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1. INTRODUCTION

The Work Study Innovative Teaching Programme (WSITP) was introduced in 1977. This followed the submission of a research proposal to the Assistant Vice Principal (Research Planning and Development) of Churchlands College by a group of interested staff, and the subsequent approval by the College that the programme be offered on a pilot basis for one year.

To quote from the original proposal:

"WSITP will use a continuous practice-teaching experience as a means of helping students to become teachers rather than just lecturing about teaching. The WSITP will be designed to assist students in their exploration and discovery of personal meanings about subject matter, people, purposes and learning about methods and about themselves.

The WSITP will use a developmental approach to practice-teaching supervision in which there is, in effect, a three person team working in the classroom; the regular teacher, the student-teacher and the college supervisor. The regular teacher and the college supervisor will be present in the planning of a unit of work and will watch implementation from introduction to conclusion and evaluation. Through this process the student-teacher will be receiving continuous assistance to build on strengths, improve weaknesses and try alternative teaching strategies. The team approach will encourage a mutual search, on a footing of equality, for more effective curricula, teaching strategies, means of evaluation and so on. Thus, the student-teacher does not have to fit into the existing classroom pattern established by the classroom teacher, rather teachers and student-teachers together are able to examine what is being done in classrooms and how it might be done differently or more effectively. Student-teachers can experiment with a variety of teaching strategies since they have a firm base of co-operation and support from the team approach. At the same time, however, the nature of the WSITP distinguishes this team work between teacher and student-teacher on a year round basis from internship and apprenticeship schemes."

About 36 students in the final year of their primary teaching course volunteered for the programme. Some withdrew after discussions with staff concerning the requirements of the programme, and 25 students were selected from those remaining on the basis of their past academic performance and their previous teaching assessments.
Each student in the programme was attached to a particular class in one of three participating schools, and taught in that class under the supervision of the teacher for four half days per week: afternoons in first semester and mornings in second. (The traditional programme involved students in ten weeks of block practice teaching during second semester.)

In addition to teaching in the school, each student undertook the normal load of formal College courses. Students started work in the schools several days before the beginning of the school year, but did not teach during the College's intra-semester break.

Three of the staff in the programme were involved in curriculum and two in education.

One member of the team was attached to each school as co-ordinator between the school and the College, and the group of students had regular meetings with the five staff involved in the programme.
2. AIMS AND PROCEDURES OF THE EVALUATION

The purposes of the evaluation were:

• to investigate the effect that the programme had on the students enrolled in it, on the teachers in the schools where the students taught, and on the College generally;

• to identify the aspects of the programme that students and staff was as being helpful to students' training;

• to identify aspects of the programme, or the way it relates to the College generally, in which some change might be beneficial; and

• to provide information to help the College decide whether to continue with the programme.

The procedure undertaken to achieve this is outlined below.

The evaluator first attended a number of meetings of the WSITP team, and two meetings between the WSITP team and students, and became conversant with papers written in connection with the programme. This enabled him to orient himself to the background, process and minutiae of the programme.

In discussions between the WSITP team and the evaluator, it was agreed that it would not be valid to try to evaluate the programme by comparing the performance of WSITP and non-WSITP students on any dimension. The reason for this is that as the students volunteered for the programme it is unlikely that they were representative of all students in the course. The evaluation would therefore proceed by concentrating on the process of the innovation, highlighting those aspects which all people involved (staff, students, school teachers etc.) saw as beneficial or capable of improvement.*

*In carrying out an evaluation it is often useful to look for unintended as well as intended effects. However in this case the resources available were modest, and it was not possible to search systematically for unintended effects.
In discussions between the evaluator and the WSITP team, and between the evaluator and the Assistant Vice Principal (Research Planning and Development) a number of areas were identified which were to form the basis of the evaluation:

Why students volunteered for WSITP.

How well the aims of staff and students agreed.

