project work, and introductory research. In addition, every student who intends to teach in secondary school takes two teaching subjects such as Maths and Business studies or English Language and Literature in English. Many universities and university colleges in Kenya, training for secondary schools, have both arts and science based courses from which students choose subjects according to their qualifications.

## 2. The study

The main objective of the study was to find out what kind of assessments were made on the performance of the cohort under study and whether there were any differences between the performance of bachelors and diploma trainees. Specifically the study set out to:

1. Examine the kind of assessments that school administrations and/or cooperating teachers made of practicing teachers in the cohort of 2014.
2. Establish how academic supervisors assess students in a given cohort on teaching practice
3. Test whether there were any relationships between academic supervisor (lecturer) scores and school supervisor scores.
4. Examine whether there were significant differences between the performance of Diploma and Bachelors students.

## 3. TP as done in Kenyan Universities:

Teaching Practice (TP) is a critical watershed in the training of teachers and gives students opportunity to try their hand at actual teaching. In Kenya, Teaching Practice (TP) is done in the third year for bachelors students and in the second year, for diploma students. The period of TP entails a period of roughly three months, a full

school term. The practicum is done after students have been put through methodology classes in their two teaching subjects, in addition to micro-teaching and production of teaching materials and aids in the semester preceding the practicum.

Students are posted to schools and engage in teaching actual students and are also expected to take part in all school activities: extra-curricular such as running clubs, games, each according to the abilities that their heads of schools identify in each of them. In addition, students are allowed, after some time to be on duty, like regular teachers.

TP entails rigour in planning and students must make schemes of work for assigned classes and subjects. They must draw up lesson plans complete with SMART objectives, seating plans of the classes being taught to enable them to learn names of their learners. Furthermore, student teachers are expected to keep records of work covered and learner assessments and tests. Generally, student teachers have two weeks to work on these preparations before tutors and lecturers visit them.

Student teachers are further required to review or reflect on their own lessons, as part of their professional growth and assess how well or how badly a given lesson has gone and why, with a view to establishing:

- ✓ What particular points contributed to what was successful and what did not work out
- ✓ What may have contributed
- ✓ What could be improved
- ✓ What alternatives were open to him/her that could have made a difference

Supervisors' discussions with students on TP are supposed to cover all these areas with the supervisors expected to make suggestions for improvement that will help the student grow in his perception of the teaching situation and content.

In the TP schools, each student has a cooperating teacher in each of the two teaching subjects. The cooperating teacher is expected to be the model and coach of the new practising teacher; he/she will answer questions on what may not be understood or know how to tackle various issues related to practice. Cooperating teachers are often older and more seasoned teachers who play the role of mentors. However, much as this may be the ideal, in some schools student teachers simply relieve the regular teacher with little help and often little guidance. In addition, some students may not ask for help even when they require it, tending to behave as if they are self-sufficient.

Many schools support practicing student teachers by offering accommodation, and meals or only meals during the day. This relieves students of the financial burden of buying food, or cooking for themselves. In turn, it releases energies for the teacher trainees to concentrate on the core business – that of learning how to be a teacher.

### **3.1 Provisions for Student Teachers of Rongo University College**

Before they proceed on TP, each student is provided with the following items:

- i. Lesson Plan book
- ii. Sample schemes of work format which they will photocopy as required
- iii. Sample Blank timetable on which to fill their teaching schedule for visit planning by lecturers
- iv. Form for final confidential report from the practice school which they return to the school after TP.

### **3.2 Teaching Supervision**

#### **The challenges of TP supervision**

With rising enrolment and dwindling public funding in public universities (Kasomo, 2012, colleges, and institutions in Africa schools of education are having to find innovative ways to prepare professionals competitively and effectively for the market at cost-effective means. The sheer number of student teachers who have to be supervised in Kenya, for example, has more than trebled over the past four to ten years in all universities and colleges training teachers.

There are many implications of the increase: number of schools required to accommodate teacher trainees, number of academic supervisors who must visit students in the practice schools, increase in the zones that need to be covered, increase in the financial base required to support student supervision in any one cycle.

One of the upshots of this increase is that some institutions may resort to hiring 'in-the field' supervisors' at a cost. Whether the institutions train the supervisors adequately to be confident that the results they are given are reliable begs the question. On the other hand, even if supervision is done by 'internal' lecturers, the question of quality and comparability remain, because of both the large numbers and number of part-time personnel who have been recruited by universities and colleges to fill the gap in the light of rising demand for higher education and training against slow growth in lecturer numbers.

