EXAMINING THE EFFECTS OF A FLEX VS. COHORT MODEL OF FIELD RESIDENCY EXPERIENCES ON TEACHER SELF-EFFICACY AND EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

A Record of Study

by

HEATHER RENEE BREZINSKI

Submitted to the Office of Graduate and Professional Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Chair of Committee,	Geor Slattery
Co-Chair of Committee,	James Laub
Committee Members,	Radhika Viruru
	Krystal Simmons
Head of Department,	Michael De Miranda

May 2020

Major Subject: Curriculum and Instruction

ABSTRACT

The Educator Preparation Program at a burgeoning university in the Southwest United States offered preservice teachers two models of field residency experience. The students who participated in the cohort model had the same university supervisor and cooperating teacher during all three semesters of field residency and took two education classes with their university supervisor. In the flex model, students potentially had a different cooperating teacher and university supervisor for each field residency and did not typically take any classes with their university supervisor. This mixed method study statistically examines the differences in rate of certification, rate of employment after graduation and graduates' sense of teacher efficacy. In addition, graduates of both the flex and cohort model were interviewed to determine perceived benefits and disadvantages of each model.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my committee chairs, Dr. Laub and Dr. Slattery and my committee members, Dr. Viruru and Dr. Simmons for their time, support and patience as I completed this research.

Thank you is extended to the faculty and staff within the Educator Preparation Program where the study took place. Their encouragement and guidance have been invaluable to me.

I would especially like to thank my family for their never-ending faith and support.

CONTRIBUTORS AND FUNDING SOURCES

Contributors

This work was supervised by a record of study committee consisting of Dr. Patrick Slattery [Chair], Dr. James Laub [Co-Chair], Dr. Radhika Viruru of the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture and Dr. Krystal Simmons of the Department of Educational Psychology.

All work conducted for the record of study was completed by the student independently.

Funding Sources

There are no outside funding contributions to acknowledge related to the research and compilation of this document.

NOMENCLATURE

COEHD	College of Education and Human Development
ELP	Educator and Leadership and Preparation
EPCC	Educator Preparation Certification Center
EPP	Educator Preparation Program
FRTS	Lecturer and Field Residency and Clinical Teaching Specialist
PIR	Public Information Request
SWUSU	Southwestern United States University where study took place
TEA	Texas Education Agency
TFA	Teach for America
TSES	Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE Page

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Problem Space

This Record of Study is directed to the Educator Preparation Program (EPP) within the College of Education and Human Development (COEHD) at a burgeoning university located in the Southwestern United States (SWUSU) and reporting information that was obtained during the spring 2017 semester. At the time of the study, the COEHD did not track certification or employment status of its teacher graduates. During the spring 2017 semester, the EPP had no idea how many of their graduates were certified or became employed as teachers after graduation. This was a problem. The Texas Education Agency (TEA) requires institutions to track graduates for three years after graduation. I am interested not only in the overall certification and employment status of SWUSU's graduates but seek to determine if there is a difference between the two models, cohort and flex, that students had to choose from during field residency. The cohort model was designed for students to stay on the same placement campus, with the same cooperating teacher for all three semesters of field residency. They also had the same university supervisor for all three semesters and took a class with the university supervisor, acting as the professor, during field residency 1 and 2. The flex model was designed for students to engage in a more traditional field residency experience. The flex students may have changed campuses, cooperating teachers and/or university supervisors each semester of field residency. There is a great deal of research on the benefits of field residency (Ball & Forzani, 2009; Darling-Hammond, 2006; Brown, Lee & Collins, 2015), however little research focuses on different models of the field residency experience. In addition to researching potential differences in certification and employment between the two models, I'm also seeking to

determine if there is a difference in teacher self-efficacy during the first few years of employment. The results of this study have many implications in terms of how SWUSU will move forward with their EPP field residency program. They may decide that all students should be in a cohort-type model or they may decide that the extra effort and resources that are required for the cohort model do not substantially benefit students.

The Problem of Practice

Context and Setting. The burgeoning Southwestern United States University (SWUSU) where this study is located opened classes in the fall of 2000 with 126 students and seven academic programs. SWUSU was originally part of an established system school until 2009 when the Governor of the state granted the university stand-alone status. During the spring 2017 semester, there were over 5,500 students enrolled at SWUSU with 4,600 being undergraduate students and 900 graduate students. The spring 2017 demographics of the university can be found in Table 1.1. There were 25 undergraduate degrees offered and 11 graduate degrees.

Table 1.1

Student Demographics at SWUSU Spring 2017 (SWUSU webpage)

Criteria	SWUSU (%)
Declared Major	
Arts & Science	58
Business	23
Education	19
Female	60
Male	40
Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity	
White	18

Table 1.1 *Student Demographics at SWUSU Spring 2017 (SWUSU webpage), Continued*

Criteria	SWUSU (%)
Hispanic or Latino	70
African-American	6
Asian/Native American/other	6

The atmosphere at SWUSU was one of excitement and high energy, but also trepidation. There had been numerous changes at SWUSU since the spring 2016 semester including downward expansion (now a four-year university), the construction of a residency hall, and many leadership changes including a new Provost. During the spring 2017 semester, the COEHD had an interim dean, a new department chair and was seeking a second department chair, as well as a newly created position of interim assistant dean. Dr. Jones (pseudonym), as interim assistant dean, was responsible for overseeing the field residency and certification program.

In the spring of 2017, the COEHD at SWUSU consisted of the Department of Counseling, Health and Kinesiology and the Department of Educator and Leadership Preparation (ELP). The Educator Preparation Program (EPP), formally the Educator Preparation and Certification Center (EPCC), was housed under ELP. The COEHD, during the spring 2017 semester, had 26 full time faculty and 35 adjuncts. During the spring 2017 semester, the EPP served 178 students in field residency 1, 111 students in field residency 2 and 74 student teachers. There were twenty-one supervisors for these students, six of which were faculty. As part of the reorganization, the EPCC, which coordinated all field residency experiences, testing and certification of pre-service teachers, was completely dissolved and four full-time faculty positions replaced it. Three of the new faculty members fell under the ELP and one was under the Department of Counseling, Health and Kinesiology. I was hired for one of those positions

which is titled Lecturer and Field Residency and Clinical Teaching Specialist. The reason for the change was largely due to the desire to have faculty more involved in the field residency and certification process. The COEHD faculty, however, had different opinions about the reorganization and, as of spring 2017, the final structure was still under discussion.

Initial understanding. When I started thinking about what I would research for my ROS, the EPCC was still in existence and responsible for field residency and certification of teacher candidates at SWUSU. I was interested in researching how effective supervisors were in the field at increasing students' teaching efficacy and bridging the theory to practice gap, and how training of contracted supervisors affects the experience. However, after the reorganization and with the creation of the EPP, the faculty had become more involved with the field residency program, and I became aware of faculty concerns regarding the cohort program. The primary reason for their concerns appeared to be due to the extra resources that were required for the cohort groups. Typically, there were 10-15 students in a cohort class which meant that the two classes that were taught during field residency 1 and 2 to the cohort students by the supervisor had very low enrollment. This situation was cause for concern since the university was severely taxed for classroom space and instructors. However, the benefits of taking class with your supervisor are documented. According to a study by Asplin and Marks (2013) student teachers were more likely to implement strategies that they had learned in class during student teaching when they had taken class with their supervisor. I was interested in seeking to determine if empirical evidence existed which would show benefits of the cohort model over the flex model in terms of certification, employment and teaching efficacy.

Relevant history of the problem. The first president of SWUSU, along with the department of education at SWUSU, initiated a program for future teachers in 2010 which

focused on preparing preservice teachers to be prepared for first day teaching, titled Model for Success Initiative: Ready From Day One. This initiative resulted in the cohort model of field residency. The goal was primarily to collaborate closely with local districts in order to "Close the Gap" in education. The program underwent several structural changes but had not lost sight of the original goals. A new president was appointed to SWUSU during the 2014-2015 school year. The new president may have had a different vision for the teacher preparation program than her predecessor had. As was previously mentioned, faculty within the COEHD were voicing concerns over the required resources for the cohort model, especially given that the university was extremely taxed for space and professors given the recent downward expansion. Therefore, they were calling for empirical evidence to maintain the program.

Faculty members at SWUSU had, in the past, been interested in researching the differences between the cohort and flex model of field residency. Prior research at SWUSU includes a study by Garza and Dorel (2015) which compared teaching efficacy of cohort students as compared to flex students while they were still enrolled at SWUSU. The unexpected results of this study were that cohort students did not have as high of efficacy as those in the flex group. The researchers surmised that this was due to the more realistic experience that cohort students encountered and suggested that this would later have a positive effect on teacher efficacy and attrition. Related research was completed by Dorel, Kearney & Garza (2016). They sought to determine if the length of time that students spend in field residency affected teaching efficacy. This research showed a significant relationship between the length of time in field residency and self-efficacy but did not compare the two models of field residency, and did not report on employment after graduation.

In the current study, I researched potential differences that existed between the cohort model and the flex model of field residency experiences on initial certification, teacher-efficacy and employment after graduation. This differs from the previous research which studied subjects that were currently enrolled as pre-service teachers at SWUSU.

Stakeholder groups and values. There were many potential stakeholders. The three primary stakeholders included university supervisors, cooperating teachers and pre-service teachers. The faculty and administrators of the COEHD at SWUSU were other primary stakeholders. Additional stakeholders were the local districts that hosted SWUSU's pre-service teachers during field residency, other teacher preparation programs and ultimately the students of teacher graduates from SWUSU. One of the major focuses of the newly structured EPP was building stronger partnerships with the districts that the students were placed in. In my experience, districts had shown some preference in the cohort model over the flex model for placement. I hoped to gain a better understanding of how those partnerships could function best and how they would ultimately impact the employment opportunities and teaching efficacy of SWUSU's students.

Framing the Problem

The Problem Situation. The problem situation at SWUSU became increasingly complex since I started the EdD program at TAMU. The Educator Preparation Program underwent many organizational changes which many members of the faculty were not in agreement with. In addition, the university supervisors were generally unhappy with the changes that were made. Essentially, faculty members that had supervised cohorts in the past were overwhelmingly in support of them while those who had not been directly involved with a cohort didn't see enough value to justify the extra resources. They wanted to see empirical evidence to be convinced of its

worth. If that evidence does not exist, then it was likely that they would vote to terminate the cohort model.

Problem or dilemma. I believe that the problem situation of flex vs. cohort model in field residency was a dilemma that existed within an even larger dilemma. Cuban describes dilemmas as "messy, complicated, and conflict-filled situations that require undesirable choices between competing, highly prized values that cannot be simultaneously or fully satisfied," (2001, p. 10). This perfectly describes the conflict that existed in the COEHD at SWUSU concerning the reorganization and administrative choices that had been made. My research is a dilemma that existed within that discord which made it more difficult to define how the faculty stakeholders truly felt about the different models. The problem of cohort vs. flex was, in and of itself, a dilemma because of the lack of space, instructors, and supervisors at SWUSU. Therefore, even if it was empirically shown that the cohort model is best practice, the university may not have had the resources to support it. My assumption is that, if that were found to be the case, the EPP would develop a hybrid model of the two.

My Journey in the Problem Space

Considering alternative viewpoints. I have considered the alternative viewpoint of eliminating the cohort program and understand the argument that revolves around it. SWUSU was severely taxed for space, resources, faculty and staff especially given the speed by which all the changes have taken place. It didn't appear as though this situation would improve anytime soon. Therefore, I understood this viewpoint. However, based on my personal experience and existing research, I did not agree with it and recognized that there were others who also strongly disagreed. One of the issues that some faculty had with the cohort model was that it was often the university supervisors, who were not faculty, leading the cohorts. They believed that the

program should be faculty driven, however, only a few faculty members had agreed to get involved.

The hybrid option had been mentioned by a few faculty members. In the hybrid model, the pre-service teachers would stay with the same university supervisor and cooperating teacher for all three semesters of field residency but would not take a class with the supervisor. I understand the appeal of this model and was not entirely opposed to it. However, the only time that full time faculty members supervised field residency students was when they were in a cohort. All flex model students were supervised by contracted, adjunct supervisors. Therefore, it was unlikely that the EPP would get any faculty involvement if it moved to a hybrid model.

To help alleviate questions about the worth of the cohort program, I designed a study that would help the faculty and administration to make an informed decision about the future of the field residency program at SWUSU. The ideal situation would be for the faculty to become more invested in the practice side of pre-service education. The students would feel more supported and the university would build stronger relationships and partnerships with the surrounding districts.

The evolution of my current understanding. My understanding of the cohort versus flex models continued to develop throughout my research. The amount of change that had occurred within the COEHD caused me to change my trajectory more than once. However, my faculty position at SWUSU gave me more direct access to faculty and made it much easier for me to understand the dilemma that existed. The point that became most apparent to me was the need for empirical evidence to shed light on the value of the cohort program. I was surprised by the lack of support for the program by faculty. I didn't realize that so many faculty members felt that the program should be dissolved. All faculty shared the primary goals of producing well

prepared teachers and helping them to get hired. My hope was that that this mixed methods research would provide enough empirical evidence for faculty and administration to make an educated decision about the fate of the program and provide clarity regarding the impact that the cohort program had on those goals.

Problem Statement

Audience: SWUSU's college of education faculty and the EPP

Ideal: Provide best practices in educating pre-service teachers which includes relevant and extensive field work, however the limited resources that are available as the university expands must be taken into consideration when making decisions about how to model the field residency experiences.

Real: There was disagreement about what is best practice as it relates to the field residency experience.

Consequences: The ELP faculty had conflicting views about what was best for the department, at least in part, because of the organizational changes. If, however, evidence was presented that showed definitive advantages for students that had completed the cohort program as compared to the flex program or showed that there is no benefit then, I believed, the ELP faculty would be able to make a united decision. My role was to conduct a nonbiased study which objectively evaluated both quantitative and qualitative data to determine if graduates of the cohort program showed an advantage in certification, acquiring jobs after college and showed higher levels of teacher efficacy as measured by Bandura's (n.d.) Teacher's Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES).

The Solution

Possible solutions. Solution 1. Conduct study with current students

Problem: There was disagreement amongst the faculty about whether the cohort program for EPP field residency students was best practice.

Solution: Expand upon a study that was conducted by Dr. Theresa Dorel which compared the teaching efficacy of currently enrolled pre-service SWUSU students.

Favorable Outcomes: Determine if there is a difference in teaching efficacy between students in the flex program versus those in the cohort program.