In what ways the concurrence of work and study benefitted students' classroom practice and understanding of educational concepts.

What use students made of resource materials.

How much time students spent on the 'classroom practice' part of the course, and whether this affected their performance in other parts of their course.

How much time staff spent on WSITP in addition to their normal load.

In what ways the programme benefitted the interaction between students and staff.

Whether students were disadvantaged by the College's 'scaling' system.

The reactions of students and school teachers to the way WSITP students' teaching was assessed.

Whether students feel they have been left out of College life because of participation in WSITP.

How student's feelings have changed throughout the year.

What effects WSITP has had on the participating schools.

What effects WSITP has had on students.

In what ways students, teachers and staff feel the programme could be improved.
Staff involved in WSITP explained the purpose of the evaluation to students, school principals, and school teachers.

Because of the nature of many of the questions, extensive structured interviews were conducted with about two-thirds of the students in small groups of two, three or four students. (The schedule of questions is shown in Appendix 1.)

One question that the evaluator considered quite crucial related to ways in which the programme might be improved. Although students had mentioned a number of points during the interviews it was felt that more information was needed to clarify which changes were seen by students to be most important. To this end three nominal group discussions were held, each with about a third of the class present (5 to 8 students per group). The technique is explained and its use described in Appendix 2.

The evaluator also held meetings with small groups of 4 to 6 school teachers in each school, and he had a separate discussion with the principal of each school. (The school teachers' interview schedule is attached as Appendix 3.)

The evaluator also interviewed a number of staff of Churchlands College who were not involved in the programme but were involved in teaching some of the formal courses undertaken by the WSITP students.

Finally, a questionnaire was administered to the students in the last week of teaching (Appendices 4 and 5). This questionnaire was restricted to eliciting information which had not been gleaned in other ways: for example, it was used to follow up some ideas which had been generated in the interviews or nominal-group discussions, or to obtain information which is best suited to a response on paper. Response to the questionnaire was 100% of the class.
It was hoped that it would be possible to include in this report some comparison of the group of WSITP students with those who did not volunteer, to see in what ways the volunteers were representative of the whole final-year class. Information is available which would have allowed a comparison in terms of previous academic attainment, attitudes of teaching and personal characteristics. There has not been an opportunity yet for staff at Churchlands to process this information, and the evaluator did not consider it vital for this study.

A final part of this evaluation should, ideally, involve obtaining information on these students' performance in schools next year. It is hoped that arrangements can be made to enable this to be done.
3. THE PROGRAMME

3.1 Aims of WSITP

The aims of the programme were identified in the original proposal as:

"(i) The development of a teacher education model:

(a) Which provides a context where student-teacher, teachers and lecturers can participate on equal terms to improve classroom instruction, school and college curricula, human interaction and personal development.

(b) Where the affective development of the student-teacher is given at least equal status with the cognitive development.

(c) Which provides a context where theory presented in the college lecture and the practice in the schools interact.

(ii) To provide opportunities for student-teachers to develop an understanding of the community served by the school and to become aware of its value in their classroom practice."

Students saw the aims of the programme to be to prepare them for the teaching profession more effectively than is done by the present system: to help them develop the necessary skills and personal teaching style in which they would feel confident; to experience the long-term effects of pursuing their teaching style; and to improve self-confidence in teaching.

Over 90% of the students felt that each of these aims had been achieved either 'very well' or 'well' with the last aim above being singled out as having been achieved particularly well.

A subsidiary aim identified by students was similar to aim (i) (c) identified by the WSITP staff: the existence of
structures both within the programme and throughout the College which would enable the above aims to be fulfilled. In particular, the tying in of teaching practice to College study ("putting theory into practice"), thereby making College work more meaningful. Students felt that this aim was the least well achieved: in contrast to their responses concerning the other perceived aims of the programme, slightly less than 20% of the class felt that this aim had been achieved 'very well' and slightly less than 40% felt it had been achieved 'well'. This point is pursued further in sections 3.6 and 4.