Dwindling resources and the sheer spread of students short-circuit the number of times each student can be seen, ensuring that many students are seen only once or twice in each of their teaching subjects. Thus students who may require mentoring by and advice from subject specialists generally do not, or hardly get it, and

therefore, may not benefit from the lecturer inputs and discussions that are critical in helping them to grow.

#### 4. Literature Review

Teacher education aims at producing quality teachers for quality education since it is the government's policy that quality is at the core of education programmes (MOEST, 2013). Teaching practice has been variously described. Chireshe (2010, 511) drawing from Kiggundu and Nayimuli 2009; Kasanda 1995; Williams and Alawiye 2001,

*'it is a form of work –integrated learning period during which a teacher under training is given the opportunity to put theory into practice by applying theoretical knowledge acquired in the lecture room to classroom teaching, before actually getting into the real world of classroom teaching'*

It is also considered as 'initiation' into actual teaching (Kigundu, 2007), although one that is supported and supervised. TP affords student teachers opportunity to learn on the job as well benefit from the inputs of more experienced mentors and support personnel. These will specifically include their lecturers-cum-supervisors, cooperating subject teachers within the TP schools, heads of the institutions to which they have been posted, and heads of departments under whom they work. In field experience significant learning can occur. Cooperating teachers have a powerful influence on the nature of the student teaching experience (Miller & Silvernail (2000).

The premium on good teachers and TP as a cardinal activity in the preparation of effective teachers has been underlined by interest and researches that examine several facets (Sandford, 1999; Williams and Alawiye, 2001; Kiggundu and and Nayimmuli 2009 and Chireshe And Chireshe 2010) of the process.

Many colleges and universities, the world over, which train teachers have a period of preparation and an extended period of teaching practice or practicum that acts both as a practice season and examination of what the students teachers have learned in both the content and theory lessons (Kasomo, 2012, Miller and Silvernail, 2000, Chumba and Kiprop, 2014). Teaching practice is an integral component of teacher training. It grants student teachers experience in the actual teaching and learning environment (Kiggundu & Nayimuli, Nayimuli, 2009). It has also been defined as a period in which a student teacher is under the supervision of a more experienced teacher, often both at his school of practice and those who have trained him who will visit and observe him from time to time.

According to Taneja (2000) and Idowu (2000) writing on the Nigerian experience, they state that Teaching practice is an important pre-qualification requirement that student teachers must qualify in because it gives them opportunity to 'put into practice what they have learnt in theory'. Kasomo argues that teaching practice enable trainees to develop 'a repertoire of teaching skills as well as gain craft knowledge' (Kasomo, 2012: 67). Teaching practice will enable trainees to test the theories, principles and content they have learned in their lectures to gauge what works and what does not in the real classroom.

Taneja (2000) and Idowu (Ibid) further argue that Teaching Practice, is not limited to the cognitive domain, but encompasses affective and psychomotor domains. In addition, teacher trainees on TP have responsibilities beyond the classroom. Student teachers, as soon as they are posted to schools, are expected to support their learners psychologically as mentors and counselors. Student teachers are expected to take part in all or most school activities during their tenure within a school (Kasomo, 2012). Besides, they are expected to prepare thoroughly for each class.

#### 5. The place of part time learners and part time students

All over Africa there is a growing number of part-time lecturers and part-time students who do not study full time. Part-time learners make over 50% of the student populations at undergraduate level, a scenario similar to that described in South Africa by Buchler et al (2007). Many of the part time students who go on TP are also people who have taught before. Little provision is made to give credit to previous training or teaching experience. Thus, they are treated like every other student who is training for the first time.

Part time lecturers in Rongo constitute more than 50% of the teaching staff, as in many countries the world over (evidence). Many of them, however, have not been involved in TP supervision, as they rightfully should be, being the faculty that help prepare teacher trainees for the field. When a few of them are involved, they are not adequately trained for the job. On the whole, however, assumptions are made about lecturers teaching at the university as being able to judge effective lessons and provide appropriate mentoring to students on teaching practice. One wonders whether there is then consistency in what we judge as effective, middling or even failed classes? Without rigorous training, is the inter-rater reliability achieved? Does an 80% from two different assessors on the two different topics mean the same thing?