Data Collections: Mixed Methods. Current students would complete the Teacher's Sense of Efficacy Scale (quantitative) to determine teaching efficacy and be interviewed (qualitative).

Solution 2. Conduct study with recent certified graduates of SWUSU

Problem: There was disagreement amongst the faculty about whether the cohort program for EPP field residency students was best practice.

Solution: Conduct a study using data obtained from the TEA on the population of recent graduates of SWUSU who graduated from the COEHD since May 2014 and obtained a Texas teaching certificate. Data would also be collected from surveys and interviews of a subgroup of the population.

Favorable Outcomes: The study would determine if there was a difference between graduates of the flex versus cohort program in employment status, time it takes to obtain initial certification, teaching efficacy and feelings of preparedness.

Data Collection: Mixed Methods. Quantitative data would be collected from the TEA which would determine the employment history and status of teachers which graduated from SWUSU. Quantitative data would also be gathered from a subgroup of the population which would take the TSES. Qualitative data would be collected through interviews of the subgroup of the population which took the TSES.

Input from Others. I spoke to the, the Interim Dean of the COEHD, Interim Assistant Dean of the COEHD, the Department Chair of the ELP and a faculty member in an effort to understand differing perspectives on the flex versus cohort field residency programs. I also spoke with classmates to clarify my thoughts on the research.

The interim Assistant Dean, and I had a very productive conversation. Dr. Jones' role as interim Assistant Dean places her in charge of the Educator Preparation Program, which is responsible for managing the field residency experiences, testing and certification. Our discussion helped me to define the stakeholders in the study. In addition to the pre-service teachers, Dr. Jones believes the university faculty, the districts that the university partners with and the campuses where our students are placed are also stakeholders in the study. This discussion led me to believe that I should also include perspectives from prior cooperating teachers, principals and district personnel who deal with placements in the research. In addition, it was suggested that I not only look at employment after graduation, but also certification status upon graduation since this is an issue that our department is currently scrutinizing due to new TEA regulations for accreditation.

Dr. James Hill (pseudonym) is the interim Dean of the COEHD. Dr. Hill's background is in Ed Admin and was, therefore, not as directly involved in the field residency program as the Assistant Dean. He did, however, have interest in the study. He was curious to know if there is a difference in relationship with faculty between the pre-service teachers that go through the flex versus cohort program. He was also interested in critical feedback and wanted to know if one model is better than the other at giving feedback from both the mentor teacher and university supervisors. The last thing that we discussed was students' perspectives on the two different models. He would like to know, from the student's perspective, what the advantages and

disadvantages are of each program. This feedback will be used when I develop the interview questions.

My discussion with the Department Chair, Dr. Denise Vogel (pseudonym), confirmed the Assistant Dean's recommendations on who the stakeholders are in the study. She agreed that the outside stakeholders include principals, mentor teachers and HR personnel. She recommended speaking to the person in charge of placements and the hiring director at the district office to determine if they have differing perspectives. The internal stakeholders that she identified were the students, the dean, assistant dean, department chair and faculty. She also identified the TEA and superintendents as potential stakeholders. This led us into a discussion about the history of the cohort model, aka. The Model for Success Initiative: Ready From Day One. She suggested that I contact the former Department Chair of the College of Education who was very involved in the development of the MSI: Ready from Day One model to gain a historical perspective.

Dr. Vogel, as the department chair and a former supervisor of a cohort group, has dual concerns. Due to her personal experience with a cohort, she was an advocate of maintaining the cohort model and does not want to see it dissolved. However, as the department chair, she has concerns about course scheduling and the competition for resources that are currently plaguing the university. She was very supportive of the research and interested in the outcome.

I also spoke with Dr. Renee Cook and asked about her perception of the two programs that are offered. Dr. Cook was a member of the ELP faculty and had been with the university since 2010. She had been somewhat vocal during faculty meetings about the extra resources that were required by the cohort groups and the fact that the university was currently short on classroom space. I asked Dr. Cook if there was anything that she would like to know about the cohort versus flex programs. She said that she would like to see data that compares the student

experiences in cohort and flex. The original cohort design had student taking courses with their supervisors at the public-school campuses where they were completing observations. This, however, does not happen due to lack of space. In her opinion, there was little difference between the cohort classes and simply taking the two classes from any professor like flex student do. She would also like to see data from interviews conducted with cohort graduated students who are practicing teachers to determine if they feel prepared to teach a grade level that is different than the one that they completed their three semesters of field residency with. Her overall perception was positive. She felt that the cohort is "a good slice of the program because students are being paired with professors or full-time adjuncts which should provide superior supervision from supervisors who are invested in the university."

My classmates that I spoke with were in favor of the second solution since it was more original research. They helped to clarify the methods that I would use and allowed me to talk through the mixed-method approach that I had planned. They also gave me advice about data collection and my timeline.

The Proposed Solution

Informing the solution. The fact that the stakeholders that I discussed the proposed solutions with all discussed the wider vision of stakeholders including districts, campuses and potentially even the TEA and superintendents made it clear that Solution 2 is the preferred solution. Having a clear understanding of the perspectives of all stakeholders will allow the department faculty and administration to make an informed decision about the future of the cohort model.

The final solution. After reflecting upon the conversations that I had with the university stakeholders, the observations that I have made at faculty meetings and the TEA meetings that I

have attended, it is obvious to me that a study focused on outcomes is what is currently needed to determine the fate of the cohort model. The problem: There was disagreement amongst the ELP faculty regarding the benefits and necessity of the cohort model given the additional resources that were required for its operation. Did the cohort model have significant benefits for stakeholders to warrant the extra resources that were required for its operation? The solution: To conduct a study which examined quantitative data to determine certification and employment status of recent graduates as well as the teaching efficacy of recent graduates. In addition, qualitative data was examined to determine the perceived value of the cohort versus flex model from the perspectives of the graduates. A favorable outcome of the study would be to show a significant difference in the data between the cohort and flex models. A not so favorable outcome would be a lack of significance and a need for further research to determine if the cohort model has significant benefit for stakeholders.

Hypothesis. I hypothesized that the cohort students would have higher employment statistics and higher levels of teacher efficacy as measured by Bandura's Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (TSES) and would receive initial certification more quickly than the flex students. This hypothesis was based both on literature and my personal experiences with the two models at SWUSU. The hypothesis was measured using both quantitative and qualitative data that was acquired from the Texas Education Agency (TEA), survey and interviews.

Future research. This study acts as the foundation for future research. There are many factors which are potentially impacted by the field residency model that teachers participated in. One area of interest is teacher attrition which is a well-known problem across the country. A study should be performed to determine if the model of field residency that pre-service teachers participate in effects attrition rates. Another area of interest is student performance. A

longitudinal study should be performed which tracks the success of K-12 students who are taught by teachers which participated in different models of field residency during teacher preparation.

Roles and Personal Histories

My background. I have been employed by SWUSU since 2009 and therefore have a personal stake in the research. I have been an adjunct, a full-time lecturer, and at the time of data collection for this study, was a Lecturer and Field Residency and Clinical Teaching Specialist (FRTS) for the Department of Education and Human Development. I had supervised two cohort groups and started a third group in the fall of 2016. The position of FRTS at SWUSU consisted of a 2/3 split responsibility. I was, as a full-time faculty member, required to teach or supervise two sections of field residency and was released from three sections to perform administrative duties. During the fall 2016 semester, I taught Classroom Management to my cohort group and supervised 12 cohort students and 6 flex students. During the spring 2017 semester, I taught Legal and Ethical Issues in Education to my cohort students and supervised them during field residency 2. I was also responsible for supervising nine of our field residency supervisors and was the point of contact for thirteen of the districts that we partnered with. I worked hard to develop close working relationships with the districts and aimed to develop new programs that would benefit both our students and their campuses. I was successful in maintaining positive working relationships with the COEHD faculty and staff. Since there was limited research on different models of field residency, this study qualified as exploratory and was based on both current literature and my experience. It's important to note that the potential for bias in the qualitative portion of the study was limited since none of the students that I worked with directly at SWUSU were involved in this study.

My field-based mentor. Dr. Jones was my field-based mentor for the fall 2016 internship. Dr. Jones was appointed Interim Assistant Dean of the COEHD in August of 2016. This position did not exist prior to Dr. Jones' appointment. She was appointed by the interim Provost who was replaced by the permanent Provost in August 2016. Dr. Jones was responsible for overseeing the EPP. She worked closely with the four newly hired lecturer/field residency and clinical teaching specialists. Dr. Jones was an associate professor at SWUSU and had been on faculty since 2008.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS

Theories

The current study is grounded in Kolb's Experiential Learning Theory (1984) which is based on the foundational theories of several prominent scholars of the twentieth century including John Dewey (1938), Kurt Lewin, Jean Piaget, Carl Jung and others (Kolb & Kolb, 2005). Experiential Learning Theory is built on six propositions: 1) Learning is best conceived as a process; 2) All learning is relearning; 3) Learning requires the resolution of conflicts between opposing modes of adaptation to the world; 4) Learning is a holistic process of adaptations to the world; 5) Learning results from synergetic transactions between people and the environment; and 6) Learning is the process of creating knowledge (Kolb & Kolb, 2005). He describes a recursive model in which the learner is required to experience, reflect, think and act. Kolb recognizes that learning style plays a huge part in how information is best acquired by individual learners. Kolb and Kolb (2005) describe learning styles as being dynamic in nature and not, in fact, fixed as most researchers portray it as being. In addition, Kolb and Kolb explain the importance of learning space. They state that "[Learning space] include(s) socialization into a wider community of practice that involves membership, identity formation, transitioning from novice to expert through mentorship, and experience in the activities of practice, as well as the reproduction and development of the community of practice itself as newcomers replace old-timers," (2015, p. 200). This idea of socialization and membership is relevant to the current research since it can be assumed that the cohort model will provide stronger feelings of membership to a cohort group than the flex model of field residency.

Relevant Literature

The impact that classroom teachers have on educational outcomes has been widely accepted, therefore, improving pre-service teacher education has been at the forefront of education reform agendas since the 1980s. One area of focus has been the divide between theory and practice. Researchers agree that field-residency experiences are an integral part of bridging that gap. Darling-Hammond (2006) researched seven long-standing and high performing teacher education programs and identified three critical components of highly successful programs. She highlights the importance of field-based experiences by stating that, "the most powerful programs require students to spend extensive time in the field throughout the entire program, examining and applying the concepts and strategies they are simultaneously learning about in their courses alongside teachers who can show them how to teach in ways that are responsive to learners," (2006, p. 307). Ball and Forzani (2009) take the discussion a step further by suggesting that the field-based experience should be the core of a pre-service teacher's education due to the unique demands of professional classroom teachers. However, some researchers also show concern over pre-service teachers' abilities to bridge the theory to practice gap alone. Santagata, Zannoni & Stigler state that, "because innovative practices are often described in teacher education courses in abstract terms – without linking them to concrete images of practices – preservice teachers may misinterpret what they observe during field experiences," (2007, p. 124).

The ultimate goal of any teacher preparation program is to produce fully prepared teachers with high levels of self-efficacy. This has been linked to a variety of positive classroom outcomes. The ability to understand how theory impacts practice is just one component of the process. Brown, Lee and Collins (2014) found, through a mixed-methods approach, that

perceived preparedness and feelings of self-efficacy rose considerably upon completion of the student teaching experience. Al-Bataineh (2009) studied cooperative teachers' perceptions of their pre-service teachers' (mentees') preparedness. He too found that, overall, the cooperative teachers had a positive perception. A study by Brannon and Fiene (2013) supports the earlier mentioned idea that having structure in the field residency experience is beneficial. They compared reflections of two groups of field residency pre-service teachers (one structured and one not) and found that the level of perceived preparedness was considerably higher in the structured group. This suggests that the quality of the field residency experience has an impact on outcomes.

There is a multitude of research regarding the necessity of field residency practicum during teacher preparation. Ball and Forzani (2009) emphasize the importance of practice focused curriculum. They encourage teacher preparation programs to enact practice as the core structure for professional preparation. One study by Henry, Purtell, Bastien, Fortner, Thompson, Campbell and Patterson (2014) looked at different portals into the field of education and found that the most effective teachers were trained through Teach for America (TFA). Interestingly, TFA has the highest degree of practical experience as compared to academic classroom time which suggests that the authentic, practical approach to teacher training is most effective. Hodson, Smith and Brown (2011) remind us however, that theory must not be forgotten. They warn against the sole focus of practice while recognizing the need for theory to be somewhat malleable stating that "the practices that theory serves are in a state of constant evolution. Theory itself must adjust to new circumstances," (2011, p. 181). A study performed by Allen and Wright (2014) highlights the importance of preservice teacher practicums as being the primary opportunity for student teachers to link theory and practice. In this study, researchers

examined perceptions and experiences of student teachers during practicum and its role in integrating theory and practice. They found that preservice teachers prefer a balanced approach between theory and practice, but that there is a need for clarification of stakeholders' roles and responsibilities with regards to the practicum experience. The importance of collaboration between university personnel and partner schools is noted. Forzani shares this view regarding a need for clarification and defined roles and states that, "some more permanent infrastructure for teaching and learning core practice-based methods will need to be built, and the common view that teaching cannot be specified or taught repudiated," (2014, p. 366).

