Comparative study on the evaluation of student teacher's performance

Charina Bardoquillo[1], Angen May Charcos[1*]

[1]Cebu Technological University - Tuburan, Cebu City, Philippines
[*]Corresponding author: angen08@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT

This study determined the comparison on the evaluation of student teacher's performance of the BSED-MATH, BEED, and BTLED students in Cebu Technological University-Tuburan Campus for the school year 2017 - 2020. The key purpose of this research was to determine the performance of the student teachers based on the evaluation of the mentors in terms of (1) instructional design and planning; (2) learning environment; (3) instructional delivery and facilitation; (4) assessment; (5) professional responsibility and conduct. The research employed a descriptive survey approach, in which researchers collected data and information from the Student Teacher Coordinator to assess the performance of student teacher mentors. The tables show the scores based on the evaluation of the student teachers under the five factors in three consecutive school years. Based on the findings of the study, it was concluded that there was a discrepancy in the result of the evaluation of the student teachers' performance in the year 2019 - 2020, which is higher compared to the two previous years. It was also determined that the student teachers scored low on the factor under Instructional Delivery and Facilitation. It is recommended to conduct a Student Teacher's Capabilities Program for all fourth-year students at Cebu Technological University to address the needs of the student teachers in terms of delivering and facilitating instructions.

1. Introduction

The teaching practicum is a complex process that engages various participants, including student teachers, cooperating teachers, university supervisors, administrators, and students. Throughout this experience, student teachers primarily gain valuable insights through observing lessons, receiving guidance from the cooperating teacher and the host school, being supervised by university representatives, fostering communication with other school staff, and collaborating with fellow peer teachers (Gan, 2014).

The practice of teaching holds great significance within teacher education, as it serves as a crucial component. Gröschner et al. (2015) point out that internships in teacher education can promote the acquisition of teaching skills. It serves the purpose of familiarizing student-teachers with the practical aspects of the teaching profession and empowers them to apply the theoretical knowledge gained through classroom interactions with their instructors. Teachers who demonstrate good instructional support provide their students with consistent, process-oriented feedback (Pianta, La Paro, & Hamre, 2008).

Assessing and enhancing the quality of teacher education programs is pivotal for ensuring the preparation of effective educators. The quality of a teacher is the most important variable when it comes to student learning and achievement (Haycock, 1998). One critical aspect of teacher education is evaluating student teacher's performance, which plays a significant role in determining the readiness of aspiring teachers for the classroom. However, the methods and criteria employed for evaluating student teacher's performance can vary across institutions and contexts. A comparative study focused on evaluating student teacher's performance across multiple educational settings can provide valuable insights into the effectiveness and consistency of evaluation practices. As stated by McMillan (2000), effective assessment is characterized by its validity, fairness, ethical nature, efficiency, and feasibility. It involves the utilization of various methodologies, the appropriate integration of technology, the enhancement of instruction, the impact on student motivation and learning, and the recognition of possible errors. Additionally, it is crucial to establish a coherent evaluation system as an integral component of the practicum. The evaluation process should primarily serve as a tool to encourage student reflection and development rather than being regarded as the foremost priority (Yan & He, 2010).

The practical teaching program aims to equip student teachers with the necessary skills to become effective educators in the future. It empowers students to actively participate in defining their teaching style and approach. Moreover, it serves as a vital link between theoretical learning within the classroom and the practical application of knowledge post-graduation. The primary goal of practical teaching is to further familiarize student teachers with the teaching profession and contribute to the education of today's youth. By engaging with student teachers, prospective educators gain a deeper insight into the experiences of being a student teacher and the essential qualities required for successful teaching (Subedi, 2009).

Globally, the Student Teacher's program allows education majors to fulfill their student teaching requirements (Mcintyre & Guyton, 1990). CHED (the Commission on Higher Education in the Philippines) mandates to fulfill its vital role in the global education community by identifying potential changes within educational systems that will shape the knowledge and skills of future educators.

In the Philippines, all teacher education curricula in all higher education institutions include practicum teaching as a prerequisite for Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSEd), Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEEd), and some Arts (B.A.) degrees. No student enrolled in a teacher education, or arts program is permitted to graduate without completing the required hours of classroom observation and experience teaching. Therefore, it will help the student teachers be more determined and progress toward their goals as future educators.

Moreover, this study aligns with the broader educational goals of improving the quality of teacher education and enhancing the overall standards of teaching. By identifying variations and commonalities in evaluation practices, educators, administrators, and policymakers can collaboratively work toward establishing more standardized and effective evaluation frameworks. Ultimately, the study aims to contribute to the development of evidence-based strategies that support the professional growth and competence of future educators.

At Cebu Technological University Tuburan, the College of Education aims to provide Education students with effective and efficient knowledge and training to prepare them for the world of work and to make them valuable members of the country. In short, the Department of Education wants to create well-trained educators soon.

The purpose of this study is to assess the comparison on the evaluation of student teacher's performance at Cebu Technological University Tuburan Campus during their student teacher internship program through several factors in three consecutive school years (2017 - 2020).

2. Theoretical basis

This section indicates a summary of theories and empirical literature that served as the basis of this research.

Social constructivism is an interpretive framework whereby individuals seek to understand their world and develop their own particular meanings that correspond to their experience (Creswell, 2013). These meanings are not etched or innate within each individual. Rather, meanings are formed through interaction with others.

Social constructivism emphasizes the role of social interactions and context in shaping individual understanding. By applying this theory, researchers can contextualize the evaluation of student teachers' performance within the specific social and cultural settings of different educational environments (Murphy, Dingwall, Greatbatch, Parker, & Watson, 1998).

Constructivism suggests that individuals create their own cognitive understanding of the experiential world, while social constructionism centers on societal aspects rather than individual perspectives (Young & Colin, 2004). Constructivism emphasizes the importance of understanding the student's perspective. When evaluating a student teacher's performance, a constructivist approach would focus on how effectively the teacher facilitates student learning, encourages critical thinking, and fosters a deep understanding of the subject matter.