3.2 Financial and Administrative support

The College Administration gave as much financial support as was requested to enable the programme to take place, including funds for a television porta-pack, typing and clerical assistance, and an honorarium and expenses connected with the external evaluation. Three hours' teaching release per week for one semester was also given to each of the five staff members in the programme.

The College also made many modifications to the third year programme - indeed, staff involved in WSITP commented on the co-operation they had received from the College; they clearly felt that the Administration and other staff had made as many modifications as possible to the established structure, bearing in mind that it had been decided that the programme had to operate within the College's normal third-year programme.

Changes which were made included:

1. the reorganisation of the twelve groups of students in third year to enable the WSITP students to comprise one group;

2. the alteration in the timetabling of core and elective units; and
the rescheduling of some first semester courses to
enable WSITP students to take them in second semester
when their load was lighter.

It was agreed that teachers supervising WSITP students would
not supervise practice teaching of first and second year students
(for which they get paid); the Department of Practice Teaching
assisted by providing honoraria for these teachers.

3.3. Students' reasons for volunteering for WSITP,
and changing attitudes

Students saw WSITP as an alternative to what they described as
the fairly hurried and compressed practice provided by the
Assistant Teacher Programme (ATP). The reasons they gave for
enrolling in the programme reflected their feeling that
a year-long involvement in practice teaching would be a better
preparation for teaching. Advantages which they anticipated
that the programme would have were the mixing of theory and
practice, the opportunity to discuss problems with staff
when they arose during the year, a more constructive and less
pressured experience than ATP and a more equitable assessment
of teaching. Some students were also influenced by a developing
boredom with isolated study and a desire to start putting two
years' training into practice. There was a feeling that venturing
into a school for the whole year was exciting, whereas ATP
was described by some students as terrifying.

Several students also mentioned that their decision to volunteer
arose partly from the respect they had for the staff involved
in the programme.

However, it is important to note that many participants in
the programme - students, teachers, WSITP staff and non-
WSITP staff - felt that the programme would not be appropriate
for all students. There was general agreement among staff,
students and teachers that if the programme were to continue screening of volunteers should continue to be carried out.

Once students started the programme their feelings, not unnaturally, underwent some changes. The most common experience was for students first to feel overwhelmed by the workload but for those who remained in the programme to be glad that they had, when interviewed towards the end of the year. Of the 25 students initially enrolled, two reverted to the traditional programme early in the year and one deferred studies for a year. The remaining 22 were asked at the end of the course whether they would recommend it as it has operated this year to someone similar to themselves; 95% indicated that they would.

3.4 Students in the classroom

Teachers who had supervised WSITP students felt that having them present in the school had a number of advantages for the school and the children in it. Their presence as additional 'teachers' allowed smaller groups to be formed within a class where this was appropriate, helped teachers in some areas in which the student was better suited to teach than the teacher (e.g. music), brought some innovative approaches into the classroom, and allowed teachers more time to devote to lesson planning.

This would seem to suggest that teachers saw the students as performing a similar role to a teacher (albeit an inexperienced one), and this was borne out by the teachers' comments. A small number of students felt that they had been treated as teachers' aides more often than as teachers, but 80% of the students felt that they had been given as much responsibility by the classroom teacher as they feel they should have been given.

There was an overwhelming feeling from both students and teachers that WSITP students had become very involved in the classroom and to some extent in the school - much more so than occurs with students in ATP.
A large majority of teachers felt that the programme was less disruptive to their teaching than ATP, and that the teacher-student relationship that developed was much more conducive to learning. However, both teachers and students did outline ways in which the differences in the day-to-day operation of schools and College caused problems. Although these differences are not normally noticed, they became important for this group of students who were working simultaneously in both. The lack of coincidence of teaching periods (terms versus semesters) caused problems of continuity in students' practice teaching. The distance between Churchlands and the participating schools (7 to 10 km) imposed additional demands on students. Teachers also mentioned that there were some fairly small idiosyncracies of students' timetables that tended to disrupt students' classroom activities - for example the need of some students to leave schools half an hour before the school lunch hour started and the occasional need to dash off to attend a lecture. Constraints on students imposed by the College timetable also made it difficult for teachers to discuss students' teaching with them as often as they wished.