Very few studies, however, have focused on the impact that university supervisors have on the field residency experience. A study performed in Finland by Turunen and Tuovila (2011) sought to bring clarity to the role of the university supervisor. Their description of field experience as "situated learning possibilities" highlights the opportunities for bridging the gap between theoretical classroom knowledge and authentic experiences (2011, p. 116). They go on to describe the university supervisor as the scaffold for such experiences. They found that a collegial approach to supervising rendered positive experiences and the importance of discussion and reflection to be imperative. Zeichner (2010) describes what he calls a "hybrid approach" to teacher preparation where the university faculty, supervisor, teacher mentor and other local experts work together to prepare preservice teachers. He ascertains that the interplay of these various sources expands learning potential and creates a new synergy. Hollins identifies the need for continuity among teacher educator partners and states that, "An important aspect of continuity is the consistency with which faculty represent the organizing ideas for teaching and model in their own teaching the practices and habits of mind candidates are expected to learn," (2011, p. 405). These studies support my hypothesis that students who went through the cohort

model will have better employment statistics, get certified more quickly and show higher teacher efficacy. Despite the recognized need for consistent, reliable, and cooperative supervision, there is a lack of studies which describe how to go about implementing such a practice and the impact that such a model would have. The most significant research and practice studies were reviewed and are listed in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1

Most Significant Research and Practice

Reference	**Significance**
Al-Bataineh, A. (2009). An examination of pre-service teacher preparedness: A cooperating teacher perspective. *The International Journal of Learning, 16*(5), 231-249.	The author studied asked cooperating teachers to complete a Likert scale survey on their perceived preparedness of their student teacher. He made comparisons based on subject matter, age, years of experience and age.
Allen, J. M. & Wright, S. E. (2014). Integrating theory and practice in the pre-service teacher education practicum. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 20*(2), 136-151.	The authors of the study examined the pre-service teachers' perceptions of their own development during student teaching. They found there to be a significantly detrimental impact an apparent lack of clarity around stakeholders' roles and responsibilities.
Antonek, J. L., Matthews, C. E. & Levin, B. B. (2005). A theme-based, cohort approach to professional development schools: An analysis of the benefits and shortcomings for teacher education faculty. *Teacher Education, 32*(1), 131-150.	The authors of this study conclude that theme-based cohorts are effective in preparing pre-service teachers as well as aiding university faculty's research.
Asplin, K. N. & Marks, M. J. (2013). Increasing the influence of university supervisors during student teaching. *The Professional Educator, 37*(1), 1-11.	The authors of this study review the effects of taking a class with the university supervisor prior to student teaching.
Ball, D. L. & Forzani, F. M. (2009). The work of teaching and the challenge for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 60*(5), 497-511.	The authors argue for making practice the basis of all teacher preparation programs and to focus on tasks and activities of teaching rather than beliefs and knowledge.
Bartolome, S. J. (2017). Comparing field-teaching experiences: A longitudinal examination of preservice and first-year teacher perspectives. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 65*(3), 264-286.	This longitudinal study provides a comparative analysis over time of preservice and first year teachers' evolving perspectives about field work activities embedded in their teacher preparation programs.
Brannon, D. & Feine, J. (2013). The effect structured participation experiences have on pre-service teachers' preparedness to teach reading. *Education, 134*(2), 185-194.	The authors examine the effects of structured participation experiences (SPE) during practicum and how they affect preparedness.
Brown, A. L., Lee, J. & Collins, D. (2015). Does student teaching matter? Investigating pre-service teachers' sense of efficacy and preparedness. *Teaching Education, 26*(1), 77-93.	The authors found that pre-service teachers' efficacy increased after student teaching particularly when they had opportunities for hands-on teaching, observe experienced teachers and a positive relationship with their cooperating teacher.

Table 2.1 *Most Significant Research and Practice, Continued*

Reference	**Significance**
Chung, M. K., Davidson, B. S. & Yeh, H. T. (2011). Obstacles pre-service teachers encountered after classroom observations on the write-up of reflections in a digital portfolio. *Focus on Colleges Universities, & Schools, 6*(1), 1-7.	The authors study digital portfolios and how university supervisors can help to improve students' reflective writing in a digital teaching portfolio.
Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). Constructing 21st century teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 57*(3), 300-314.	The author argues for three "critical" components for a strong teacher education program: (1) coherence and integration in coursework and clinical work; (2) extensive and intense supervision during clinical work; and (3) close proactive relationship with diverse schools, which model good teaching.
Darling-Hammond, L. & Youngs, P. (2002). Defining "highly qualified teachers": What does "scientifically-based research" actually tell us? *Educational Researcher, 31*(9), 13-25.	In this article, the authors challenge the outcomes of the 2002 U.S. Secretary of Education's Annual Report on Teacher Quality which calls to essentially dismantle teacher education systems.
Dorel, T. G., Kearney, W. S. & Garza, E. (2016). Ready from day one? The relationship between length of pre-service teacher field residency and teacher efficacy. *Critical Questions in Education, 7*(1), 38-52.	The authors in this study found that there is a significant correlation between the length of time spent in field residency and pre-service teachers' sense of teaching efficacy.
Graber, K. C. (1996). Influencing student beliefs: The design of a "high impact" teacher education program. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 12*(5), 451-466.	The author studied a pre-service teacher program with strong influence on teacher beliefs and found nine program features of importance which include cohort groups and progressive and compatible internships.
Graham, P. (1997). Tensions in the mentor teacher-student teacher relationship: Creating productive sites for learning within a high school English teacher education program. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 13*(5), 513-527.	The author found that there are two highly decisive patterns for uncertainty between student teachers and mentor teachers. They are philosophical differences and tolerance for uncertainty. She found five ways to relieve tensions which includes mentor teacher ownership and consistent university teacher educators.
Gürsoy, E., Kesner, J. E. & Salihoglu, U. M. (2016). Clinical supervision model in teaching practice: Does it make a difference in supervisors' performance? *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 41*(11), 61-76.	The authors utilize as mixed-methods approach to study the implementation of a specialized Clinical Supervision Model and the effects it had on the teacher trainees and cooperating teachers.
Henry, G. T., Purtell, K. M., Bastian, K. C., Fortner, C. K., Thompson, C. L., Campbell, S. L, & Patterson, K. M. (2014). The effects of teacher entry portals on student achievement. *Journal of Teacher Education, 65*(1).	The authors of this study examined teachers' effectiveness based on their formal preparation and qualifications when first entering the profession.
Hodson, E., Smith, K. & Brown, T. (2015). Reasserting theory in professionally based initial teacher education. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 18*(2), 181-195.	This study is based in England. The authors studied how well pre-service teachers understood theory and focused on the mentors' conceptions of theory.
Hoffman, J. V., Wetzel, M. M. & DeJulio, S. (2018). Multiple literacy tutoring experiences across a teacher preparation program: How can practice in hybrid spaces challenge the "practice makes practice" dilemma? *Action in Teacher Education, 40*(1), 58-76.	This qualitative study examines quality versus quantity in preservice teacher field experiences. It examines the use of literacy tutorials as hybrid spaces for the purpose of giving preservice teachers opportunities to that are not highly present in elementary classrooms.

Table 2.1 *Most Significant Research and Practice, Continued*

Reference	**Significance**
Hokka, P. & Eteapelto, A. (2014). Seeking new perspectives on the development of teacher education: A study of the Finnish context. *Journal of Teacher Education, 65*(1), 39-52.	The authors of this article focus on the changing structures of teacher education programs and teacher educators' professional learning and the perceived obstacles that exist within the organizational development.
Hollins, E. R. (2011). Teacher preparation for quality teaching, *Journal of Teacher Education, 62*(4), 395-407.	The author of this study encourages a practice-based approach to teacher preparation and one that mirrors the practices for quality teaching in PK-12 schools.
Ivankova, N. V., Creswell, J. W. & Stick, S. L. (2006). Using mixed-methods sequential explanatory design: From theory to practice. *Field Methods, 18*(1), 3-20.	The authors look at potential issues with mixed-methods sequential explanatory design. The authors suggest ways to conduct the study to avoid potential pitfalls.
James, R., Hall, B. & Fraiha, A. (2015). Towards improving the informal feedback loop: Cooperating teacher, pre-service teacher structured discussions. *International Journal of Pedagogy & Curriculum, 21*(3/4), 1-12.	The authors study the perceived communication challenges between pre-service teachers and cooperating teachers and find that consistent, structured time is extremely important.
Kolb, A. Y. & Kolb, D. A. (2005). Learning styles and learning spaces: Enhancing experiential learning in higher education. *Academy of Management Learning and Education, 4*(2), 193-212.	The authors explore theory and research on experiential learning to enhance experiential learning in higher education.
Lafferty, K. E. (2018). The difference explicit Preparation makes in cooperating teacher practice. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 45*(3), 73-95.	This study examined 10 university-based credentialing programs to determine how preparation of cooperating teachers affected preservice teachers' perceptions and rating of their field experience.
Long, J. J., van Es, E. A. & Black, R. W. (2013). Supervisor-student teacher interactions: The role of conversational frames in developing a vision of ambitious teaching. *Linguistics and Education, 24* (2), 179-196.	The authors in this article explored conversational frames that took place between supervisors and their student teachers. They found that frame type has an influence on student outcome and the likelihood that the student will act on the supervisor's suggestions.
Menon, D. & Sadler, T. D. (2018). Sources of science Teaching self-efficacy for preservice elementary Teachers in science content courses. *International Journal of Science and Math Education, 1*(16), 835-855.	This qualitative study investigates factors that affect elementary preservice teachers' self-efficacy of teaching science. The study utilized the Science Teaching Efficacy Belief Instrument.
Santagata, R., Zannoni, C. & Stigler, J. W. (2007). The Role of lesson analysis in pre-service teacher Education: an empirical investigation of teacher Learning from a virtual video-based field experience. *Journal of Math Teacher Education, 10*(2), 123-140.	The authors of this study examined the use of video analysis of pre-service teachers' instruction. They found that with proper supervision, the ability to analyze a lesson improved significantly.
Sciuchetti, M. B. (2019). The development of preservice Teachers' self-efficacy for classroom and behavior Management across multiple field experiences. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 44*(6), 19 34.	The author examined preservice teachers' self-efficacy for classroom and behavior management as they progressed through their teacher preparation using an exploratory methodology.
Slade, M. L., Burnham, T. J., Catalana, S. M. & Waters, T. (2019). The impact of reflective practice on teacher candidates' learning. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning, 13*(2), 1-8.	This study highlights how critical reflection and implementing reflective practice during educator preparation have significant influence on preservice teachers

Table 2.1 *Most Significant Research and Practice, Continued*

Reference	Significance
Steele, A. R. (2017). An alternative collaborative supervision practice between university-based teachers and school-based teachers. *Issues in Educational Research, 27*(3), 582-599.	The author performed action research to study a joint supervision model between school-based and university-based teachers for the purpose of developing partnerships and mutual understanding to best serve student teachers' professional development.
Tschannen-Moran, M. & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*(7), 783-805.	This study is written by the authors of the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale and explains their rationale behind creating the scale as well as addresses issues of validity and reliability.
Turnen, T. A. & Tuovila, S. (2015). Mind the gap. Combining theory and practice in a field experience. *Teaching Education, 23*(2), 115-130.	The authors describe a study conducted in a Finnish university which seeks to clarify the role of the university supervisor and use a collegial supervision approach to combine theory and practice in experiential learning.
Valencia, S. W., Martin, S. D., Place, N. A. & Grossman, P. (2009). Complex interactions in student teaching: Lost opportunities for learning. *Journal of Teacher Education, 60*(3), 304-322.	The authors use an ecological approach in this study and examine the interactions between the three primary stakeholders (student, supervisor and mentor). They found numerous lost opportunities for learning due to problems with communication.
Wetzel, M. M., Taylor, L. A. & Vlach, S. K. (2017). dialogue in the support of learning to teach: A case study of a mentor/mentee pair in a teacher education program. *Teaching Education, 28*(4), 406-420.	The authors of this study conduct a case analysis of a mentoring relationship between a cooperating teacher and preservice teacher which consists of problem-posing dialogue within pre- and post- conferences.
Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college-and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(1-2), 89-99.	The author examines studies that examine more closely connecting campus courses and field experience. He argues that this new "hybrid" space will link practitioner and academic knowledge if partnerships are strong.

Significance of the Literature Review

The literature affirmed my understanding of the importance of the field residency experience in pre-service teacher preparation. However, I was surprised by the lack of research regarding best practices in field residency. I found very little research on supervisor and/or cooperative teaching training, timeframes in practice, or different models of field experience. The literature did, however, give me insight into what appear to be the major issues with supervision of pre-service teachers. It appears that the communication between the three primary stakeholders (student, supervisor and cooperating teacher) is of great concern as well as the delivery of feedback. I decided to include questions about communication, feedback, and

reflective practices during the interviews to determine if there was a difference in perceptions of communication between cohort and flex students.

I used a mixed methods sequential explanatory design, and therefore the article by Ivankova, Creswell, and Stick (2006) was extremely helpful as it also used the same type of mixed methods design. Several of the articles that have been reviewed use surveys and interview subjects. Most of these articles thoroughly described the methods that they used including how the interviews were coded which was also helpful to me.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Statement Regarding Human Subjects and the IRB

A review of the methods for collecting information from human subjects was completed by the Texas A&M University Institutional Review Board as well as the Southwestern United States University Review Board. Both institutions found the proposed research to be compliant with federal guidelines. The IRB approvals are attached as Appendix I and II to this proposal. In addition, site authorization approval was obtained from Southwestern United States University and is attached as Appendix III.

Goals, Objectives and Activities

The goals, objectives and activities are outlined in Table 3.1 below.

Table 3.1

Goals, Objectives, and Activities Associated with the Problem Solution

Goal	Objective	Activity
I. Determine if there is a difference in initial certification and initial employment between graduates of the cohort model versus the flex model.	A. Review TEA documents to determine the employment status of teachers who graduated from SWUSU.	1. Contact TEA and request a spreadsheet with employment data by TEA number. Retrieve TEA numbers from SWUSU's certification officer to cross compare with the TEA list.
	B. Place teachers in one of two groups based on whether they completed field residency in the flex or cohort model.	1. Review TEA numbers obtained from SWUSU certification officer and determine if they belong to prior students of the flex or cohort program.

Table 3.1 *Goals, Objectives, and Activities Associated with the Problem Solution, Continued*

Goal	Objective	Activity
II. Determine if there is a difference between teaching efficacy of students who went through the cohort model compared to those who went through the flex model.	A. All certified education graduates of SWUSU will be emailed and asked to complete the TSES.	1. Get the list of graduates from the COEHD who were certified since May 2014 from the certification officer. Contact the Alumni Affairs off to get their current email addresses. 2. Send an email which includes a link to the TSES survey which will be housed in the Survey Monkey website.
	B. Determine if there is a difference in efficacy between graduates of the cohort program and the flex program.	1. Review the data from the surveys to determine if there is a significant difference between students that were in the cohort program versus the flex program.
III Determine, through interview, what factors from their field residency experiences the recent graduates perceive to be most important to their preparedness and current career in education.	A. Contact a random sample of graduates who completed the surveys and invite them to meet for an hour-long interview.	1. Contact, via email or phone, individuals that had completed the survey and ask them to take part in an interview. Ideally, there will be 10-12 graduates from the cohort model and 10-12 from the flex model. Schedule interviews and prepare interview questions. 2. Interview subjects, take notes, code notes and review the data for significant differences between graduates of the cohort group versus the flex group.