Christie (2005) highlights that constructivism is an educational theory wherein learning is both an active engagement and a personalized interpretation of reality. According to this perspective, knowledge is built from experiences and evolves through various encounters. The theory places significant emphasis on problem-solving and comprehension. Moreover, it underscores the significance of authentic tasks, experiences, collaborative efforts, and assessment as integral components within this framework of learning.

Prawat (1992) suggests that the majority of understandings of constructivist theory concur with the idea that it entails a significant shift in the focal point of instruction, placing the students' individual endeavors to comprehend at the core of the educational process.

Gray (1997) suggests that constructivist teaching is founded upon the concept of learning that arises from the active engagement of learners in creating meaning and knowledge. It asserts that constructivist teaching fosters learner motivation and critical thinking while urging independent learning.

The phase of teacher preparation known as practicum involves student teachers observing or participating in classroom instruction. Although branded and organized differently, it is a universal standard technique. One typical contrast is between student teachers, which lasts longer and have more responsibility for instruction, and field experiences, which occur one day a week and concentrate on observation (Filipsson et al., 2018). Every student must practice in a class environment during student teaching before receiving their teaching license, which is respected to be the culmination of teacher education as emphasized by Cibula et al. (2018). Stewart, Lambert, Ulmer, Witt, and Carraway (2017) indicated that the student teaching program, according to interns, continued to be the most significant component of their teacher education curriculum.

During their internship, students appreciate the school's many cultures and activities. In the course, the students build networks with co-workers and community members. The student teachers actively engage in their educational process during their internship while getting equipped for their future tasks (Rice et al., 2015). In a similar study, student instructors who engaged with the neighborhood developed a better knowledge of the students within and outside the classroom (Yancey, 2023).

According to Aljafar, Rahman, Ahmad, and Zahran (2020), teaching practice is an essential tool for learning to teach. Both the student teachers' teaching abilities and their classroom conduct are polished. Its significance and necessity in teacher education programs are acknowledged worldwide. The method and approach used in teaching can vary depending on the institutions, but no teacher education program exists without a teaching practice course. While teaching practice provides many advantages for the growth of student teachers, the reality is that it has some serious issues that have a detrimental impact on the efficacy of teaching practices. Even though many researchers have already looked into its issues, more academics still need to look into teaching techniques. Student teachers are the best source for determining the elements influencing teaching techniques. In the end, issues must be resolved with thorough planning and preparation to maximize the benefits of student instructors' efficient teaching techniques.

The literature on the use of learning materials to enhance a knowledge fact or concept in the classroom acknowledges that teachers' effective use of relevant and high-quality learning materials helps students improve their perceptual abilities by arousing their interest, reducing their anxiety, and reducing their lethargy. Experience has proven that today's students struggle to comprehend abstract ideas. They like to study when information communication via tangible tools like diagrams, models, scientific instruments, audio and video recordings, radio, television, presentations, and other ICT resources. These varied mediums are ways of widening, deepening, and enhancing the lesson while offering first-hand encounters that enable each student to witness and experience other environments passively. For the students to comprehend the significance of each idea, the student-teachers must choose and use the best teaching resources to explain and clarify the lesson's goals (Creneti, 2012).

For learning to take place, teachers must actively interact with the students. Hamre et al. (2012) stressed that teachers must have the ability to verify effective interactions with a high level of competency to translate training into changes in their practice,' the author theorized, to learn about effective teacher-child connections. Effective collaboration skills encompass the ability to utilize team teaching methods, cultivate robust connections with fellow professionals, and exhibit approaches to assist students facing language and learning challenges (Hamilton-Jones & Vail, 2014). A stronger chance of fostering a positive bond between the host teacher and the student teacher exists if the host teacher can showcase these abilities to the student teacher. This demonstration would enhance the classroom experience for both the teacher and the students. "Preservice teachers reported less burnout during their student teaching practicum when they received excellent mentoring from their mentor instructors (McLean & Sandilos, 2022)".

3. Methodology

This study employed the descriptive method utilizing a survey questionnaire. The questionnaire was adapted from Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (PEAP)/University of Florida) containing a score of .956 (α = .956) indicating that the reliability of the questionnaire was excellent. The researchers seek information and gather data from the Student Teacher's

Coordinators for the result of the student teaching mentor's evaluation of student teachers in Cebu Technological University Tuburan - Campus for the School Year 2017 - 2020.

The researchers used a purposive sampling method in choosing the respondents for the study. This is to determine how well student teachers at Cebu Technological University's BSED-MATH, BEED, and BTLED programs performed overall in terms of instructional design and planning, the learning environment, instructional delivery and facilitation, evaluation, and professional responsibility and conduct. The study includes 127 respondents from the student teachers of the A.Y. 2017 - 2018, 49 student teachers for the A.Y. 2018 - 2019, and 61 student teachers for the A.Y. 2019 - 2020.

4. Result and discussion

The data acquired, the statistical analysis, results, findings, and interpretation are all presented here. These are arranged logically in tables according to the chronology of the specific research problem, which is to achieve a comparative study on the evaluation of the student teacher performance of student teachers in Cebu Technological University for the S.Y. 2017 - 2020.

4.1. Result

Table 1 presents the profile of the respondents as to subject (s) Taught.

