Journal of Social and Scientific Education, Vol. 2 No. 3: 250-267 ISSN 3047-0684
Available online at https://doi.org/10.58230/josse.v2i3.386

Evaluation of On-Campus Practice Teaching at a Laboratory High School of a University using the Group-Level Assessment

[1]May Ann B. Lapitan, [2]Ann Jelin G. Angeles, [3]Rufo Gil Z. Albor, [4]Abriel S. Bulasag, [5]Inero V. Ancho
University of the Philippines Los Baños, Philippines
[5]ivancho@up.edu.ph

ABSTRACT

The group-level assessment (GLA) is a type of participatory evaluation that involves stakeholders in generating themes and action plans in the process. The primary objective of this study is to evaluate the on-campus practice teaching program at a university laboratory high school (LHSU) using GLA. Since 2006, fourth-year students pursuing a Bachelor of Science in Mathematics and Science Teaching have participated in on-campus practice teaching at LHSU. The absence of systematic feedback collection and comprehensive evaluation has led to program supervision relying on anecdotal experiences and observations by LHSU coordinators and cooperating teachers (CTs). This study addresses this gap by aiming to identify strengths, needs, areas for improvement, and action plans generated by stakeholders. Employing a qualitative participatory design through GLA, 16 stakeholders participated, providing data through responses to open-ended prompts. Recognized strengths include the program's role in translating theoretical knowledge into real-world teaching scenarios, while needs involve establishing on-campus teaching colloquia and a resource hub for teaching and learning materials. An identified area for improvement is enhancing feedback mechanisms. Stakeholders proposed action plans, including establishing partnerships with local and international teacher education institutions, and establishing a department for the mathematics and science teaching program. This study makes a substantial contribution by enhancing the quality of teacher preparation programs in mathematics and science education. Furthermore, this study serves as a valuable reference for future researchers engaged in the evaluation of practice teaching or education programs using GLA.

Keywords: Group Level Assessment, Participatory Evaluation, Practice Teaching Evaluation, Program Evaluation

INTRODUCTION

The on-campus practice teaching program at LHSU commenced in 2006 with the start of the practicum of the first cohort of fourth-year students enrolled in the Bachelor of Science in Mathematics and Science Teaching program at a university in Laguna. The student teachers (STs) are majors in biology, mathematics, science, or chemistry. This is the reason why the mathematics and science teachers at LHSU have been assigned to serve as CTs to STs. There are also two CTs from LHSU assigned to facilitate the on-campus practice teaching program: one from the math and one from the science department. They are called LHSU coordinators. Since the university does not have a faculty of education to facilitate practice teaching, the main responsibility for the supervision, planning, organization, and implementation of the on-campus teaching program lies mainly with the LHSU coordinators.

The practice teaching program is a 120-hour teaching experience that takes place over 15–16 weeks in a semester. The first week is dedicated to an orientation of the school and course policies, course requirements, the grading system, the roles and responsibilities of all

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.
*Copyright (c) 2025 **May Ann B. Lapitan, Ann Jelin G. Angeles, Rufo Gil Z. Albor, Abriel S. Bulasag, Inero V. Ancho**

the stakeholders, and an overview of their on-campus activities. In the second and third weeks, the STs observe their CTs' and other teachers' classes at LHSU.

Despite the program's long existence, only two evaluations have been conducted to date. The first evaluation occurred when the practice teaching program transitioned to a remote learning mode, serving as an informal feedback-gathering mechanism from STs and CTs to enhance the program's remote delivery. The second evaluation utilized the CIPP model to assess the context, input, process, and product dimensions of the on-campus practice teaching program. The results of the CIPP evaluation were used by the LHSU coordinators to further improve the offering of the program in a blended learning mode. While these efforts offered valuable insights, they also highlighted the need for a more participatory, inclusive, and sustained evaluation approach that actively engages all program stakeholders.

The lack of systematic and continuous feedback collection and comprehensive evaluation has resulted in a dependency on anecdotal experiences and observations by LHSU coordinators and CTs for program supervision. This absence of formal assessment creates challenges that are addressed reactively rather than proactively. Recognizing the pivotal role of practice teaching programs in preparing future educators, there is an urgent need for a systematic evaluation to ensure program effectiveness (Abdullah & Mirza, 2020; Tindowen et al., 2019). Furthermore, the program lacks a structured framework for improvement, posing a risk of neglecting crucial areas that could enhance alignment with the educational needs and aspirations of stakeholders.

Training prospective teachers is a crucial component of every teacher's educational curriculum, as it equips STs with the necessary skills and knowledge to eventually qualify as effective educators (Ulla, 2016). Additionally, the practice teaching component is a key aspect of any teacher training program (Abdullah & Mirza, 2020; Calamlam et al., 2016). Moreover, practice teaching is a procedure that includes the activities done at the practice school to hone the abilities an ST acquired during their undergraduate studies (Abdullah & Mirza, 2020; Ekiz, 2022; Sürücü et al., 2017).

The purpose of the practice teaching course is to familiarize STs with teachers and students through observations and interviews in schools where they practice (Ekiz, 2022). In addition, since learning occurs in a variety of systems and forms, practice teaching programs have been seen as an essential component of the curriculum for higher education because they bridge the gap between theory and practice (Tindowen et al., 2019).

In the Philippines, all teacher education curricula across higher education institutions mandate the inclusion of practicum teaching as a requisite for obtaining degrees in Bachelor of Elementary and Secondary Education (Ulla, 2016). Graduation for students in teacher education and arts programs is contingent upon the completion of the prescribed number of hours for both actual classroom observation and practice teaching (Ulla, 2016).

