

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY: APPLIED BUSINESS AND EDUCATION RESEARCH

2026, Vol. 7, No. 9, 3918 – 3938

<http://dx.doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.07.09.12>

Research Article

21st Century Student Teaching Practices: Inputs to Curriculum Enhancement

Jovita E. Villanueva*, Eunice B. Custodio, Mayleen Dorcas B. Castro

Graduate School, Bulacan State University, Philippines

Article history:

Submission 15 July 2026

Revised 14 September 2026

Accepted 23 September 2026

*Corresponding author:

E-mail:

jovita.villanueva@bulsu.edu.ph

ABSTRACT

The study focused on determining student teaching practices of the College of Education and its cooperating schools and cooperating teachers. It involved 265 student teachers enrolled in the student teaching program of college of education in the academic year 2024-2025. The student teachers were deployed in the different cooperating schools in the divisions of Bulacan and city of Malolos in the province of Bulacan, region III in the Philippines. The concern included deployment practices, supervisory practices, and mentoring practices. The study also included forty-eight (48) cooperating teachers which served as mentors among student teachers during their student teaching activity. Data gathered were taken using a questionnaire and unstructured interview. The questionnaire asked student respondents about the practices being observed pertaining to deployment, supervisory and mentoring. Similar concerns were asked among cooperating teachers. An unstructured interview was also conducted among student teachers' cooperating teachers via open ended questions. The interview was done to check the congruency of their responses in both interview and questionnaires. The gathered data were treated using weighted mean and standard deviation. Responses in the interview were analyzed using thematic analysis. Results of this study revealed several strengths in the current student teaching model. First, the deployment of student teachers to diverse school contexts provided valuable exposure to real-world classroom dynamics. Student teachers reported gaining firsthand experience in lesson planning, classroom management, and student engagement. Second, many cooperating teachers were found to be highly supportive, providing constructive feedback and modeling professional behavior, which significantly contributed to the development of student teachers' confidence and competence. Significant findings of the study will be used as inputs to student teaching curriculum enhancement.

Keywords: *Deployment Practices, Mentoring Practices, Student Teaching, Student Teaching Program, Supervisory Practices*

How to cite:

Villanueva, J. E., Custodio, E. B., & Castro, M. D. B. (2026). 21st Century Student Teaching Practices: Inputs to Curriculum Enhancement. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*. 7(9), 3918 – 3938. doi: 10.11594/ijmaber.07.09.12

Introduction

The fundamental cornerstone of Education is for nation-building, serving as a critical driver for the development of a country's human capital. The advancement of a nation's workforce is linked intrinsically to the quality of its competent teachers, who are responsible for shaping the minds and skills of future generations. Therefore, the caliber of educators directly influences the overall competence and productivity of the nation's manpower. In today's rapidly evolving global landscape, the demand for quality education has never been more urgent. The education system must adapt to the complex and dynamic needs of the 21st century—a society characterized by constant change, technological innovation, and a vast flow of information. To prepare students effectively, education must go beyond traditional knowledge transmission; it must equip learners with the critical skills required to navigate, analyze, and apply information in meaningful ways.

The 21st century education explicitly emphasizes cultivating the students' competencies such as critical thinking, problem-solving, digital literacy, collaboration, and effective communication. These competencies of students may empower them not only to succeed academically but also to thrive in future careers and contribute positively to society. Today, where information is abundant and can be easily accessed by anyone, especially our students, the ability to discern, synthesize, and creatively utilize the knowledge acquired becomes paramount.

At its core, modern education aims to raise confident, flexible learners who can use what they know to solve real-world problems and seize new opportunities. To make this happen, we must constantly improve how we train and support teachers, giving them the tools they need to deliver the strong education students deserve today.