Guiding Questions, Information Collection Methods and Rationale for Methods

Guiding questions. There were originally five guiding questions about the problem solution that guided my study. Do graduates of the EPP cohort model become certified more quickly than graduates of the flex program? Are graduates of the EPP cohort model employed more quickly than graduates of the flex program? Do graduates of the EPP cohort model remain in their positions longer than graduates of the flex program? Do graduates of SWUSU's EPP cohort model have higher teacher efficacy, as measured by the Teacher's Sense of Efficacy Scale, during the first few years of teaching than graduates of the flex program? What are the

perceived benefits and disadvantages of being part of the cohort model as compared to the flex model? Unfortunately, I was unable to address the question, "Do graduates of the EPP cohort model remain in their positions longer than graduates of the flex program?" This was due to the expense associated with obtaining the necessary data from TEA to address the question properly. It, therefore, was not included in the study.

Collecting Data. This is a mixed methods study. Quantitative data was collected from TEA documents which allowed me to compare the number of graduates of SWUSU that were certified and employed by a Texas public school. I used a t-test to determine if there was a significant difference in certification and employment status between the two groups. Quantitative data was also collected from the results of the TSES that graduates were asked to complete. I used t-tests to determine if there was a significant difference between the two groups on each of the questions. Qualitative data was collected through interviews of a random sample of graduates who completed the survey. The notes from the interview were coded and reviewed to identify trends in the responses.

Summary. Table 3.2 provides a summarization of the guiding questions, the data collection methods as well as a rationale for the chosen methods.

Table 3.2

Guiding Questions, Data Collection Methods and Rationale for Methods

Guiding Questions	Data Collection Methods	Rationale for Methods
1. Do graduates of the EPP cohort model become certified more quickly than graduates of the flex program?	Collect the TEA numbers of all graduates of the EPP at SWUSU since May 2014. Contact the Texas Education Agency (TEA) and request certification information based on those TEA numbers. Determine the certification date and how it compares to the graduation date.	The information collected from TEA will be more accurate and quicker to obtain than asking the individuals for the information.

Table 3.2 *Guiding Questions, Data Collection Methods and Rationale for Methods, Continued*

Guiding Questions	Data Collection Methods	Rationale for Methods
2. Are graduates of the EPP cohort program employed more quickly than graduates of the flex program?	Collect the TEA numbers of all graduates of the EPP at SWUSU since May 2014. Contact the Texas Education Agency (TEA) and request employment information based on those TEA numbers. Determine the hire date and how it compares to the graduation date.	The information collected from TEA will be more accurate and quicker to obtain than asking the individuals for the information.
3. Do graduates of SWUSU's EPP cohort program have higher teacher efficacy, as measured by the TSES, during the first few years of teaching than graduates of the flex program?	Obtain current email address of all certified EPP graduates from SWUSU since May 2014 from the Alumni Association. Email all graduates asking them to complete an online survey regarding teacher efficacy. The survey being used is Bandura's Teacher's Sense of Efficacy Scale.	Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) have studied the validity and reliability of the TSES with acceptable results. The TSES is widely accepted as an instrument to measure teacher efficacy. The reliabilities are included in Appendix IV.
4. What are the perceived benefits and disadvantages of being part of the cohort program as compared to the flex program?	Contact a random sample of graduates who completed the TSES and ask if they would be willing to meet for an interview. Interview questions will be based on the feedback that was received from stakeholders as well as the results of the TSES. The interview notes will be coded and reviewed.	Interview notes can be combined with quantitative data to write narratives about the graduates' experiences while in school and how they have affected their career as an educator. This will provide a more complete picture of the perceived benefits/disadvantages of one program over the other.

Instruments and Analysis

Protocols and instruments. A request was sent to the Texas Education Agency (TEA) to acquire employment information by TEA number. The certification officer at SWUSU provided the TEA numbers for all graduates. The SWUSU list was divided into two groups: graduates of

the cohort model and graduates of the flex model. A t-test was performed to determine if there was a difference in employment start dates between the two groups.

Email addresses and phone numbers of graduates of the College of Education and Human Development teacher certification program since May 2014 were obtained from the registrar's office at SWUSU. All graduates were emailed or called using the recruitment email or recruitment phone call script (Appendix V) and asked to complete Bandura's Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale. The participants were asked to include either their TEA number or their K number from SWUSU on the survey. These numbers were used to determine whether the participant completed the cohort model or flex model during field residency. The results of the TSES were analyzed using a t-test to determine if there is a significant difference between the two groups on teacher self-efficacy.

A random sample of participants were chosen and contacted for an interview. The recruitment email and script for the interview is included in Appendix V. The interview questions were developed based on the results of the TSES and the discussion with faculty. The interview responses were coded and analyzed for trends within and between the two groups. The timeline for completing all work for this record of study is included in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3 *Timeline for Completing ROS*

Mo	**Wk**	**Contact/Activity**	**Collect**	**Analyze/Action**	**Product/Audience**
Pre-Intervention Activities Before Study Begins					
Aug 2016	1	SWUSU Department of Education and Human Development EPP – Request permission – Present Overview	Information sheets of study	Complete the sheets	Proposal to Dean of College and Assistant Dean in charge of the Educator Preparation Program

Table 3.3 *Timeline for Completing ROS, Continued*

Mo	**Wk**	**Contact/Activity**	**Collect**	**Analyze/Action**	**Product/Audience**
Aug 2016	2	Return formal request to School Research Review Board			
	3	Wait to hear back from School Research Review Board			
	4	Receive request for edits to IRB		Make Edits to IRB write emails and scripts and resubmit	
Sept 2016	1-3	Wait to hear back from IRB			
	4	Receive request for edits to IRB		Make Edits to IRB and resubmit	
Oct 2016	1	Receive approval of IRB with provisions. SWUSU IRB approval and site authorization must be obtained			IRB approval from TAMU
	2	Complete formal request to SWUSU School Review Board			
	3	Wait to hear back from SWUSU IRB. Investigate site authorization process.		Email Holly Verhasselt for Site Authorization	

Table 3.3 *Timeline for Completing ROS, Continued*

Mo	Wk	Contact/Activity	Collect	Analyze/Action	Product/Audience
	4	Receive IRB approval from SWUSU. Submit Site Authorization request.			IRB approval from SWUSU
Nov 2016	1-4	Wait to hear back from Holly Verhasselt regarding site authorization			
Dec 2016	2	Receive site authorization approval from Holly Verhasselt		Work on ROS proposal.	Site authorization approval from SWUSU
Jan 2017	1-4	Continue writing ROS proposal. Meet with stakeholders.	Dr. James Hill notes Dr. Jones notes	Work on ROS proposal.	
Feb 2017	1	Continue writing ROS proposal. Meet with stakeholders	Dr. Vogel notes Dr. Cook notes	Work on ROS proposal	
	2	Complete ROS proposal. Email proposal to Dr. Slattery and request date for ROS proposal defense.			Completed ROS proposal
	4	Defend ROS proposal			

Table 3.3 *Timeline for Completing ROS, Continued*

Mo	Wk	Contact/Activity	Collect	Analyze/Action	Product/Audience
Intervention Activities					
March 2017	1a	Email Laurie Ayers at TEA to request employment data by TEA number	TEA Employment data		
	1b	Request list of TEA numbers of graduates since May 2014 from Rebecca Longoria at SWUSU	TEA numbers of SWUSU graduates		
April 2017	2-4	Work on revisions to proposal			
June 2017	1-4	Determine who to contact at TEA to receive requested information			
July 2017	1-4	Request list of certification seeking SWUSU graduates since May 2014 from registrar			
August 2017	1	Submit revised proposal			Revised proposal accepted
	2-4	Sort spreadsheet of graduate list obtained from registrar			
Oct 2017	1-3	Submit renewal of IRB to both TAMU and SWUSU			IRB approval from SWUSU

Table 3.3 *Timeline for Completing ROS, Continued*

Mo	Wk	Contact/Activity	Collect	Analyze/Action	Product/Audience
Nov 2017	1-4	Make revisions to TAMU IRB renewal			IRB approval from TAMU
Dec 2017	1-4	Create spreadsheets to submit a PIR to TEA			
Jan 2018	1-2	Set up Survey Monkey TSES to email to graduates			
	3-4	Correspond with Dana Colbert at TEA regarding PIR request			
Feb 2018	1-4	Continue to work with Dana Colbert at TEA to obtain requested data			
May 2018	1	Receive partial release of PIR data from TEA		Continue to work with Dana Colbert at TEA	
June 2018	1-4	Review TSES survey responses			
Sept 2018	2	Submit renewal of IRB to both TAMU and SWUSU			
	3	Receive PIR documents from TEA		Begin reviewing spreadsheets	
Oct 2018	1	IRB renewals approved			IRB approval

Table 3.3 *Timeline for Completing ROS, Continued*

Mo	Wk	Contact/Activity	Collect	Analyze/Action	Product/Audience
	1-4	Review and organize data from TEA			
Nov 2018	1-4	Sort data from TEA and TSES			
Feb 2019	1-4	Work with certification officer at SWUSU to fill gaps in data			
March 2019	1-4	Work with ITS at SWUSU to pull graduate data from Banner			
May 2019	1-4	Work with certification officer to fill gaps from new data pulled from Banner			
June 2019	1-4	Sort and categorize completed data lists			Completed TEA data merged with SWUSU data
Aug 2019	1-2	Run statistics on all data sets Analyze survey data			Statistical analysis for TEA data and TSES data for questions 1 and 2
	3	Write interview questions based on information from TSES and TEA data	Interview questions		
	4	Email request for interviews to all TSES participants			

Table 3.3 *Timeline for Completing ROS, Continued*

Mo	**Wk**	**Contact/Activity**	**Collect**	**Analyze/Action**	**Product/Audience**
Sept 2019	1-3	Conduct phone interviews with 7 graduates	Interview notes		Interview notes
	2	Submit renewal of IRB to both TAMU and SWUSU			
	4	IRB renewals approved			IRB approval
Oct 2019	1-2	Code interview notes and analyze		Code interview notes, identify relevant quotes	Gather data for question 4.
Nov 2019	1-2	Review of current literature on models of field residency		Conduct lit review	
ROS Preparation					
Nov 2019	3-4	Work on draft of ROS chapters	Complete all analysis; synthesize information		
Dec 2019	1-3	Complete ROS draft, share with chairs			Draft copies and eventual Final Draft/share with Thematic Chair
Jan 2020	3	Share ROS with Committee			Final Draft
Feb 2020	1-4	Defend ROS			

Table 3.3 *Timeline for Completing ROS, Continued*

Mo	Wk	Contact/Activity	Collect	Analyze/Action	Product/Audience
March 2020	1-4	Receive Thesis clerk approval			
May 2020		Graduate			
		Share final copy with stakeholders through presentation during a faculty meeting and distribute a written copy.			Summary of Findings; Copy of Completed Study

Issues of Reliability, Validity, Confidentiality, and Other Ethical Concerns

Participants were only identified through their Texas Education Agency number or Southwestern United States University number. There were no other identifying information attached to the research. There was an information sheet and an Informed Consent Document that all participants were required to complete (Appendices VI and VII). The data from the study was stored in a locked office in the Main Building, room 100, on the SWUSU campus. Any digital data was encrypted, and password protected. The data was stored for the duration of the study and will be stored for three years after the study commences. The TSES is included in Appendix IV and has been widely accepted as a valid and reliable survey (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). In addition, graduates who had been supervised and/or taught by me during their time at SWUSU were excluded from the study.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this mixed-methods exploratory record of study was to determine if there was empirical differences between the two models of field residency, cohort and flex, offered by the Educator Preparation Program at SWUSU. The study compared the rate at which graduates from the two different models of field residency, cohort and flex, are TEA certified after graduation and then hired as a classroom teacher. The teacher-efficacy of a subgroup of graduates was measured by Bandura's Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale. In addition, a small group of graduates were interviewed to gain insight into the graduates' perceptions of preparedness and value of the model of field residency that they participated in while at SWUSU. The following questions were addressed:

1. Do graduates of the EPP cohort model become certified more quickly than graduates of the flex program?
2. Are graduates of the EPP cohort model employed more quickly than graduates of the flex program?
3. Do graduates of SWUSU's EPP cohort model have higher teacher efficacy, as measured by the Teacher's Sense of Efficacy Scale, during the first few years of teaching than graduates of the flex program?
4. What are the perceived benefits and disadvantages of being part of the cohort model as compared to the flex model?

Sample

Records from a total of 558 Southwestern United States University EPP graduates were received from the Texas Education Agency. The records were sorted into groups based on the model of field residency that the graduate participated in during field residency, the data is reported in Table 4.1. There were 194 graduates who were identified as participating in the cohort model and 364 graduates who were identified as participating in the flex model. All graduates were identified as having graduated from the EPP at SWUSU between May 2014 and December 2016.

Table 4.1

TEA Data Sample

Month/Year Graduated	Cohort Students Graduated	Flex Students Graduated	Total Graduated
May 2014	34	55	89
August 2014	1	6	7
December 2014	52	52	104
May 2015	22	52	74
August 2015	0	1	1
December 2015	40	62	102
May 2016	12	57	69
August 2016	0	2	2
December 2016	33	77	110
Totals	*194*	*364*	*558*

This study focused on the number of days between graduation and certification and between graduation and getting employed by a Texas public school. However, it is interesting to note that, at the time of this study: 166 of the 194 (86.08%) cohort graduates were recorded as being certified and 325 of the 364 (89.29%) flex graduates were recorded as being certified. In

addition, 93 of the 194 (47.94%) cohort graduates were recorded as having a been hired by a Texas public school district and 238 of the 364 (65.38%) flex graduates were recorded as having been hired.

Inferential Statistics Tests

In this section, results of statistical analyses used to address three of the five research questions will be presented. The differences between graduates of the cohort model and flex model in certification and employment, as reported by the TEA, were analyzed using an unpaired, two-tailed t-test. Descriptive statistics for the number of days between graduation and becoming certified, as well as for the number of days between graduation and becoming employed for each of the groups are provided in Table 4.2. Outliers were calculated and statistics were calculated on the data set with the outliers removed. Outliers are defined as numbers that are more than 1.5 times the length of the box away from either the lower or upper quartiles. Table 4.2 also shows descriptive statistics for the data for all graduates and with outliers removed.