Table 1

Profile of the respondents as to subject (s) Taught

Subjects Taught	2017 - 2018		2018 - 2019		2019 - 2020		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Mathematics	59	20.07	39	28.68	30	15.31	128	20.45
English	65	22.11	12	8.83	47	23.98	124	19.81
Filipino	37	12.59	10	7.35	29	14.79	76	12.14
Science	28	9.52	17	12.5	30	15.31	75	11.98
Araling Panlipunan	40	13.61	11	8.09	12	6.12	63	10.06
MAPEH	23	7.82	15	11.03	12	6.12	50	7.99
ESP	7	2.38	3	2.2	6	3.06	16	2.55
EPP	2	0.68	0	0	4	2.04	6	0.96
TLE	26	8.84	28	20.59	15	7.66	69	11.02
MTB	7	2.38	1	0.73	11	5.61	19	3.04
Total	294	100	136	100	196	100	626	100

Source: Data analysis result of the research

Table 1 shows the distribution of respondents to the subject (s) taught for the year 2017 - 2018, 2018 - 2019, and 2019 - 2020. The findings utilized the frequency count and percentage. The number of respondents may vary in this table since some student teachers handled multiple subjects every shift.

Table 2

Profile of respondents as to Grade Level Taught

Grade Level Taught	2017 - 2018		2018 - 2019		2019 - 2020		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Kindergarten	1	0.34	0	0	4	3.2	5	0.89
One	11	3.75	1	0.69	18	14.4	30	5.33
Two	12	4.1	1	0.69	15	12	28	4.97
Three	12	4.1	1	0.69	11	8.8	24	4.26
Four	10	3.41	0	0	18	14.4	28	4.97
Five	15	5.21	1	0.69	15	12	31	5.51
Six	19	6.48	1	0.69	17	13.6	37	6.57
Seven	51	17.42	38	26.21	4	3.2	93	16.52
Eight	50	17.06	26	17.93	6	4.8	82	14.56
Nine	52	17.75	34	23.45	9	7.2	95	16.87
Ten	55	18.77	42	28.96	8	6.4	105	18.65
Eleven	3	1.02	0	0	0	0	3	0.53
Twelve	2	0.68	0	0	0	0	2	0.37
Total	293	100	100	100	100	100	563	100

Source: Data analysis result of the research

Table 2 shows the distribution of respondents as to Grade Level Taught for the years 2017 - 2018, 2018 - 2019, and 2019 - 2020. The findings utilized the frequency count and percentage. The number of respondents may vary in this table since some student teachers handled multiple grade levels every shift.

Table 3

Profile of respondents as to Number of Students per Class

Number of Students per Class	2017 - 2018		2018 - 2019		2019 - 2020		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
65 to 75	32	17.11	21	21.65	4	3.48	57	14.29
54 to 64	41	21.92	30	30.93	7	6.09	78	19.55
43 to 53	40	21.39	13	13.4	13	11.3	66	16.54
32 to 42	37	17.79	22	22.68	43	37.39	102	25.56
21 to 31	27	14.44	8	8.25	32	27.83	67	16.79
10 to 20	10	5.35	3	3.09	16	13.91	29	7.27
Total	187	100	97	100	115	100	399	100

Source: Data analysis result of the research

Table 3 shows the distribution of respondents as to the number of students per class for the year 2017 - 2018, 2018 - 2019, and 2019 - 2020. The findings utilized the frequency count and percentage.

Table 4

Overall performance of student teacher's mentor's evaluation (2017 - 2020)

Factors	2017 - 2018		2018 - 2019		2019 - 2020		Total	
	$\bar{x}$	VD	$\bar{x}$	VD	$\bar{x}$	VD	$\bar{x}$	VD
1. Instructional Design and Planning	1.57	VS	1.54	VS	1.42	O	1.51	VS
2. The Learning Environment	1.53	VS	1.5	VS	1.4	O	1.48	O
3. Instructional Delivery and Facilitation	1.63	VS	1.57	VS	1.48	O	1.56	VS
4. Assessment	1.6	VS	1.53	VS	1.46	O	1.53	VS
5. Professional Responsibility and Conduct	1.35	VS	1.48	O	1.24	O	1.36	O
Factors Average Mean	**1.54**	**VS**	**1.54**	**VS**	**1.4**	**O**	**1.49**	**O**

Legend: Outstanding - 1.00 - 1.49, Very Satisfactory - 1.50 - 2.49, Satisfactory - 2.50 - 3.49, Need Improvement - 3.50 - 4.49, Unsatisfactory - 4.49 - 5.00
Source: Data analysis result of the research

This table pertains to the overall performance of student teachers as to the five factors in evaluating their performance: Instructional Design and Planning, The Learning Environment, Instructional Delivery and Facilitation, Assessment and Professional Responsibility and Conduct in the A.Y. 2017 - 2018, 2018 - 2019, 2019 - 2020. These findings utilized the weighted average mean.

Table 5

Student teacher's performance as to Instructional Design and Planning (2017 - 2020)

Instructional Design and Planning	2017 - 2018		2018 - 2019		2019 - 2020		Overall mean	
	$\bar{x}$	VD	$\bar{x}$	VD	$\bar{x}$	VD	$\bar{x}$	VD
1. Align instruction with state-adapted standards at the appropriate level of rigor.	1.62	VS	1.57	VS	1.32	O	1.5	VS
2. Sequence lessons and concepts to ensure coherence and required prior knowledge.	1.47	O	1.48	O	1.4	O	1.45	O
3. Design instruction for students to achieve mastery.	1.52	VS	1.54	VS	1.41	O	1.49	O
4. Select appropriate formative assessment to monitor learning.	1.53	VS	1.64	VS	1.37	O	1.51	VS
5. Use diagnostic students to plan lessons.	1.87	VS	1.87	VS	1.54	VS	1.75	VS