For the incorporation and adaptation of 21st century skills into the education system, the government became explicit with its implementation through DepEd order no. 21 series of 2019, which specifies that the Enhanced Basic Education Program must equip students with information media and technology skills, learning and innovation

skills, communication skills and life and career skills while simultaneously, requiring that the curriculum must use "pedagogical approaches that are constructivist, inquiry-based, reflective, collaborative, differentiated and integrative." While DepEd order no 42 series of 2017, the National Adoption and Implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers is focused on the Content Knowledge and Pedagogy, and specifically mentions strategies for developing critical and creative thinking, as well as other higher order thinking skills of the students' manifestation of learning can be seen in the performance of the students. Same goes with the teacher education program, where students are sent to cooperating schools for practice teaching during their immersion program, where their performance will be observed and evaluated.

Student teachers should be equipped and should have much knowledge for them to be prepared for the challenges in dealing with learners, colleagues and staff within school premises as cited by Haracija et.al. (2024). Student teachers must be equipped with pertinent skills in order to cater to various aspects of classroom management which includes lesson planning and evaluation, disciplining students, working with learners, student teachers, and teacher colleagues, and transitioning into a professional teaching role Darling-Hammond (2021).

Student teaching is part of the curriculum, organized by the school and is mandatory for all students who pursue education (Rachel 2016). The program is aimed at providing future teachers a taste of the kind of career they are going to have in the future. In line with this, the university sends student teachers to various educational institutions in order to provide the student teachers the necessary exposure and be able to apply the knowledge, skills and values they have acquired in school. Since it is already the 21st century, it is necessary that student teachers will be trained based on what 21st century education demands.

Student teaching is a great opportunity for soon to be teachers. In fact, it is widely recognized as one of the most critical components of a teacher education program. This stage allows pre-service teachers to gain

invaluable hands-on experience, thereby allowing them to apply theoretical knowledge in real classroom scenarios.

Student teaching as believed in many countries is said to be the final step toward obtaining the teacher certification after completing an undergraduate degree. Usually, student teachers will be deployed in a real classroom for one full semester that lasts approximately 14-16 weeks, though placement lengths vary between states and programs. The program will gradually introduce you to teaching responsibilities under the guidance of a mentor, also known as a cooperating teacher or host teacher who the school will assign.

The main target of student teaching is to provide the student the finest introduction to the teaching profession possible. Setting attainable goals that are appropriate for the student teacher's development and abilities is primarily on the cooperating teacher Jessica et. al. (2022).

Student teaching, field experience, and practicum experience are crucial in the development of new teachers. These activities will allow student teachers to experience working with students in classrooms or in laboratory environments that bridge the gap between university instruction and the experience of teaching Cleaver, et al. (2025). Student teaching is recognized as one of the most important elements of teacher preparation (Darling-Hammond, 2014; Grossman, 2010; National Council for Accreditation Teacher Education [NCATE], 2006; Whitford & Villaume, 2014), cited in Defeo et. al. (2024).

Those teacher-participants serving as cooperating teachers are performing a vital role in producing quality teacher education graduates who eventually will produce future professionals. In addition, the role of the cooperating teacher is to help the cooperating teacher to have professionally rewarding experience while helping the student teacher prepare for a career in teaching. Cooperating teachers from various schools, particularly those employed in the Department of Education (DepEd) are the one leading future educators and guide them on how to facilitate the teaching and learning process more

specifically the teaching and learning process for the 21st century. Cooperating teachers should also adhere to what is being asked by 21st century education.

Bringing student teaching into the 21st century requires taking the lead instead of trailing behind, to actively seeking out new ways of performing things while staying in touch with the world outside of the education system. To transform on a broad scale requires leadership in the classroom and across the school community, where every teacher can take steps immediately to help their students succeed, especially when sending them to practice what they have learned during their stay in the school.

Cooperating teachers are believed to have an impact on the development of the student teacher's professional attitudes, as well as their acquisition of essential knowledge and skills. Their mentorship helps bridge the gap between theory and practice, fostering confidence and competence in novice educators. However, it is important to recognize that teaching practices that were effective several years ago may no longer aligned with the evolving needs of today's learners and the demands of a modern workforce. Educational approaches must continuously adapt to address contemporary challenges and opportunities in teaching and learning.

The key influence during the student teaching period are cooperating teachers, who play a pivotal role in shaping the future performance and professional growth of student teachers. Through modeling effective teaching strategies and classroom management techniques, cooperating teachers offer practical examples that student teachers can emulate.