Importantly, recent studies emphasize that the effectiveness of practicum programs is strongly influenced by the quality of feedback mechanisms and meaningful stakeholder engagement during evaluation (Burns & Apgar, 2024; Omodan et al., 2024; Rodríguez-Campos & Bauman, 2024). These investigations suggest that participatory evaluation approaches yield outcomes that are more actionable and contextually relevant, fostering collective ownership and sustained program improvement (Boyle & Cook, 2025; Holmén et al., 2021; Leal Filho et al., 2025).

Realizing the importance of properly implementing practice teaching programs for future educators, an evaluation of the practice teaching program offered at LHSU was conducted in 2022 using the CIPP model. The Teaching Practice Evaluation Questionnaire that was developed by Aslan and Saglam (2017) and translated into English in the study conducted by Ekiz (2022) was used as the main instrument for evaluation. Added to the questionnaire are open-ended questions on each component of the CIPP model in order for the participants to elaborate further on their views on the indicated items per CIPP dimension. Some of the recommendations were to conduct this study with a larger number of participants, consider including all the stakeholders in the program in evaluating the program for a more meaningful and comprehensive evaluation, and do a regular review of the program to get the feedback of all the stakeholders regarding the program implementation and use this information to further improve the program. These recommendations were implemented in the present study.

According to Vaughn & Lohmueller (2014), the GLA evolved as a modification of the Group Level Team Assessment (Reddy, 1996). Although initially designed as a three-day training and organizational development tool to enhance the performance of intact organizational teams, the GLA has been consistently utilized since its establishment in 1998 (Vaughn & Lohmueller, 2014). Moreover, GLA is a participatory large-group method that involves the collaborative generation of timely and valid qualitative data (Vaughn & Lohmueller, 2014). Furthermore, the GLA is most appropriate for groups ranging from 15 to 60 individuals, although the process can be adjusted for smaller or larger groups. This methodology has found application in diverse evaluation-related projects, spanning program evaluation, research, needs assessment, intervention planning, project management, curriculum development, and community building (Vaughn & Lohmueller, 2014). While GLA has been applied in science education, youth development, and healthcare, its use in teacher education remains rare, presenting a methodologically novel contribution in this field.

Moreover, recent participatory evaluation studies reinforce the relevance of this approach in higher education. For example, Wang et al. (2022) demonstrated how participatory pedagogical approaches in sustainability education can influence students' competencies, attitudes, and behaviors. Yuan et al. (2022) applied video-based reflective practice in language teacher education to bridge institutional expectations with classroom realities, highlighting the value of collaborative evaluation in professional development. In addition, Harawa (2022) examined participatory monitoring and evaluation in a school improvement program in Malawi, concluding that shared decision-making fosters a stronger culture of accountability and innovation.

The following authors implemented the GLA in their studies using seven steps: Graham et al. (2015), Vaughn and DeJonckheere (2019), Vaughn et al. (2020), and Vaughn and Lohmueller (2014). These are the seven steps: climate setting, generating, appreciating, reflecting, understanding, selecting, and action. By applying the GLA process, they were able to involve the stakeholders in the entire process of evaluation, especially in identifying themes and formulating action plans to further improve the programs being evaluated in their studies.

In light of the gaps mentioned and given the importance of practice teaching programs, this study aims to systematically evaluate the on-campus practice teaching program at LHSU using the group-level assessment (GLA) model. The GLA model enables the generation of participant-driven data and the formulation of action plans relevant to the evaluation (Vaughn

& Lohmueller, 2014). Furthermore, it explores the potential of adapting and scaling GLA across other teacher training programs, from institutional review cycles to national quality assurance initiatives and regional inter-university collaborations. Specifically, the study seeks to answer how stakeholders perceive the strengths and areas requiring improvement within LHSU's on-campus practice teaching program. It also investigates what specific aspects of the program stakeholders identify as needing attention and what solutions they propose to address these concerns.

METHODS OF RESEARCH

Research Design

This study employed a qualitative, participatory evaluation design using the Group-Level Assessment (GLA) framework (Vaughn & Lohmueller, 2014). GLA is a structured, seven-step participatory process designed to elicit stakeholder perspectives, cluster and prioritize ideas, and generate actionable recommendations through facilitated group dialogue. The approach is particularly suited to program evaluations in education because it combines real-time data generation with collaborative meaning-making, thereby ensuring that findings are grounded in the lived experiences of participants (Curtis, 2021; Zukoski & Luluquisen, 2021). It has been successfully applied in teacher education and community-based program contexts where stakeholder engagement is essential (Boyle & Cook, 2025; Holmén et al., 2021). The present study applied GLA to evaluate the on-campus practice teaching program, with the dual aims of identifying strengths and areas for improvement and fostering a sense of shared responsibility among stakeholders for implementing changes.

Participants

The GLA session was attended by sixteen (16) purposively selected participants, including STs, CTs, CAs, and program administrators. This group was intentionally kept small to ensure equitable participation and the possibility of reaching consensus within the limited time frame of a facilitated session. While small by quantitative standards, such a group size is optimal for GLA and other participatory qualitative designs, as it allows for rich dialogue, minimizes the risk of voices being overshadowed, and fosters trust among participants (Vaughn & Lohmueller, 2014; Bamberger et al., 2012). The session took place in a dedicated meeting space conducive to group work, with large wall-mounted cartolina sheets prepared for data generation, clustering, and labeling.