Table 4.2

Descriptive Statistics from TEA Data

Groups	Cohort						Flex					
	N	*M*	*SD*	*SEM*	Mdn	range	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*SEM*	Mdn	range
All Graduates												
Graduated v. Certified	166	110.12	182.6	14.17	32	1110	325	81.56	141.06	7.82	28	1031
Graduated v. Employed	93	218.43	183.78	19.06	107	825	238	194.19	184.48	11.96	107	829
With Outliers Removed												
Graduated v. Certified	148	56.85	66	5.43	24	249	282	36.94	34.62	2.06	24	158
Graduated v. Employed	86	181.26	131.15	14.14	107	467	220	153.88	119.4	8.05	105.5	469

The differences between the means of the cohort model and flex model responses on each of the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale questions were analyzed using an unpaired, two-tailed t-test. Descriptive statistics for each of the questions on the TSES are provided in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3

Descriptive Statistics from TSES Questions

Groups	Cohort				Flex			
	N	*M*	*SD*	*SEM*	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*SEM*
How much can you influence the decisions that are made in the school?	17	4.65	2.06	0.5	27	5	2.18	0.42
How much can you express your views freely on important school matters?	17	5.29	2.05	0.5	27	5.56	2.19	0.42
How much can you do to get the instructional materials and equipment you need?	17	5.53	2.45	0.59	27	5.07	2.20	0.42
How much can you do to influence the class sizes in your school?	17	2.47	1.97	0.48	27	2.52	2.12	0.41
How much can you do to get through to the most difficult students?	17	6.41	2.32	0.56	27	6.89	1.76	0.34
How much can you do to promote learning when there is a lack of support from home?	17	6.12	2.09	0.51	27	6.37	1.76	0.34
How much can you do to increase students' memory of what they have been taught in previous lessons?	17	7.18	1.7	0.41	27	7.19	1.42	0.27
How much can you do to motivate students Who show low interest in schoolwork?	17	7.06	1.98	0.48	27	6.67	1.57	0.30
How much can you do to get students to work together?	17	7.41	1.62	0.39	27	7.22	1.25	0.24
How much can you do to overcome the influence of adverse community conditions on students' learning?	17	6.35	1.73	0.42	27	5.70	1.66	0.32
How much can you do to get children to do their homework?	17	4.88	1.93	0.47	27	5.52	1.63	0.31
How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?	17	7.47	1.46	0.35	27	7.37	1.28	0.25

Table 4.3 *Descriptive Statistics from TSES Questions, Continued*

Groups	Cohort				Flex			
	N	*M*	*SD*	*SEM*	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*SEM*
How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?	17	7.12	1.62	0.39	27	7.37	1.31	0.25
How much can you do to prevent problem behavior on the school grounds?	17	6.00	2.09	0.51	27	6.19	1.82	0.35
How much can you do to get parents to become Involved in school activities?	17	5.24	1.64	0.40	27	5.30	1.66	0.32
How much can you assist parents in helping their children do well in school?	17	6.35	1.84	0.45	27	6.22	1.60	0.31
How much can you do to make parents feel comfortable coming to school?	17	6.76	2.11	0.51	27	7.07	1.49	0.29
How much can you do to get community groups involved in working with the school?	17	4.88	2.20	0.53	27	5.52	1.83	0.35
How much can you do to get churches involved in working with the schools?	17	4.24	2.88	0.70	27	4.26	1.99	0.38
How much can you do to get businesses involved in working with the school?	17	4.35	2.45	0.59	27	5.33	1.73	0.33
How much can you do to get local colleges and universities involved in working with the school?	17	5.18	2.48	0.60	27	5.59	1.80	0.35
How much can you do to make the school a safe place?	17	7.00	2.12	0.51	27	7.56	1.50	0.29
How much can you do to make students enjoy coming to school?	17	7.94	1.75	0.42	27	7.59	1.58	0.30
How much can you do to get students to trust teachers?	17	7.88	1.32	0.32	27	7.70	1.14	0.22
How much can you help other teachers with their teaching skills?	17	5.53	2.00	0.49	27	6.44	1.76	0.34
How much can you do to enhance collaboration between teachers and the administration to make the school run effectively?	17	4.65	2.50	0.61	27	5.96	2.34	0.45
How much can you do to reduce school dropout?	17	5.47	2.55	0.62	27	5.93	1.71	0.33

Table 4.3 *Descriptive Statistics from TSES Questions, Continued*

Groups	Cohort				Flex			
	N	*M*	*SD*	*SEM*	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*SEM*
How much can you do to reduce school absenteeism?	17	5.18	1.98	0.48	27	5.59	2.08	0.40
How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in schoolwork?	17	7.47	1.62	0.39	27	7.52	1.34	0.26

Note. Questions reprinted from Bandura, A. (n.d.) Teacher Self Efficacy Scale. Unpublished manuscript.

Research question 1. Research question 1 addressed comparing the means for the graduates of the cohort and flex models regarding the number of days between graduation from SWUSU and TEA certification. An unpaired, two-tailed t-test was used to determine statistical significance between the means. The data indicates that there is not a statistically significant difference between the two groups, $t(489) = 1.9152$, $p = .056$, despite graduates in the flex group ($M = 81.56$, $SD = 141.06$) having few days between graduation and certification than the cohort group ($M = 110.12$, $SD = 182.60$).

The values greater than 250 were determined to be outliers in the cohort data set and values greater than 159 were determined to be outliers in the flex data set. An unpaired, two-tailed t-test was used to determine that the difference between the two groups with the outliers removed, is extremely statistically significant. The data, without the outliers, indicates that there is a statistically significant difference between the two groups, $t(428) = 4.1060$, $p < .0001$, with graduates in the flex group ($M = 36.94$, $SD = 34.62$) having significantly few days between graduation and TEA certification than the cohort group ($M = 56.85$, $SD = 66$).

Research question 2. Research question 2 addressed comparing the means for the graduates of the cohort and flex models regarding the number of days between graduation from

SWUSU and employment at a Texas public school. An unpaired, two-tailed t-test was used to determine statistical significance between the means. The data indicates that there is not a statistically significant difference between the two groups, $t(329) = 1.0757$, $p = .2829$, despite graduates in the flex group ($M = 194.19$, $SD = 184.48$) having few days between graduation and employment than the cohort group ($M = 218.43$, $SD = 183.78$).

The values greater than 471 were determined to be outliers in the cohort data set and values greater than 471 were determined to be outliers in the flex data set. The data, without the outliers, indicates that there is not quite a statistically significant difference between the two groups, $t(304) = 1.7532$, $p = .0806$, with graduates in the flex group ($M = 153.88$, $SD = 119.4$) having fewer days between graduation and employment than the cohort group ($M = 181.26$, $SD = 131.15$).

Research question 3. Research question 3 addressed comparing the means for the graduates of the cohort and flex models on Bandura's Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (TSES). The N is smaller than anticipated. Although the request to complete the TSES was sent to 558 individuals, only 44 individuals chose to complete the survey. There were 17 graduates of the cohort model and 27 graduates of the flex model who completed the survey. Although the N was too low to reflect reliable statistical significance, an unpaired, two-tailed t-test was used to provide descriptive statistics to compare the two groups. The small data set indicates that there is not a statistically significant difference between the two groups, $t(1274) = 1.8197$, $p = .069$, despite graduates in the flex group ($M = 6.15$, $SD = 2.06$) having a slightly higher average rating than graduates in the cohort group ($M = 5.92$, $SD = 2.38$).

Bandura's TSES questions are divided into 7 subgroups. The subgroups include Efficacy to Influence Decision Making, Efficacy to Influence School Resources, Instructional Self-

Efficacy, Disciplinary Self-Efficacy, Efficacy to Enlist Parental Involvement, Efficacy to Enlist Community Involvement, and Efficacy to Create a Positive School Climate. A t-test was conducted on each of the 7 subgroups of questions. The difference between the two groups is considered not to be statistically significant in any of the subgroups of questions. The results of the t-tests can be found in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4

Descriptive Statistics from Overall Scores on TSES

Groups	Cohort			Flex					
	N	*M*	*SD*	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*
Efficacy to Influence Decision Making	34	4.97	2.05	54	5.28	2.18	0.6574	86	.5127
Efficacy to Influence School Resources	17	5.53	2.45	27	5.07	2.20	0.6396	42	.5259
Instructional Self-Efficacy	136	5.99	2.42	216	6.01	2.18	0.9235	350	.9235
Disciplinary Self-Efficacy	51	6.71	2.05	81	6.98	1.57	0.8502	130	.3968
Efficacy to Enlist Parental Involvement	51	6.12	1.95	81	6.20	1.73	0.2463	130	.8059
Efficacy to Enlist Community Involvement	68	4.66	2.49	108	5.18	1.89	1.55	174	.1229
Efficacy to Create a Positive School Climate	136	6.39	2.33	215	7.11	5.02	1.573	349	.1166

Qualitative Results

In this section, results of interviews conducted with a small group of graduates will be reviewed. These results will address the final research question. The interview questions can be found in Appendix VIII. Seven graduates volunteered to complete an interview. All of those interviewed also completed the TSES survey. Although the limited number of participants will not allow for generalizability, their responses do offer insight into what these seven graduates experienced and how they perceived their field residency experiences.

The transcripts from the interviews were coded and evaluated to identify trends in the responses. The Code List can be found in Appendix IX. The interviews were coded in the following categories: University Level Quality, District Level Quality and Preparedness and

Change. The University Level Quality Category includes Relationship with University Supervisor, University Supervisor Effectiveness, Support by University Supervisor and Coursework. The District Level Quality Category includes Cooperating Teacher Effectiveness, Relationship with Cooperating Teacher, Support by Cooperating Teacher and Placement Information. The Preparedness and Change Category includes Preparedness and Suggested Changes.

Research question 4. Research Question 4 addressed the perceived advantages and disadvantages of being part of the cohort model for field residency. It was discovered that it was very rare for a student to have a true cohort or flex experience. There were two students who identified themselves as being part of a cohort and five students who identified themselves as being part of the traditional flex group. Cohort students are those students who have the same university supervisor and cooperating teacher for field residency 1, field residency 2 and clinical teachers. They also take two or more classes from their university supervisor during the field residency 1 and field residency 2 semesters. Flex students are those students who have a different university supervisor and a different cooperating teacher for field residency 1, field residency 2 and clinical teaching. These students may or may not take classes with the university supervisor during field residency. It was found that of the seven graduates who were interviewed only one had a true cohort experience and one had a true flex experience. The other five experienced some elements of both the flex and cohort models. One of the identified cohort students had three different cooperating teachers throughout her field residency experience. She switched districts from field residency 1 to field residency 2. She had two cooperating teachers for clinical teaching since she was a generalist with special education. One of the two clinical teaching cooperating teachers was the same one from field residency 2. The other was a new

cooperating teacher. She did, however, have the same university supervisor for all three experiences. The remaining four graduates who identified as being part of the flex model, had either two semesters of field residency with the same university supervisor and/or two semesters of field residency with the same cooperating teacher.

Rather than comparing the cohort and flex groups' interview responses, the evaluation of the Code List was more wholistic given the nature of the interviewees' field residency and clinical teaching experiences. There were, however, relevant statements made regarding the cohort and flex models during the interviews. One graduate stated that, "Looking back, rather than having been in a cohort, I would have changed [cooperating teachers] each semester because I feel I would have learned more, gained different perspectives and had a broader understanding." In contrast, another graduate stated, "I really wish I would have stayed with one mentor. I chose flex to have different experiences at different grade levels, however, having one [cooperating teacher] would have helped with consistency and maybe opened a door for a teaching job."

The comments made by the graduates that were coded as District Level and University Level were equally divided. There were slightly more comments made coded as Preparedness and Change with most of those comments being coded as Preparedness. Overall, the interviewees emphasized the importance of having a positive relationship with their university supervisor as well as the importance of high-quality feedback and communication from both the university supervisor and cooperating teacher. Effectiveness of the cooperating teacher was more often focused on than relationship with the cooperating teacher. The opposite was true regarding university supervisors, where the comments were more frequently concerning relationship rather than effectiveness. The most common negative comments often referred to the

university supervisor focusing on paperwork rather than on mentoring during field residency. There was nothing specific or relevant to note about the relationship or effectiveness of the university supervisor or cooperating teaching in terms of the number of semesters that the interviewee was placed with each.

Summary

In this chapter, descriptive statistics for the participants of the quantitative portion of the study were presented. The results of the t-test inferential statistics tests addressed how quickly EPP graduates become TEA certified, how quickly they become employed after graduation and the level of teacher efficacy between graduates of the cohort model and the flex model were presented. It was found that there was not a statistically significant difference on any of the measures between graduates from the cohort model compared to those from the flex model of field residency without outliers being removed. In addition, qualitative results of interviews were reviewed to address the question of perceived benefits and disadvantages of the cohort and flex models. The coded and evaluated interview notes reveal common concerns around the mentoring and supervisory practices during field residency experiences. The most notable concerns include communication, quality of feedback and developing positive working relationships with supervisors.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter will summarize the record of study and the data analysis used to explore the research questions. It will explain the findings from the data analysis performed and conclusions. The last section will include implications and recommendations for further study.

Summary

The purpose of this mixed-methods record of study was to determine if there is a statistically significant difference between graduates of the cohort model versus the flex model of field residency on the following measures: 1) the rate at which students became certified after graduation; 2) how quickly they were employed; and 3) self-reported teaching efficacy. In addition, qualitative data was collected via interview from a small group of graduates and examined to determine the perceived value of the cohort versus flex model from the perspectives of the graduates. SWUSU grew tremendously in the time that it took to complete this record of study and experienced a great deal of change in faculty and administration. In the spring 2017 semester, when this record of study was proposed, the faculty within the College of Education and Human Development (COEHD) had differing viewpoints on the value of the cohort model for field residency. Those who opposed the model had concerns about the required resources for the cohort model, especially given that the university, at that time and still today, is taxed for space and professors. There was a call for empirical evidence to determine if the cohort model significantly benefitted the students more so as compared to the flex model.

A mixed methods approach was determined to be the best design for this record of study since quantitative data was collected to determine certification and employment rates as well as

determining self-reported levels of teacher efficacy. Unpaired, two-tailed t-tests were performed to evaluate the quantitative data. Qualitative data was collected to provide insight into the perceived benefits and drawbacks of both the cohort and flex models of field residency. The qualitative data was coded, sorted and evaluated.

A public information request (PIR) was sent to the Teacher Education Agency (TEA) to obtain the date of initial certification as well as the date of employment for all SWUSU certification seeking graduates of the COEHD between May 2014 and December 2016. The PIR was for date of initial certification, date first assigned (employed), and end date assigned. A total of 558 graduate names and TEA numbers were sent in the PIR request. TEA delivered certification data on 491. Of the 491, 166 were identified as having completed field residency in a cohort group and 325 participated in the flex model. An unpaired t-test was used to determine if there was a significant difference between the amount of time that it took for graduates of the cohort model and graduates of the flex model to become certified. This data was used to address the following research questions:

1. Do graduates of the EPP cohort model become certified more quickly than graduates of the flex program?
2. Are graduates of the EPP cohort model employed more quickly than graduates of the flex program?

