A Review of Selected TEIs STP Model: Inputs to Relevant PNU-STP

Helen F. de los Santos & Lydia P. Hilbero

One of the many problems assailing Philippine Education, according to the Congressional Commission on education (EDCOM), is the progressive deterioration of basic education (EDCOM Report, 1993). It also notes that our elementary and secondary schools have failed to teach the expected competencies to the students, as much as it reveals that the teachers are the main culprits, one reason being that many teachers themselves do not posses at least the minimum teaching competence.

In 1997 the Filipino grade and high school students ranked 37th and 38th respectively in a test administered to 39 nations for the Third International Mathematics and Science Study. This is certainly one other instance that reflects the deplorable performance of most Filipino students. The 1993 EDCOM Reports again attributed such inadequacy to poor teacher preparation and training, as well as to the low quality of students enrolled in teacher training institution.

The same observation echoes in one Professional Regulation Commission report in 2006, where it revealed that in the last four years, the national rate of passing in the Licensure Examinations for Teachers has not indicated any improvement. To exemplify, it noted that in 2005, only 26% registered a passing rate, as compared with the 27%, 26%, and 35% of the 2004, 2003, and 2002 respective rates. This may be one reason why the then Department of Education Secretary Florencio Abad had said in an interview account in 2005 that,

apparently, basic education could not as yet deliver quality education because of the failure of most teacher training institutions to provide the department with quality graduates.

The Presidential Commission for Educational Reform (PCER) must have been a bit prophetic when it found in a 2000 survey that some aspects of the educational system were either stagnating or deteriorating. It offered as evidence the perpetual shortfalls in classrooms, textbooks, and teachers; unsatisfactory achievement scores in Math, Science, and Language; increasing disparity among regions and between urban and rural areas; decline of private sector participation, and the recurring issue regarding language instruction. All these contributing factors, it further averred, took a heavy toll on overall teacher development, which, it claimed, as it cited the 1998 World Educational Report, has "in fact declined over the last 30 years and continues to decline in every region and most countries."

To address these problems, PCER has recommended the implementation of Project Teacher Empowerment to Achieve Competence and Humaneness (TEACH), which aimed at strengthening the competencies of both in-service and pre-service teachers. In the same view, the Commission on Higher Education (CHED), in collaboration with the Teacher Education Council, developed the master plan for Teacher Education (CHED Report, 1997). This plan envisions to design programs for teacher education that will enhance the positive image of the teacher through a deliberate effort of improving the curriculum and the teachers' workplace. It also hopes to bring about a culture of excellence and world-class competitiveness, which will once more bring teachers at the helm of all professions.

In this light, one of its earlier tasks was to require teacher education institutions (TEIs) to review, and if need be, redesign their curricula and syllabi. It also set up centers of excellence for the different areas that TEIs must be concerned

with, such as, for example on research, science and math instruction, and teacher education.

These various progressive initiatives done by the CHED to improve and uplift the teaching profession via the TEIs were largely made the basis for the crafting and eventual implementing of the CHED Memorandum Order No. 30 (CMO 30), series of 2004. This document on the "Revised Policies and Standards for Undergraduate Teacher Education Curriculum", seeks among other things, to define certain limits regarding the TEIs' education and other allied programs, competency standards, curriculum, and course specifications. Together with the Joint CHED-DepEd Memorandum, which was issued subsequently, certain guidelines for the implementation of the new teacher education curriculum were formulated for TEIs' compliance.

Such moves created additional, albeit necessary demands on many TEIs. The Philippine Normal University (PNU), for one, which is considered as the country's premier teacher training institution, has been tasked to play a crucial role in addressing major educational issues and concerns. Being a Center of Excellence in teacher education on a national level, it has been its mandate to pioneer in delivering efficient and effective, yet innovative, relevant, functional, and quality program in teacher education. It thus becomes incumbent upon PNU not only to consider possible alternative sources for educating the teachers, but also to conceptualize and experiment on a variety of programs.

While carrying out more vigorously its mandated objectives, functions, and responsibilities, the University embarked on a five-year modernization program which is predicated upon such a mission. Through this effort the Department of Student Teaching (DST) saw a rebirth of sort when the Board of Regents (BOR) approved its creation on January 12, 2003. Where it used to be for many years only a

unit under the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, it is now an independent department.

At its inchoate stage, the DST, saddled with such challenges as are brought about by university-wide changes and development, already finds it difficult to provide quality experience to its clientele, the student teachers (STs). For one, there is now a mismatch between the growing number of STs and the present condition and circumstances prevailing in the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) where they hold their campus teaching practicum. There is, for example, only one class in certain grade/year level at the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) that can accommodate only a few STs at a time. With the total number of STs per term ranging between 600 to 700, accommodation problems definitely boggle the mind. Given also the substandard classrooms in terms of size and facilities, most STs have to stay outside while the class is going on. This situation somehow deprives them of the learning they otherwise would have gained from observing the supervising instructors (SIs) or their peers teach the class have they been inside the classroom all throughout the session.