Instruments/ Materials

The main instrument used in the evaluation is the set of prompts. Developing prompts is crucial and integral to data collection in GLA (Vaughn & DeJonckheere, 2019). Prompts are open-ended statements or fill-in-the-blank sentences to encourage participants to share their own thoughts and experiences (Vaughn & DeJonckheere, 2019). The prompts to be displayed on the wall charts should be intentionally balanced, encompassing a mix of open-ended and structured elements, strengths and weaknesses, positive and negative aspects, specific and broad, and a blend of both playful and serious tones, in alignment with the recommendations put forth by Reddy (1996), cited in Vaughn and Lohmueller (2014).

Initially, 32 prompts were drafted patterned after the prompts developed by Vaughn and Lohmueller (2014). According to Vaughn and Lohmueller (2014), evaluators can use their developed prompts as they are, modify them to fit particular contexts, or use them as a starting point to create unique open-ended statements that are more closely in line with the specific needs of their groups.

An expert in participatory evaluation and involved in the quality assurance of the programs at the university served as a consultant and checked the prompts that were initially made. The expert revised the initial draft of prompts to align with the ASEAN University Network-Quality Assurance framework. The expert included an additional seven prompts, bringing the total to 39 (see Appendix). To establish the appropriate number of prompts, Vaughn and DeJonckheere (2019) and Vaughn and Lohmueller (2014) suggested tailoring the quantity to the group size. A general guideline is to allocate approximately one to one to 1.5 prompts for each participant, capped at a maximum of 35 prompts per session. This approach ensures an optimal balance, fostering diverse responses without overwhelming participants or consuming excessive time. Given the total attendance of 16 participants, the number of prompts for the GLA was streamlined to 20. The expert advised selecting from the pool of 39 prompts, emphasizing the importance of ensuring each category was adequately represented. Consequently, two prompts were identified per category. Table 1 shows the final set of selected prompts.

Table 1 Final GLA Prompts

Category	Prompts
Open-Ended (Program Specification and Expected Learning Outcomes)	1. A valuable project or topic that would enhance the MST 200A experience is... 2. Engaging and impactful moments in MST 200A occur when...
Structured (Program Structure and Content, Teaching and Learning Strategy)	3. The most effective teaching and learning method in MST 200A is exemplified by... 4. Constructive feedback or advice that has positively influenced MST 200A includes...
Strengths (Positive Aspects of the program)	5. Resources and materials in MST 200A that significantly contribute to the learning process are... 6. An aspect of MST 200A that consistently meets or exceeds diverse stakeholder expectations is...
Weaknesses (Areas for Improvement)	7. Challenges or obstacles in MST 200A that impact learning or teaching effectiveness include... 8. An area in MST 200A that could benefit from improvement or revision is...
Positive (Quality of Faculty, Facilities and Infrastructure)	9. My favorite part of MST 200A is… 10. One thing the MST 200A does really well is…
Negative (Areas of Concern)	11. I find it tough in MST 200A when we have to… 12. One thing that could be improved in MST 200A is…
Specific (Targeted Feedback)	13. To help us learn better, MST 200A could include more on… 14. I would learn more effectively if MST 200A had...
Broad (Overall Course Direction)	15. A big change that could make MST 200A even better would be… 16. To make the most of our time, MST 200A should emphasize less on…
Silly (Creative Reflection)	17. If MST 200A were a TV show, it would be most like… 18. If MST 200A had a mascot, it should be...
Serious (Long-term Impact)	19. In a few years, I'll remember MST 200A for... 20. One major takeaway from MST 200A that I'll apply in real life is...

Note: MST 200A: The on-campus practice teaching program offered at LHSU

Step 1: Climate Setting

During this step, a comprehensive session overview was presented to participants. This included explaining the evaluation's objectives, specifying the practical use of the evaluation results, providing an introduction to GLA, and briefly explaining the steps involved in GLA. An approval was obtained from all participants to potentially include their pictures in both the presentation and the paper. After that, the co-facilitator conducted an icebreaker activity designed to discover participants' hobbies and interests. Subsequently, the GLA rules were presented, and expectations from participants were emphasized, including the importance of respecting others' opinions, viewing this platform as an opportunity to hear the voices of all stakeholders, encouraging sharing and collaboration, and approaching evaluations objectively by accepting constructive criticism, even if it entails negative feedback.



Figure 1 An Overview of GLA and an Icebreaker Activity

Step 2: Generating

A generous timeframe of 50 minutes was allocated for participants to formulate and record their responses on the charts. Snacks and refreshments were provided, allowing participants the freedom to indulge while engaging in this step. Responses varied, with participants expressing their thoughts through phrases and illustrations, not full sentences, written directly on large cartolina sheets posted on the walls. This format allowed all contributions to be visible to the group and facilitated immediate interaction with the data. Throughout this phase, light music played in the background to create a lively atmosphere. Some participants engaged in casual conversations with their peers. Figure 2 shows some pictures taken during the generation step.



Figure 2 Participants Responding to Prompts

Step 3: Appreciating

Participants actively engaged in the immersive experience of absorbing collective data from the wall charts. Alongside this, they were encouraged to engage in discussions and share observations with their peers. Additionally, participants had the freedom to highlight particularly noteworthy responses or add their comments to the displayed prompts. The interactive nature of Step 3 allowed participants to engage with each other while responding to and appreciating the content on the wall charts. This step was allocated a duration of 15 minutes, fostering a dynamic and collaborative environment. Figure 3 shows some pictures taken during the appreciation step.