Another consequence of the programme was that staff in WSITP spent more time in the participating schools that they would have under the traditional programme: staff spent two to three school half-days each week in the schools.

One drawback seen by a number of students was that students in the programme were exposed to only a single class rather than two different classes as in ATP. Although this was seen as unfortunate in some ways, it was acknowledged by students and teachers that exposure to different classes was largely incompatible with the philosophy of WSITP and therefore not possible. In general neither staff, students or teachers felt that this was a serious drawback.

However, teachers were unanimous in their opinion that the one week block of continuous teaching that WSITP students had was not enough.
A further suggestion made by a number of students was that it might have been better to have students teach in the mornings during first semester and in the afternoons during second semester (a reversal of the arrangement). In this way the lessons which require more preparation would have been taken in the second semester, in which students were less pressed for time.

As a way of obtaining an overall picture of teachers' impressions of the way the programme had affected them, teachers were asked if they would be prepared to be involved again. Over 90% of those involved indicated that they would, assuming that some of the major changes suggested in section 4 were implemented. Of these 90%, a few teachers expressed the view that although they would wish to be involved again, they felt that because of their personal teaching style they would benefit from being alone in the classroom (i.e. not involved in WSITP) on, say, alternate years.

All three school principals were enthusiastic about the way in which the programme prepared students for teaching, and all would be happy for their schools to participate again. At the time of preparation of this report the Principal of Churchlands College had recently received from one principal a letter that can only be described as a eulogy on the programme.

3.5 Interaction between students and staff

In discussions with students the main recurring theme was that it was possible to acquire and develop teaching skills in a real classroom situation while being able to draw upon expert advice from staff of Churchlands. This was backed up by students' responses to the questionnaire: 86% of the class felt the statement 'Lecturers involved in WSITP were helpful in discussing what happened at school' was 'very true' and the rest of the class felt it was 'true'.
Some advantages often mentioned were:

- getting to know children, and develop an enthusiasm for teaching them;

- the ability to see how a teacher's relationship with a class develops over a year: "If you have a problem you have to sort it out, whereas with ATP you only spend a few weeks in a class."

- the experience gained in the corollaries of teaching: e.g. preparing reports on students and awarding grades;

- acquiring general experience in teaching, and thereby gaining confidence and dispelling nervousness;

Staff (both those directly involved in the programme and those who were not) noticed that as students settled into teaching, and developed the concerns that practising teachers have, they came to consult all staff more and more often.

3.6 Integration of work and study

Students mentioned a number of advantages which they felt accrued because of the concurrence of 'work' and 'study'. These included:

- the chance to try out ideas suggested in College courses;

- the fact that 'aids' made in College courses can be addressed towards an obvious and useful end; and

- the ability to translate from courses to classroom: "You're told something in an Ed. Psych. class and you think 'a child wouldn't behave like this' and then you get into a school and discover they do!" In short, students saw College become "one big resource centre" as they gained experience in their first year of teaching.
However, students were unanimous in their feeling that in some areas their College studies were not well integrated with their school experience. They also felt that allowance for the demands placed on them by the programme was not made by some of the staff members not involved in the programme.

This may be partly due to the innovative nature of the programme, and the fact that it is a pilot project and not yet established within the College. It seems that many of the staff not involved in the programme are not as aware of it to the extent that students feel they need to be if they are to teach students who are participating in it.

This was identified as one of two main problems that students saw in the programme as it operated within Churchlands College this year.