Nationally, in the words of Van Wyk et al (2010: 1039) writing about SA state:

*It is recommended that professional teachers should be regarded as the essential resource of the education system and that programmes for teacher education and training should reinforce the professional competencies and commitments of teachers...*

Their statement remains true for Kenya, where, in spite of the changes in teacher preparation rigour over the recent years, there is still a premium laid on what teachers should achieve with learners, especially because they train and nurture human resource for the needs of communities (Alexander et al (2009) at tertiary level.

## 6. Methodology

The study was done among 113 randomly selected students who made 27% of third year bachelors and second year diploma students of Rongo University who had just finished their teaching practice in various schools in May 2014. The college trains teachers at both Diploma and Bachelors levels. The study captured 45 female and 68 male students, as summarized in Table 1 below.

Students in the study were selected through stratified random sampling. All the diploma and degree students were put into two separate lists by registration numbers. They were then selected randomly to come up with 27% of the total number. The total number of those who went to TP was 418 students.

**Table 1:** Students participating in the study by level and gender

Level of training	Gender				
	Male	% age	Female	%age	Totals number
Diploma	24	21	17	11	41
Degree	44	24	28	17	72
<b>Totals</b>	<b>68</b>		<b>45</b>		<b>113</b>

The study utilized both supervisor assessments from the practice schools and the university. In the schools, school principals or their representatives, were asked to rate student teachers posted to their schools by rating them on a five-point Likert scale where (1) = very poor; (2) = poor; (3) = average; (4)= satisfactory/good; (5) = excellent on the following areas:

- i. Attendance
- ii. Punctuality in attending their classes
- iii. Reliability
- iv. Work output
- v. Involvement in school activities
- vi. Student personality (confidence, authority, relationships with other members of staff)
- vii. Student –learners relationship (authority, confidence, responsibility and relationship with learners)
- viii. Overall assessment (in terms of competence and potential to become a good teacher)
- ix. Final grade (in light of overall assessment, what grade does the student- teacher deserve both in class and outside?).

Copies of both in-school and university supervisor scores were then retrieved from TP files for comparison. Gender was not considered an issue in the current study even though issues have risen in relation to scores and lecturers' demanding favours from female students in exchange for marks in the literature (Kiggundu and and Nayimmuli 2009 and Chireshe And Chireshe 2010).

Academic supervisors rated students on scheming, lesson planning, lesson presentation; these were scored out 100 marks; lesson delivery included development as well as use of resources and innovativeness, as shown in appendix 1. On the whole most students had three visits from the academic supervisors by the end of TP. Only 21 students had 2 visits, one visit per subject. At the end of TP marks were aggregated and awarded out of 100%. Only aggregate scores from supervisors, and the confidential assessments of the schools were used in the study.

## 7. Results of the study

### Assessments of school administrations and cooperating teachers

In this study and sample of 103 randomly selected students' scores given by school administrators ranged between 1 (very poor) to 5 (excellent). Even as we state this, it is noteworthy that only one school supervisor had the courage to give a student on TP an assessment of 'very poor' in punctuality, attendance and reliability.

The mode of these assessments was 5 (excellent), while the mean of the scores was 4.5. The means of aggregate ratings by the school supervisors on all aspects of the TP ranged between 3.2 to 5.0 which was the full marks. The scores were positively skewed as most of the 103 students were rated for all aspects above between '4' (very good) and '5' (excellent). The means themselves ranged between 4.55 to 4.70. As shown in the table below:

**Table 2: Student Assessments by school heads and deputies**

No	What was assessed	Mean for category
1	<b>ATTENDANCE</b>	4.720
2	<b>PUNCTUALITY</b> ( <i>in attending classes and arriving in school</i> )	4.547
3	<b>RELIABILITY</b> ( <i>to what extent can you rely on the student-teacher as a serious, involved and a committed person</i> )	4.604
4	<b>WORK OUTPUT</b> ( <i>what is the student-teacher's ability to use his/her conscientiousness and involved in learning</i> )	4.604
5	<b>INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL ACTIVITIES</b> ( <i>performing duties, involvement in sports, debates, clubs etc</i> )	4.581
6	<b>STUDENT'S PERSONALITY</b> ( <i>Confidence, authority and nature relationships with other members of staff</i> )	4.595
7	<b>STUDENT'S- LEARNER RELATIONSHIP</b> ( <i>responsibility and relationship with learners</i> )	4.720
8	<b>OVERALL ASSESSMENT</b> ( <i>In terms of competence and potential to become a good teacher</i> )	4.627

Where overall grade is D or E, briefly give reasons for giving the student this grade.....