Figure 3 Participants Appreciating and Sharing Observations Regarding Prompts

Step 4: Reflecting

During the reflecting step, participants were instructed to spend some time alone, contemplating the overall meaning of the data. They were also encouraged to write down their initial thoughts on what they had observed during the appreciating step. They were given 5 minutes to reflect. Figure 4 shows some pictures taken during Step 4.



Figure 4 Participants Reflecting and Writing Initial Thoughts

Step 5: Understanding

Participants were divided into three smaller groups, each consisting of five to six members. Within each group, there were representatives for CTs, CAs, and STs. Six to seven prompt charts were distributed to each group, ensuring that they received charts covering a diverse range of categories.




Figure 5 Group Discussion and Reporting of Themes

Step 6: Selecting

In step six, we can either have a large group discussion facilitated by a leader, or participants can stay in their small groups from step five to collaborate on this next phase (Vaughn & DeJonckheere, 2019). In this particular GLA, it was decided to keep participants in small groups to delve deeper into the themes from Step 5 and identify overarching themes. Additionally, they were instructed to prioritize these final themes and categorize them as immediate, midterm, or long-term. They were further instructed to evaluate each identified theme based on its importance and feasibility. This step took approximately 30 minutes to complete. Figure 6 shows some pictures taken during the selection step.



Figure 6 Participants Selecting Priorities from the Themes

Step 7: Action

One distinguishing feature of the GLA is its emphasis on participatory action planning (Vaughn and Lohmueller, 2014). After identifying priorities within the overarching themes in Step 6, participants were presented with a sample table. Following the advice of the second expert, the first column denotes priorities categorized as immediate, midterm, or long term. The second column specifies the responsible individuals, committees, or institutions, while the third column outlines the concrete steps needed to address or achieve these priorities. Participants were reminded of the importance of crafting specific and feasible action plans. Another substep added to this GLA involves the reporting of each group's action plan table. After 30 minutes of completing the table, each group was given five minutes to present their outputs. Step 7 took approximately 45 minutes to complete. Figure 7 shows some pictures taken during the action step.




Figure 7 Participants Drafting the Action Plans

The seven GLA steps, climate setting, generating, appreciating, reflecting, understanding, selecting, and action, were then implemented in the actual session. Throughout Steps 4 to 6, particular care was taken to facilitate balanced contributions from all stakeholders, prevent dominance by a few voices, and document both individual and group perspectives verbatim on flipcharts for collective review.

Data Analysis and Trustworthiness

The analysis integrated participant-generated thematic clusters with subsequent independent verification and expert review, using an adapted multi-stage thematic analysis approach (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Vaughn & Lohmueller, 2014). The first coding layer occurred in real time during the Understanding stage, when participants grouped related phrases and assigned preliminary theme labels. The second layer took place in the Selecting stage, when themes were refined through group consensus. The third layer occurred after the session, when the first author and a co-coder independently re-coded all raw data, including photographs of the cartolina sheets and field notes, to check for accuracy, completeness, and consistency with the participant-generated themes. Discrepancies were resolved through discussion until agreement was reached.

To ensure trustworthiness, several strategies were employed. Member checking was conducted in real time, as participants confirmed the accuracy of each cluster and its label during both small-group and plenary discussions. Peer debriefing was conducted with two external experts in participatory evaluation, who reviewed the coding framework, thematic structure, and representative phrases for conceptual soundness. Methodological triangulation was achieved by combining participant-led clustering, independent researcher coding, and expert review, thereby increasing the credibility of the findings. An audit trail, including field notes, photographs of all stages, and the exact prompts used, was maintained. The complete list of prompts is included in the appendix to enhance transparency and reproducibility. These measures align with Lincoln and Guba's (1985) standards for credibility, dependability, and confirmability in qualitative research.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

To examine how stakeholders perceive the strengths, needs, and areas for improvement in the on-campus practice teaching program at LHSU, the study employed the GLA approach. In Step 5 of the GLA (Understanding), each group received prompt charts and examined common themes from the assigned prompts. Following in-depth discussions, the

groups presented their themes in a plenary session. The facilitators compiled the reported themes, projected them for collective viewing, and conducted real-time member checking to ensure completeness and accurate reflection of the groups' identified themes. Table 2 presents the themes generated by each group from their assigned prompts.

Table 2 Group-Generated Themes from Assigned Prompts

Group A	Group B	Group C
On-campus practicum engaging and impactful moments - Panel evaluation - Observation among STs Tough things in on-campus practicum - Transition from F2F to online vis-à-vis - Transportation - Correcting misconception - Unprepared STs Mascot (sunflower, Jollibee, Big Ben and Big Bird, Dora the explorer) - STs will bloom - Flexibility Aspects - Students are creative and innovative - STs in off-campus practicum were commendable (training) Game changer - More interaction in CA and CT - Flexible teaching - Mentoring and discussion among other CTs - Introduction to other pedagogies - Multiple feedback from several panels - Teaching materials and learning materials compilation: put it in a specified area/room to inspire other ST who will be enrolled in on-campus practice teaching	More post-conference feedback - More demonstration teaching experience/opportunities - With guest panel in solo teachings Challenges - Materials (late submission of teaching materials, lesson plans/Slide presentations) - Infrastructures - Transportation - Time (in general) - Content and pedagogy (late submission-late correction) Products of on-campus practicum - Teachable - More students feedback - Criticism from students Takeaway - Continuous improvement - Professionalism Shared experiences - Appreciate on-campus practicum - Learnings can be applied during practicum and when applying for jobs Show - Enhance talent of the STs Recommendations - Will have colloquium with CAs, CTs, and STs - Improvement of demonstration teaching - 3fs: feedback, frequency and food	Retain - Achieving the on-campus practicum outcomes - Preparing ST for the future - Guided and well-taken cared of in on-campus practicum Improve - Applied already (collaborative teaching) - Rubrics in lesson plan - Scheduling (jive schedule from university and LHSU schedule) majors and timeslots Change - Emphasize less on non-teaching duties