For another reason, especially in the high school level, there are majorship areas that lack corresponding SIs. Records show that in recent years, CTL high school teachers' specialization is only in such areas as English, Mathematics, Filipino, and Biology. The STs whose major fields of concentration are in General Science, Chemistry, Physics, and Values Education are, therefore, not given proper placement.

Considering that STs stay only for a quarter of a term in either the campus or off-campus internship program (which runs for only about 12 weeks of exposure for observation and actual instruction), the special Wednesday policy at the CTL, following the university practice, may seem to be a bit ruinous on quality, even adequacy, of learning that the STs should otherwise be gaining.

Moreover, although the co-and extra-curricular activities are important part of the student teaching experiences, the instructional skills that can be developed from actual classroom work may again be put to task, if too many such activities are held within the 6-week period of internship (e.g. boy/girl scout investitures, Sportfest and field demonstrations, which could eat a lot of time from STs for student rehearsals).

All these confirm the findings of the 1999 CHED-PNU Collaborative Research on Laboratory Schools (CORELS) to the effect that greater participation and actual classroom teaching are more apparent in off-campus than on-campus teaching experience; and that a significant number of TEIs have neither been giving adequate exposure nor have accomplished many activities that develop the pre-service teacher competencies to a greater extent.

There is, however, one other thing to consider should a revision of the STP become a necessary option. This concerns the Joint CHED and DepEd Memorandum Order, which has been issued under DepEd order no. 39, s. 2005. With its premise that says that student teaching being one of the most important and crucial phases in Teacher Education and that all TEIs and public and private schools involved "shall ensure that students teachers are well prepared for their eventual assumption as teachers," it further requires that TEIs and DepEd schools concerned "shall forge a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the TEIs which should stipulate the administrative and financial arrangements effective SY 2005-2006." It has, thus, set some collaborative guidelines regarding deployment of Preservice teachers for their Field Study and Practice Teaching courses and the specific roles and functions that CHED, DepEd, and TEIs are expected to perform. With this new concern emerging, most TEIs, especially SUCs whose budget has been slashed down, face another challenge insofar as implementing their STPs are concerned.

Because of these challenges and concerns, the DST deems it necessary to rethink the structures as well as the overall system involved in the STP that it presently implements, especially since some of the practices it has observed through the years virtually bear little relevance to the existing demands, concerns, and recent developments in student teaching. New modalities, therefore, need to be resorted to in order to fully address these concerns and challenges.

As the UNESCO International Commission on Education for the 21st Century Report has so aptly stated, "… the profound changes required on teacher education (and for that matter, on student teaching), call not for more of the same – more time, more subject, more courses – but rather for a transformation of the conventional teacher education model." These words may well be taken as a solid anchor in DST's search for new program models of student teaching, which is the primary reason for this study. It thus ventures on revisiting its current STP vis-à-vis those of the other TEIs, as it tries to provide an empirical basis for proposing a new STP model that takes into account the needs of the new breed of student teachers.

This study, therefore, purposely reviews the student teacher programs of several TEIs to find out how they relate with the demands of the PNU prospective teachers in particular, and its student teaching program in general. With the review results as basis, a new and relevant STP may have to be proposed.

The study specifically aimed at 1) identifying the nature of the STPs utilized by selected TEIs; 2) identifying the components and/or mechanisms that TEIs have established and implemented to ensure the effectiveness of the programs, and, 3) determining the procedures, policies, and incentive system that have been set up and used to guarantee that

stakeholders (cooperating school personnel) stay in the program.

Values of Student Teaching

The student teaching phase of all Teacher Education programs may be considered as both a beginning and an end. It begins a training experience that provides the student a "supervised laboratory" in which to learn. Through this scheme, the student gains new skills and polishes the professional skills that they must have already acquired. It becomes an end in the sense that it is usually the final phase of a course in education – it completes a period during which exposure to theory and practical application takes place. It requires the synthesizing of all previous course works, training, and background experiences. As Hollingsworth (1998) aptly puts it, student teaching is one culminating phase of professional preparation for teaching where students are provided opportunities to "try their wings and to sharpen and expand already acquired competencies."

