The Pennsylvania State University

The Graduate School

Department of Educational and School Psychology and Special Education

EFFECT OF A SELF-EVALUATION CHECKLIST ON THE QUALITY OF STUDENT TEACHERS' SCRIPTED LESSON PLANS

A Thesis in

Special Education

by

Denise M. Casciato

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

May, 2007

The thesis of Denise Casciato has been reviewed and approved* by the following:

Charles Hughes
Professor of Special Education
Chair of Committee
Thesis Adviser

David Lee
Associate Professor of Special Education
Professor-in-Charge of Graduate Programs in Special Education

John Mc Cool
Distinguished Professor of Systems Engineering

*Signatures are on file in the Graduate School

ABSTRACT

Effective instructional strategies allow students to become active learners who are able to practice newly learned skills to mastery (Englert, 1984; Hughes, 1998). One part of effective instruction consistently identified in the literature is prompting. The significance of prompting was also noted by Rosenshine (1995) who recommended that teachers needed to spend more time on this part of direct instruction for students to make academic gains. While it is difficult to ensure that effective teaching practices such as prompting will be used in the classroom, one solution may be to place an emphasis on effective instruction during the student teaching practicum. Student teaching experiences have long been considered an important component of teacher education programs (Sudzina & Knowles, 1993). One promising technique which can be used in student teaching is self-evaluation, a strategy in which the individual observes his/her behavior and rates it according to a predetermined scale (Hughes, Ruhl & Misra, 1989). For this study, a multiple baseline design across participants design was used to evaluate the effects of a self-evaluation checklist on the quality of student teachers' scripted lesson plans. The checklist contained a rubric comprised of nine areas which were summarized from the effective teaching research on guided practice/prompting. Those skill areas were as follows: (a) task analysis (b) prompt step replicates model (c) clarity of question or direction (d) students asked to perform skill, (e) students asked to explain answers, (f) fading of prompts), (h) non-examples and (i) minimal pairs. Student teachers rated themselves on a scale of 1-4 for each part of the scripted prompt step. All participants made gains in each area of the checklist. This study showed that teachers did improve in their ability to write scripted prompt lesson plans which followed a direct instruction format after being instructed in the use of a self-evaluation checklist.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank you to everyone who helped me in this long journey. In particular, I would like to thank my committee. Your patience with me is unsurpassed. Dr. Charles Hughes is the consummate model of an effective educator. He is responsible for training many of the talented teachers I have been fortunate to work with over the years. I have long admired his commitment to the field of special education. Dr. David Lee has inspired all who work with him with his passion and dedication to the research which helps so many students with disabilities. He has been most generous with his time and wisdom. Dr. John McCool is distinguished in his intelligence and wit. I am privileged to know him. Dr. James McAfee taught the first special education course I took at Penn State. I remember being in awe of his breadth of knowledge then, as I am now.

I will always value Dr. Mary Catherine Scheeler as a lifelong friend, respected colleague, and my personal cheerleader. I am indebted to my former student teachers, my current teachers and my Norristown friends including Myra, Anita, Donna and Bill, and particularly, Pam and Cheryl, for their technical expertise. I am thankful for Kristie Bruno's detective work in finding important pieces of research. I would also like to include a personal note of thanks to Dr. Edward Freed for his encouragement and astute feedback.

To my cousins, Christeen Fox and Mary Lou Cahill, my uncles Frank, Joseph, Kevin, Robert and my Aunt Claire, all of whom led significant lives- you are my heroes.

I am most grateful to my siblings, cousins, and my treasured nieces and nephews. They showed me how to teach and learn with compassion and humor. I can't imagine my life without them.