Teacher education programs facilitate student teaching by selecting a cooperating teacher in the USA who has at least three years of experience, as well as the capacity to mentor and have a positive impact on the preservice teachers' development. Preservice teachers are then placed in a school setting for at least 10 weeks. During this placement, student teachers gain teaching experience and feedback in authentic settings (Boyd et al., 2009; Fives et al., 2007); develop knowledge, skills, and

professional identity through practices (Grossman & McDonald, 2008); and reflect on the impacts of their practice (Canipe & Gunckel, 2019; Nagro & deBettencourt, 2019). High-quality student teaching experiences are important to help preservice teachers bridge the gap between preservice preparation and early years of teaching (Colson et al., 2017; Darling-Hammond, 2014; Grisham et al., 2000; Grossman et al., 2009) as they shift from their position as learners in the college classroom into teacher roles in schools and communities (Zeichner & Bier, 2015) as cited by Defeo et. al. (2024).

In light of these realities, this study aims to identify and analyze the teaching practices exhibited by student teachers and teaching management practiced by cooperating teachers. The findings are intended to provide meaningful insights that can inform curriculum enhancement efforts, ensuring that teacher education programs remain relevant and responsive to the dynamic needs of learners and society.

Method of the Study

The study made use of a mixed method research approach where survey questionnaires were administered to both the student teachers and the cooperating teachers also referred to as mentors. The questionnaire for student teachers contained questions asking about their deployment practices being practiced by the cooperating teachers and the cooperating schools. There was also a questionnaire for cooperating teachers asking the same questions on deployment practices, mentoring practices and questions asking about their supervisory practices. The questionnaire was crafted by the researchers after considering several literature discussing student teaching practices. After the crafting process, the instrument went through

validation by experts in the field of student teaching and a statistician for content validity and reliability. There was also an interview conducted among cooperating teachers to validate responses gathered from the questionnaires.

The instruments were then distributed to respondents after seeking ethical clearance from the university research management office, clearance as well were secured from two schools divisions namely: division of city schools of Malolos and schools division of the province of Bulacan.

The researcher made use of a purposive sampling method where only partner cooperating teachers of Bulacan State University were considered in the data gathering. There were 265 student teachers and 48 cooperating teachers involved in the study during the second semester (2nd) of the school year 2024-2025. The questionnaires were distributed among cooperating teachers in the two division offices.

For the treatment of data, the researchers computed for the weighted means in gauging the responses of student teachers and cooperating teachers in the questions about practices in student teaching deployment and mentoring. Likert Scale was used with the following details: 4.50 - 5.00 - Always, 3.5 - 4.49 - Often, 2.50 - 3.49 - Sometimes, 1.50 - 2.49 - Selcom, and 1.00 - 1.49 - Never.

For the qualitative part, the researchers considered utilizing the 6 steps thematic analysis of Braun and Clarke (2006). The steps include familiarization, coding, generating themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and writing up.

Results and Discussions

Table 1 presents the number of students to each specific age category, along with the corresponding percentage of the total sample.

Table 1. Frequency and Percentage as to Age

Age	Frequency	Percentage
20	2	0.8
21	101	38.1
22	110	41.5
23	33	12.5
24	13	4.9
25	3	1.1

Age	Frequency	Percentage
26	1	0.4
27	2	0.8
Total	265	100.0

Dominant Age Group. The most represented age group is 22, accounting for 41.5% of the sample. Followed closely by age 21 at 38.1%. Combined, ages 21 and 22 make up 79.6% of all respondents. This shows the population is heavily concentrated in this age bracket.

Skewness of Age Distribution. The distribution is heavily right-skewed, meaning it is concentrated among the younger ages (especially 21–22) with very few participants above 23. Ages 25 to 27 together make up only 2.3% of the total.

Minority Age Groups. Ages 20, 25, 26, and 27 are minimally represented, all under 1.2% individually. These outliers could be due to early or late entry into the population under study (e.g., students, trainees, etc.).

Most participants are likely in their second or third year of a university program, typically aged 21–22. Very few participants are either very young entrants (20) or older students (25–27), possibly indicating standard age

progression through the system or low non-traditional entry rates.