After the GLA session, the researchers reviewed the themes generated by stakeholders in Step 5 and observed that these themes could be further categorized. The experts then reviewed the categories to ensure that all identified themes were comprehensively represented. Table 3 presents the summary of themes developed by stakeholders, categorized as strengths, needs, and areas for improvement.

Table 3 Summary of the Themes Generated by Stakeholders

Strengths	Needs	Areas for Improvement
Meaningful engagement	Lesson plan format and rubric	CT and CA collaborations
Positive symbolism	CT-CA collaborations	Time allocation
Professionalism growth	Resource hub	ST Development
Application of learning	Provision of resources	Proper feedback mechanisms
	Teaching colloquium	Teaching load

Strengths

As shown in Table 3, four themes emerged under strengths. During their practicum, STs engage in meaningful learning experiences through various channels. Teacher observers take an active role in evaluating and providing feedback to STs after both initial and final teaching demonstrations. Likewise, CTs conduct pre- and post-lesson discussions with STs, offering valuable evaluations that foster growth. This constructive feedback plays a pivotal role in the professional development of STs, while the consistent guidance of the CTs ensures a supportive and instructive environment. The role of structured feedback and mentoring in professional development is well-documented in recent studies, particularly in how timely and constructive evaluations from cooperating teachers and supervisors influence skill refinement, confidence, and teaching effectiveness (Aptoula, 2021; Asregid et al., 2023; Kang, 2021). In addition, STs benefit from opportunities to observe their peers teaching in actual classroom settings, further enriching their overall practicum experience, as corroborated by several studies (Baran et al., 2023; Ratliff & Chesser, 2025).

Furthermore, stakeholders recognized the on-campus teaching environment as a practical venue for STs to apply the knowledge and skills acquired from their coursework. This application of learning extends beyond the campus, becoming evident in off-campus teaching experiences and even in future employment opportunities. Serving as a bridge between theory and practice, the setting enables STs to translate theoretical concepts from their education courses into real-world teaching scenarios. It also offers a space for them to refine their talents and creativity, contributing to their holistic development as educators. Studies on practice-based teacher education emphasize that providing structured opportunities to apply learned skills in authentic contexts strengthens instructional competence, adaptability, and professional identity (Meneses et al., 2023; Matsumoto-Royo et al., 2021).

Needs

Stakeholders identified several essential requirements to enhance the program. To streamline the teaching process, they recommended establishing a standardized lesson plan format with a corresponding evaluation rubric, ensuring structure and consistency for STs. Broader mentorship involvement was also emphasized, enabling STs to benefit not only from their assigned CTs but also from other experienced teachers at LHSU. To strengthen resources, the establishment of a centralized hub for teaching and learning materials was proposed, ensuring convenient access for all stakeholders. Addressing infrastructural needs, stakeholders highlighted the importance of adequate rooms and offices, along with shuttle services to facilitate transportation between LHSU and the university. Finally, they proposed an on-campus teaching colloquium to serve as a venue for STs to share best practices and research findings with neighboring schools, fostering collaborative learning and professional growth. Studies on comprehensive teacher preparation affirm that structured planning, broad

mentorship, and collaborative learning communities are essential for developing skilled, adaptable, and engaged educators (Ye et al., 2025; Larsen et al., 2023).

Areas for Improvement

Stakeholders identified key areas for improvement within the program. Greater collaboration between CTs and CAs is encouraged to further enrich the learning experience. They emphasized the need for increased time allocation for both practice teaching and on-campus teaching overall. STs are urged to improve their preparedness, manage tasks efficiently to meet deadlines, and remain adaptable in shifting to online teaching methods in response to changing learning modalities. Furthermore, stakeholders underscored the importance of enhancing both the content knowledge and pedagogical skills of STs to ensure accuracy and effectiveness in instruction. Studies on effective teacher preparation emphasize that longer practicum periods, strong mentorship, and integrated digital pedagogy are essential for developing competent educators for diverse teaching contexts (Charles et al., 2023; Jimarkon et al., 2021; Gisbert-cervera et al., 2022).

The fourth area for improvement centers on creating a more robust feedback mechanism. This entails gathering inputs from multiple sources, including various teacher observers and students, across different stages of teaching, rather than relying solely on feedback from initial and final demonstrations. Incorporating feedback from guest panels during solo teaching sessions is also seen as a valuable enhancement, enriching the assessment process and supporting the professional growth of STs, as identified also in key studies (Kang, 2021; Wilcoxen & Lemke, 2021).

The final theme for improvement relates to teaching load. Stakeholders advocate for reducing non-teaching duties and prioritizing constructive tasks directly linked to instruction, such as exam construction and checking. They also advise against assigning STs to subjects outside their specialization, such as math and science, to ensure better alignment between their expertise and teaching assignments. This strategic approach aims to optimize both the teaching responsibilities and overall practicum experience of STs. Several studies support this view, noting that aligning teaching assignments with subject-area expertise enhances instructional quality, teacher confidence, and learner outcomes while ensuring more meaningful professional preparation (Mavuru & Pila, 2021; Du Plessis et al., 2023).