Graduates who participated in the flex model of field residency had a shorter average number of days between graduation and certification (M=81.56) compared to graduates of the cohort model (M = 110.12). However, the data did not indicate that there is a statistically significant difference between the two groups. Graduates who participated in the flex model also had a shorter average number of days between graduation and becoming employed (M = 194.19)

as compared to graduates of the cohort model (M = 218.43). However, the data did not indicate that there is a statistically significant difference between the two groups.

Bandura's Teaching Self-Efficacy Scale survey was created using Survey Monkey and emailed to all 558 identified graduates. There were 44 participants who chose to complete the survey. Of the 44 participants, 17 were graduates of the cohort model and 27 were graduates of the flex model. This data was used to address the following research question:

3. Do graduates of SWUSU's EPP cohort model have higher teacher efficacy, as measured by Bandura's Teacher's Sense of Efficacy Scale, during the first few years of teaching than graduates of the flex program?

Although the N was too low to reflect reliable statistical significance, an unpaired, two-tailed t-test was used to provide descriptive statistics to compare the two groups. The small data set indicated that there is not a statistically significant difference between the two groups, however, graduates from the flex group reported slightly higher average ratings (M = 6.15) compared to graduates from the cohort group (M = 5.92).

An email was sent to participants who completed the TSES requesting an interview. A total of seven participants were interviewed. Each participant was asked eight interview questions. Due to scheduling and distance constraints, all interviews were conducted over the telephone, and took between 20-35 minutes. Notes were taken during the interview and then coded, sorted and evaluated for trends. This data was used to address the following research question:

4. What are the perceived benefits and disadvantages of being part of the cohort model as compared to the flex model?

The interviews revealed that it was rare for a graduate to have participated in purely a cohort or flex model of field residency. Most experienced a mix of both. Therefore, rather than comparing the cohort and flex groups' interview responses, the evaluation of the code list was more wholistic in nature. The qualitative data highlights the importance of having a positive relationship with the university supervisor, receiving high-quality feedback, and participating in effective communication from both the university supervisor and cooperating teacher. The effectiveness of the cooperating teacher was also highlighted along with the need for university supervisors to focus on mentoring and coaching rather than paperwork.

Conclusions

This record of study has revealed that graduates of the cohort model of field residency do not become certified more quickly than graduates of the flex model of field residency. In fact, graduates of the flex program, on average, get certified more quickly than graduates of the cohort program, however, the difference is not statistically significant.

Likewise, graduates of the cohort model do not become employed by a school district more quickly than graduates of the flex model of field residency. Once again, while not statistically significant, graduates of the flex model, on average, were employed more quickly than graduates of the cohort model.

This study was unable to address the question of teacher retention after employment due to cost associated with obtaining data from the Texas Education Agency. In order to answer the question, the query would need to encompass each contractual year since teacher employment is reported as a separation at the end of each contract even if the teacher has been offered a contract with the same district for the following year.

The number of graduates who participated in the Teacher Self-Efficacy Survey were too few to determine if there was a statistical significance. However, the data suggests that, while not statistically significant, graduates of the flex model of field residency have a slightly higher sense of teacher efficacy than graduates of the cohort program as self-reported on Bandura's Teacher Self-Efficacy Survey.

The qualitative portion of the study revealed that although students were categorized as having participated in a cohort model or flex model of field residency, most students actually experienced elements from both models. Furthermore, the comments that were made which directly related to the being part of a specific model were positive for each type. Therefore, rather than comparing the two models, the focus was on the overall field residency experience and the perceived relationships with both the cooperating teacher and university supervisor. The participants highlighted the importance of having a positive relationship with their university supervisor, while the most discussed quality of the cooperating teacher was that of effectiveness in the classroom. High quality feedback and communication were identified as being important aspects for both the university supervisor and cooperating teacher.

Implications

The results of this record of study imply that the additional resources that are required of the cohort model of field residency are not justifiable at this time. Based on the results of this study, the graduates who participated in the cohort model, as implemented by SWUSU at the time, do not have an advantage over the graduates who participated in the flex model of field residency in terms of the rate of certification or employment, and do not appear to have a higher level of teaching self-efficacy. Therefore, the implication is that the cohort model should be put on hold and potentially reconsidered in the future in order to conserve limited resources such as

classroom space and faculty assignments and work towards implementing best practice field residency experiences for students. Based on interviews, it appears that a hybrid model of field residency, containing elements of both the cohort and flex models, already existed at SWUSU's Educator Preparation Program and could be considered as an alternative approach for those faculty members who were in favor of the cohort model. The recommendation would be that the hybrid model be given structure in order to manage it effectively.

Furthermore, rather than using additional resources for a current cohort model, it appears as though resources should be used for training university supervisors and cooperating teachers on how to deliver high quality feedback and how to communicate effectively with field residency students and clinical teachers. In addition, it may also be beneficial to deliver training to cooperating teachers on how to develop positive relationships with field residency students.

It can be speculated that the results of this study were inconsistent with the literature due to the lack of consistency within the two field residency models offered at SWUSU as well as fundamental differences between SWUSU's cohort and those studied. As previously mentioned, it appears as though a true cohort or flex experience rarely occurred. This would explain the lack of statistically significant findings. In addition, a deeper look at the literature reveals that not only is it important for students to take classes with the university supervisor, but also that the students' "perceptions of their university supervisors' knowledge, and the amount of influence they felt their university supervisors had on their practices in the classroom," (Asplin & Marks, 2013). Therefore, a deeper look at the perception of the university supervisors' knowledge and influence of the university supervisor is a recommendation for future research. Another important point is that the cohort model at SWUSU had students placed in the same classroom

and therefore grade level for all three semesters of field residency and clinical teaching. None of the literature cited included a model where students were stagnated in their placement.

Given this information, it is recommended that, at some point in the future, SWUSU revisits the idea of implementing a cohort model for field residency and include research on learning communities in higher education. Love, defined learning communities as, "an intentional restructuring of the curriculum and student course-taking patterns to emphasize an interdisciplinary focus with attention paid to students' academic and social development," (2012, p. 7). The need for structure and adherence to that structure is apparent when considering implementation of a new cohort model in field residency. My recommendation is to use a research-based learning community approach to establish that structure.

Recommendations for Future Research

The literature clearly suggests that the field residency experience is of paramount importance in any educator preparation program. Although this record of study did not yield statistically significant results when comparing the two models of field residency offered by Southwestern United States University, it cannot be assumed that studies of other models of field residency would yield the same results. Recommendations for further study related to this topic are as follows:

1. An exploratory study is needed to discover the different models of field residency implemented by educator preparation programs across the country.
2. Once the different models of field residency are determine, a quantitative study similar to this record of study is needed to compare the different models to determine if there is a significant difference between the models on rate of certification, rate of employment, teacher retention, and teacher self-efficacy.

3. A longitudinal study is needed to determine if the model in which the classroom teacher participated in has a significant effect on student learning in the K-12 setting.
4. It is further recommended, based on the results of the qualitative portion of this record of study that an exploratory study be performed to determine how different educator preparation programs train their university supervisors and cooperating teachers on delivering feedback and communicating effectively with field residency students.
5. As mentioned previously, a study that measure the perceived knowledge and amount of influence that university supervisors have on clinical teachers is needed.
6. A literature study that researches successful cohort models (ie. learning communities) is needed to guide the reconsideration of a cohort model of field residency at SWUSU.

LITERATURE CITED

Al-Bataineh, A. (2009). An examination of pre-service teacher preparedness: A cooperating teacher perspective. *The International Journal of Learning, 16*(5), 231-249.

Allen, J. M. & Wright, S. E. (2014). Integrating theory and practice in the pre-service teacher education practicum. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 20*(2), 136-151.

Asplin, K. N. & Marks, M. J. (2013). Increasing the influence of university supervisors during student teaching. *The Professional Educator, 37*(1), 1-11.

Ball, D. L. & Forzani, F. M. (2009). The work of teaching and the challenge of teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 60*(5), 497-511.

Bandura, A. (n.d.). Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale. Unpublished manuscript.

Brannon, D. & Feine, J. (2013). The effect structured participation experiences have on pre service teachers' preparedness to teach reading. *Education, 134*(2), 185-194.

Brown, A. L., Lee, J. & Collins, D. (2015). Does student teaching matter? Investigating pre service teachers' sense of efficacy and preparedness. *Teaching Education, 26*(1), 77-93.

Cuban, L. (2001), How can I fix it? Teachers College Press: New York, NY.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). Constructing 21st century teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 57*(3), 300-314.

Dewey, J. (1938). Experience and education. Free Press: New York, NY.

Dorel, T. G., Kearney, W. S. & Garza, E. (2016). Ready from day one? The relationship between length of pre-service teacher field residency and teacher efficacy. *Critical Questions in Education, 7*(1), 38-52.

Garza, E. V. & Dorel, T. G. (2015). Two paths of field residency: A study of self-efficacy. *Southwest Teaching and Learning Journal, 4*(1), 24-36.

Henry, G. T., Purtell, K. M., Bastien, K. C., Fortner, C. K., Thompson, C. L., Campbell, S. L., & Patterson, K. M. (2014). The effects of teacher entry portals on student achievement. *Journal of Teacher Education, 65*(1), 7-23.

Hodson, E., Smith, K. & Brown, T. (2015). Reasserting theory in professionally based initial teacher education. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 18*(2), 181-195.

Hollins, E. R. (2011). Teacher preparation for quality teaching, *Journal of Teacher Education, 62*(4), 395-407.

Ivankova, N.V., Creswell, J.W. & Stick, S. L. (2006). Using mixed-methods sequential explanatory design: From theory to practice. *Field Methods, 18*(1), 3-20.

Kolb, A. Y. & Kolb, D. A. (2005). Learning styles and learning spaces: Enhancing experiential learning in higher education. *Academy of Management Learning and Education, 4*(2), 193-212.

Kolb, D. (1984). Experiential learning. Prentice-Hall: Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Love, A. G. (2012). The growth and current state of learning communities in higher education. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning,* 2012: 5-18. doi:10.1002/tl.20032.

Santagata, R., Zannoni, C. & Stigler, J. W. (2007). The Role of lesson analysis in pre-service teacher Education: an empirical investigation of teacher learning from a virtual video based field experience. *Journal of Math Teacher Education, 10*(2), 123-140.

Tschannen-Moran, M. & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*(7), 783-805.

Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college-and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(1 -2), 89-99.

APPENDIX A

TAMU IRB APPROVAL

DIVISION OF RESEARCH

Submission Approval

DATE: October 07, 2016

MEMORANDUM

TO: Geor Slattery
TAMU - College Of Education & Human Dev - Teaching, Learning And Culture

FROM: Dr. David Martin
Chair, TAMU IRB

SUBJECT: Approval for Submission Response for Initial Review Submission Form REF: 043339

Study Number: IRB2016-0584D

Title: Examining the Effects of a Flex vs. Cohort Model of Field Residency Experiences on Teacher Self-Efficacy and Employment Opportunities

Initial Application Approval Date: 10/07/2016

Continuing Review Due: 09/01/2017

Expiration Date: 10/01/2017

Documents Reviewed and Approved: Only IRB-stamped approved versions of study materials (e.g., consent forms, recruitment materials, and questionnaires) can be distributed to human participants. Please log into iRIS to download the stamped, approved version of all study materials. If you are unable to locate the stamped version in iRIS, please contact the iRIS Support Team at 979.845.4969 or the IRB liaison assigned to your area.

Submission Components			
Study Document			
Title	Version Number	Version Date	Outcome
Recruitment email and scripts	Version 1.0	08/16/2016	Approved
Teachers' Sense of Efficacy	Version 1.0	08/15/2016	Approved
Study Consent Form			
Title	Version Number	Version Date	Outcome
Information Sheet	Version 1.2	10/04/2016	Approved
Consent Form	Version 1.3	08/15/2016	Approved

Document of Consent: Written consent in accordance with 45 CF 46.116/ 21 CFR 50.27

750 Agronomy Road, Suite 2701
1186 TAMU
College Station, TX 77843-1186
Tel. 979.458.1467 Fax. 979.862.3176

Waiver approved under 45 CFR 46.117 (c) 1 or 2/ 21 CFR 56.109 (c)1

Waiver of Consent:

Provisions:

No research may be done until the following things are submitted: 1. Site authorization

2. TAMU San Antonio IRB Approval

Comments:

- Interview questions need to be submitted via an Amendment when they are available
- This study has been approved for 405 participants.
- This IRB study application has been reviewed and approved by the IRB. Research may begin on the approval date stated above.
- Research is to be conducted according to the study applicationapproved by the IRB prior to implementation.
- Any future correspondence should include the IRB study number and the study title.

Investigators assume the following responsibilities:

1. **Continuing Review:** The study must be renewed by the expiration date in order to continue with the research. A Continuing Review application along with required documents must be submitted by the continuing review deadline. Failure to do so may result in processing delays, study expiration, and/or loss of funding.
2. **Completion Report:** Upon completion of the research study (including data collection and analysis), a Completion Report must be submitted to theIRB.
3. **Unanticipated Problems and Adverse Events:** Unanticipated problems and adverse events must be reported to the IRB immediately.
4. **Reports of Potential Non-compliance:** Potential non-compliance, including deviations from protocol and violations, must be reported to the IRB office immediately.
5. **Amendments:** Changes to the protocol and/or study documents must be requested by submitting an Amendment to the IRB for review. The Amendment must be approved by the IRB before being implemented.
6. **Consent Forms:** When using a consent form or information sheet, the IRB stamped approved version must be used. Please log into iRIS to download the stamped approved version of the consenting instruments. If you are unable to locate the stamped version in iRIS, please contact the iRIS Support Team at 979.845.4969 or the IRB liaison assigned to your area. Human participants are to receive a copy of the consent document, if appropriate.
7. **Post Approval Monitoring:** Expedited and full board studies may be subject to post approval monitoring. During the life of the study, please review and document study progress using the PI self-assessment found on the RCB website as a method of preparation for the potential review. Investigators are responsible for maintaining complete and accurate study records and making them available for post approval monitoring. Investigators are encouraged to request a pre-initiation site visit with the Post Approval Monitor. These visits are designed to help ensure that all necessary documents are approved and in order prior to initiating the study and to help investigators maintain compliance.
8. **Recruitment**: All approved recruitment materials will be stamped electronically by the HRPP staff and available for download from iRIS. These IRB-stamped approved documents from iRIS must be used for recruitment. For materials that are distributed to potential participants electronically and for which you can only feasibly use the approved text rather than the stamped document, the study's IRB Study Number, approval date, and expiration dates must be included in the following format: TAMU IRB#20XX- XXXX Approved: XX/XX/XXXX Expiration Date: XX/XX/XXXX.
9. **FERPA and PPRA:** Investigators conducting research with students must have appropriate approvals from the FERPA administrator at the institution where the research will be conducted in accordance with the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). The Protection of Pupil Rights Amendment (PPRA) protects the rights of parents in students ensuring that written parental consent is required for

   participation in surveys, analysis, or evaluation that ask questions falling into categories of protected information.
10. **Food:** Any use of food in the conduct of human research must follow Texas A&M University Standard Administrative Procedure24.01.01.M4.02.
11. **Payments:** Any use of payments to human research participants must follow Texas A&M University Standard Administrative Procedure21.01.99.M0.03.
12. **Records Retention**: Federal Regulations require records be retained for at least 3 years. Records of a study that collects protected health information are required to be retained for at least 6 years. Some sponsors require extended records retention. Texas A&M University rule 15.99.03.M1.03 Responsible Stewardship of Research Data requires that research records be retained on Texas A&M property.