Most literature on student teaching points to the relevance or significance of the training that would-be teachers gain from student teaching experience. It is, in fact, one important element in the life of education students, if not the best means to apply all learnings acquired into the real world of classroom or the best gauge so far in determining whether or not a maximum fit exists between theory and practice. Prospective as well as practicing teachers often cite the student teaching experience as an essential component in their professional training. In this regard, Schulman (1992) strongly affirms this stance when he holds that:

> … the full year teaching experience was the best part … (It) was the main source of primary strength. It's wonderful to see how a year flows and be able to prepare and expect changes in you and your students as the (days) progress, also being able to dialogue, reflect with other interns… (p.117)

> The internship, or student teaching, is usually the most significant experience in the preparation of teachers… (It) brings together all the elements, which novice teachers will face in their own classroom (p. 107)

Myers (1995) reaffirms this stance by citing a student teacher's insight on the yawning gap between theory and practice:

> The main value is the experience in teaching. I could and did read many books on how to plan, organize, and teach, but this experience gave me the chance to carry out what I had read and thought about. Now I could put my ideas and those of others into practice.

In addition, Wiseman, (2001) cites the value and opportunities that student teaching provides: a) opportunities for self analysis, as student teachers develop insights into his/her strengths and weaknesses; b) opportunities to work with different individuals, which help develop in the students working relationships with adults and children; c) opportunities to realize personal and professional objectives by developing in the student an accepting attitude towards personal and professional responsibilities and competence in equating theory with practice. Conant (1993) concurs, as he adds that it equally provides excellent tools in facing the multifarious tasks inside the classroom.

Student Teaching Program Models

Undeniably, the importance of student teaching experience cannot be ignored, but, what program should be designed and implemented to ensure that the would-be-teachers could be fully equipped with the needed skills and competence?

In the United States, there has been unprecedented pressure for student teaching reforms, most of which come from teacher education establishments. Current publications in the field revealed a great effort to create new, more relevant arrangements. The reasons cited for these reforms include "a greatly increased need for more student teaching positions" (Kagan, 1992); "the campus laboratory schools can no longer accommodate the demands of the training" (Stewart, 1997), and a "severe lack of trained supervising teachers" (Odell, 1990).

It was largely because of this condition that, as early as the 1960s, the Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education recommended in its Report No. 1 that, as to the original arrangements, the students, faculty and officials of Massachusetts Schools and Colleges considered "turning the practical phases of teacher education over almost entirely to public school people" (Dallen and Scifman, 1971), a scheme which this present study has taken as one STP model. Hence, the student teachers are not given the opportunity to practice-teach in the university that grants the degree, but are instead relegated to the care and guidance of professional teachers in the public schools.

The same arrangement is followed in Northern Illinois University (NIU). During their student teaching, the student teachers are required to spend 10 to 14 weeks of practice in the public school that the university assigns them. They are not allowed to student teach at NIU. In this connection, Zeichner (1992) also claimed that 95% of American universities that offer teaching education courses utilize public school sites for student teaching early field experiences.

In support of this idea, Goodson (1992) reveals in his report, "A national survey of student teaching programs: The multi-state teacher education project," that most states solicit the cooperation of public school teachers in molding the teacher candidates in terms of instructional competence and that the

practicum assignments range from six weeks at some schools to 18 weeks at others, with total clock hours spent in student teaching from 180 hours to over 500 hours. Such arrangement shows diversity in student teaching practices and even in the incentives most universities provide the cooperating public school teachers, the range of which is from nothing to several hundred dollars.

In yet another similar, but modified scheme, the Michigan State University established a network of student teaching centers throughout the state, where around each center cluster cooperating public schools that regularly take in student teachers. Here, a university representative serves as the coordinator of the student teaching center in the area, supervising student teachers and holding seminars for them. Besides maintaining good relationship with the cooperating school, she/he frequently takes a hand in training or supervising student teachers. Here, the model used is called the Block Plan, where the semester is divided into 1) few weeks of campus-based seminars to prepare the student teacher; 2) larger blocks of weeks for off-campus student teaching, and, 3) few weeks of campus-based analyzing and evaluating the student teaching experience.

In the Philippines, a good number of TEIs are similarly inclined to "provide [student teachers] with early field-based experiences by immersing them right away to public school teaching-learning system" (CORELS, 1999). This idea seems to echo what McIntyre and Byrd (1997, cited in CORELS) have observed to the effect that most TEIs in western countries prefer early field experiences to give pre-service teachers opportunities "to teach more effectively and confidently in a wide variety of situations and to an increasingly diverse population of students." Whether by innate system design, or by mere recent intentions, many TEIs in the Philippines tend to take as an option having their students practice teach on an off-campus basis. Seemingly, the trend now veers to give student teachers opportunities for maximum, if not full

immersion to field-based experiences offered by the public school system, although several private schools are also beginning to offer their services to some TEIs. This trend is, in fact, what the CMO 30 and DepEd Order # 39 give full attention, to as it pursues and requires TEIs to make sure that as soon as education students start taking education subjects, they need to be provided with corresponding experiences that expose them early on to authentic classroom setting. In this scheme, it is hoped that the students recognize the connection between theory and practice. For this reason, TEIs are, therefore, required to offer six units of field study courses that correspond to the identified education subjects, and six more units for practicum/student teaching course.