To determine which aspects of the program stakeholders perceive as needing attention and how they propose addressing these concerns, key actions were also identified by stakeholders during Step 6 (Selecting) and Step 7 (Action) of the GLA approach.

Immediate Plans

Immediate plans identified by stakeholders include allocating space and budget for establishing a repository or resource hub dedicated to housing all teaching and learning materials developed by stakeholders. Addressing the need for a proper feedback mechanism involves revisiting and revising teaching demonstration evaluation sheets, including the rubric. Lastly, urgently required is the standardization of lesson plans and the development of a distinct rubric for evaluating lesson plans. Strengthening these systems (support systems and infrastructure) is essential for cultivating well-prepared, adaptable, and competent educators

ready to meet the demands of diverse teaching contexts (Kaur et al., 2021; Manowaluilou & Reeve, 2022)

Midterm Plans

Stakeholders outlined several midterm plans to enhance various aspects of the program. First, they emphasized the importance of assisting students with registration concerns to ensure a smoother process. To strengthen collaboration and effectiveness within the teaching community, they proposed team-building activities involving CTs and CAs. They also identified the need to improve teaching demonstration guidelines, including strategic planning for panel composition and increasing the frequency of teaching demonstrations to enable a more comprehensive evaluation.

Long-Term Plans

The comprehensive evaluation of the program through GLA revealed a range of findings, providing valuable insights into its strengths, needs, and areas for improvement. Combined with the stakeholders' immediate, midterm, and long-term plans, these results offer a holistic view of the program's current state and its envisioned direction.

The program exhibits notable strengths that underpin its success. The most critical among these is the active engagement of stakeholders, which fosters a collaborative environment where teaching evaluations are enriched by diverse perspectives. The program's strong commitment to the professional growth of STs is evident in the recognition of their creativity, innovation, and teachability. Positive feedback from teacher supervisors during off-campus teaching further attests to the program's effectiveness in translating theoretical knowledge into practical teaching skills, complemented by the valuable experiences gained during on-campus teaching at LHSU. Practice teaching remains widely recognized as the most effective means for students to apply theoretical and conceptual knowledge from coursework to real classroom contexts (Tindowen et al., 2019). Similar findings emerged from Lapitan's (2022) CIPP-based evaluation, which showed that both STs and CTs acknowledge the program's ability to provide opportunities for STs to put their education course learnings into practice.

One of the themes identified for improvement is insufficient time allocation, a concern also reported in Ulla's (2016) and Aslan and Sağlam's (2017) studies as a common challenge faced by STs. Aslan and Sağlam (2017) observed that the duration allotted for teaching practice is inadequate, while Ulla (2016) emphasized that providing ample in-class practice time before actual classroom teaching helps STs build confidence and develop greater teaching effectiveness.

In Ekiz's (2022) study, CTs highlighted the challenge of assisting teacher candidates in the absence of lesson planning, which hindered regular communication with both the candidates and practice teachers. Similarly, stakeholders in the present study identified this as an area for improvement, emphasizing the need to provide STs with clearer guidance to enhance their professionalism and strengthen their teaching pedagogy.

Vaughn and DeJonckheere (2019) acknowledged this aspect as a limitation of GLA. They noted that GLA's effectiveness is contingent upon the comfort and willingness of stakeholders to share public data. Consequently, controversial or sensitive issues might not be

openly addressed within the framework of GLA. While scholarship on GLA continues to expand, there remains limited methodological discourse on its limitations and potential avenues for strengthening the approach (Jackson-Gordon et al., 2025; Vaughn et al., 2022). Future research may build on earlier studies by examining strategies to encourage candid dialogue on sensitive topics, assessing ways to integrate confidential feedback mechanisms alongside GLA, and exploring professional development models that strengthen supervisory competence among CAs.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

While the use of Group-Level Assessment (GLA) in this study has yielded valuable insights into the strengths, needs, and areas for improvement of the on-campus practice teaching program, several limitations must be acknowledged. First, the study's relatively small sample size (n = 16) limits the generalizability of findings beyond the immediate program context. Although GLA is designed for participatory engagement rather than statistical representation, future research should consider including a larger and more diverse stakeholder group to capture a broader range of perspectives.

Second, because GLA relies on public and collaborative data generation, some participants may have withheld sensitive or critical feedback due to perceived social or professional dynamics. This could have resulted in the underrepresentation of contentious issues, such as inter-stakeholder disagreements or structural challenges. To mitigate this, future evaluations could integrate complementary methods such as anonymous surveys or individual interviews conducted in parallel with GLA to ensure that all perspectives are captured.

Third, the feasibility and sustainability of the action plans generated during the GLA session remain untested within the scope of this study. Implementation outcomes may be influenced by institutional policies, budgetary constraints, or administrative priorities that extend beyond the researchers' control. Pilot testing selected action plans and conducting follow-up evaluations would provide evidence on their actual effectiveness.

Lastly, while the present study contributes to the methodological literature by applying GLA in a teacher education context, where it has seen limited prior use, it does not compare GLA with other participatory or traditional evaluation approaches. Comparative studies could help determine whether GLA offers distinct advantages in fostering stakeholder engagement, identifying actionable priorities, and promoting program improvement in teacher preparation programs.