In contrast, a number of staff outside the programme who were interviewed felt that the students' classroom practice had had a beneficial effect in some areas (e.g. Language Arts); staff commented on students' increased motivation and sense of purpose and their increased understanding.

A development that occurred through the year, as students gained experience in teaching, was that they came to look at courses as practising teachers would: both staff and students remarked on this point. In interviews, students were not backward in referring to courses which they felt were either relevant or irrelevant to the needs of teachers in training, although this question was not specifically asked of them.

3.7 Workload

The pattern of formal classes and practice teaching undertaken by the two groups of students is shown on the next page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College week</th>
<th>Traditional programme</th>
<th>WSITP programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inservice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Vacation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prac review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In brief, students in the traditional programme spent 10 weeks in full-time practice teaching - a total of 50 days. WSITP students spent 30 weeks practice teaching for 4 half-days per week, and one week teaching full-time - a total of 65 days. So the absolute difference in the amount of time that the different groups spent teaching was 15 days - a significant but not large difference - and this additional work that the WSITP students did was spread over an extra two weeks.

In discussions on their workload, students were unanimous in their feeling that incredible demands had been placed on them, particularly early in the year. This was remarked upon by all students and by a number of teachers, and it had been recognised by the staff very early in the year. It was not unusual for students to spend up to three hours per night (or alternatively all of each weekend) preparing for their school activities, in addition to their normal workload arising from College courses.

Although it was generally felt that the workload was much greater in first term than in the rest of the year (probably due to the greater amount of preparation needed for subjects which are taught in schools in the afternoon) students felt that their total workload throughout the first two terms was consistently very heavy.

However, from an analysis of the relative workloads of WSITP and non-WSITP students, it would appear that the major problem in this regard is the distribution of the work required of students throughout the year rather than the absolute amount of work required. During first term, students were undertaking formal College courses, coming to terms for the first time with teaching in a classroom for an extended period, and designing lessons for the afternoon classes in schools (which require more preparation that the 'skills' sessions normally taught in the mornings).
It is worth noting that staff did not feel that students' workloads affected their performance in formal courses adversely. In some cases quite long extensions were granted to the WSITP group to enable them to complete assignments; in other cases students handed work in on time but obviously worked extremely long hours to do so.

3.8 Use of Resource Materials

One might have thought that as students undertook their first year of teaching, they would make ample use of the extensive library and audio-visual resources at Churchlands College. Although there was good evidence in the interviews conducted with students of their awareness of the contribution that these resources can make to teaching, their use of the College's facilities was mixed. Many of them made much more use of these resources than during previous teaching practice periods, but some felt that they would be better off making their own aids because of the likelihood of them having to do so next year, and others felt that they could not spare the time to browse.

In response to the questionnaire, 55% of the students felt that the statement 'Access to the library and borrowing arrangements were as good as they could have been' was 'very true' and a further 27% felt it to be 'true'.

The corresponding question referring to the audio-visual centre drew responses of 38% 'very true' and 38% 'true'. Even so, a number of students realised that they had had better access to the audio-visual centre than students would have on ATP. This, of course, is not a direct consequence of the programme but of the fact that it has been run with only a small number of students at a time when other students were not on ATP.
3.9 Participation in College Life

One might have anticipated that participation in an innovative programme such as this, requiring much absence from College and prescribing students' time at College more tightly because of the additional workload, would tend to isolate this group of students from others in the same year.

There was certainly evidence of this. In response to the question 'Does participation in WSITP make you feel left out of College life? Does it matter?' a few students commented that they didn't know what was going on at College, and students generally spent what free time they had talking within the group about their new-found interests in the classroom. However, virtually no students reported that they were missing anything, and a number indicated that they would not have wished to participate more actively in College activities even if they had been freer to do so.

3.10 Assessment

Two main concerns arose on assessment: the way in which teaching is assessed, and the possible effect of the practice of 'scaling' students' marks on the WSITP group.