Finally, to my parents, Mary Ann and Carmen, who were my first and greatest teachers. You sustained our family through difficult times, quietly cheered our successes, and always motivated us to meet the next challenge. I will spend the rest of my life thanking you, and striving to honor all that you have done for me.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The principles of effective teaching have been well documented. In a review of the literature on effective instruction, Brophy & Good (1986) noted that effective teachers placed an emphasis on pace, academic engaged time, teacher-led instruction, and providing/soliciting/responding to information. Six teaching functions of effective instruction were identified by Rosenshine and Stevens (1986): daily review and checking homework, presentation, guided practice, correctives and feedback, independent practice, and weekly and monthly review. Ellis and Lenz (1999) found that students' rate of success was positively correlated to the amount of time they received direct instruction from the teacher. With the use of effective teaching practices, students become active learners who are able to practice newly learned skills to mastery (Englert, 1984; Hughes, 1998).

One part of effective instruction is prompting, also known as guided practice. Prompted practice occurs when the teacher guides students to perform a skill during the acquisition stage of learning, usually through verbal teacher questioning (Hughes, 1998). Good and Grous, (1979), Brophy & Good (1986) and Rosenshine and Stevens (1986) promoted the use of "prompt-practice-prove" to help students achieve. The significance of prompts was emphasized by Rosenshine (1995) who recommended that more time be spent on this step of instruction. He suggested that ineffective teachers tend to move from the model to check, often disregarding the prompt step. Without prompts, students were unable to complete academic tasks correctly, and made minimal progress. Prompts should allow the students to practice newly acquired skills correctly (Deshler & Schumaker, 1998; Englemann, 1980; Kameenui & Simmons, 1990), and should be systematically developed to promote errorless learning (Deshler & Schumaker, 1998). Errorless learning has been defined as an instructional procedure that uses prompts to

elicit only correct responses from students (Alberto and Troutman, 2003). Teachers are viewed as an integral part of the prompt step; it is the teacher's responsibility to construct and deliver effective prompts which guide the student from a passive to an active learner (Rosenshine, 1997).

Although the use of well designed instruction has been shown to have a positive effect on student performance (Brophy & Good, 1986), researchers continue to voice their concerns that these empirically validated practices are not being applied to the classroom (Gersten & Brengelman, 1996; Gersten, Vaughn, Deshler & Schiller, 1997; Rosenberg, 1996; Simpson, Whelan & Zabel, 1993; Wong, 1997). The goal of every educator should be to use effective instructional strategies to maximize levels of student achievement.

It is difficult to ensure that effective teaching practices such as prompting will be used in the classroom. One solution may be to place an emphasis on effective instruction during the student teaching practicum. Although student teaching is considered to be one of the most essential components of an undergraduate teacher training program (Sudzina & Knowles, 1993), there has been limited research in this area. For example, there is little longitudinal information about the impact of the cooperating teacher and the length of the practicum on later teaching performance (Buck, Morsink, Griffin, Hines & Lenk, 1992). Moreover, Lyon, Vaassen and Toomey (1989) found that general and special education teachers received little or no supervisory support during student teaching. The teachers in this study reported that lack of supervision had a negative effect on their ability to interact with, and learn from other faculty. Similarly, in a follow-up of first year special education teachers, Morsink, Blackhurst, and Williams (1979) stated that increased amount of supervision during student teaching resulted in higher job satisfaction. Supervision may be able to provide a link between best practices and the classroom for student teachers.

A variety of instructional methods can be used in the supervisory situation. One promising technique which can be used in student teaching is self-evaluation, a self-management strategy in which the individual observes his/her behavior and rates it according to a predetermined scale (Hughes, Ruhl & Misra, 1989). Strong self-management skills are essential for effective teaching, and teacher education programs should provide specific guidelines to help educators analyze their skills (McDougal and Brady, 1998; Renzaglia, Hutchins and Lee, 1997). Garland (1982) recommended that student teachers should move from a passive to active role in the evaluation process. Techniques such as self-evaluation could increase independence for student teachers, and therefore supplement more direct forms of supervision. With other populations, self-management strategies have resulted in generalization to other settings (Misra, 1992). This represents an appropriate shift for student teachers who will soon be novice teachers without the support of the university supervisor and a cooperating teacher.