Instructional Design and Planning	2017 - 2018		2018 - 2019		2019 - 2020		Overall mean	
	$\bar{x}$	VD	$\bar{x}$	VD	$\bar{x}$	VD	$\bar{x}$	VD
6. Develop learning experiences that require students to demonstrate a variety of applicable skills and competencies.	1.56	VS	1.49	O	1.46	O	1.5	VS
7. Plan time realistically for pacing, content mastery, and transitions.	1.54	VS	1.69	VS	1.6	VS	1.61	VS
8. Reminded students of upcoming assignments, projects or tests.	1.45	O	1.24	O	1.33	O	1.34	O
9. Key concepts or content are presented and emphasized accurately.	1.63	VS	1.43	O	1.43	O	1.5	O
10. The activity provided elicits learners' prior knowledge or serves as a springboard for new learning.	1.49	O	1.48	O	1.34	O	1.44	O
Factor Average Mean	**1.57**	**VS**	**1.54**	**VS**	**1.42**	**O**	**1.51**	**VS**

Legend: Outstanding - 1.00 - 1.49, Very Satisfactory - 1.50 - 2.49, Satisfactory - 2.50 - 3.49, Need Improvement - 3.50 - 4.49, Unsatisfactory - 4.49 - 5.00
Source: Data analysis result of the research

This table relates to the compilation summarizing the performance level of student teachers in the field of Instructional Design and Planning for the academic years 2017 - 2018, 2018 - 2019, and 2019 - 2020. These results were based on the employment of a weighted average mean.

During the academic year 2017 - 2018, with a computed mean of 1.57, the researchers concluded that the level of Student Teachers' Performance in terms of Instructional Design and Planning was highly satisfactory. Similarly, in the subsequent academic year 2018 - 2019, with a calculated mean of 1.54, the researchers perceived the level of Student Teachers' Performance in Instructional Design and Planning as very satisfactory.

In the academic year 2019 - 2020, the researchers observed a calculated mean of 1.42, indicating that the level of Student Teachers' Performance in Instructional Design and Planning was outstanding. When considering the overall mean, student teachers achieved a score of 1.51, denoting a very satisfactory performance level in Instructional Design and Planning.

These findings suggest that student instructors are well-equipped to craft teaching strategies that ensure the quality of learning materials and activities used in the classroom. Furthermore, they exhibit a profound understanding of individual learning styles, effectively tailoring strategies to assist all students in achieving their academic objectives.

Table 6

Level of student teacher's performance as to The Learning Environment (2017 - 2020)

The Learning Environment	2017 - 2018		2018 - 2019		2019 - 2020		Overall mean	
	$\bar{x}$	VD	$\bar{x}$	VD	$\bar{x}$	VD	$\bar{x}$	VD
1. Organizes, allocates, and manages the resources of time.	1.52	VS	1.59	VS	1.53	VS	1.55	VS
2. Manages individuals and class behaviors through a well-planned management system.	1.74	VS	1.67	VS	1.63	VS	1.68	VS
3. Conveys high expectations to all students.	1.63	VS	1.53	VS	1.43	O	1.53	VS
4. Respects students' cultural, linguistic, and family backgrounds.	1.22	O	1.1	O	1.17	O	1.16	O
5. Models clear, acceptable oral communication skills.	1.47	O	1.45	O	1.34	O	1.42	VS
6. Maintains a climate of openness, inquiry, fairness, and support.	1.32	O	1.28	O	1.23	O	1.28	O
7. Integrates current information and communication technologies.	1.7	VS	1.63	VS	1.62	VS	1.65	VS
8. Adapts the learning environment to accommodate the needs of diverse students.	1.54	VS	1.56	VS	1.21	O	1.44	O
9. Utilizes assistive technologies to enable students to achieve their educational goals.	1.68	VS	1.75	VS	1.48	O	1.64	VS
10. Arranges the classroom to maximize learning while providing a safe environment.	1.48	O	1.41	O	1.32	O	1.4	O
Factor Average Mean	**1.53**	**VS**	**1.5**	**VS**	**1.4**	**O**	**1.48**	**O**

Legend: Outstanding - 1.00 - 1.49, Very Satisfactory - 1.50 - 2.49, Satisfactory - 2.50 - 3.49, Need Improvement - 3.50 - 4.49, Unsatisfactory - 4.49 - 5.00
Source: Data analysis result of the research

This table displays the performance of student teachers concerning The Learning Environment during the years 2017 - 2018, 2018 - 2019, and 2019 - 2020. These outcomes make use of the weighted mean approach.

The researchers established that the student teachers' performance in creating a conducive learning environment during the year 2017 - 2018 was highly satisfactory, achieving a computed mean of 1.53. Similarly, for the year 2018 - 2019, the researchers determined that the student teachers' performance in fostering a suitable learning environment was also highly satisfactory, with an average weighted mean of 1.50. In the subsequent year, the researchers

found that student teachers excelled in cultivating a learning environment, securing an exceptional average weighted mean of 1.40.

The overall mean score of 1.48 reflects an outstanding performance by student instructors in terms of The Learning Environment. This numerical assessment aligns with their remarkable achievement. This discovery underscores that student teachers excel in creating a safe learning environment for their students, displaying respect for their diverse backgrounds, and structuring the classroom in a manner that aids students in reaching their educational objectives. This finding demonstrates that student teachers effectively develop and manage a positive learning environment for their students.

Table 7

Level of student teacher's performance as to Instructional Delivery and Facilitation (2017 - 2020)

Instructional Delivery and Facilitation	2017 - 2018		2018 - 2019		2019 - 2020		Overall mean	
	$\bar{x}$	VD	$\bar{x}$	VD	$\bar{x}$	VD	$\bar{x}$	VD
1. Deliver Engaging and challenging classroom lessons.	1.56	VS	1.13	O	1.29	O	1.43	O
2. Deepen students' understanding through content area literacy and application of the subject matter.	1.63	VS	1.61	VS	1.57	VS	1.6	VS
3. Identify gaps in student subject matter knowledge.	1.75	VS	1.67	VS	1.58	VS	1.67	VS
4. Modify instruction to respond to preconceptions or misconceptions.	1.64	VS	1.51	VS	1.52	VS	1.56	VS
5. Relate and integrate the subject matter with other disciplines and life experiences.	1.56	VS	1.53	VS	1.52	VS	1.54	VS
6. Employ higher-order questioning techniques.	1.81	VS	1.81	VS	1.68	VS	1.77	VS
7. Apply varied instructional strategies to teach for student understanding.	1.58	VS	1.46	O	1.36	O	1.47	O
8. Differentiate instruction based on assessment of student learning needs.	1.71	VS	1.69	VA	1.49	O	1.63	VS
9. Support, encourage, and provide immediate to specific feedback to students to promote student achievement.	1.45	O	1.42	O	1.37	O	1.41	O
10. Utilize student feedback to monitor instructional needs and adjust instruction.	1.59	VS	1.55	VS	1.44	O	1.53	VS
Factor Average Mean	1.63	VS	1.57	VS	1.48	O	1.56	VS