Most school supervisors, did not qualify their assessment of students in any category; a few however, went out of their way to qualify their grading of students in some categories.

102 out of 103 supervision comments did not give any extremely negative ratings of '1', '2' or played it safe by giving '3'. Among the 103 in-school reports only one head made comments to qualify their rating. She stated "*The student has been quite exemplary in her work*", which I found interesting as this was a female head assessing a female student. Her scores had no 'very good' (4) or excellent (5), but ranged between satisfactory and good. The other heads rated the students good, '4' or very good/excellent '5' without qualifying their scores.

A test of the means for each category of assessments from the schools showed that there were no significant differences in the heads' assessment of the students overall. There were no significant differences in scores for diploma and bachelors students and no significant differences between scores for females and males.

**Academic supervisor scores given for teaching and related activities.**

**Table 3: Student Scores by Category**

	Bachelors Scores %	Diploma Scores %
Mode	69.0	70.0
Mean	69.52	68.86
Maximum	86.0	82.0
Minimum	52.0	47.0
Range	34.0	35.0

Academic supervisor scores were given from an aggregate of 100. The scores were given for various aspects listed above, with the bulk of the marks (80%) being given for lesson development, that is, actual teaching as observed and assessed by the supervisor. The range of scores in this category varied from 52% to 86 for bachelors students and 47% to 82% for Diploma students as shown in Table above. The range of marks was 34 and 35 respectively for the two groups. The mean scores were 69.52% and 68.86% respectively for degree and diploma students respectively. The means were not statistically different. In total there were no significant differences between scores of diploma and bachelors students, but there were significant differences in mastery of subject matter as well as introduction to lessons scores between diploma and bachelors students. In testing for differences in content mastery between the two groups, the t-test statistic of 5.421 (df -198, p=0.000) which was significant. The bachelors had significantly better content mastery than their diploma counterparts.

**Relationships between academic supervisor (lecturer) scores against the school supervisor scores.**

When scores from the academic supervisors and school supervisors were tested for relationship, it was noted that there were significant relationships of  $r = 0.97$  for both diploma and bachelors students. All students who had done well in their teaching were also rated highly by the supervising heads or cooperating teachers. This means that both diploma and bachelors students performed almost at par in their teaching practice.

There were no significant differences between the diploma students. In fact the correlation between Diploma and Bachelors students was 0.96. Furthermore, students were assessed work output, student-learner relationships, and student personality against academic supervisor scores. The results were significant when the three attributes were regressed against Academic Supervisor scores. Table 4 below shows regression values for both diploma and bachelors students.

**Table 4:** Regression values for Work output, student personality, student-learner relationships and Academic Supervisor scores by category.

	Bachelors	Diploma
Work output	0.754	0.747
Student Personality	0.756	0.747
Student Learner relationship	0.736	0.729

As can be seen from Table 4 above, there were no significant differences between the correlations for diploma and bachelors students in variables being examined.

## 8. Discussion

Both the assessments made by supervisors are in most cases quite high. We have stated above that the scores were positively skewed with most students in both groups scoring above 65%. This is not considering that TP is both a practicum and examination. It either points to the dedication with which students approach and carry out the exercise or the generosity of the academic supervisors who assess and mentor them. The relatively high marks across students could also be attributed to the fact that most lecturers in education have also gone through the same teaching practice and realize how challenging it is. Teaching is a progression of learning and improving, and all tutors and teachers realize this. So it means that most lecturers give marks both for effort and substance and seem to be empathic with those that are just starting out on the long journey.

School supervisors do all of the above, but also in the light of schools who really need teacher attachées because of shortage may also feel that they need to be more generous in their assessments. Alternatively, as stated before, it is possible that most of the subjects genuinely put in extra effort to impress those supervising them as they strove to fit into school routines and teaching.

The means of variables attendance, punctuality, reliability, work output, involvement in school activities, students personality, student-learner relationship and overall assessment ranged between 4.547 and 4.720. The near perfect means of the likert scale show both what have discuss above, sheer effort and/ or empathic assessments of students on both practice while learning the ropes.