Perhaps the use of effective instructional strategies in the classroom can best be controlled through carefully developed teacher education programs. Guyton and McIntyre (1990) emphasized the need for teacher education programs where the coursework and field experiences shared a conceptual framework. This study attempts to follow the guidelines suggested by Guyton and McIntyre (1990) by assisting student teachers in generalizing the effective teaching skills they have been taught in their required classes to the student teaching setting. Since the participants in this study have all had training in direct instruction, it is hoped they can use this knowledge, along with self-evaluation, to improve the quality of the prompt step in their lesson plans.

This study will address the following question:

Does self-evaluation improve the quality of the prompt step in student teachers' lesson plans?

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter is a comprehensive review of the research on three main topics: (a) direct/effective instruction, (b) preservice student teaching, and (c) self evaluation. Direct instruction is the overarching principle that guides the use of prompting and other components of effective instruction.

Direct/Explicit Instruction

Since students with disabilities have struggled academically, it's appropriate that they should be taught with evidence based teaching practices that can allow them to succeed in the classroom. Direct instruction, also referred to as explicit instruction, and has proven to be effective instructional strategy (Brophy & Good, 1986; Carnine, & Stein, 1990; Ellis & Fouts, 1997; Gersten & Keating, 1989; Hempenstall, 1999; Llyod, Forness, & Kavale, 1990; Rosenshine, 1986; Rosenshine& Stevens, 1986; Silbert, Carnine, & Stein, 1990; Simmons, Baker, Fuchs, Fuchs & Zigmond, 1995). Direct instruction embraces the principles of effective instruction. Rosenshine and Stevens (1986) found the use of effective instruction practices resulted in higher levels of achievement for students. They identified six teaching functions of effective instruction: daily review and checking homework, presentation, guided practice, correctives and feedback, independent practice, and weekly and monthly review. Students' rate of academic success was positively correlated to the amount of time they received direct instruction from the teacher (Ellis & Lenz, 1996).

Rosenshine (1986) described direct instruction as "the performance of students is monitored, questions are at a low cognitive level, and feedback is immediate and

academically oriented (p.67)". Direct instruction has also been defined as "the systematic teaching of academic strategies to students" (pp. 22, Simmons et al., 1995). Five principles of direct instruction were outlined by Stein, Carnine and Dixon (1998): (a) teach big ideas in content (teach to mastery), (b) teach explicit/generalizable strategies (use a variety of problem types), (c) use scaffolding to assist student in learning new material, (d) integrate skills and concepts within/across discipline, and (e) provide adequate review.

Although there is much evidence to support the use of effective instruction in the classroom, research continues to show this is not occurring (Gersten & Brengelman, 1996; Gersten et al., 1997; Rosenberg, 1996; Simpson, et al., 1993; Wong, 1997). Since students with disabilities are usually struggling academically, an ineffective teacher will only exacerbate the situation. Effective instruction strategies should be used to enhance student achievement.

Gersten and Keating (1989) reviewed the results of Project Follow Through. This longitudinal study by the US Department of Education compared the effectiveness of twelve different instructional programs with over 100,000 at risk children across the United States. The authors concluded that direct instruction was the most effective approach, and that students who received direct instruction made academic gains in reading, language and math. The long term positive results varied according to region, but they included a lower dropout rate, better attendance, fewer grade retentions, and a higher graduation rate.

A meta-analysis of direct instruction by Llyod et al., (1990), and a review of the literature by Ellis and Fouts, (1997) also determined there is a strong empirical base to

support the use of direct instruction. The use of direct instruction with mildly handicapped learners is supported by many researchers including Christenson, Yssledyke and Thurlow (1989), Gersten, (1998); Hughes, (1998), and Lloyd, et al., (1998). In summarizing effective teaching practices for students with mild handicaps, Christenson, et al., (1989) classified four categories of "instructional clarity:" (a) a demonstration prompt/practice, (b) the degree to which instruction is explicit, (c) student understanding of task demands, and (d) systematic application of learning principles. (p.24).