Legend: Outstanding - 1.00 - 1.49, Very Satisfactory - 1.50 - 2.49, Satisfactory - 2.50 - 3.49, Need Improvement - 3.50 - 4.49, Unsatisfactory- 4.49 - 5.00
Source: Data analysis result of the research

The researchers perceived the level of student teachers' performance in Instructional Delivery and Facilitation.

In the year 2017 - 2018, the researchers evaluated the performance of student teachers in terms of Instructional Delivery and Facilitation, obtaining a mean score of 1.63, indicating a highly satisfactory performance. Similarly, during the year 2018 - 2019, the researchers assessed the instructional delivery and facilitation of student teachers, resulting in a mean score of 1.57, signifying a very satisfactory performance. In the subsequent year, 2019 - 2020, the researchers examined the performance of student teachers in instructional delivery and facilitation, yielding a mean score of 1.48, denoting an exceptional level of performance. Upon analyzing the collective data from the three years, the researchers determined that the overall mean for student teachers' performance in Instructional Delivery and Facilitation was 1.56, indicating a highly satisfactory performance.

Table 8

Level of Student Teacher's Performance as to Assessment (2017 - 2020)

Assessment	2017 - 2018		2018 - 2019		2019 - 2020		Overall mean	
	$\bar{x}$	VD	$\bar{x}$	VD	$\bar{x}$	VD	$\bar{x}$	VD
1. Analyze and apply data from multiple assessments to diagnose students' learning needs and inform instruction based on those needs.	1.74	VS	1.75	VS	1.54	VS	1.68	VS
2. Design and align formative and summative assessments that match learning objectives and lead to mastery.	1.52	VS	1.42	O	1.41	O	1.45	O
3. Use a variety of assessment tools to monitor student progress, achievement, and learning gains.	1.68	VS	1.62	VS	1.51	VS	1.6	VS
4. Modify assessment and testing conditions to accommodate learning styles and varying levels of knowledge.	1.66	VS	1.58	VS	1.47	O	1.57	VS
5. Share the importance and outcomes of student assessment data with the student.	1.48	O	1.4	O	1.43	O	1.44	O
6. Apply technology to organize and integrate assessment information.	1.69	VS	1.67	VS	1.51	VS	1.62	VS
7. Use pre-assessment data to develop expectations for students, to differentiate instruction, and to document learning.	1.59	VS	1.78	VS	1.53	VS	1.63	VS
8. Give constructive and frequent feedback to students on their learning.	1.45	O	1.4	O	1.54	VS	1.46	O
9. Ask questions of students throughout the lesson to ascertain understanding.	1.6	VS	1.28	O	1.37	O	1.42	O
10. Provided group tasks that promoted higher-level thinking.	1.56	VS	1.42	O	1.31	O	1.43	O
Factor Average Mean	**1.6**	**VS**	**1.53**	**VS**	**1.46**	**O**	**1.53**	**VS**

Legend: Outstanding - 1.00 - 1.49, Very Satisfactory - 1.50 - 2.49, Satisfactory - 2.50 - 3.49, Need Improvement - 3.50 - 4.49, Unsatisfactory - 4.49 - 5.00

Source: Data analysis result of the research

The student-teacher performance as to assessment was very satisfactory in 2017 - 2018. The researcher noted that the overall assessment of student teachers' performance was deemed satisfactory, as evidenced by a calculated mean of 1.60, indicating highly acceptable performance for the academic year 2017 - 2018. Similarly, the researcher observed that the overall assessment of student teachers' performance remained at an acceptable level with a mean of 1.53, thus reflecting a highly satisfactory performance in assessment evaluation. The researchers concluded that the performance level of student teachers in assessment is outstanding, supported by a computed mean of 1.46. When considering the combined mean of student teachers' performance in assessment over a span of three years, the researchers determined that the student teachers achieved an overall computed mean of 1.53, signifying a highly satisfactory performance.

Table 9

Level of Student Teacher's Performance as to Professional Responsibility and Conduct (2017 -2020)

Professional Responsibility and Conduct	2017 - 2018		2018 - 2019		2019 - 2020		Overall mean	
	$\bar{x}$	VD	$\bar{x}$	VD	$\bar{x}$	VD	$\bar{x}$	VD
1. Reflect on the extent to which learning goals were met and how instruction can be changed to facilitate learning.	1.55	VS	1.42	O	1.3	O	1.42	O
2. Demonstrate a sense of efficacy.	1.48	O	1.33	O	1.32	O	1.38	O
3. Build professional relationships with colleagues/mentors to share teaching insights to coordinate learning activities for students.	1.25	O	1.14	O	1.2	O	1.2	O
4. Demonstrate initiative and self-reliance in the preparation of the lesson.	1.31	O	1.25	O	1.26	O	1.27	O
5. Demonstrate professional responsibilities, punctuality, attendance, and timely completion of records and reports.	1.45	O	1.48	O	1.33	O	1.42	O
6. Present a professional appearance in dress, grooming, attitude, and demeanor in accordance with school norms.	1.18	O	1.06	O	1.12	O	1.12	O
7. Demonstrate enthusiasm for teaching.	1.24	O	1.21	O	1.2	O	1.22	O
8. Demonstrate responsiveness to supervision (ability to accept constructive criticism and incorporate suggestions into teaching performance).	1.33	O	1.29	O	1.22	O	1.28	O
9. Demonstrate responsibility for maintaining accurate student records and other important information.	1.29	O	1.27	O	1.25	O	1.27	O
10. Engages in activities outside the classroom intended for school and student enhancement.	1.39	O	1.22	O	1.26	O	1.29	O
Factor Average Mean	**1.35**	**O**	**1.27**	**O**	**1.24**	**O**	**1.29**	**O**