However, the fact that most school principals and cooperating teachers did not qualify their own assessments of student teachers leaves a lot of room for questions as to whether they take the assessment of student who are average seriously or thoughtfully. There is certainly more room to get the supervisors to be more critical in their evaluation by offering more incisive and well thought out comments. It may also be that instead of offering just one space for comment each assessment category should offer an option for the school supervisor to make appropriate comment. This would call a revision of the instrument for heads and cooperating teachers. It worthy of note that out of the one comment that stated "*the student has been quite exemplary in her work*" did not bear that out with her scores which were between satisfactory (3) instead of very good (4) or excellent (5). It may be that the comment below the assessment grid only inviting comments where a grade 'D' or 'E' was given made it easy for heads and their deputies to avoid committing themselves by giving reasons for their grading of students under their charge.

The performance of diploma and bachelors students was almost equal except for mastery of subject matter between the two groups. This is almost expected, as the diploma students had studied their two teaching subjects for two years, while the bachelors had done so for three years. The depth of subject mastery was therefore skewed in favour of the bachelor students. This is an important because in the view of the researcher when the issue of content has been dealt with, the teacher can then concentrate on how deliver the same. When teachers struggle with both methodology and content, they may be disadvantaged in the classroom.

The fact that knowledge of subject did not necessarily translate into better teaching can be interpreted to mean that teaching is a lifelong learning experience. Any effective teacher learns his trade through trial and error with different groups on learners. Skills of teaching are tried out in the real classroom and take patience, increasing knowledge, practice, and growing confidence. The knowledge gained from one class to another, and one year to another helps the teacher build an arsenal of routines that work most of the time. It should, however, be remembered that teaching is a complex process that involves many observable and not-easy-to observe processes. Thus we can confidently say that effective teachers are not made in three months, but TP provides a good opportunity for students to try their hand at live teaching.

There was congruence between the scores by the school supervisors and university supervisors. The fact that those who scored well on aspects on the confidential report also did well in the classes speaks about the close connection about how teaching as an art is closely related to other teacher characteristics and environmental factors, such as willingness to take on extra duties, which provide any teacher with more time to blend with colleagues and students. The spill over gives many advantages to the classroom.

School supervision and in our context, special support given by practice school administrations, may also be instrumental in helping new students settle and get to do what is expected of them; this may have a cascade effect on the efforts that students on teaching practice.

## 9. Conclusions

This research makes the following brief conclusions: one, teachers on practice tend to put into their practice a lot of effort and this is borne out by both supervisors and the nearly similar scores for both diploma and bachelors trainees. It is also possible that supervisors, both academic and school, who have been in the same seat themselves, may be more empathetic in their assessments of student teachers on TP and may reward effort as well as actual performance, thereby being generous in their scoring. It was borne out that the longer student teachers spend in the content lecture rooms, the better their subject mastery. Knowledge of subject matter is important but not sufficient of itself for effective teaching; other factors come into play. It seems that teaching effectiveness is an aspect that grows with experience and experimentation. TP is a mine field and more research could be done in areas such as the kind of supervisory and mentoring that cooperating teachers provide to trainees on TP, school environments and students' survival or coping strategies. The studies would feed further into teacher training to make it more viable and effective.