Prompting. One part of effective instruction that is consistently identified in the literature is prompting. In an early study, Zeamon and House (1963) proposed that special education students need more prompting to reach mastery of skills. The significance of prompting was also noted by Rosenshine (1995). He recommended that teachers needed to spend more time on this part of direct instruction for students to make gains. Without prompts, students were unable to complete academic tasks correctly, and made minimal progress. Prompts should allow the students to practice newly acquired skills correctly (Englemann, 1980; Kameenui & Simmons, 1990; Deshler & Schumaker, 1998).

In order for prompts to be effective, they must be carefully developed (Deshler & Schumaker, 1998; Rosenshine, 1997), provide immediate feedback (Englert, 1984; Swanson, 1999) and be systematically faded (Swanson, 1999). It is the teacher's responsibility to develop prompts which guide the student from a passive to an active learner. Prompts and corrective feedback are important, as teachers who use carefully constructed prompts promote errorless learning (Deshler & Schumaker, 1998; Englemann, 1980; Kameenui & Simmons, 1990). Errorless learning has been defined as

"an instructional procedure that prompts to evoke only correct responses."(p. 533, Alberto & Troutman, 2003). The use of most to least prompts is recommended to support errorless learning (Alberto & Troutman (2003); Demchak (1990). When students are prompted to practice correct responses, they do not practice errors which will have to be unlearned.

Corrective feedback can differ depending upon whether the errors are procedural or factual (Hughes, 1998). Errors also need to be carefully checked for systematic patterns (Deshler & Schumaker, 1998; Kameenui & Simmons, 1990). A study by Rosenshine (1997) found that effective teachers were found to ask specific task related questions and provide feedback, while ineffective teachers were found to ask fewer questions, and provide minimal prompts when correcting errors. Effective teachers also provide feedback that is immediate, non-judgmental, and related to the task (Rosenshine, 1997).

Scaffolding is part of prompting and corrective feedback. It provides "support" for students during initial stages of skill acquisition. It should not be viewed as a permanent fixture; instead, it should be taken away in increments to allow students to become more independent learners (Kameenui & Carnine, 1998), Rosenshine, 1997; Stein, Carnine, and Dixon, 1998) define scaffolding as carefully constructed feedback and materials to assist student in completing work independently. Good scaffolding is dependent upon the teacher's knowledge of the curriculum; the level of scaffolding should be directly related to the student's ability (Pressley, Hogan, Wharton-McDonald, Mistretta, & Ettenberger (1996). Some examples of scaffolding were identified by Rosenshine (1997) and they are as follows: providing procedural prompts (wh questions),

providing models of appropriate responses, thinking aloud while modeling, anticipating potential problem areas, and controlling difficulty of material. Wharton and Mistretta (1996) caution that scaffolding should not be used in isolation and it should be coupled with other effective teaching strategies. Teachers can control task difficulty through scaffolding (Swanson, 1999), thus decreasing student errors.

Examples/Non-Examples

Another important part of direct instruction is the use of examples and non-examples. Examples should be based on skills that the students have just been taught, while non-examples should provide a review of previously taught skills which serve as discrimination examples (Stein, Kinder, Silbert & Carnine, 2006). A study by Englert (1984) showed effective teachers used more examples, and non-examples. When examining the teaching of fractions to students with learning disabilities, Kelly, Gerstein and Carnine (1990) recommended using a full range of examples, and that similar items should be clustered together. Other researchers suggested that the range of examples and non-examples must be appropriate and varied (Englemann, 1980; Kameenui and Simmons 1990).

The ability of the teacher to be able to recognize or develop good examples and non-examples is underscored by a recent analysis of mathematics textbooks by Jitendra, Griffin, Deatline-Buchman, Dipipi-Hoy, Scesniak, Sokol and Xin (2005). In a review of five 3rd grade textbooks, the authors found that only two contained sufficient examples, while none contained non-examples. In order to ensure students can master skills, teachers will have to provide supplementary materials to the curriculum. If they do not

have adequate preparation in the area of examples and non-examples, their students tend to under generalize or over generalize their responses.