Legend: Outstanding - 1.00 - 1.49, Very Satisfactory - 1.50 - 2.49, Satisfactory - 2.50 - 3.49, Need Improvement - 3.50 - 4.49, Unsatisfactory - 4.49 - 5.00
Source: Data analysis result of the research

This table relates to the condensed overview of the level of professional responsibility and conduct exhibited by student teachers during the years 2017 - 2018, 2018 - 2019, and 2019 - 2020. The researchers discovered that the level of professional responsibility and conduct demonstrated by student teachers is outstanding.

4.2. Discussion

This study assessed the comparison on the evaluation of student teacher's performance of Cebu Technological University during their student teaching internship program in various cooperative schools from 2017 - 2020.

Academic year 2017 - 2018

It was revealed that among the five levels of Student Teacher Performance, respondents rated "instructional delivery and facilitation" with a weighted average of 1.57, "the learning environment" with a weighted average of 1.53, "assessment" with a weighted average of 1.63, and "professional responsibility and conduct" with a weighted average of 1.60 as highly satisfactory. Additionally, "instructional delivery and facilitation" received a weighted average of 1.35 and was also assessed as very satisfactory.

Regarding the Comprehensive Performance Level Table for Student Teachers, the mean of the factor averages is 1.54, signifying a highly satisfactory rating. The results suggest that the overall table suggests a strong approval of the aspects related to the performance levels of student teachers.

Quality teaching aids utilized by teachers play a crucial role in enhancing students' perceptual skills and capturing their attention, as indicated by research by Zurcher, Phadke, Coppola, and McNeil (2016). Additionally, these aids help alleviate feelings of anxiety and boredom among students. Students tend to find learning more enjoyable when instructional methods involve tangible resources like charts, models, scientific equipment, and digital materials. To ensure students grasp the significance of concepts, it's imperative for student-teachers to make use of the most effective available teaching resources. Fasano (2023) emphasizes the significance of student engagement in online learning as it showcases cognitive growth and the capacity to generate information, ultimately contributing to student accomplishments. Furthermore, research outcomes underline the importance of fulfilling the needs of student teachers in terms of their academic motivation and confidence in their abilities, as evidenced by Poom-Valickis and Löfström (2019).

Academic year 2018 - 2019

According to the collected data, the five aspects of the Level of Student Teacher Performance were ranked as highly satisfactory by respondents. These included "instructional delivery and facilitation," which had a weighted mean of 1.54, "the learning environment," with a weighted mean of 1.50, "assessment" with a weighted mean of 1.57, and "professional responsibility and conduct," with a weighted mean of 1.53. Similarly, "instructional delivery and facilitation" had a weighted mean of 1.48 and received a very satisfactory rating. In relation to the Overall Performance Level Table for Student Teachers, the average mean score of the factors was 1.54, signifying a high level of satisfaction. The results indicate that the comprehensive table indicates a positive sentiment toward the various aspects of student teachers' performance levels.

Tyagi, Jaiswal, and Sharma (2023) stated that teachers' dedication to their profession is crucial for achieving enhanced performance, thereby contributing to substantial advancement and development within the school context. Abdulloh, Lubis, and Lubis (2023) suggest that educators in schools can enhance students' emotional intelligence. Moreover, teachers'

responsibilities extend beyond merely imparting knowledge and skills to students; they must also fulfill roles as leaders, educators, and mentors for all students, as highlighted by Yaakob, Don, Pauzi, Fauzi, and Habibi (2023). Additionally, Hascher and Kaiser's (2015) work in 2012 underlines that successful learning is influenced by a range of environmental factors such as mentoring and feedback, as well as individual factors like emotions and motivation.

Academic year 2019 - 2020

Upon analyzing the averaged mean factors from the tabulated data, which is 1.40, the researcher concluded that the performance level of student teachers regarding aspects like Instructional Design and Planning, The Learning Environment, Instructional Delivery and Facilitation, Assessment, as well as Professional Responsibility and Conduct, is exceptionally impressive.

In the comprehensive evaluation, the researchers observed that the cumulative performance of the student teachers over the course of three years amounts to 1.49, indicating an exceptional level of achievement.

This discovery suggests that the performance of student teachers is nearly flawless; they possess the necessary skills to educate learners and are keen to identify how they can enrich students' learning experiences. It is imperative for student-teachers to recognize the necessity of identifying and utilizing optimal teaching tools to assist students in comprehending the subject matter and understanding its significance. Fasano (2023) emphasizes the significance of engaging students in online learning, as it showcases students' dedication to cognitive growth and their capacity to generate knowledge, ultimately resulting in academic success.

In the overall performance, the researchers perceived that the total overall performance of the student teachers in three years is 1.49, which is equivalent to outstanding.

These findings indicate that the student teacher's performance is almost perfect; they are well-equipped to teach the learners and will look for what they should contribute to the learning of the students. The student-teachers need it is essential for teachers to find and use the best teaching aids to aid pupils in their understanding of the material and why it is essential to them. Fasano (2023) highlights the importance of student involvement in online learning because they feel it demonstrates students' effort for cognitive development and their ability to create information, leading to student achievement.