## References

- Alexander, G. M. M. Van Wyk and C.D. Jaftha (2009). Exploring community engagement: A higher education initiative. Saabrücken, Germany: VDM Verlag Dr Müller Aktiengesellschaft and Co. KG and licensors.
- Buchler, M. J. Castle, R. Osman, and S. Walters (2007). Equity, access and success; Adult learners in public higher education. *Council for Higher Education Triennial Review, Pretoria*.
- David, M. & Sutton, C.D. (2004). *Social research: The basics*. London: Sage Publications Federal Republic of Nigeria (2004). *National policy on Education*. Abuja: NERDC
- Chumba, S. K and Kiprop, C. (2014). Teacher Preparation in Public Universities in Kenya: Challenges and Mitigation. *International Journal of Education and Research*. 2, 6.
- Furlong, J., Hirst, P., Pocklington, P. & Miles, S. (1988). *Initial Teacher Training and the Role of the School*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Gujjar, A.A. (2009). *Teaching practice: Concept, stages, objectives and suggestions*. <http://www.addthis.com/bookmark.php?v=20>
- Idowu, A.I. (2000). Teaching practice exercise: An overview. In A.I. Idowu, S.O. Daramola, Idowu, S.O. Daramola, A.S. Olorundare, O.O. Obiyemi, NYS. Ijaiya, and K. Lafinhan (Ed.). Idowu, S.O. Daramola, A.S. Olorundare, O.O. Obiyemi, NYS. Ijaiya, and K. Lafinhan(Ed.). *A guide to teaching practice*. Ilorin: Faculty of Education, University of Ilorin.
- Jekayinfa, A.A. (2000). The essence of lesson presentation in teaching practice. In A.I. Jekayinfa, A.A., et al. (2013). Lecturers' Assessment of Teaching Practice Exercise
- Kasomo, D. (2012). An Evaluation of Teaching in Kenya. *Scientific and Academic Publishing. Education* 2012, 2 (4): 66-72.
- Kiggundu, E<sup>1</sup>; Nayimuli, S. <sup>1</sup> (2009). Teaching practice: a make or break phase for student teachers. *South African Journal of Education*. vol.29 n.3 Pretoria Aug. 2009. 345 -358.
- Nigerian Universities. *Journal of Education and Practice*. ISSN 2222-1735 (Paper) ISSN 2222-288X (Online). Vol 3, No 4, 2012. 79
- Ngidi, D.P. & Sibaya, P.T. (2003). *Student teachers' anxieties related to practice teaching*. *South African Journal of Education*. 23. 18-22.
- Marais, P. & Meier, C. (2004). *Hear our voice: Student teachers' experience during practical teaching*. African Journal of Education Review. 1. 220-233.
- Ministry of Education Science and Technology Circular, 2013, pp. 123. Government Printers, 2013.
- Miller L. and Silvernail, D. (2000). Learning to become a teacher: The Wheelock way. In Darling-Hammond (Ed.), *Studies in excellence in Teacher education: Preparation in the undergraduate years*. (pp. 67-107) Washington DC. American Association of Colleges for teacher Education.
- Omosewo, E.O. (2000). Guideposts in teaching physics at the senior secondary level. In A.I. Olorundare A.S. O.O. Obiyemi, N.Y. S. Ijaiya, and K. Lafinhan (Eds.). *A guide to teaching practice*. Ilorin: Faculty of Education, University of Ilorin <http://www.scielo.org.za/pdf/v29n3/a04v29n3.pdf>
- Tanega, R. P. (2000). *Encyclopaedia of comparative education*. Vol.4. New Delhi: Anmol Publications Ltd.
- Trowbridge, L.W. & Bybee, R.W. (1990). *Becoming a secondary school science teacher*. (5th Ed.) Virginia: Merrill Pub. Co.
- Van Wyk M.M. et al (2010). Education as Transformation: A case of faculty. *South African Journal of Higher Education*. Unisa. University of South Africa Press. 24, 6 .
- Miller and Silvernail, 2000, Chumba and Kiprop, 2014

**SCHOOL OF EDUCATION  
 TEACHING PRACTICE ASSESSMENT CRITERIA**

NAME OF STUDENT \_\_\_\_\_ REG. NO \_\_\_\_\_ ZONE \_\_\_\_\_  
 SCHOOL \_\_\_\_\_ SUBJECT \_\_\_\_\_ CLASS \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_  
 TOPIC/ SUBTOPIC \_\_\_\_\_ TIME \_\_\_\_\_