From observation, however, a number of institutions still practice the old system of having student teachers "try their wings" in teaching in their own basic education level departments, or what was previously called (laboratory schools), CMO notwithstanding. This system entails six to ten weeks of having observation and participation (in some cases, including practice teaching) in these departments, and spend almost similar number of weeks of practice teaching off-campus. Practice teaching (in some cases referred to as student teaching, internship, or practicum) is set apart from the field study courses that provide prospective teachers early immersion in the world of teaching.

For institutions that do not have laboratory schools, student teachers are right away sent out for off-campus internship. Some others, especially the private institutions that have elementary and high school departments, do not allow their student teachers to use the students therein for practice teaching purposes for obvious reasons. If they do, the most that they provide are observation activities. However, a few others still practice the "straight on campus system" where all phases of internship are done in the university itself.

As regards incentives and benefits, the guidelines on Preservice teacher deployment reflected in the Joint CHED and DepEd Order suggest a "flexible incentive system", as should be specified in the Memorandum of Agreement between the TEI and the public school officials. The system may, therefore, vary, whether this involves monetary or non-monetary incentives. No wonder then, the TEIs with their schools division partners follow different systems as are "mutually agreed upon", and, if may be added, the financial capability of the TEI is one big consideration made in forging any agreement.

Method

Participants. This study involved 17 TEIs, eleven of which are government schools and six privately-run institutions. The government institutions included Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology, Tarlac State University, University of Eastern Philippines, Rizal Technological University, Don Mariano Marcos State University, West Visayas Technological State College, Mindanao State University, Iligan Institute of Technology, Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Maynila, Leyte Normal University, and Polytechnic University of the Philippines. The seven private schools involved were comprised of St. Louis University, Wesleyan Colleges, University of Sto. Tomas, St. Peter's College, College of the Immaculate Conception, and Far Eastern University.

These institutions were chosen on the basis of who among the student teachers enrolled in Education II (Practice Teaching) during the first quarter of SY 2007-2008 could help in identifying the schools to be included. In distributing and retrieving of the survey forms prepared for this present study of the 25 letters and survey forms sent, only these 17 institutions returned the accomplished forms.

The participants from these institutions included *12* deans and/or college supervisors (CSs) *24* supervising instructors (SIs), and *26* student teachers (STs) for a total of *62* participants, as shown in the profile of participants in Table 1.

Table 1. Profile of the Participants

Variable/Participants	**Deans/CSs**	**SIs**	**STs**	**Total**
Age: 20 & below			17	17
21-30			9	9
31-40				
41-50	1	9		10
51-60	9	12		21
61 & above	2	3		5
Total:	12	24	26	62
Number of years in present position	**Deans/CSs**	**SIs**	**STs**	**Total**
0-6	9	4	12	25
6-10	2	3	4	9
11-15	1	4	2	7
16-20		7	5	12
21-more		6	3	9
Total:	12	24	26	62
Highest Education Attainment	**Deans/CSs**	**SIs**	**STs**	**Total**
BEED/BSE		2	14	16
With earned units in MA/MS		7	10	17
With earned units in EdD/PhD		15	2	17
PhD/EdD Graduate	12			12
Total:	12	24	26	62
Gender	**Deans/CSs**	**SIs**	**STs**	**Total**
Male	2	3	5	10
Female	10	21	21	52
Total:	12	24	26	62

Table 1 shows that 9 out of the 12 deans who participated in this study were on the 51-60 age range. Twelve SIs fell in the same age category, actually pointing what the common age of most deans and Sis was.

In terms of the number of years in their present position, 9 deans and 12 CS were in 0-6 category, indicating that these school officials are relatively new in the position, as compared with the SIs who cluster mostly in the 16-20 and 21-more years. One explanation that may be offered here is that these Deans and CS could have been recently promoted and/or given the responsibility that often goes with the position. The perceived downside part of this situation could be that the effectiveness with which they perform their functions in guiding the student teachers do their tasks well enough may somehow be snagged. The SIs, on the other hand, may have gained some form of expertise, having stayed in the position long enough to have found the confidence and the competence to help the student teachers.

As to the highest educational attainment, most of the deans and SIs involved, with 12 of the former and 15 of the latter, have the required doctorate and master's degree to ensure better help for the student teachers.

As is largely true among many sectors in the academe/education department, more females got involved in this study: 10 out of the 14 deans, 21 among the 24 SIs, and 21 among the 26 CS.