CONCLUSIONS

This study demonstrated that the Group Level Assessment (GLA) approach can serve as an effective participatory evaluation method in teacher education, enabling stakeholders to collaboratively identify strengths, areas for improvement, and actionable recommendations for an on-campus practice teaching program. The participatory nature of GLA fostered ownership of results, enriched the evaluation with multiple perspectives, and generated insights that may inform future program design and policy decisions. Given the limited application of GLA in teacher education, especially within Southeast Asia, these findings offer both empirical evidence and a methodological contribution to the field. Future research could

address these limitations by combining GLA with complementary individual interviews to reduce group conformity bias, expanding the participant base to include a broader range of stakeholders, and applying the approach in varied teacher training settings to explore scalability and adaptability. By refining the use of GLA in educational evaluation, subsequent studies can strengthen its utility as both a research and program improvement tool.

REFERENCES

Abdullah, N. A., & Mirza, M.S. (2020). Evaluating pre-service teaching practice for online and distance education students in Pakistan. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 21(2), 81–97. https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v21i2.4606

Aptoula, N. Y. (2021). Pre-service teachers' perceptions about the efficacy of different types of feedback on micro-teaching activities. *Journal of Theoretical Educational Science*, 14(2), 79-92. https://doi.org/10.30831/akukeg.752214

Aslan, M., Sağlam, M. (2017). Evaluation of teaching practice course in education faculties according to opinions of academicians. *Karaelmas Journal of Educational Sciences*, 5; 335-351.

Asregid, D., Mihiretie, D. M., & Kassa, S. A. (2023). Teacher educators use of feedback to facilitate reflective practice among pre-service teachers during microteaching. *Cogent Education*, 10(2), 2257121. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2257121

Bamberger, M., Rugh, J. & Mabry, L. (2012). RealWorld Evaluation Second Edition. Sage Publications.

Baran, E., AlZoubi, D., & Bahng, E. J. (2023). Using video enhanced mobile observation for peer-feedback in teacher education. *Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education*, 39(2), 102–113. https://doi.org/10.1080/21532974.2023.2180116

Boyle, F., & Cook, E. J. (2025). Navigating complexity in sustainability and climate action: Comparing participatory action research and developmental evaluation in higher education. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-03-2025-0098

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, *3*(2), 77-101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Burns, D., & Apgar, M. (2024). A synthesis of systemic action research processes in the CLARISSA programme on worst forms of child labour (CLARISSA Research and Evidence Paper 20). Institute of Development Studies. https://doi.org/10.19088/CLARISSA.2024.039

Calamlam, J., Montebon, D., Palmiery, A., Delos Santos, M.V., & Favila, S. (2016). Mentoring practices in PNU partner schools: towards policy creation in capacity building of cooperating teachers for effective mentoring. *Indonesian Journal of Educational Review*, *3*(1).

Charles, E., Metsala, J., & Specht, J. (2023). Gains in pre-service teacher efficacy for inclusive education: contributions of initial beliefs and practicum length. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 29(8), 1234–1251. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2023.2264855

Curtis, V. (2021). Participatory evaluation in higher education: Engaging multiple stakeholders to assess sustainability competencies. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education, 22*(8), 1869–1885. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-02-2021-0066

Du Plessis, A. E., Wheeley, E., Klieve, H., Gramotnev, D. K., & Gramotnev, G. (2023). The out-of-field phenomenon: Perceptive consequences and support needs through the lens of graduating second career preservice teachers. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, 20(1), 1-27. https://doi.org/10.53761/1.20.01.09

Ekiz, M. A. (2022). Evaluation of teaching practice course according to the opinions of teaching staff, practice teachers and pre-service teachers. *Education Quarterly Reviews*, 5(2). https://doi.org/10.31014/aior.1993.05.02.512

Gisbert-Cervera, M., Usart, M., & Lázaro-Cantabrana, J. L. (2022). Training pre-service teachers to enhance digital education. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 45(4), 532–547. https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2022.2098713

Graham, K. E., Schellinger, A. R., & Vaughn, L. M. (2015). Developing strategies for positive change: Transitioning foster youth to adulthood. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *54*, 71–79. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2015.04.014

Harawa, M. T. (2022). A study on the opportunities and challenges of participatory monitoring and evaluation on project management: A case of a school improvement program in Rumphi District in Northern Malawi. *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews, 3*(11), 3352–3384. https://ijrpr.com/uploads/V3ISSUE11/IJRPR8301.pdf

Holmén, J., Adawi, T., & Holmberg, J. (2021). Student-led sustainability transformations: Employing realist evaluation to open the black box of learning in a Challenge Lab curriculum. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education, 22*(8), 1886–1902. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-02-2021-0067

Jackson-Gordon, R., Eldreth, D. A., Sloane, S., & Dariotis, J. K. (2025). Using Group Level Assessment in community-engaged projects: Participatory research validity considerations. *Educational Action Research*, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2025.2529942

Jimarkon, P., Wanphet, P., & Dikilitas, K. (2021). Pre-service teachers' digital experiences through digital pedagogical practices in Norway. *Nordic Journal of Comparative and International Education (NJCIE)*, 5(4), 86-103. https://doi.org/10.7577/njcie.4230

Kang, H. (2021). The role of mentor teacher–mediated experiences for preservice teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 72(2), 251-263.