Field Experiences/Student Teaching

Field Experiences are considered to be one of the most important components of teacher education programs by educators and student teachers alike (Sudzina & Knowles, 1993). The skills of the supervisor and cooperating teacher, the teaching placement, and the framework of the undergraduate program have all been identified as factors that can have a positive or negative impact upon the student teacher's success (Renzaglia, et .al., 1997). Although longitudinal research is nearly non-existent, the significance of student teaching continues to be stressed (Maheady & Greenwood, 1997). Despite this, there continues to be a lack of empirical data about the effects of the student teaching experience (Buck, et al., 1992; Maheady & Greenwood, 1997; Ross, Colon, & McCallum, 2005). Maheady and Greenwood (1997) suggested instead of measuring teacher competencies, teachers must be able to demonstrate they know how to teach a specific skill. Ultimately and ideally, student gains should be used to measure the success of teachers (Brownell, Ross, Colon, & McCallum (2005).

The requirements of special education undergraduate student teaching programs also differ. Conderman, Morin, and Stephens (2005) surveyed 61 undergraduate special education programs to examine their grading systems, assignments and supervision. They found that 48% of the student teachers received a letter grade, and that 45% used a satisfactory/unsatisfactory (U or S) rating. The majority of those receiving a letter grade had A's, while the majority of those receiving a rating were satisfactory. Ninety-seven percent were required to write lesson plans, while only 36% were required to audiotape

or videotape a lesson. Eighty percent were required to reflect upon their experiences. More than half of the student teachers had to write an assessment report, or develop a behavior-change project. Over 98% of supervisors provided feedback either in written or oral form to student teachers.

In a national survey of 115 institutions of higher education, Prater and Sileo (2004) found commonalities in the strengths and weaknesses of the respondents' special education teacher programs. Among the programs' assets were strong university and student teaching practicum site relationships, multiple preservice settings, field experiences that were coordinated with methods courses, opportunities to work with a diverse population, and a solid, conceptual framework. Several of these strengths were also seen as challenges for other teacher education programs. In order to determine the effect of the student teaching experience on students, the authors recommended that more research should focus on the number, length and variety of field experiences, as well as the frequency of supervisory visits. They voiced concern that limitations which were identified in the special education student teaching literature a decade ago (Buck et al., 1992) were still not addressed.

Mastropieri's (1989) was among the first to suggest that special education teacher program general education research based on effective teacher characteristics to determine what constitutes an exemplary. Brownell et al., (2005) expanded upon this, and reviewed the special education preservice teacher research from 1990 to 2003. They concluded that strong supervision was an integral component to the success of preservice programs, and that preservice teaching experiences needed to be carefully developed and monitored. They also contended that student teachers' coursework should reflect

research validated practices, and these practices should be used during their preservice experiences. They advocated increased government and professional organizations to support comparative and longitudinal studies in special education teacher education, as there are still no conclusive studies that support a particular program structure.

In an early look at recent graduates of a special education teaching program, Morsink, Blackhurst and Williams (1979) discussed a follow-up strategy to assist first year teachers. A pilot program was developed using "SOS" audiotapes. When the teachers had a problem, they were asked to record it on "SOS" cassettes and send it back to their supervisor. While there were a small number of subjects, and they participated on a voluntary basis, the authors stated that some changes were made to the teacher preparation program based on the teachers' responses. The ability of the teachers to reflect upon their concerns was seen as being an important part of this process.

Several studies recommended that student teachers be given an opportunity to be more reflective in their preservice experiences (Dieker & Monda-Amaya, 1997; Goethals & Howard, 2000; Pelletier, 2000). Weiss and Weiss (2001) suggested that an effective framework for good reflective practices should have the student teacher playing an active, rather than passive role in the process. Buck, et al (1992) proposed that preservice teachers should link their field experiences to their undergraduate coursework. By doing this, they would be better able to evaluate and assess their own performance.