Instruments

The main data-gathering instrument utilized in this study was the two-part survey-questionnaire. While Part I focused on the personal background of the respondents, Part II was subdivided into four parts that jibed with the specific objectives of the study; hence, Part A, dwelt on the kind of STP that the institution involved implemented; Part II B, on the components/mechanisms that support the STP; Part II C, on

STP procedures and policies, and Part II D, on incentives and benefits that the institutions have set up to further lend support to their STP.

Details of Part II A described eight STP models where the participants were asked to simply check the one that closely resembled the program implemented in their own institution and to rate each item to determine whether or not it was relevant in terms of the needs of the STs and the purpose of the program. Using a rating scale of 1-5, a grade of 5 meant very much relevant; 4, much relevant; 3, moderately/fairly relevant; 2, less relevant, and 1 not relevant. Part II B enumerated 19 support components/mechanisms each of which the participants ticked off, if it so fitted their STP. Part II C had seven STP policies and procedures from which the participants chose those parts of their own program, and if so, the extent of implementation, as indicated in the rating scale used 1-5, where 5 meant the item was implemented to the fullest extent; 4, to a large extent; 3, to a moderate extent; 2, to a limited extent, and 1, to the least extent. Part II D listed 10 incentives from which the participants also chose those that supported their STP.

Five informal interviews were conducted with some participants coming from the SLU, LNS, WVSU, UEP, and RTU to either clear out some discrepancies noted from the responses given through the questionnaire, (e.g. description of STP) or to elaborate on some of these responses (e.g. on incentives and support mechanisms).

Data Collection Procedures and Treatment

Letter-requests were sent out to the TEIs to which STP the student teachers who opted to help in the study had access. Attached to the letter-request were the questionnaires retrieved and sent back to the DST-PNU office similarly with the help of the STs.

The data gathered were treated by using basic descriptive statistics such as tallying and frequency counts, and computing for means and percentages, where applicable.

Results and Discussion

Student Teaching Program Implemented by TEIs

The nature of the most commonly used student teaching program is illustrated in Table 2 as follows:

Table 2. The Student Teaching Program Implemented by Selected TEIs

STP Description	TEIs implementing it	%	Rank
1. Regular on and off campus STP	4	23.5%	3
2. Straight on campus STP	1	5.8%	4
3. Straight off campus STP	7	41.2%	1
4. LS observation and participation and off campus STP	5	29.5%	2
5. Other STP model	---	---	---
Total	62	100%	---

Table 2 shows that the STP most TEIs use is that of "straight off campus" model, a program common among 7 TEIs that accounts for 41.2% of the 17 TEIs involved in this study. In this model, the student teachers acquire teaching experiences not from the TEIs own "laboratory" school, but from either the public or the private ones outside the campus. One reason that might be cited for this practice, as gathered from the results of some interviews undertaken with officials of TEIs concerned, is that, especially among TEIs, the recommendation of CHED based on the results of the CORELS study (1999) was slowly, but seriously being considered. This further implies that these TEIs have sought, if not utilized other STP models. CHED has recommended the downsizing of laboratory school enrolment until there is only one section left

for each grade or year level for economic reasons. Based on the results of CORELS, it has, therefore, also recommended, that TEIs may take the Total Field Immersion (TFI) as alternative STP or shorten the on-campus work so that the laboratory school can focus on their newly defined roles. The TFI model is the equivalent straight off-campus STP described in this study.

From Table 2, it can also be gleaned that the student teaching program next in rank is that which involves classroom observation and participation in the degree granting institutions where the student teachers enrolled are assigned to other schools to conduct their off campus practice teaching. This STP model was ranked second, with a frequency score of 5 and an equivalent percentage of 29.5%. Together with the data gathered from the student teaching documents of the schools concerned and the subsequent interviews made, this result shows that the student teachers undergo on-campus teaching experience where they further hone their instructional skills through observation, participation, and, in some instances, student teach, before they are allowed to go to off-campus schools where they are given the benefit of putting these skills into practice. The classroom observation and participation experience is acquired within a six-week period. Before this scheme, however, a two-week DST-managed orientation-workshop program is held for the student teachers. It was learned that the private TEIs which implemented this STP have existing elementary and high school departments, whose students have parents strongly opposing the arrangement of letting their children taught by inexperienced student teachers even only for a certain period of time; hence in most cases, campus teaching experience has been done away with.

This reason might as well explain the rather surprising result where the less utilized STP with the regular on and off campus feature which for years has been the only model in use even for private schools. Table 2 shows that this STP is implemented by only four TEIs or 23.5% of the 17 involved in the study.

Probably, this same explanation points out why only one (5.8%) of the involved TEIs opts to use the "straight on campus" STP. Based on the data in Table 2, no one among the respondents made use of models other than what have been described among the choices.