Activities and programs may be initiated and planned which may be best tailored to the needs of 21- and 22-year-olds. The age diversity is low; further strategies might be needed to include more diverse age groups of students if part of the goal. If cross-tabulating with other variables (e.g., gender, academic year, performance), the skew toward age 21–22 should be considered as it may bias outcomes.

This age distribution shows a highly concentrated young adult population, likely tied to a specific life stage or academic context, with very limited representation from older individuals. The insights drawn could inform targeted interventions, planning, and further research questions.

Table 2 presents the frequency and percentage distribution in terms of the students' gender.

Table 2. Frequency and Percentage Distribution as to Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	83	31.3
Female	181	68.3
LGBTQ	1	0.4
Total	265	100.0

Table 3 shows the frequency and percentage distribution as to the Major of the student-respondents. The data reveals that a total of 265 respondents participated in the study, representing various fields of specialization in teacher education. The largest proportion of respondents specialized in Science, with 57 students or 21.5% of the total. This indicates a strong interest or enrollment in the Science major, reflecting the continued emphasis on science education as a priority in the academic curriculum.

The next most represented fields are Home Economics (HE) with 48 respondents (18.1%), and Social Science with 46 respondents

(17.4%). These figures suggest that a significant number of student teachers are being prepared in fields related to life skills and social studies, both essential for holistic education.

Following closely are Mathematics majors, comprising 42 respondents (15.8%), and Physical Education (PE) with 41 respondents (15.5%). The relatively strong representation in these areas highlights the importance of numeracy and physical development in the educational system and the corresponding demand for qualified teachers in these disciplines.

Table 3. Frequency and Percentage Distribution as to Major

Major	Frequency	Percentage
Elementary	29	10.9
HE	48	18.1
Science	57	21.5
PE	41	15.5
ICT	2	.8
Math	42	15.8
Social Science	46	17.4
Total	265	100.0

The *Elementary Education* major accounts for 29 respondents (10.9%), which, while lower than some of the other specializations, still represents a significant share. These student teachers are expected to be versatile and well-rounded, as they handle multiple subjects in the primary education level.

Interestingly, the Information and Communication Technology (ICT) major had the lowest number of respondents, with only 2 (0.8%). This might reflect limited enrollment in ICT teacher preparation programs or potentially fewer available slots or cooperating schools for ICT student teaching placements. Given the growing importance of digital literacy and technology integration in classrooms, this low figure could point to an area that might benefit from greater institutional support or strategic development in the future.

The distribution of respondents in terms of students' major shows a diverse representation across teaching disciplines, with the highest concentration in Science, followed by Home Economics and Social Science. While most teaching fields are well represented, the notably low number of ICT majors highlights a potential gap that could be

addressed to better align with 21st-century educational needs. This breakdown provides valuable insight into the focus areas of teacher preparation programs and may help institutions assess where to direct additional resources, training, or recruitment efforts.

Table 4 presents the frequency and percentage distribution as to the Grade Level Assigned of the student-respondents. The data reveals that the overwhelming majority of student teachers were assigned to teach Grade 10, with 219 out of 265 respondents (82.6%) deployed at this level. This dominant figure clearly indicates a strategic emphasis or institutional preference for placing student teachers in upper junior high school levels, particularly Grade 10. It may reflect the greater need for instructional support in Grade 10, possibly due to the critical nature of the grade as a preparatory stage before Senior High School (SHS), or it may be influenced by the availability of cooperating teachers or curricular demands.

In contrast, the distribution among the lower grades is considerably smaller: a) Grade 9 with 21 student teachers (7.9%); b) Grade 8 with 15 student teachers (5.7%); and c) Grade 7 with 6 student teachers (2.3%).