Self-Evaluation

Self-evaluation is a part of self-management techniques which includes self-monitoring (documenting if behavior occurred), self-instruction (providing prompts for solving problem) and self-reinforcing (choosing and administering reward). In self-

evaluation a person measures and evaluates his/her own performance according to previously established criteria (Hughes, Ruhl & Misra, 1989; Kanfer &Gaelick-Buys, 1991). A majority of the special education research on self-management techniques has focused on students with disabilities. These students typically work on academic skills and specific behaviors. In a review of nineteen self-management research articles on students with mental retardation, Hughes, Korinek and Gorman (1991) found there were generally positive outcomes for students. The majority of studies used self-monitoring and self-instruction strategies. There were no self-reinforcement studies, while self-evaluation was only used twice. It was recommended that future research provide students with the opportunity to show generalization and maintenance of newly acquired behaviors. While the type of self-management strategy chosen should be dependent upon the student's cognitive abilities, another study cautioned against the structure of some programs. Gross and Brigham (1980) described a study where students who had been successful using self-evaluation rebelled because of the time involved using them. Thus, self-evaluation instruments should be developed which are able to be used efficiently and effectively.

Although most self-management research has focused on students with disabilities, there is an increasing number of studies on the use of self-management strategies with special education teachers. An early study by Johnston and Afflerbach (1983) concluded that self evaluation increased the use of effective teaching practices, and could result in long-term changes in teacher instruction. Griffin and Kilgore (1998) investigated the use of self-assessment with special education student teachers. In this study, Group A was asked to evaluate their lessons and provide a written response using

the following criteria: 1) clarify and define problematic situations of practice, 2) identify the source of their problems, 3) suggest alternative instructional strategies to address their problems, and 4) assess the adequacy of their solutions (p. 57). This information was used by the supervisor to guide the post-conference. Group B received traditional supervisory feedback; no organized self-assessment system was in place, and the majority of post-lesson discussion was led by the supervisor. While the results showed there was no difference between the two groups, and that the structured self-assessment had no effect on their teaching behaviors, the authors did see a link between the practices of beginning teachers, and their future teaching behavior. This suggests that preservice teaching may present the opportunity to affect positive changes in teaching behaviors with potential implications for their beginning years of teaching.

Allinder, Bolling, Oats and Gagnon (2000) looked at the impact of self-monitoring for teachers of students with disabilities, and its effect on these students' mathematics achievement. Thirty-one teachers were divided into three groups. Two treatment groups received instruction in curriculum based measurement (CBM), while the control group received no training. The treatment groups were then split, with one half receiving training in self-monitoring (CBM/SM). The CBM/SM group also had to answer a series of questions which included how the student had improved, and what new target skills could be developed. A formal plan was then developed for 2-3 weeks, and changed as necessary throughout an entire school year. The results showed the students of those teachers who had both CBM and self-monitoring training made the greatest gains. It was suggested that when provided with the framework of the self-monitoring questions, the CBM/SM teachers were better able to adjust the instruction to fit their

students' needs. The authors also stated that self-monitoring also had implications for use with praise, questioning techniques and delivery of instruction.

A study by Sutherland and Wehby (2001) focused on the effects of self-evaluation on special education teachers who taught students with emotional disturbances. They looked at their rate of praise and the frequency of correct academic responses. The experimental group was instructed in the use of positive praise. These teachers were then asked to practice the praise strategies, and listen to five minutes of their audio taped instruction each day. They predicted a goal for praise statements over a fifteen minute period, and then charted their actual results on a daily basis. The experimental group made significant gains over the control group during the intervention phase in increasing the frequency of praise statements and correct responses. However, this did not continue during the maintenance phase where the experimental group's behavior reverted to levels displayed during the baseline phase. The authors contended that the limited number of probes during the maintenance phase could have had a negative impact on the results.