Support Mechanisms of STPs Utilized by TEIs

Student teaching programs normally have inherent, established mechanisms that support their effective implementation. In the case of the TEIs that have been involved in this study, Table 3 provides data on what mechanisms support the STPs of these TEIs.

Table 3. Components/mechanisms that support the STPs of TEIs

Mechanisms	If mechanism is part of STP					
	Yes	%	No	%	Don't Know	%
1. Well-designed Student Teaching Program	30	48-38	16	25.80	16	25.80
2. Clear Student Teaching Program Objectives	36	58.06	15	24.19	11	17.74
3. Student Teaching Program Organizational Structure	26	41.93	19	30.64	17	27.41
4. Adequate student teaching Faculty	42	67.75	20	32.25		
5. Well-defined roles and functions of US, SI, CT, ST	35	56.45	12	19.35	5	8.06
6. Adequate facilities	30	48.38	32	51.62		
7. Adequate instructional materials and resources (e.g. forms and supplies, certificates, etc.)	23	44.01	36	59.06	3	5.85
8. Well-selected cooperating/ partner schools/CTs	32	51.62	23	37.09	7	11.29
9. Clear, well-disseminated Student Teaching Program policies	39	62.91	19	30.64	4	6.45
10. Management/ supervisory System	40	64.52			22	35.48
	If mechanism is part of STP					

Mechanisms	Yes	%	No	%	Don't Know	%
11. System of articulation/ dialogue/feedback	40	64.52	5	8.96	17	26.52
12. System used in Student Teaching placement	25	40.73	14	22.58	23	37.09
13. Acceptable US/SI – ST ratio	30	48.38	26	41.94	6	9.58
14. Logistic assistance	34	54.83	11	17.75	17	27.42
15. Community Service Program	36	58.05	19	30.65	7	11.30
16. Other administrative support	34	54.83	10	16.14	17	27.43
17. Student Teaching Activities planned/ implemented/coordinated	45	72.58	6	9.67	11	17.75
18. Existing Student Teaching Program Manual	15	24.19	43	69.36	4	6.45
19. Expected competencies of Student Teaching clear, specific and well-defined	45	72.59	13	20.96	4	6.45

As shown in Table 3, the most commonly utilized mechanisms that the TEIs have are on items "student teaching activities planned/implemented/ coordinated," and "expected competencies of the STs are clear, specific, and well designed" with almost 73% or 45 of the participants. In fact, this poses as the primary reason for the existence of the STPs – equipping the STs with necessary instructional skills and competencies. With the second item being a part of their STP, it can be inferred that there is clear direction as to what the program wants for the STs.

Next in rank is the item "adequate student teaching faculty," which the STPs of 68% or 42 respondents have as a support mechanism. Again, such being the case is expected because without adequate faculty, the development of STs would not be fully ascertained, monitored, and directed. The same explanation goes for the two items that have been both ranked third: "management/supervisory system" and "system of articulation/dialogue/feedback," with 64.52% or 40

participants indicating these items are part and parcel of their STPs.

The item "adequate instructional materials and resources" turned out to be that which only 23 or 44% of the respondents reported to have as a support mechanism of their STP. Especially in the government TEIs, such support is often minimal, which could likely be the main reason for 36 or 58% of the respondents who have so indicated. Seemingly, it points out that policies and procedures may be available and are more likely enforced, but the fact that they are not contained in a document such as a manual or handbook implies that these policies and procedures may not have been well-disseminated or not strictly enforced so that changes and deviations could often likely happen. This may be one factor going against the implementation of STPs since without any solid document to get by, there is apparently no sure basis for actions and decisions.

Another item that is worth looking into is the acceptability of US/SI-ST ratio. Some 26 or 42% of the participants claimed that there was no acceptable supervisor-student teacher ratio. This could mean that there are more STs in proportion to the number of STs, such that the STs deem the practice unacceptable, in fact, six or 10% of the respondents do not exactly know what the ratio was. This could mean that there are TEIs that do not have either a clear-cut system in determining how many STs the supervisors could each have for performance monitoring and evaluation, or a means by which such information could be made known to all concerned, the STs in particular.

Also, although 32 or 52% of the respondents claimed that the cooperating schools and critic teachers were well-selected, 23 or 37% disclaimed for their own STPs, while 7 or 11% had no idea if they were-selected or not. Since a total of 30 or almost 50% of the respondents either said outright this was not so or claimed that they had no idea, it is apparent that this

particular item is not clear enough to these respondents. Possibly, it may also indicate that the policy on selecting cooperating schools and critic teachers is neither well-disseminated nor made clear.

STP Procedures and Policies

Data revealed that insofar as identified procedures and policies on student teaching are concerned, the TEIs involved in the study have all these as part of their STPs. All 62 or 100% of the respondents reported that the STs are informed of the policies specific to their program. This finding, however, seems to negate the fact that there are at least two items that are STP policy-related which 37% (23) and 35% (22) of the respondents did not know anything about: on the system used in the student teacher placement and management/supervisory system.