Table 4. Frequency Distribution as to Grade Level Assigned

Grade Level	Frequency	Percentage
7 th grade	6	2.3
8 th grade	15	5.7
9 th grade	21	7.9
10 th grade	219	82.6
SHS	4	1.5
Total	265	100.0

This suggests that fewer opportunities or placements are available for student teachers

in the lower junior high levels, or that these levels are less prioritized for practicum

assignments. This could also be influenced by the complexity and specialization of subject matter in Grade 10, which aligns more closely with the student teachers' major fields. Furthermore, only 4 student teachers (1.5%) were assigned to Senior High School (SHS). The minimal representation in SHS may be due to stricter qualification requirements for teaching SHS subjects, such as greater content specialization or licensure considerations, as well as possibly limited availability of cooperating SHS teachers or classes open for practicum assignments.

The deployment pattern clearly reflects a concentration of student teacher placements in Grade 10, likely due to curricular needs, teacher availability, and institutional policy. The low numbers in Grades 7 to 9 and SHS highlight a potential imbalance in practicum distribution that institutions may wish to evaluate and address to ensure a more well-rounded training experience for student teachers. Broadening the exposure across all grade levels, including SHS, could better equip future educators with the flexibility and experience required to teach diverse student populations.

Table 5 presents the frequency and percentage distribution as to the Cooperating

Teachers' Age of the student-respondents. The dataset presents the frequency and percentage distribution of 54 respondents according to coded age categories. While the specific age ranges corresponding to each code (e.g., 1, 2, 3, etc.) are not explicitly defined, we can still analyze the data based on the distribution pattern of these codes.

The most frequently occurring age group is code 4, representing 11 respondents or 20.4% of the total. This is followed by: a) Code 2 with 10 respondents (18.5%); b) Code 1 with 9 respondents (16.7%); c) Code 6 with 8 respondents (14.8%), and d) Code 5 with 7 respondents (13.0%).

These codes account for the majority of respondents, suggesting that the student teachers generally fall within a concentrated age range, likely representative of the typical age for pre-service teachers undergoing practicum (usually between 21-25 years old, assuming a college-level cohort). In contrast, age ranges 51-55 and 56- above each with only 2 respondents (3.7%), represent the least common age groups, indicating either younger or older outliers within the population. Meanwhile 31-35 also shows a smaller proportion, with 5 respondents (9.3%).

Table 5. Frequency and Percentage Distribution as to Cooperating Teachers' Age

Age	Frequency	Percentage
21-25	9	16.7
26-30	10	18.5
31-35	5	9.3
36-40	11	20.4
41-45	7	13.0
46-50	8	14.8
51-55	2	3.7
56-above	2	3.7
Total	54	100.0

The distribution suggests that while there is some variability in the ages of respondents, the majority fall into a central age cluster, reflecting the traditional age bracket for student teachers nearing the end of their academic program.

The age distribution of the respondents indicates that most student teachers are within a common age range, with a concentration

around codes 1 to 4, possibly representing ages typical of college juniors or seniors. The lower frequencies at the extremes (codes 7 and 8) suggest minimal age diversity among the cohort. To enhance clarity and interpretation, it is recommended that future presentations of the data include specific age ranges for each code to allow for a more meaningful demographic analysis.

Table 6 shows the frequency and percentage distribution as to the Cooperating Teachers' Civil Status of the student-respondents. The data indicates that among the 54 respondents, the majority are married, with 38 individuals (70.4%) reporting this status.

This suggests that most of the student teachers in this group are adults with established family responsibilities, which may have implications for their time management, teaching placement preferences (e.g., proximity to home), and support needs during deployment.

Table 6. Frequency and Percentage Distribution Cooperating Teachers' Civil Status

Civil Status	Frequency	Percentage
Single	12	22.2
Widow/er	4	7.4
Married	38	70.4
Total	54	100.0

Meanwhile, 12 respondents (22.2%) are single, indicating a notable minority who may still be in the earlier stages of adulthood or pursuing their studies prior to settling down. This group may have more flexibility in terms of assignment location and scheduling. A small portion of the respondents, 4 individuals (7.4%), are listed as widowed. While this is a minority, it reflects a diverse demographic within the group, including those who may have returned to school to pursue or complete a teaching degree later in life.

The civil status distribution of the respondents shows a predominantly married population, suggesting that many student teachers are balancing academic responsibilities with family life. The presence of single and widowed individuals highlights some diversity in life circumstances, which teacher education institutions may consider when planning deployments, support services, and mentoring programs. Understanding the civil status of student teachers can help provide more tailored and empathetic support systems during their practicum experience.