5. Conclusions and recommendations

Based on the indicated findings, the following conclusions were drawn:

Proposing the implementation of a student teacher's capabilities program is highly advisable for enhancing the skills and understanding of effective teaching among student teachers. This initiative holds the potential to advance the overall performance of student teachers in relation to the five fundamental aspects: Instructional Design and Planning, The Learning Environment, Instructional Delivery and Facilitation, Assessment, and Professional Delivery and Conduct. Such a recommendation could significantly elevate the performance of student teachers. Additionally, conducting in-depth research is essential to identify the underlying causes behind the subpar performance of student teachers in this realm. Moreover, a comprehensive investigation into the influence of the remaining four factors on student teachers' performance in Instructional Delivery and Facilitation is also strongly recommended.

References

Abdulloh, K. N., Lubis, S., & Lubis, L. (2023). The relationship between emotional intelligence and family support with student achievement in history at SMA Negeri 1 Pancur Batu. *International Journal of Educational Review, Law And Social Sciences (IJERLAS), 3*(5), 1674-1684.

Albasin-Lacaba, I. G., Avenir, M., Permejo, J., & Edu, E., Jr. (2022). Anxiety of practice teachers on final teaching demonstration. *Journal of Education, Management and Development Studies, 2*(1), 110-121.

Aljafar, M. R., Rahman, A. M., Ahmad, S. R., & Zahran, A. (2020). Factors affecting the effectiveness of teaching practices. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences, 9*(3), 520-528.

Andrade, H. L. (2019, August). A critical review of research on student self-assessment. In *Frontiers in education* (Vol. 4, p. 87). Lausanne, Switzerland: Frontiers Media SA.

Behizadeh, N., & Lynch, T. L. (2017). Righting technologies: How large-scale assessment can foster a more equitable education. *Berkeley Review of Education, 7*(1).

Brown, G. T. (2019, June). Is assessment for learning really assessment? In *Frontiers in education* (Vol. 4, p. 64). Lausanne, Switzerland: Frontiers Media SA.

Cherry, K. (2020). *The David Kolb theory of how experience influences learning*. New York, NY: Verywell Mind.

Cheung, S. K. S., Kwok, L. F., Phusavat, K., & Yang, H. H. (2021). Shaping the future learning environment with smart elements: Challenges and opportunities. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 18*(1), Article 16. doi:10.1186/s41239-021-00254-1

Ching, G. (2018). A literature review on the student evaluation of teaching: An examination of the search, experience, and credence qualities of SET. *Higher Education Evaluation and Development, 12*(2), 63-84.

Christie A. (2005). *Constructivism and its implications for educators*. Retrieved May 10, 2023, from https://projectkings.com.ng/2021/05/26/constructivists-learning-strategies-and-students - academic-performance-in-physics/

Cibula, D., Pötter, R., Planchamp, F., Avall-Lundqvist, E., Fischerova, D., Haie-Meder, C., ... Raspollini, M. R. (2018). The European society of gynaecological oncology/European society for radiotherapy and oncology/European society of pathology guidelines for the management of patients with cervical cancer. *Virchows Archiv, 472*, 919-936.

Creneti, J. (2012). *Types of teaching aids*. Retrieved May 10, 2023, from http./Avww.ehow.com.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among the five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Dayagbil, F. T., Palompon, D. R., Garcia, L. L., & Olvido, M. M. J. (2021, July). Teaching and learning continuity amid and beyond the pandemic. In *Frontiers in education* (Vol. 6, p. 678692). Lausanne, Switzerland: Frontiers Media SA.

Dimkpa, D. I. (2015). Teachers' conduct in the 21st century: The need for enhancing students' academic performance. *Journal of Education and Practice, 6*(35) 71-78.

Fasano, R. D. (2023). *Documentary-style educational video for online learners: Student perceptions of an innovative approach to learning* (Doctoral dissertation, Northeastern University). Retrieved May 10, 2023, from https://repository.library.northeastern.edu/files/neu:4f18p6793/fulltext.pdf

Filipsson, K., Petersson, T., Höjesjö, J., Piccolo, J. J., Näslund, J., Wengström, N., & Österling, E. M. (2018). Heavy loads of parasitic freshwater pearl mussel (Margaritifera margaritifera L.) larvae impair foraging, activity and dominance performance in juvenile brown trout (Salmo trutta L.). *Ecology of Freshwater Fish, 27*(1), 70-77.

Fishback, W. W. (1948). A rationale for the evaluation of student teaching. *The Elementary School Journal, 48*(9), 498-504.

Gan, Z. (2014). Learning from interpersonal interactions during the practicum: A case study of non-native ESLstudent teachers. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 40*(2), 128-139.

Gonzales, R. (2017). Student teachers' performance as evaluated by cooperating officials. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences, 4*(4), 21-29.

Gray, A. (1997). *Constructivist teaching and learning* (SSTA Research Centre Report No. 97-07). Retrieved May 10, 2023, from https://saskschoolboards.ca/wp-content/uploads/97-07.htm

Gröschner, A., Müller, K., Bauer, J., Seidel, T., Prenzel, M., Kauper, T., & Möller, J. (2015). Praxisphasen in der Lehrerausbildung - Eine Strukturanalyse am Beispiel des gymnasialen Lehramtsstudiums in Deutschland [Field experiences in teacher training: a structural analysis of secondary teacher education in Germany]. *Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft, 18*(4), 639-665.

Hamilton-Jones, B. M., & Vail, C. O. (2014). Preparing special educators for collaboration in the classroom: Pre-service teachers' beliefs and perspectives. *International Journal of Special Education, 29*(1), 76-86.

Hamre, B. K., Pianta, R. C., Burchinal, M., Field, S., LoCasale-Crouch, J., Downer, J. T., ... Scott-Little, C. (2012). A course on effective teacher-child interactions: Effects on teacher beliefs, knowledge, and observed practice. *American Educational Research Journal, 49*(1), 88-123.