Firstly, staff of the Practice Teaching Department were concerned about the assessment of WSITP students' teaching. They certainly had no doubt that the WSITP students were at a different point in their teaching experience than the students on ATP. One of the staff assessing them felt that the students had proved to themselves that they could teach, were quite self-assured in the classroom, did not make as many written notes in preparation for a lesson as students on ATP (which was considered quite reasonable) and in general did not prepare as much for their assessment. It was felt that this made it difficult for staff to compare their teaching with students on ATP.
According to grades received, the WSITP students did achieve better teaching marks than the rest of the class: 82% received A or B grades, compared with 66% of the students on ATP. However, considerable caution must be exercised in any comparison, because of the way in which the group was selected.

Secondly, students were concerned that the College's practice of 'scaling' marks (so that a fixed proportion of any group receive As, Bs and Cs) might disadvantage them. This could have happened if the WSITP group were above average in any area and if lecturers teaching them had to ensure that the statutory proportions of each grade were awarded. From talking to staff it appeared that an attempt was made to remove any iniquities caused by this system, but because of the structure of the College it had to be done as a special case.
4. SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

Bearing in mind the judgements that students, teachers and staff have made on the programme, it is worthwhile to consider modifications that might occur if the programme were to continue.

Virtually all the suggestions for ways in which the programme could be made more effective related to its integration into the College structure. The points listed below are specific examples of this general principle.

- As far as the students were concerned, a change in the demands placed on them in the first part of the year was the one change above all that they feel is necessary in a revised programme. Students were asked whether they could see any solution to this problem. There was a widely-held feeling that to compress a proportion of the work normally done in third year into second year would be no great imposition, as it could be done by eliminating duplication which students felt was present in some areas.

If the number of formal classes which students need to take in third year was reduced then the time required of staff in supervising students' teaching in the schools would not need to be taken as an additional load: time needed to do this would be made available by a diminished number of formal classes.

The question of whether any condensation of course material was possible was then raised with College staff. In general, staff did not feel that any condensation of subject matter could take place; however, some staff thought that there might be some duplication in some areas, although not their own.
Some reorganisation of students' timetables might be carried out, to help them to be better assimilated into the schools; for example:

College timetable might be arranged so that disruption to students' school commitments are minimised.

Some attempt might be made to minimise the amount of travel that students must often do between their home, College and their School.

A longer period of continuous teaching might be introduced.

An attempt should be made to alleviate the problems caused by the fact that schools operate on terms and the College on semesters.

One method of fixing the first two points above was suggested by many students and teachers: the students could spend full days rather than half days at both school and College.

Appropriate electives and relevant parts of core studies might be able to be done as prac. work in schools.

It was pointed out by WSITP staff that one way of achieving all these points above would be to mount the WSITP programme as a completely separate programme within third year.

Other suggestions were:

Staff of the College who are not involved in the programme could be made more aware of its aims and methods, and their co-operation enlisted. This should result in more integration of College courses and the school experience, which was considered to be very important by both students and staff.
• Teachers could be briefed at some length on the aims of the programme and the expectations that the College has of them. For example, there could be an opportunity for staff to discuss with teachers what is expected of them in a supervisory capacity, how much of the students' time it is reasonable to commit, and the place that the College sees students having in the schools. At an organisational level, teachers felt that it would be useful for each of them to know what the College timetable required of the students.

• Consideration could be given to the question of who should meet the cost of materials for aids that students make for their classroom activities. This year many students spent several dollars per week in this way, and there was a feeling that the cost should be met by the schools or the College.

The feeling conveyed by a number of staff interviewed was one of a growing appreciation of what the programme entailed as it progressed. As the year went on, staff outside the programme obviously became increasingly aware that it would be necessary to make some adjustments to accommodate to the needs of the WSITP students. The extent to which this actually occurred was obviously very varied and depended totally on factors outside the control of the programme.