Table 7 presents the frequency and percentage distribution as to the Cooperating Teachers' Gender of the student-respondents. The data shows a significantly female-dominated population among the 54 respondents. Specifically, 45 respondents (83.3%) are female, while only 9 respondents (16.7%) are male.

This reflects a common trend in the field of teacher education, where women typically outnumber men, especially in elementary and secondary education programs. The high percentage of female student teachers may be influenced by societal norms, career preferences, or perceptions of teaching as a nurturing profession, traditionally associated with women. On the other hand, the relatively low number of male respondents suggests that men remain underrepresented in the teaching profession, particularly at the pre-service level. This imbalance could have implications for efforts to promote gender diversity and balance in education, especially in areas where male role models in the classroom are lacking.

Table 7. Frequency and Percentage Distribution as to Cooperating Teachers' Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	9	16.7
Female	45	83.3
Total	54	100.0

The gender distribution among the respondents highlights a clear female majority in the teaching profession at the pre-service level. While this aligns with broader trends in education, it also points to the need for strategies to encourage greater male

participation in teacher education programs. Promoting gender inclusivity and balance can contribute to a more diverse and representative teaching workforce, which benefits students by exposing them to a broader range of perspectives and role models.

Table 8 presents the frequency and percentage distribution as to the Cooperating Teachers' *Educational Attainment* of the student-respondents. The data indicates that the majority of the respondents, 38 out of 54 (70.4%), have a Bachelor's degree with Master's units, meaning they have pursued or

are currently pursuing graduate-level education beyond their undergraduate studies. This reflects a strong commitment to professional growth and academic advancement, which is commendable in the teaching profession where ongoing development is vital.

Table 8. Frequency Distribution as to Cooperating Teachers Educational Attainment

Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percentage
College Graduate	10	18.5
Masters Graduate	6	11.1
Bachelor's With MA Units	38	70.4
Total	54	100.0

Meanwhile, 10 respondents (18.5%) are college graduates with no reported postgraduate studies. This group likely consists of early-career educators or student teachers who may pursue further studies in the future as part of their career development. A smaller yet significant portion, 6 respondents (11.1%), are already Master's degree holders, indicating a higher level of academic qualification. These individuals likely bring more experience and expertise to the classroom and may be considered for mentor roles or leadership positions in the future.

The educational attainment data reveals a highly qualified respondent group, with the majority already engaged in or having completed postgraduate studies. This is a positive indicator of the professional readiness and academic ambition of the student teachers. Teacher education institutions may leverage

this by providing advanced training opportunities, leadership roles, and support for full graduate degree completion to further strengthen the teaching workforce.

Table 9 presents the frequency and percentage distribution in terms of Cooperating Teachers' *length of Teaching Experience* of the student-respondents. The respondents demonstrate a broad spectrum of teaching experience, indicating a well-rounded pool of educators. The largest segment of teachers (25.9%) has between 6 to 10 years of experience, representing early to mid-career professionals who likely balance growing expertise with openness to new teaching methods. Close behind, 22.2% have served for 26 to 30 years, suggesting a significant group of veteran teachers with extensive classroom experience who can offer valuable mentorship to student teachers.

Table 9. Frequency Distribution as to Cooperating Teacher's length of Teaching Experience

Length of Teaching Experience	Frequency	Percentage
6-10	14	25.9
11-15	7	13.0
16-20	8	14.8
21-25	8	14.8
26-30	12	22.2
31-35	5	9.3
Total	54	100.0

Nearly 30% of respondents fall within the 16 to 25 years' experience range, marking a solid core of mid-career educators with deep practical knowledge. The remaining groups include teachers with 11 to 15 years (13%) and

31 to 35 years (9.3%) of experience, completing a diverse distribution of experience levels.

This diversity in teaching tenure provides a robust foundation for both supporting novice

teachers and maintaining effective instructional practices. The presence of both relatively new and seasoned teachers ensures a dynamic environment conducive to learning, mentoring, and professional growth within the teacher education institution.