Hascher, T., & Kaiser, C. (2015). The acquisition of negative knowledge during field experience in teacher education. *Fehler: Ihre Funktionen im Kontext individueller und gesellschaftlicher Entwicklung*, 227-244.

Haycock, K. (1998). Good teaching matters: How well-qualified teachers can close the gap. *Thinking k-16, 3*(2), Article n2.

Isman, A. (2011). Instructional design in education: New model. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology - TOJET, 10*(1), 136-142.

Mclntyre, D. J., & Guyton, E. (1990). Student teaching and school experiences. In *Handbook of research on teacher education*. London, UK: Macmillan.

McLean, L., & Sandilos, L. (2022). Teachers well-being: Sources, implications, and directions for research. *Routledge Resources Online, 1*(1), 1-8. doi:10.4324/9781138609877-REE153-1

McMillan, J. H. (2000). Fundamental assessment principles for teachers and school administrators. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation, 7*(1), Article 8.

Murphy, E., Dingwall, R., Greatbatch, D., Parker, S., & Watson, P. (1998). Qualitative research methods in health technology assessment: A review of the literature. *Health technology assessment (Winchester, England), 2*(16), iii-274.

Ní Shé, C., Farrell, O., Brunton, J., & Costello, E. (2021). Integrating design thinking into instructional design: The #OpenTeach case study. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 38*(1), 33-52.

Okoye, K., Arrona-Palacios, A., Camacho-Zuñiga, C., Hammout, N., Nakamura, E. L., Escamilla, J., & Hosseini, S. (2020). Impact of students evaluation of teaching: A text analysis of the teachers qualities by gender. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 17*(1), 1-27.

Oyarzun, B., Barreto, D., & Conklin, S. (2018). Instructor social presence effects on learner social presence, achievement, and satisfaction. *TechTrends, 62*, 625-634.

Pianta, R. C., La Paro, K. M., & Hamre, B. K. (2008). *Classroom assessment scoring system™: Manual K-3.* Baltimore, MD: Paul H Brookes Publishing.

Poom-Valickis, K., & Löfström, E. (2019). "Pupils should have respect for you, although I have no idea how to achieve this?": The ideals and experiences shaping a teacher's professional identity. *Educational Studies, 45*(2), 145-162.

Prameswari, S. J., & Budiyanto, C. (2017). The development of the effective learning environment by creating an effective teaching in the classroom. *IJIE (Indonesian Journal of Informatics Education), 1*(1), 79-86.

Prawat, R. S. (1992). Teachers' beliefs about teaching and learning: A constructivist perspective. *American Journal of Education, 100*(3), 354-395.

Quintero, L. J. C., & Williamson, B. (2021). Assembling new toolboxes of methods and theories for innovative critical research on educational technology. *NAER: Journal of New Approaches in Educational Research, 10*(1), 1-14.

Reardon, M. (2013). *A review related literature of student teaching evaluation.* Richmond, VA: Virginia Commonwealth University.

Rice, F., Frederickson, N., Shelton, K., McManus, C., Riglin, L., & Ng-Knight, T. (2015). *Identifying factors that predict successful and difficult transitions to secondary school.* London, UK: University College London.

Rivera, P. M., Gómez, F. P., & de Caldas, J. (2017). Understanding student-teachers' performances within an inquiry-based practicum. *English Language Teaching, 10*(4), 127-139.

Rusticus, S. A., Pashootan, T., & Mah, A. (2023). What are the key elements of a positive learning environment? Perspectives from students and faculty. *Learning Environments Research, 26(*1), 161-175.

Shaughnessy, M., DeFino, R., Pfaff, E., & Blunk, M. (2021). I think I made a mistake: How do prospective teachers elicit the thinking of a student who has made a mistake? *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education, 24*, 335-359.

Stewart, J., Lambert, M. D., Ulmer, J. D., Witt, P. A., & Carraway, C. L. (2017). Discovering quality in teacher education: Perceptions concerning what makes an effective cooperating teacher. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 58*(1), 280-299.

Subedi, D. (2009). Assessing English language teaching student teachers on teaching practice. *Journal of NELTA,* 138-145.

Tyagi, A., Jaiswal, D., & Sharma, J. (2023). Role of training comprehensiveness and resource commitment in enhancing the police performance leading to development of public trust. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, 1-12.

Western Governors University. (2022). *Experiential learning theory*. Millcreek, UT: Western Governors University.

Wrenn, J., & Wrenn, B. (2009). Enhancing learning by integrating theory and practice. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 21*(2), 258-265.

Yaakob, M. F. M., Don, Y., Pauzi, N., Fauzi, N. F., & Habibi, A. (2023). Increasing teacher leadership skills in coping with student discipline problems through discipline management approaches. *Mojem: Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Management, 11*(1), 55-67.

Yan, C., & He, C. (2010). Transforming the existing model of teaching practicum: A study of Chinese EFL student teachers' perceptions. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy, 36*(1), 57-73.

Yancey, K. B. (Ed.). (2023). *ePortfolio as curriculum: Models and practices for developing students' ePortfolio literacy*. Milton Park, UK: Taylor & Francis.

Young, R., & Collin, A. (2004). Introduction: Constructivism and social constructionism in the career field. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 64*(3), 373-388.

Zain, I. M., Muniandy, B., & Hashim, W. (2016). An integral ASIE ID model: The 21st century instructional design model for teachers. *Universal Journal of Educational Research, 4*(3), 547-554.

Zheng, L., & Smaldino, S. (2003). Key instructional design elements for distance education. *Quarterly Review of Distance Education, 4*(2), 153-166.

Zurcher, D. M., Phadke, S., Coppola, B. P., & McNeil, A. J. (2016). Using student-generated instructional materials in an e-homework platform. *Journal of Chemical Education, 93*(11), 1871-1878.