This electronic document provides notification of the review results by the Institutional Review Board.

APPENDIX B

SWUSU IRB APPROVAL

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

SANANTONIO

Office of Graduate Studies and Research

Main Campus, Central Academic Building, Suite 405D One University Way, San Antonio, Texas 78224 Phone: (110) 784·2323 · gradstudies@tamusa.tamus.edu

---

Date: October 24, 2016

To: Heather Brezinski, Principal Investigator, College of Education and Human Development From: Dr. Josephine Sosa-Fey, Director of Graduate Studies and Research, Institutional Review Board Chair

Re: Institutional Review Board (IRB) Proposal Application {Log #2016-79)

IRB proposal entitled "Examining the Effects of a Flex vs. Cohort Model of Field Residency Experiences on Teacher Self-Efficacy and Employment Opportunities" meets the criteria for Expedited Review in the *Policies and Procedures for Personnel Engaged in Research Involving Human Subjects* manual. As the Chair of the !RB, I have reviewed your proposal and have approved it. You may now begin data collection.

Please keep in mind that any additions to or changes in procedures involving human subjects as well as any problems connected with the use of human subjects once the project has begun must be brought to the attention of the IRB immediately. Additionally, you (as the principal Investigator) are responsible for providing whatever surveillance is necessary to ensure that the rights and welfare of the human subjects in your study are properly protected.

The time line of your project is from the date of this approval {October 24, 2016) to midnight October 23, 2017. The !RB approves protocols for a 12-period. If you, as the Principal Investigator, wish to collect data after that date, you must submit a written request to the !RB for a Renewal prior to that date. The request must be approved in writing by the Chair of the !RB (or his/her designate) before data collection can be continued. At the end of your research project, you must submit a completion report to the !RB.

You must also notify the Institutional Review Board at IRB@tamusa.tamus.edu when you complete your research project. Report any adverse events immediately to the !RB Chair or designated person. Please contact me, or any !RB member, if you have any questions.

APPENDIX C

SWUSU SITE AUTHORIZATION

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

SAN ANTONIO

December 9, 2016

Institutional Review Board Texas
A&M University

To whom it may concern:

Heather Brezinski has contacted Texas A&M University-San Antonio to collect data required for her dissertation research.

We are open to Heather Brezinksi collecting data from participants at our campus if approval is gained from Texas A&M University's IRB and A&M-San Antonio's IRB.

If you have any questions, I may be reached at 210-784-1204 or holly.verhasselt@tamusa.edu.

Holly Verhasselt, Ph.D.
Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS OFFICE ONE UNIVERSITY WAY

SAN ANTONIO, TX 78224

APPENDIX D

BANDURA'S TEACHERS SENSE OF EFFICACY SCALE

BANDURA'S INSTRUMENT
TEACHER SELF-EFFICACY SCALE

This questionnaire is designed to help us gain a better understanding of the kinds of things that create difficulties for teachers in their school activities. Please indicate your opinions about each of the statements below by circling the appropriate number. Your answers will be kept strictly confidential and will not be identified by name.

Efficacy to Influence Decision making

H ow much can you influence the decisions that are made in the school?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing		Very Little		Some Influence		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal

H ow much can you express your views freely on important school matters?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing		Very Little		Some Influence		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal

Efficacy to Influence School Resources

H ow much can you do to get the instructional materials and equipment you need?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing		Very Little		Some Influence		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal

Instructional Self-Efficacy

H ow much can you do to influence the class sizes in your school?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing		Very Little		Some Influence		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal

H ow much can you do to get through to the most difficult students?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing		Very Little		Some Influence		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal

H ow much can you do to promote learning when there is lack of support from the home?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing		Very Little		Some Influence		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal

H ow much can you do to keep students on task on difficult assignments?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing		Very Little		Some Influence		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal

H ow much can you do to increase students' memory of what they have been taught in previous lessons?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing		Very Little		Some Influence		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal

H ow much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in schoolwork?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing		Very Little		Some Influence		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal

H ow much can you do to get students to work together?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing		Very Little		Some Influence		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal

H ow much can you do to overcome the influence of adverse community conditions on students' learning?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing		Very Little		Some Influence		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal

H ow much can you do to get children to do their homework?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing		Very Little		Some Influence		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal

Disciplinary Self- Efficacy

H ow much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing		Very Little		Some Influence		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal

H ow much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing		Very Little		Some Influence		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal

H ow much can you do to prevent problem behavior on the school grounds?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing		Very Little		Some Influence		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal

Efficacy to Enlist Parental Involvement

H ow much can you do to get parents to become involved in school activities?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing		Very Lit le		Some Influence		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal

H ow much can you assist parents in helping their children do well in school?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing		Very Lit le		Some Influence		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal

H ow much can you do to make parents feel comfortable coming to school?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing		Very Little		Some Influence		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal

Efficacy to Enlist Community Involvement

H ow much can you do to get community groups involved in working with the schools?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing		Very Little		Some Influence		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal

H ow much can you do to get churches involved in working with the school?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing		Very Little		Some Influence		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal

H ow much can you do to get businesses involved in working with the school?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing		Very Little		Some Influence		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal

H ow much can you do to get local colleges and universities involved in working with the school?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing		Very Little		Some Influence		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal

Efficacy to Create a Positive School Climate

H ow much can you do to make the school a safe place?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

H ow much can you do to make students enjoy coming to school?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

H ow much can you do to get students to trust teachers?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

H ow much can you help other teachers with their teaching skills?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

H ow much can you do to enhance collaboration between teachers and the administration to make the school run effectively?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

H ow much can you do to reduce school dropout?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

H ow much can you do to reduce school absenteeism?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

H ow much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in schoolwork?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

APPENDIX E

RECRUITMENT EMAIL AND SCRIPT FOR STUDY AND INTERVIEW

INFORMATION SHEET

Project Title: Examining the Self-Efficacy and Preparedness of Undergraduate Pre-Service Teacher Graduates

You are invited to take part in a research study being conducted by Heather Brezinski, a researcher from Texas A&M University. The information in this form is provided to help you decide whether or not to take part. If you decide to take part in the study, you will be asked to complete a survey. If you decide you do not want to participate, there will be no penalty to you, and you will not lose any benefits you normally would have.

Why Is This Study Being Done?

The purpose of this study is to determine what the teacher self-efficacy is and how prepared for a career in education recent licensed teacher graduates of Texas A&M University-San Antonio (SWUSU) feel.

Why Am I Being Asked To Be In This Study?

You are being asked to be in this study because you graduated from SWUSU's teacher preparation program between the fall of 2014 and the spring of 2016.

How Many People Will Be Asked To Be In This Study?

405 people (participants) will be invited to participate in this study locally.

What Are the Alternatives to being in this study?

The alternative to being in the study is not to participate.

What Will I Be Asked To Do In This Study?

You will be asked to complete a teacher self-efficacy survey and you may be asked to participate in an interview with the investigator. Your participation in this study will last up to one and one- half hours and includes one visit.

Will Photos, Video or Audio Recordings Be Made Of Me during the Study?

Not during the survey portion of the study.

Are There Any Risks To Me?

The things that you will be doing are no greater risks than you would come across in everyday life.

Are There Any Benefits To Me?

The direct benefit to you by being in this study is gaining some understanding of your feelings of preparedness for a career in education and level of self-efficacy in teaching.

Will There Be Any Costs To Me?

Aside from your time, there are no costs for taking part in the study.

Side effects (injury) can happen in any research study. These effects may not be your fault or the fault of the researcher involved. Known side effects have been described in the "Are there any risks to me?" section of this consent form. However, side effects that are not currently known may happen and require care. You do not give up any of your legal rights by signing this form.

Will I Be Paid To Be In This Study?

You will not be paid for being in this study.

Will Information From This Study Be Kept Private?

The records of this study will be kept private. No identifiers linking you to this study will be included in any sort of
report that might be published. Research records will be stored securely and only the investigators will have access
to the records.

Information about you will be stored in a locked file cabinet and computer files will be protected with a password.
This consent form will be filed securely in an official area.

People who have access to your information include the Principal Investigator and research study personnel. Representatives of regulatory agencies such as the Office of Human Research Protections (OHRP) and entities such as the Texas A&M University Human Subjects Protection Program may access your records to make sure the
study is being run correctly and that information is collected properly.

Information about you and related to this study will be kept confidential to the extent permitted or required by law.

Who may I Contact for More Information?

You may contact the Principal Investigator, Patrick Slattery, PhD, to tell him about a concern or complaint about
this research at 512-657-7043 or pslattery@tamu.edu. You may also contact the Additional Principal Investigator,
Heather Brezinski at 210-439-8693 or Brezinski10@tamu.edu.

For questions about your rights as a research participant, to provide input regarding research, or if you have
questions, complaints, or concerns about the research, you may call the Texas A&M University Human Subjects
Protection Program office by phone at 1-979-458-4067, toll free at 1-855-795-8636, or by email at irb@tamu.edu.

What if I Change My Mind About Participating?

This research is voluntary and you have the choice whether or not to be in this research study. You may decide to
not begin or to stop participating at any time. If you choose not to be in this study or stop being in the study, there will be no effect on your relationship with Texas A&M University-San Antonio.

By taking this survey you are agreeing to participate in this research.

APPENDIX F

INFORMATION SHEET

Project Title: Examining the Self-Efficacy and Preparedness of Undergraduate Pre-Service Teacher Graduates

You are invited to take part in a research study being conducted by Heather Brezinski, a researcher from Texas A&M University. The information in this form is provided to help you decide whether or not to take part. If you decide to take part in the study, you will be asked to sign this consent form.
If you decide you do not want to participate, there will be no penalty to you, and you will not lose any benefits you normally would have.

Why Is This Study Being Done?

The purpose of this study is to determine what the teacher self-efficacy is and how prepared for a career in education recent licensed teacher graduates of Texas A&M University-San Antonio (SWUSU) feel.

Why Am I Being Asked To Be In This Study?

You are being asked to be in this study because you graduated from SWUSU's teacher preparation program between the fall of 2014 and the spring of 2016.

How Many People Will Be Asked To Be In This Study?

405 people (participants) will be invited to participate in this study locally.

What Are the Alternatives to being in this study?

The alternative to being in the study is not to participate.

What Will I Be Asked To Do In This Study?

You will be asked to participate in an interview with the investigator. Your participation in this study will last up to one and one-half hours and includes one visit.

Visit 1
This visit will last about one hour. During this visit the investigator will interview about your experiences at SWUSU and your feelings of preparedness for a career in education.

Will Photos, Video or Audio Recordings Be Made Of Me during the Study?

There will be an audio recording taken of you during the study, but you will not be identified by name or any other personal identifiers in the audio recording.

The researchers will make an audio recording during the study so that she can refer back to the recording when evaluating responses for the study only if you give your permission to do so. Indicate your decision below by initialing in the space provided.

_____ I give my permission for audio recordings to be made of me during my participation in this research study.

_____ I do not give my permission for audio recordings to be made of me during my participation in

this research study.

Are There Any Risks To Me?

The things that you will be doing are no greater risks than you would come across in everyday life.

Are There Any Benefits To Me?

The direct benefit to you by being in this study is gaining some understanding of your feelings of preparedness for
a career in education and level of self-efficacy in teaching.

Will There Be Any Costs To Me?

Aside from your time, there are no costs for taking part in the study.

Side effects (injury) can happen in any research study. These effects may not be your fault or the fault of the researcher involved. Known side effects have been described in the "Are there any risks to me?" section of this consent form. However, side effects that are not currently known may happen and require care. You do not give
up any of your legal rights by signing this form.

Will I Be Paid To Be In This Study?

You will not be paid for being in this study.

Will Information From This Study Be Kept Private?

The records of this study will be kept private. No identifiers linking you to this study will be included in any sort of
report that might be published. Research records will be stored securely and only the investigators will have access to the records.

Information about you will be stored in a locked file cabinet and computer files will be protected with a password.
This consent form will be filed securely in an official area.

People who have access to your information include the Principal Investigator and research study personnel. Representatives of regulatory agencies such as the Office of Human Research Protections (OHRP) and entities such as the Texas A&M University Human Subjects Protection Program may access your records to make sure the study is being run correctly and that information is collected properly.

Information about you and related to this study will be kept confidential to the extent permitted or required by law.

Who may I Contact for More Information?

You may contact the Principal Investigator, Patrick Slattery, PhD, to tell him about a concern or complaint about this research at 512-657-7043 or pslattery@tamu.edu. You may also contact the Additional Principal Investigator,
Heather Brezinski at 210-439-8693 or Brezinski10@tamu.edu.

For questions about your rights as a research participant, to provide input regarding research, or if you have questions, complaints, or concerns about the research, you may call the Texas A&M University Human Subjects
Protection Program office by phone at 1-979-458-4067, toll free at 1-855-795-8636, or by email at irb@tamu.edu.

APPENDIX G

INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT

Consent Form

What if I Change My Mind About Participating?

This research is voluntary and you have the choice whether or not to be in this research study. You may decide to not begin or to stop participating at any time. If you choose not to be in this study or stop being in the study, there will be no effect on your relationship with Texas A&M University-San Antonio.

STATEMENT OF CONSENT

I agree to be in this study and know that I am not giving up any legal rights by signing this form. The procedures, risks, and benefits have been explained to me, and my questions have been answered. I know that new information about this research study will be provided to me as it becomes available and that the researcher will tell me if I must be removed from the study. I can ask more questions if I want. A copy of this entire consent form will be given to me.