Even though effective instruction techniques have been empirically validated, it appears teachers are not using these practices in the classroom (Deshler & Shiller,1997; Gersten & Brengelman, 1996; Gersten, Vaughn, Deshler & Schiller, 1997; Rosenberg, 1996; Simpson, Whelan & Zabel, 1993; Wong, 1997). Student teachers should have ample opportunities to practice effective teaching strategies before they enter the teaching profession. However, there is little research on student teachers' use of effective instruction when developing lesson plans. General guidelines to promote use of effective instruction strategies by preservice teachers were developed by Mastropieri (1989). She noted the importance of scripted lesson plans to prevent student teachers from deviating

from lesson objectives. Although there was no research to substantiate the use of scripts, it was recommended preservice teachers script their plans to enable their students to reach the intended objectives. Presently, there are no data to support the use of scripted prompt lesson plans. Since prompting was seen as being an integral part of effective teaching, and self-evaluation has proven to be a helpful self-management technique, this study attempts to address this void by having the subjects complete a Self-Evaluation Prompt Checklist. Student teachers have many demands placed on them, so the completion of the checklist should add minimal time to their student teaching requirements. The purpose of this study was to examine the effect of the use of this checklist with pre-service teachers scripted lesson plans.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

Participants and Setting

The initial pool of participants was comprised of fifteen special education student teachers from a large state university, who were placed in the same urban-suburban school district for their practicum. All had taken undergraduate coursework which focused on instructional and curriculum design, and effective instructional procedures. Each student teacher completed the same assignments, and fulfilled the same responsibilities in the classroom to meet the requirements of the student teaching practicum. A pre-assessment was conducted to select the participants for the study from this initial pool. To collect pre-assessment data, each student teacher submitted their lesson plans for one week. To insure anonymity, every student teacher randomly chose a number from 1 to 15; each lesson plan was subsequently identified by that number for the remainder of the study. Those student teachers who exhibited the greatest difficulty writing the scripted prompt step, as shown by the lowest average scores, were chosen to be part of the study.

Mark was a 21 year old male assigned to an elementary Resource Room Learning Support Classroom; his area of instruction was fourth grade math. The number of students in his math class ranged from 10 to 15. The students in this classroom were classified as learning disabled, mildly mentally retarded, or emotionally disturbed. Dana was a 21 year old female assigned to an elementary Resource Room Learning Support Classroom; her area of instruction was third grade math. All of her students were diagnosed with learning disabilities. The number of students in her class ranged from 8

to 10. John was a 22 year old male assigned to a Full-time Emotional Support Classroom in a high school; his area of instruction was communications. The number of students in his classroom ranged from 10 to 13. All students in the Emotional Support classroom were classified as emotionally disturbed; four also had learning disabilities, while one who was also mildly mentally retarded.

Approximately 6,500 students were enrolled in the school district. The demographics were as follows: 44% -Caucasian, 46%-African American, 2%-Asian, and 3% Hispanic. Special education services were provided for 16% of the school population.

Dependent Variable

Scores from the Prompt Self-Evaluation Checklist served as the dependent measure for this study. The researcher used the checklist (see Appendix A) to evaluate each participant's plan after it was developed, and before it was implemented in the classroom. The checklist contained a rubric comprised of nine areas which were summarized from the effective teaching research on guided practice/prompting. The nine areas were as follows: (a) task analysis (Rosenshine,1995); (b) prompt step replicates model (Deshler & Schumaker, 1998; Ellis & Lenz, 1998; Hughes, 1998;), (c) clarity of question or direction (Rosenshine 1995; Rosenshine and Stevens, 1986; Rosenshine, 1986; Stallings, Cory, Fairweather and Needels; Swanson, 1999), (d) students asked to perform skill (Gersten, 1998; Rosenshine, 1986, Rosenshine & Stevens, 1986, Rosenshine, 1995), (e) students asked to explain answers, (Gersten, 1998; Rosenshine 1995; Rosenshine & Stevens, 1986; Rosenshine, 1986; Swanson, 1999), (f) fading of prompts (Demchak, 1989; Rosenshine, 1995; Swanson, 1999), (g) examples, (Rosenshine and Stevens, 1986); (h) non-examples (Hughes, 1998; Kaneenui &

Simmons, 1990), and (i) minimal pairs (Kaneenui & Simmons, 1990). A scale of 1-4 was used to rate each part of the scripted prompt step.