Regarding knowledge of the roles and functions of their supervisors, critic teacher, and student teachers, only 46 or 74% indicated that this was a policy implemented as part of their STP. By contrast, 11 or 17% said there was no such policy, and 5 or 8% did not know if there was any.

Twenty-two respondents (35.48%) claimed that a part of their STP policies concerns an agreement between their institutions and DepEd, whose terms and conditions are clear to them. However, 40 or 60.51% of them did not know if there was any such a policy at all. These data are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. STP Procedures and Policies

Procedures and Policies	If part of STP					
	Yes	%	No	%	Don't Know	%
1. Student teachers are informed of policies specific to the area/program where they belong	62	100				
2. Student teachers are well informed of the roles and functions of US, SI, CT, ST	46	76.19	11	17.14	5	8.06
3. A pre-assessment of the student teachers is conducted before…	61	98.38			1	2.62
4. Orientation of Student Teachers is properly scheduled	62	100				
5. A memorandum of agreement with DepEd schools is made clear with terms and conditions specified	22	35.48			40	64.51
6. Evaluation mechanisms are clear and well-defined	46	74.19	16	25.80		

Data on the extent of the implementation of the STP policies and procedures showed that, overall, these are implemented to a moderate extent, as the average weighted mean score is 3.44. Of all the items in this category, that on informing the STs about general and specific policies had the highest weighted mean score (4.24), which means that this is implemented to a large extent.

The item that reads "a memorandum of agreement with DepEd schools is made clear…" got the lowest score, at 2.24 to mean that such a policy, if it exists at all, is implemented to a limited extent. This only confirms the information that almost two-thirds of the respondents do not have any idea about this item. All data pertinent to STP implementation is presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Extent of STP policy implementation

Policies	Extent of implementation					
	1	2	3	4	5	Wt.mean
1. Student teachers are informed of policies specific to the area/ program where they belong	2	3	5	20	32	4.24
2. Student teachers are well informed of the roles and foundations of US, SI, CT, ST	13	3	12	19	15	3.32
3. A pre-assessment of the student teachers is conducted before…	1	2	25	31	3	3.53
4. Orientation of Student Teachers is properly scheduled		2	30	18	12	3.64
5. A memorandum of agreement with DepEd schools is made clear with terms and conditions specified	22	18	10	9	3	2.24
6. Evaluation mechanisms are clear and well defined	12	4	14	17	15	3.30
					Total:	3.44

Incentives and Benefits

Most TEIs provide incentives to their partner DepEd schools as the data for this particular area reveal. Besides the new practice of remunerating public schools for the practice teaching needs of TEIs, as provided for in the Joint CHED and DepEd Order, and other forms of incentives, the most common practice in this regard is that of awarding certificate of appreciation to the concerned teachers. From the available data, fifty-nine or 95% of the respondents have reported this. This incentive is the simplest and the easiest to think and plan about, and has been practiced for many years, on top of the recent required but still unspecified "flexible incentive system", as CMO 39 suggests'. Unsurprisingly, insofar as the extent of

such practice is concerned, it is ranked first, with 4.87 weighted mean, which means that it is "very much practiced".

The next most commonly preferred incentive is that of giving token of appreciation and/or honoraria, with the weighted mean score of 4.35. Its extent of practice appears "much". From interviews, it was gathered that tokens of appreciation normally came in the form of personal gifts to the CTs as well as the principal. Honoraria came in the form of minimal cash. The least commonly offered incentive was that of inviting/hiring CTs for part time university teaching, with such item obtaining a weighted mean score of 1.72. Closely following this item with a mean score of, with 1.88 was that of granting scholarships for short-term courses. The reason probably being that both forms of incentives entail much funding. In fact, for these items, only four for the first, and two for the latter, claimed that such forms of incentives are practiced in their institution. All other incentives were moderately practiced, which means that, they could have been given as a need arose not on a regular basis. Overall, though, it seems that giving incentives other than what the CMO 39 requires, is not a very popular move since the average weighted mean score is only 2.83, which means that giving incentives is done in moderation. Table 6 shows the complete data on incentives and benefits that are provided the partner schools.