The data reflects a diverse and experienced teaching workforce, with most respondents having more than a decade of classroom experience. This mix of early-, mid-, and late-career educators is an asset to the teaching profession, especially in mentoring student teachers. The presence of many educators with

20+ years of service highlights a pool of potential cooperating teachers who can provide deep pedagogical insight and practical mentorship, while those in the earlier stages of their careers contribute fresh perspectives and adaptability. Institutions may use this information to balance deployment and mentorship programs across experience levels, ensuring continuity and collaboration in teacher development.

Table 10 presents the weighted mean as to the deployment practices of Teacher Education Institution.

Table 10. Weighted Mean as to Deployment Practices of Teacher Education Institution

Deployment Practices of Teacher Education Institution	WM	SD	VI
1. Forge a Memorandum of Agreement with Department of Education	4.32	1.16	Often
2. Assigns maximum of two (2) student teachers to a cooperating teacher.	2.84	1.64	Sometimes
3. Assigns maximum of 25 student teachers per school per semester.	3.08	1.57	Sometimes
4. Ensures that the student teachers are proven physically, mentally and emotionally fit before deployment.	4.85	.437	Always
5. Ensure that student teachers are enrolled in accident insurance.	4.67	.760	Always
6. Ensures that relevant DepEd policies and guidelines and applicable law and regulations are respected and complied with, and the student teachers are well oriented, informed and guided to also ensure their compliance.	4.80	.457	Always
7. Conduct regular conferences with cooperating teachers as regard to the performance of the student teachers.	4.52	.691	Always
8. Provides an incentive of Php1,000.00 to cooperating principals per semester.	4.27	1.35	Often
9. Provides an incentive of Php300.00 to cooperating teachers based on the number of student teachers handled per semester.	4.11	1.38	Often
10. Issues certificate of appreciation to cooperating principal/cooperating teachers at the end of the semester.	4.85	.510	Always
11. Provides discounts on tuition fees to cooperating teachers pursuing graduate studies.	3.07	1.55	Sometimes
12. Accepts student teachers from schools with whom there is an existing memorandum of agreement.	4.57	.873	Always
13. Receives student teachers that were sent personally by the student teaching supervisors.	4.80	.499	Always
14. Considers student teachers that were assigned based on their choices.	4.50	.839	Always
15. Assigns student teachers based on their field of specialization.	4.75	.588	Always
16. Considers the proximity of the residences of his/ her student teacher.	4.71	.627	Always
17. Provides safe spaces for student teachers.	4.78	.613	Always

Deployment Practices of Teacher Education Institution	WM	SD	VI
18. Provides discounts on tuition fees to cooperating teachers pursuing graduate studies.	4.87	.393	Always
Total Mean	4.35		Always

Items with mean scores between 4.20 and 5.00 indicate that the institution consistently follows its deployment practices. However, these high numbers mostly prove that official policies are in place, not that every student gets the exact same high-quality experience at every partner school. Majority (13 out of 18 items) indicates institutional compliance and proper deployment protocols. Notable “Always” items are the following: a) Physically, mentally, and emotionally fit student teachers (WM = 4.85); b) Orientation and compliance with DepEd policies (WM = 4.80);

c) Certificate issuance for cooperating teachers/principals (WM = 4.85); d) Specialization-based assignments (WM = 4.75); e) Discounts for cooperating teachers (WM = 4.87); f) Proximity and safety considerations (WM = 4.71 & 4.78). These practices emphasized student teacher welfare, regulatory compliance, appreciation of stakeholders, and logistical efficiency. They reflect institutional maturity and ethical responsibility.

Items with a WM between 3.40 and 4.19 are practiced regularly but not as consistently. “Often” Items are as follows: a) Forging MOA with DepEd (WM = 4.32); b) Php1000 incentive to cooperating principals (WM = 4.27); and c) Php300 incentive to cooperating teachers (WM = 4.11). Financial incentives and formal agreements are acknowledged but may lack uniformity in implementation. This may be due to budget constraints or variability across cooperating schools.