All staff interviewed agreed that a comprehensive briefing of Churchlands staff should precede any future offering of the programme. However, there was a good deal of evidence that the first run of WSITP had already 'educated' a number of staff into its aims and methods, so that more allowance would be made next time around.
5. **CONCLUSION**

Finally, it is useful to summarise the feelings of the different groups of people involved in WSITP.

Staff of Churchlands involved in the programme remain convinced of the value of the programme. This carries all the more conviction when one considers that a first run through or a pilot programme is always subject to difficulties which will not need to be faced in subsequent years, and when one also considers the large amount of additional work necessary to get the programme started. Staff interviewed who were not involved in the programme also see its advantages outweighing its disadvantages.

Students remain enthusiastic and committed to the programme, despite the large amount of work required of them, and those of them who can look forward to teaching next year feel very well prepared for it. When asked whether they would recommend the programme as it has operated this year to someone similar to themselves, 21 of the 22 students indicated that they would.

Schoolteachers and Principals felt, almost without exception, that the WSITP students will be far better equipped than others to embark on teaching. Principals of all participating schools indicated that they would be happy for their schools to participate in the programme again, and over 90% of the teachers involved indicated that they would be pleased to be involved again assuming that some of the major changes suggested were implemented.

In conclusion, making a decision whether or not an innovation should continue involves the decision-makers balancing the gains of the programme against any losses in other areas. However, there is quite clearly an overwhelming feeling from staff, students and teachers that, assuming that it is possible to overcome some of the drawbacks arising from the integration of the programme into the College system, the implementation of the innovation should be completed.
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1. Why did you volunteer for WSITP?

2. What do you think the aims of WSITP are?

3. What do you see as the main differences between WSITP and the conventional programme? 
   ..... the 'good' things 
   ..... the 'bad' things

4. How much time did you spend on the "classroom practice" part of the course?

5. How integrated were the "classroom practice" and "study" parts of the course?

6. What use did you make of resource materials?

7. Do you think the scaling system disadvantages you?

8. Any doubts about the prac. teaching assessment?

9. Does participation in WSITP make you feel "left out" of College life? Does it matter?

10. How have your feelings about WSITP changed throughout the year?

11. What changes would have made WSITP "better" for you?
A2. NOMINAL GROUP TECHNIQUE

The nominal group technique derives its name from the fact that although group discussion takes place at some stages of the meeting, the group of students is only "nominally" a group when members generate suggestions and indicate their relative importance.

The technique thus combines the illuminative value of the contribution of ideas from members of a group in a non-threatening atmosphere, followed by group discussion, with the benefit of members being able to indicate their considered preferences privately.

Method:-

1. Ask students to write down on a sheet of paper as many answers as they can think of to the question:

"What changes should be made to WSITP if it were to be implemented on a normal basis?"

Emphasise that these sheets will not be collected or seen by anyone else - they are merely for the student's own reference.

2. Go around the group, asking people to read out their contributions, and write them on the board. It is usually best to go around quite quickly, postponing comment until all suggestions are written up - this removes any diffidence people may have about offering suggestions.

3. Have a little discussion on the subjects now listed on the board, and if necessary arrange them into logical combinations.

4. Code the subjects (say, A, B, C, etc.) and ask each student to write each letter on a piece of paper, and beside each letter a number, as follows, to indicate how important he/she feels this item is:-

3 very important
2 important
1 not very important
0 not important at all

5. The pieces of paper on which students have written their rankings are then collected and the factors which a large proportion of the group feel to be important are isolated.
A3. SCHEDULE OF QUESTIONS ASKED OF SCHOOLTEACHERS

1. What effects has WSITP had in the school?
   is it disruptive?
   what has been the effect of having students in the school?
   what has the involvement of Churchlands faculty been in the school?

2. How does the students' teaching experience in WSITP compare with that in assistant teaching practice?
   are they getting the appropriate experience?
   are they getting sufficiently broad experience?