Kaur, A., Kabilan, M. K., & Ismail, H. N. (2021). The role of support system: A phenomenological study of pre-service teachers' international teaching practicum. *The Qualitative Report*, 26(7), 2297-2317. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2021.4817

Lapitan, M. B. (2022). Evaluation of the practice teaching program using the CIPP model [Unpublished paper]. UP Rural High School, UP Los Baños.

Larsen, E., Jensen-Clayton, C., Curtis, E., Loughland, T., & Nguyen, H. T. M. (2023). Re-imagining teacher mentoring for the future. *Professional Development in Education*, 51(4), 683–697. https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2023.2178480

Leal Filho, W., Salvia, A. L., Pretorius, R. W., & Brandli, L. L. (2025). Promoting sustainable development via stakeholder engagement in higher education. *Environmental Sciences Europe, 37*(1), 112. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12302-025-00789-3

Lincoln, Y.S. and Guba, E.G. (1985) Naturalistic Inquiry. SAGE, Thousand Oaks, 289-331. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767(85)90062-8

Manowaluilou, N., & Reeve, E. M. (2022). Pre-service teachers' self-efficacy support systems resulting in a desire to become teachers. *International Education Studies*, 15(2), 41-53. https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v15n2p41

Matsumoto-Royo, K., Ramírez-Montoya, M. S., & Conget, P. (2021). Opportunities to develop lifelong learning tendencies in practice-based teacher education: Getting Ready for Education 4.0. *Future Internet*, 13(11), 292. https://doi.org/10.3390/fi13110292

Mavuru, L., & Pila, O. K. (2021). Pre-service teachers' preparedness and confidence in teaching life sciences topics: What do they lack? *Education and New Developments*, 106-110. https://doi.org/10.36315/2021end023

Meneses, A., Nussbaum, M., Veas, M. G., & Arriagada, S. (2023). Practice-based 21st-century teacher education: Design principles for adaptive expertise. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 128, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104118

Omodan, B. I., Mafunda, A., Mbebe, E., & Mdolota, S. (2024). A participatory lens to enhance collaborative learning among university students in rural South Africa. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Rural and Community Studies, 6*, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.38140/ijrcs-2024.vol6.19

Ratliff, L., & Chesser, B. (2025). Perceptions of 1st and 2nd Year pre-service teachers' first classroom observations. *Research in Education Curriculum and Pedagogy: Global Perspectives*. https://doi.org/10.56395/pz8av257

Reddy, W. B. (1996). Group-level team assessment: *A 10-step sequence to a committed team. San Diego*, CA: Pfeiffer.

Rodríguez-Campos, L., & Bauman, C. B. (2024). Collaborative evaluation: A catalyst for transforming professional networks. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies, 16*(2), 24–33. https://doi.org/10.5897/IJEAPS2024.0780

Sürücü, A., Ünal, A., & Yildirim, A. (2017). Evaluation of teaching practice course teachers according to opinions of math teacher candidates. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science*, *3*(1), 107–113. https://doi.org/10.21890/ijres.05826

Tindowen, D. J., Bangi, J., & Parallag, C. J. (2019). Pre-service teachers' evaluation on their student internship program. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, *18*(10), 279–291. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.18.10.18

Ulla, M. B. (2016). Pre-service teacher training programs in the Philippines: the student-teachers practicum teaching experience. *EFL Journal : Journal of EFL, Linguistics, and Literature*, *1*(3). https://doi.org/10.21462/eflj.v1i3.23

Vaughn, L. M., & DeJonckheere, M. (2019). Methodological progress Note: Group level assessment. *Journal of Hospital Medicine*, *14*(10), 627–629. https://doi.org/10.12788/jhm.3289

Vaughn, L. M., & Lohmueller, M. (2014). Calling all stakeholders. *Evaluation Review*, *38*(4), 336–355. https://doi.org/10.1177/0193841x14544903

Vaughn, L. M., Jacquez, F., Deters, A., & Boards, A. (2020). Group-Level Assessment (GLA) as a methodological tool to facilitate science education. *Research in Science Education*, *52*(2), 539–551. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-020-09960-8

Vaughn, L. M., Jacquez, F., Deters, A., & Boards, A. (2022). Group-level assessment (GLA) as a methodological tool to facilitate science education. *Research in Science Education*, 52(2), 539-551. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-020-09960-8

Wang, Y., Sommier, M., & Vasques, A. (2022). Sustainability education at higher education institutions: Pedagogies and students' competences. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education, 23*(8), 174–193. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-11-2021-0465

Wilcoxen, C. L., & Lemke, J. (2021). Preservice teachers' perceptions of feedback: The importance of timing, purpose, and delivery. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, 18(8), 1-28. https://doi.org/10.53761/1.18.8.14

Williams, L., & Sembiante, S. F. (2022). Experiential learning in U.S. undergraduate teacher preparation programs: A review of the literature. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *112*, 103630. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.103630

Ye, X., Cheng, T., & Yang, W. (2025). Learning engagement and professional identity among pre-service teachers: the sequential mediating role of adaptability and self-concept. *Behavioral Sciences*, 15(7), 881. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs15070881

Yuan, R., Mak, P., & Yang, L. (2022). 'We teach, we record, we edit, and we reflect': Engaging pre-service language teachers in video-based reflective practice. *Language Teaching Research, 26*(3), 552–571. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820938823

Zukoski, A., & Luluquisen, M. (2021). Participatory evaluation: What is it? Why do it? What are the challenges? *Community-based Public Health Policy & Practice* (2nd ed., pp. 225–241). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-68865-5_14