Procedures

Baseline. During the baseline condition, all student teachers designed and taught a lesson to their respective students each day. As with all lesson plans the student teachers taught throughout the semester, they were also required to document whether the students met the lesson objective, and provide a short narrative to describe the strengths and weaknesses of every lesson. A copy of the lesson plan and an evaluation of student and teacher performance were made by the participant, and collected by the researcher. The scripted prompt section of the lesson plan was then evaluated by the researcher according to the rubric of the Prompt Self-Evaluation Checklist.

A traditional supervisory method was used during baseline. The supervisor observed the entire lesson (the average lesson time ranging from 40 to 60 minutes), and wrote a narrative summary of the lesson, including event recording of specific teacher or student behavior as needed. When the lesson was finished, the supervisor held a post-conference to discuss the lesson's outcome, and recommendations for implementing and delivery future instruction would be discussed. These post-conferences were usually held immediately after the lesson, however some were held later in the day due to schedule conflicts. The supervisor observed each student teacher ten to eleven times during the semester.

All student teachers were required to write daily lesson plans for each lesson they taught. These lesson plans followed the model previously introduced in their

undergraduate direct instruction classes. A typical lesson plan included the following: lesson objectives, opening (with attention, review, goal and relevance of lesson), body (model, prompt and check steps), and closing (review, preview, and independent work). The student teachers also summarized the instructional activities for each step of the lesson, and there was no scripting required for any portion of the plan. However, for this study, in addition to lesson plans that followed the same direct instruction format, every student teacher was also required to include a fully scripted prompt section. This lesson was then taught by the student teacher to one class on a daily basis. The researcher then independently rated the lesson plans of each student using the same checklist. Feedback was provided by the researcher to the participants within three days of receiving and reviewing the lesson plan. The researcher met with each participant, and specific areas of concern were addressed on an individual basis.

Intervention. The independent variable was the completion of the Prompt Self-Evaluation Checklist (see Appendix A). Just prior to intervention, the researcher provided instruction in the use of the Prompt Self-Evaluation Checklist using three of a given participant's baseline lesson plans. A modified model-prompt-check format was followed to teach this checklist. First, each statement on the checklist was reviewed, and an explanation of the rubric was provided. The researcher modeled the use of the Prompt Self-Evaluation Checklist. The prompt section of the participant's first lesson plan was rated by the researcher according to the checklist, and an explanation of each score was provided. Then, the researcher and Mark used the Prompt Self-Evaluation Checklist together to rate the prompt section of the second lesson plan. Each section was discussed, and if there were any discrepancies in the scoring, that specific section was

reviewed. Finally, the participant and researcher completed the Prompt Self-Evaluation checklist for the third lesson plan independently. Mark's checklist scores were compared with the researcher's checklist scores. If there were significant differences in any section, that section was reviewed. When the researcher and participant's scores were similar, the student teacher was required to complete the checklist independently after writing each lesson plan. A supplementary sheet was provided which reviewed the components of each section of the checklist (see Appendix B). In addition, the student teachers were required to record their scores for each section of the checklist on a summary sheet (see Appendix C). If there were ratings of 1 or 2 for any section (which indicated poor performance), the participant was asked to make corrections on the lesson plan. A copy of every lesson plan and the completed Prompt Self-Evaluation Checklist was collected on a weekly basis by the researcher. The lesson plan was then reviewed, and evaluated by the researcher using the Prompt Self-Evaluation Checklist criteria. Each participant's daily average scores on each item, as well as a composite score, were plotted on individual graphs by the researcher.

Experimental Design

A single-subject multiple baseline design was used to evaluate the effects of self-evaluation (independent variable) on the quality of student teachers' lesson plans (dependent variable). A multiple-baseline across subjects design was used in this study (Tawney & Gast, 1984). This design documented each participant's performance (on writing the prompt step in lesson plans). This study included two phases: baseline and intervention (see Figure 2). Data were collected for every lesson delivered for three student teachers during the baseline and intervention phase.