3. Some students have suggested that some teachers did not seem to have been as clear as they might have been on the aims of WSITP. Did you feel sufficiently well briefed?

4. Did the students ever want to try any new ideas that you didn't agree with?

5. Do you think it is more appropriate to consider WSITP students as 'teachers' or as 'teachers aides'?

6. What changes do you think would have made the programme more effective?

7. Would you be prepared to be involved again?
6. Would you recommend the programme as it has operated this year to someone similar to yourself?

WSITP EVALUATION

QUESTIONNAIRE

Firstly, I would like to express my thanks for the help you have given me over the last few months in evaluating the WSITP programme.

Now, as the final step in the evaluation, I would be grateful if you could take a little time to fill in this questionnaire.

The questionnaire is not intended to give a comprehensive summary of WSITP - it will just be used to supplement the information that has already emerged in discussions.

In addition to indicating the appropriate number where appropriate, please comment as freely as you wish - either on the questionnaire or on a separate piece of paper which you can then enclose with the questionnaire.

Your answers will be confidential, and no attempt will be made to identify individuals.

Thank you for your help.

Rod McDonald
1. Some of the advantages of WSITP that have been suggested are listed below. How important is each of them to you as someone trained to be a teacher?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Not very important</th>
<th>Not important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the chance to try out ideas suggested in College courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>getting to know children, and develop an enthusiasm for teaching them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the chance to see how a teacher's relationship with a class develops over a year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience gained in preparing reports, awarding grades, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being able to use 'aids' made in College courses, in the classroom.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Some students mentioned that it was easy to see that some courses were very relevant to teaching. Which courses (if any) would you put in this category?

Some students also commented that some courses had no obvious relevance to teaching. Which courses (if any) would you put in this category?

3. Please circle the appropriate number on each line to indicate how true each of the statements was as far as you are concerned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Very true</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>Not very true</th>
<th>Not true at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers involved in WSITP were helpful in discussing what happened at school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to the Library and borrowing arrangements were as good as they could have been</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to the audio-visual centre and borrowing arrangements were as good as they could have been</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was given as much responsibility by the classroom teacher as I feel I should have been given</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload was much greater in first term than in the rest of the year.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Below are listed some of the aims of WSITP. How well do you think each aim has been achieved for you in all College and School experiences this year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Not very well</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to help you develop the skills needed for teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to help you develop a personal teaching style in which you feel confident</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to experience the long-term effects of pursuing one's own teaching style</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to improve self-confidence in teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to tie College work in with teaching practice.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some of the advantages of WSITP that have been suggested are listed below. How important is each of them to you as someone training to be a teacher?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Not very</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- the chance to try out ideas suggested in College courses
- getting to know children, and develop an enthusiasm for teaching them
- the chance to see how a teacher's relationship with a class develops over a year
- experience gained in preparing reports, awarding grades, etc.
- being able to use 'aids' made in College courses, in the classroom.

Some students mentioned that it was easy to see that some courses were very relevant to teaching. Which courses (if any) would you put in this category?

Some students also commented that some courses had no obvious relevance to teaching. Which courses (if any) would you put in this category?

3. Please circle the appropriate number on each line to indicate how true each of the statements was as far as you are concerned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very true</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>Not very true</th>
<th>Not true at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lecturers involved in WSITP were helpful in discussing what happened at school
Access to the Library and borrowing arrangements were as good as they could have been
Access to the audio-visual centre and borrowing arrangements were as good as they could have been
I was given as much responsibility by the classroom teacher as I feel I should have been given
Workload was much greater in first term than in the rest of the year.

4. Below are listed some of the aims of WSITP. How well do you think each aim has been achieved for you in all College and School experiences this year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Not very well</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- to help you develop the skills needed for teaching
- to help you develop a personal teaching style in which you feel confident
- to experience the long-term effects of pursuing one's own teaching style
- to improve self-confidence in teaching
- to tie College work in with teaching practice.