Table 6. Type and Extent of Incentive/Benefits Given to Partner DepEd Schools

Types	If Practiced						Extent of Practice					
	Yes	%	No	%	Dnt Knw	%	1	2	3	4	5	Wt Mn
1. Holding of recognition / awards day for the CTs and officials of partner DepEd Schools	25	40.32	37	59.67			16	16	5	7	18	2.91
2. Granting of tuition discounts for graduate Studies	24	38.70	38	61.29			19	12	7	17	7	2.69
3. Giving of token of appreciation/ honoraria	52	83.87	10	16.12			8	10	6	16	31	4.35
4. Conducting needs assessment and corresponding faculty development sessions for the Schools	36	58.06	26	41.97			16	16	14	10	6	2.58
5. Giving out of certificates of appreciation	59	95.16	3	4.83					2	4	56	4.87
6. Donating resource materials/ Devices	56	90.32	6	9.67			21	12	9	9	10	2.54
7. Assisting low-performing students through remedial/ tutorial classes	28	45.16	34	54.83			17	15	12	10	8	2.62
8. Offering/ granting discounts to university sponsored seminars/ conferences	30	48.38	32	51.61			23	16	16	4	2	2.16
9. Granting scholarships for short-term Courses	4	6.45	29	46.77	30	46.77	30	19	6	4	3	1.88
10. Inviting/ hiring CTs for part-time teaching	2	3.22	31	50	29	46.77	33	17	8	4	0	1.72

Conclusions

Based on the results of this study, the following conclusions were made:

1. Many government and private TEIs are beginning to veer away from the regular, traditional student teaching program of having practice teaching done on both on-campus-and-off-campus basis.
2. Corollary to this conclusion, most TEIs appear to prefer the straight off-campus STP model, even if some of them have a basic education department.
3. The STP models utilized by most TEIs have strong support mechanisms in the form of planned and organized ST activities and adequate faculty that help maintain and direct the implementation of their programs.
4. Apparently, that less preferential attention is given to such support mechanisms as provision for adequate instructional materials and resources, an acceptable supervisor-student teacher ratio, and well-selected cooperating schools and critic teachers.
5. STPs of most TEIs follow and implement certain policies and procedures but some of these seem to be not very clear to student teachers and other users, particularly those that concern placement and supervisory system.
6. Most TEIs provide incentives and benefits to cooperating schools and their staff, but often appear only as a token of appreciation and vary from time to time.

Recommendations

From the conclusions derived, it is recommended that the university STP be revised in such a way as to consider the following:

1. financial viability of maintaining the Center for Teaching and Learning, so as to accommodate only very few student teachers at a time;
2. possibility of adopting a "straight off-campus" STP model to maximize the honorarium that the university provides cooperating schools' staff;
3. specifying in the CMO 39 – suggested memorandum of agreement (MOA) between DepEd (through the Schools Division superintendents concerned) and TEIs the "flexible incentive system" as well as the "reward system" it mentions, and by providing bigger and more useful incentives for cooperating schools and teachers
4. including in the CMO 39 – suggested MOA between DepEd (through the schools Division Superintendents concerned) and TEIs details of the conduct of FS activities
5. preparation/approval of student teachers' manual, incorporating most provisions of the Joint CHED and DepEd Order in deploying pre-service teachers

References

Commission on Higher Education Memorandum Order # 11, s. 1999.

Commission on Higher Education Memorandum Order # 30, series 2004.

Commission on Higher Education Report: Master plan for teacher education, 1997.

Conant, J.B. 1993. The teacher and the taught: Education in Theory and Practice. NY: Delta Books.

Dallen, R. and L. Scifman. 1971. Teacher Preparation: Status, problems, and proposed solutions. Massachusettes: UM Press.

Department of education Order # 39, s. 2005. (Joint Commission on Higher Education and DepEd Order # 39, series 2005)

Education Commission Report: Making education work: Areas of concern in Philippine education. 1993. Congressional Oversight Committee on Education

Exemplary Education Program Handbook, 2000. Illinois: NIU Press.

Goodson, J. 1992. Studying Teachers. NY: TC Press.

Higher Education Act of 1994 (RA 7722)

Hollingsworth, S. 1998. Making field-based program work. Journal of Teacher Education, 39 (4).

Kagan, D.M. 1992. Professional growth among pre-service and beginning teachers. Educational Research Journal.

Myers, C.B. 1995. The professional Educator. CA: Wadsworth.

Odell, S.J., 1990. Induction support of new teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 29.

PNU – CHED's Collaborative Research on Laboratory Schools. Redefinition of Laboratory Schools as Support Structures for Teacher Education Programs. 1999.

Presidential Commission for Educational Reform (2000). A Survey for the Implementation of Project TEACH.

Professional Regulation Commission Report (2006). Report of Licensure Examinations for Teachers' Rating: 2000-2005

Schulman, J. 1992. Case Methods in Teacher Education. NY: Press.

UNESCO International Commission on Education for the 21st Century Report. 2001.

Wisemann, D., Cooner, D., & Knight, S. 2001. Becoming a teacher in a field-based setting. California: Wadsworth.

Zeichner, K. 1992. Rethinking the practicum in professional development schools. Journal of Teacher Education, 43.