Participant's Signature	Date
Printed Name	Date

INVESTIGATOR'S AFFIDAVIT:

Either I have or my agent has carefully explained to the participant the nature of the above project. I hereby certify that to the best of my knowledge the person who signed this consent form was informed of the nature, demands, benefits, and risks involved in his/her participation.

Signature of Presenter	Date
Printed Name	Date

APPENDIX H

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Interview Questions

Project Title: Examining the Self-Efficacy and Preparedness of Undergraduate Pre-Service

Teacher Graduates

1. How many university supervisors did you work with during field residency 1, field residency 2 and clinical teaching?
2. Did you take any classes at Texas A&M-San Antonio with your university supervisor(s)?
3. Describe your working relationship with your university supervisor(s).
4. Did you feel supported by your university supervisor(s)? Please explain.
5. Do you feel that your university supervisor(s) helped to prepare you for a teaching career?
   Why or why not?
6. How many cooperating teachers (mentors) were you assigned to during field residency 1, field residency 2 and clinical teaching?
7. Describe your working relationship with your cooperating teacher(s).
8. To what extent did your cooperating teacher(s) empower you to be in charge of the classroom?
9. How much were you able to participate in total teach during clinical teaching?
10. How prepared did you feel to have your own classroom after completing clinical teaching?
11. Is there anything that you would have changed about your entire field residency experience
    that, you believe, would have helped you to feel more prepared for your own classroom?

APPENDIX I

CODE LIST

Code List

Codes

University Level Quality Category
Relationship with University Supervisor: RLUS
University Supervisor Effectiveness: USEF
Support by University Supervisor: SPUS
Coursework: CSWK

District Level Quality Category
Cooperating Teacher Effectiveness: CTEF
Relationship with Cooperating Teacher: RLCT
Support by Cooperating Teacher: SPCT
Placement Information: PLCT

Preparedness and Change
Preparedness: PRPS
Suggested Changes: SCHG

US = University Supervisor
CT = Cooperating Teacher

Category	Code	Comment	Subject
District Level Quality	CTEF	CT for FR 1 more about how not to be a teacher	KCOLL
District Level Quality	CTEF	FR 1 CT was fabulous – showed me real world and realistic expectations	HMEY
District Level Quality	CTEF	FR 2 and clinical CT focused on content and how best to teach it	HMEY
District Level Quality	CTEF	FR 2 and clinical CT was very will to try new things	HMEY
District Level Quality	CTEF	My CT didn't give me as much feedback as I wanted	TSCOT
District Level Quality	CTEF	CT did not coach – would give bad evaluations but did not say why	TSCOT
District Level Quality	CTEF	FR 2 CT was great – no issues	FHAW
District Level Quality	CTEF	Clinical teaching CT was a coach and showed little care – he showed a lot of travel videos	FHAW
District Level Quality	CTEF	I had no coaching or mentoring from my clinical CT at all – was a classic history teacher/coach	FHAW
District Level Quality	CTEF	I did pretty much all of the teaching during clinical – I planned with my CT but was allowed to teach the lessons – the teacher stayed in the room and mentored me	DSTEP
District Level Quality	CTEF	My FR 2 and clinical CT was very helpful – let me sit in on ARDs, took me to see STAAR testing accommodations, gave me as much experience as possible and was very encouraging	AGUE
District Level Quality	CTEF	The middle school gen ed teacher during clinical would let me jump in at anytime – I had a lot of total teach time	AGUE
District Level Quality	CTEF	The clinical CT was more hand-on and gave me a lot more responsibilities such as tutoring and guided reading	APER

Category	Code	Comment	Subject
District Level Quality	CTEF/	I didn't have a good relationship with my FR 1 CT – she was checked out – getting ready to retire – didn't share lessons and wasn't helpful	AGUE
District Level Quality	CTEF/SPCT	I was able to participate in total teach and was also left alone in a substitute position, but that didn't go well	APER
District Level Quality	PLCT	Switched districts – good variety – had to do all levels EC-12	KCOLL
District Level Quality	PLCT	CT different for each semester	KCOLL
District Level Quality	PLCT	2 CTs – one for FR 1 and one for FR2 and clinical teaching	HMEY
District Level Quality	PLCT	At end of clinical, I was able to see other grade levels and teachers – loved that – got to take so many things from other teachers	HMEY
District Level Quality	PLCT	It was so much easier to go from FR 2 to clinical since I already knew the school	AGUE
District Level Quality	PLCT	I requested to go back to the FR 2 teacher for clinical teaching	AGUE
District Level Quality	PLCT	I felt like part of the team during clinical teaching – gen ed teacher at the middle school was the first male teacher I had worked with and it was cool to see a different perspective	AGUE
District Level Quality	PLCT	I really wish I would have stayed with one mentor – I chose flex to have different experiences at different grade levels however having one would have helped with consistency and maybe opened a door for a teaching job	APER
District Level Quality	PLCT/	FR 1 CT was a jerk – was the department head and would send me to go spy on his teachers – used me to get information on them	FHAW
District Level Quality	RLCT	CT for FR 2 still talk to -	KCOLL
District Level Quality	RLCT	FR 2 US was very present and accessible	HMEY
District Level Quality	RLCT	Had 1 CT for all three semesters	TSCOT
District Level Quality	RLCT	Had a different CT for all three semesters	FHAW
District Level Quality	RLCT	CT relationships were phenomenal – still keep in touch with them	DSTEP
District Level Quality	RLCT	Had 3 CTs, one for FR 1 and one for FR 2 and ½ clinical teaching, and one for the other ½ of clinical teaching since generalist with special ed	AGUE
District Level Quality	RLCT	All of the CTs were very willing to have me in their class and the relationships were good – they were more than willing to answer questions	APER
District Level Quality	RLCT/	Had the same CT for FR 1 and FR 2 had a different one for clinical but all were on the same high school campus	DSTEP
District Level Quality	SPCT	The FR 1 and 2 CTs didn't empower me to take control – they allowed me to walk around and talk to kids but it would have been better to be more actively involved then an observer	APER
District Level Quality	SPCT/	Administrator at the high school never had my back – you have to support people you work with – it's important for the kids to see too	FHAW

Category	Code	Comment	Subject
District Level Quality	SPCT/	Clinical CT gave me full latitude – he stayed in the room the first couple of weeks but then checked out and I took over	FHAW
Preparedness and Change	PRPS	CT for 1st half clinical allowed me to take over full class schedule	KCOLL
Preparedness and Change	PRPS	CT for 2nd half clinical was inclusion so was dependent on which gen ed teacher we were with	KCOLL
Preparedness and Change	PRPS	2nd half CT did not have as much full teach but did go to all trainings	KCOLL
Preparedness and Change	PRPS	Felt very prepared to have own classroom	KCOLL
Preparedness and Change	PRPS	First year questions were primarily on paperwork	KCOLL
Preparedness and Change	PRPS	FR 1 US had little impact on preparedness	HMEY
Preparedness and Change	PRPS	FR 2 US made me feel prepared	HMEY
Preparedness and Change	PRPS	FR 2 and clinical CT said "You've got this" and would leave me alone in the room because she wanted it to be as realistic for me as possible	HMEY
Preparedness and Change	PRPS	Was able to full teach during clinical – followed pacing guide	HMEY
Preparedness and Change	PRPS	I felt prepared to have that age group for sure	HMEY
Preparedness and Change	PRPS	Subject wise, I didn't feel prepared since all I taught was Math	HMEY
Preparedness and Change	PRPS	Felt very prepared for management and interactions	HMEY
Preparedness and Change	PRPS	I was allowed to take over class periods – was never left alone – did not ever take over the entire day	TSCOT
Preparedness and Change	PRPS	I felt ready for my own class – it was a whirlwind	TSCOT
Preparedness and Change	PRPS	FR 2/clinical US made me feel prepared – primarily through feedback and an informal approach – gave many examples of own experiences	FHAW
Preparedness and Change	PRPS	I felt fine with my own classroom – had outside resources and help	FHAW
Preparedness and Change	PRPS		
Preparedness and Change	PRPS	The program is designed to prepare students so yes – I felt prepared by the USs	DSTEP
Preparedness and Change	PRPS	I had quite a bit of autonomy – I found my own rhythm and my own niche as a teacher	DSTEP
Preparedness and Change	PRPS	Everyone is nervous with their first class, but I was confident too	DSTEP
Preparedness and Change	PRPS	First job was in a rough class – if I hadn't have gone through the program – for example if I went through an alt cert – I wouldn't have been as prepared	DSTEP
Preparedness and Change	PRPS	I truly believe that you don't really get true experience until your first year of teaching – people say that your first year is your survival year which I never really believed until I experienced it	AGUE

Category	Code	Comment	Subject
Preparedness and Change	PRPS	I felt prepared enough as to how to do things – I had a Texas Teachers teacher on my campus last year and compared to her I was much more prepared – she had not support and no feedback	AGUE
Preparedness and Change	PRPS	I felt good going in to my first year – comfortable with expectations – felt really prepared – however was hired as a general ed teacher and found I wasn't prepared for example – I knew how to do reading resource but didn't real know how to teach it for gen ed	AGUE
Preparedness and Change	PRPS	I did not feel that my US helped to prepare me for my first year – the extent of their support only went so far – it's almost impossible to have a true experience	APER
Preparedness and Change	PRPS	The practice teaching wasn't realistic	APER
Preparedness and Change	PRPS	At the time I felt prepared	APER
Preparedness and Change	PRPS/	Felt very prepared – had a planning period where we worked as a team every day on the campus	TSCOT
Preparedness and Change	PRPS/	Looking back – rather than having been in a cohort I would have changed each semester because I feel I would have learned more, gained different perspective and had a broader understanding	TSCOT
Preparedness and Change	PRPS/	I lacked the ability to read data and being able to differentiate for students on that level	APER
Preparedness and Change	SCHG	Wish would have had placement in a behavior unit – since I knew this is what I wanted to do	KCOLL
Preparedness and Change	SCHG	Would be great to spend a couple hours each week with a different teacher for the whole clinical semester	HMEY
Preparedness and Change	SCHG	Looking back – it would have been better not to be in a STAAR tested classroom	TSCOT
Preparedness and Change	SCHG	I suggest bringing in people who have graduated and have them talk to students about the reality of teaching	FHAW
Preparedness and Change	SCHG	I would suggest more critical questions from the supervisors and mentors – they were superficial in nature	DSTEP
Preparedness and Change	SCHG	The reflection questions could have also been better – more critical	DSTEP
Preparedness and Change	SCHG	I wish I would have had more hours in a classroom with a teacher and kids during FR 1 and FR 2 and to have learned more hands-on rather then sitting in the class watching	AGUE
Preparedness and Change	SCHG	I recommend more rigorous preparation program for data and content	APER
Preparedness and Change	SCHG	I would try to be more involved with the campus and during meetings – especially with data and the planning process	APER
Preparedness and Change	SCHG/	Looking back, would have been nice to have some kind of campus training at the placement site – would have taken a bigger role with duties	HMEY

Category	Code	Comment	Subject
University Level Quality	CSWK	Took 2 classes with US – not sure which ones	KCOLL
University Level Quality	CSWK	Did not take class with either US	HMEY
University Level Quality	CSWK	Took several classes with the US	TSCOT
University Level Quality	CSWK	I had one class at Palo Alto with one of my USs	AGUE
University Level Quality	CSWK	EPP was more pedagogical and not so much content	APER
University Level Quality/	CSWK	Professors of History at TAMUSA were great – I learned how to run a classroom and keep students engaged by keeping lessons discussion based	FHAW
University Level Quality	RLUS	US same for all three semesters	KCOLL
University Level Quality	RLUS	US relationship = phenomenal	KCOLL
University Level Quality	RLUS	US offered to help to assist setting up first classroom	KCOLL
University Level Quality	RLUS	Had two USs – one for FR 1 and one for FR2 and clinical	HMEY
University Level Quality	RLUS	FR 2 US – loved her – willing to drive to location outside of normal districts	HMEY
University Level Quality	RLUS	US same for all three semesters (was a faculty member)	TSCOT
University Level Quality	RLUS	Had two USs – one for FR 1 and one for FR 2 and clinical teaching	FHAW
University Level Quality	RLUS	FR 1 US was very rigid, strict – not good at explaining things and didn't seem to care	FHAW
University Level Quality	RLUS	FR 2 and clinical US was the opposite – very approachable, not afraid to tell you when you were screwing up, but made me feel like she still had my back	FHAW
University Level Quality	RLUS	Had a different US each semester (3 total)	DSTEP
University Level Quality	RLUS	Had a different US for all three semesters	AGUE
University Level Quality	RLUS	The clinical teaching US was helpful – I felt I could reach out to her when needed	AGUE
University Level Quality	RLUS	Had three different USs	APER
University Level Quality	RLUS	FR 1 US was super nice and helpful – not as intense since we primarily just did observation hours	APER
University Level Quality	RLUS/ USEF	FR 2 US was not as supportive – it was more about the paperwork – the feedback was not as helpful or in depth – didn't feel approachable	APER
University Level Quality	RLUS/ USEF	CT US was amazing – was a retired teacher and had a lot of knowledge – was approachable and very helpful and understanding	APER
University Level Quality	SPUS	Felt very supported by FR 2 US – could contact her at anytime	HMEY
University Level Quality	SPUS	Felt supported by all of the university supervisors – I followed protocols and did what was requested	DSTEP
University Level Quality	USEF	US was very knowledgeable	KCOLL
University Level Quality	USEF	FR 1 US was very hands off – not much communication	HMEY
University Level Quality	USEF	FR 2 US – Very detailed in notes – even more so than current principal	HMEY
University Level Quality	USEF	FR 2 US – used academic vocabulary – very good at catching little things	HMEY
University Level Quality	USEF	FR 2 US – very good communication	HMEY

Category	Code	Comment	Subject
University Level Quality	USEF	FR 2 US gave great feedback	HMEY
University Level Quality	USEF	Very good working relationship with US – gave more feedback than mentor teacher did	TSCOT
University Level Quality	USEF	With the FR 2/clinical US there was give and take – communication	FHAW
University Level Quality	USEF	The FR 1 US was very strict and formal – felt like she was just checking off boxes	FHAW
University Level Quality	USEF	The US for FR 1 had a lot of criticisms – was not constructive – I was very nervous (She had been my teacher at Palo Alto)	AGUE
University Level Quality	USEF	The FR 2 US was really good and understanding – would give tips and offer help – easier to look at specifics	AGUE