**IN TRIPLICATE (Original: Student, Duplicate: TP Coordinator, Triplicate: lecturer)**

CRITERION	PERFORMANCE			REMARKS
	B/AV	AV	AB/AV	
<b>1. PREPARATION ( 12 marks)</b> <b>a. Scheme of work (from syllabus)</b> Availability, remarks, complete (Max-2) <b>b. Lesson Plan</b> i. Objectives, audience, behavior, standard and condition. (Max-2) ii. Learning activities: varied, challenging, learner centered (Max-4) iii. Sequential arrangement of content and concurrence with scheme(Max-4)	0	1	2	
<b>2. PRESENTATION ( 79 marks)</b> <b>a) Introduction (4 marks)</b> Use of learners' experience and link with current lesson (set induction), aroused interest(Max- 4) <b>b) Lesson development (30 marks)</b> i)Logical selection and presentation of content (Max-5) ii)Relevance of content to class level (Max-5) iii)Adequacy of content to lesson time, depth of coverage (Max-5) iv)Strategies and methods (participatory) (Max-5) v) Use of teaching skills: motivation, reinforcement, questioning, stimulus variation, voice projection (Max-5) vi)Mastery of content (Max-5) <b>c) Communication (5 marks)</b> i)Verbal (fluency, voice pitch, audibility and use of appropriate language (Max-2) ii)Non-verbal (appropriate use of gestures, eye contact, facial expression, body movements (Max-3) <b>d) Use of resource materials (15 marks)</b> i)Chalk board layout and use (Max-3) ii) Use of ICT (Max-3) iii)Timingand attractiveness (Max-3) iv)Appropriateness (age level) (Max-3) v)Innovative, originality and creativity(Max-3) <b>e) Classroom organization and management (20 marks)</b> i)Control and knowledge of learners by name (Max-5) ii)Learner participation (Max-5) iii)Use of group work/ provision for individual differences (Max-5) iv)Teacher/ learner rapport (Max-5) <b>f) Conclusion (5 marks)</b> i)Closure skills: review, questions, exercises (Max-2) ii)Concluding activities, evaluation (Max-2) iii)Assignments (Max-1)	0-2	3	3-4	
<b>3. TEACHER PERSONALITY AND ORGANIZATION (6 marks)</b> i)Confidence, dressing, mannerisms integrity, interaction with learners, handling of challenges (Max-3) ii) Maintenance of records, TP file, Health records file(Max-3)	0-12	13- 18	19-30	
<b>4.USE OF PREVIOUS COMMENTS AND SELF APPRAISAL ON THE LESSON (Max-3)</b>	0-2	3	4-5	
	0-6	7-8	9-15	
	0-8	9-13	14-20	
	0-2	3	4-5	
	0-3	4	5-6	
<b>TOTAL MARKS</b>				

Advisor's name: .....  
 Signature: ..... Date:.....



**SCHOOL OF EDUCATION**

**TP PERFORMANCE CONFIDENTIAL REPORT (To be filled and SEALED by the principal/ Deputy**

**Principal)**

**NAME:** \_\_\_\_\_ **REG. NO:** \_\_\_\_\_ **ZONE:** \_\_\_\_\_

**NAME OF SCHOOL:** \_\_\_\_\_ **SUBJECTS**

**COMBINATION:** \_\_\_\_\_

**ATTENDANCE**

Date of report: ..... Date of departure: .....

Tick in the appropriate box the student teacher's overall attendance during the entire teaching practice exercise

Very poor     Poor     Average     Satisfactory     Highly satisfactory

**PUNCTUALITY** (*in attending classes and arriving in school*)

Very poor     Poor     Average     Satisfactory     Highly satisfactory

**RELIABILITY** (*to what extent can you rely on the student-teacher as a serious, involved and a committed person*)

Very poor     Poor     Average     Satisfactory     Highly satisfactory

**WORK OUTPUT** (*what is the student-teacher's ability to use his/her conscientiousness and involved in learning*)

Very poor     Poor     Average     Good     Very good

**INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL ACTIVITIES** (*performing duties, involvement in sports, debates, clubs etc*)

Very poor     Poor     Average     Good     Very good

**STUDENT'S PERSONALITY** (*Confidence, authority and nature relationships with other members of staff*)

Very weak     Weak     Average     Good     Excellent

**STUDENT'S- LEARNER RELATIONSHIP** (*Authority, responsible and relationship with learners*)

Very poor     Poor     Average     Good     Very good

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** (*In terms of competence and potential to become a good teacher*)

Very poor     Poor     Average     Satisfactory     Highly satisfactory

**FINAL GRADE** (*in light of overall assessment, what grade does the student-teacher deserve both in class and outside?*)

E =Very poor     D =Poor     C =Satisfactory     B =Good     A =Excellent

Where overall grade is D or E, briefly give reasons for giving the student this grade.....

**NAME:** \_\_\_\_\_ **DESIGNATION:** \_\_\_\_\_

(PRINCIPAL OR DEPUTY PRINCIPAL ETC)

**SIGNATURE:** \_\_\_\_\_ **DATE AND OFFICIAL STAMP:**