Items with WM between 2.60 and 3.39 suggest inconsistent or conditional implementation. “Sometimes” Items that were noted are the following: a) Two student teachers per cooperating teacher (WM = 2.84, SD = 1.64); b) 25 student teachers per school cap (WM = 3.08); c) Tuition discounts for cooperating teachers (duplicate entry); and d) Acceptance from schools with MOA (WM = 3.07). These are areas of concern. For instance, the student-teacher-to-mentor ratio has a high standard deviation (SD = 1.64) indicating diverse practices or lack of a clear policy. Similarly, school assignment caps and discount incentives may not be systematically enforced.

As reflected in the table, Low SD (e.g., 0.393 - 0.760) was noted which indicates consistent agreement among respondents (e.g., Items 4, 6, 10, 17, 18). These are well-established practices. While, High SD (e.g., >1.3) on the other hand, indicates variability in implementation or perception, possibly due to differences across cooperating schools or administrators (e.g., Items 2, 3, 8, 9).

The data reveals that the Teacher Education Institution has strong deployment practices especially regarding compliance, student safety, and mentorship support. However, there are inconsistencies in teacher-student assignment ratios, MOA execution, and incentive distribution, which require policy reinforcement and monitoring.

Table 11 presents the weighted mean as to the deployment practices of Cooperating Teachers.

Table 11. Weighted Mean as to Deployment Practices of Cooperating Teachers

Deployment Practices of Cooperating Teachers	WM	SD	VI
1. Provides the best cooperating teacher handling various academic classes and ensures that these resource teachers and mentors have been oriented on their responsibilities.	4.72	.624	Always
2. Ensure that activities provided by cooperating schools promote professionalism and the development of beginning teachers.	4.70	.624	Always
3. Allows student teachers to access school information for research and instructional purposes.	4.46	.788	Often

Deployment Practices of Cooperating Teachers	WM	SD	VI
4. Cooperating teachers evaluate student teachers and submit reports of ratings on time.	4.64	.665	Always
5. Cooperating teacher guide and counsels me in the different stages of the teaching career.	4.70	.655	Always
6. Cooperating teachers shares his/her knowledge of the subject matter.	4.71	.712	Always
7. Cooperating teachers encourage me to participate in all school activities.	4.58	.769	Always
8. Conduct regular conferences with the student teaching supervisor/ chair as regard to the performance of the student teachers.	4.29	.890	Often
9. Cooperating teachers help develop student teacher potentials as future teachers.	4.69	.616	Always
10. Cooperating teachers give constructive criticisms.	4.65	.701	Always
11. Cooperating teachers give feedback to the student teaching supervisor/ chair.	4.55	.847	Always
12. Promotes a healthy mentor- mentee relationship by even providing a desk or personal work space.	4.61	.730	Always
13. Reviews and discusses lessons with student teachers.	4.48	.853	Often
14. Enhances students skills in lesson planning	4.66	.720	Always
15. Teaches skills on classroom management	4.75	.587	Always
16. Teaches skills on questioning techniques	4.64	.671	Always
17. Teaches skills in preparing instructional materials	4.59	.753	Always
18. Teaches the skills on preparing examination and other forms of assessment	4.46	.847	Often
Total Mean	4.60		Always

The total mean score of 4.60 interpreted as "Always" clearly shows that cooperating teachers are highly engaged in the mentorship and development of student teachers. This indicates that, in general, cooperating teachers consistently uphold their roles and responsibilities in guiding, mentoring, and supporting student teachers during their deployment.

A closer look at the individual indicators shows that the majority of practices (14 out of 18 items) were rated as "Always" practiced. Among the highest-rated practices are the teaching of classroom management skills (WM = 4.75), the assignment of well-oriented and competent cooperating teachers (WM = 4.72), and the sharing of subject matter expertise by mentors (WM = 4.71). These findings suggest that cooperating teachers are committed to developing core teaching competencies in student teachers and ensuring that they are guided by experienced and well-prepared mentors.

Furthermore, cooperating teachers were also perceived to consistently provide constructive feedback, professional guidance, and emotional support, as evidenced by high ratings on indicators such as giving constructive criticisms (WM = 4.65), guiding student teachers through various stages of the teaching career (WM = 4.70), and fostering healthy mentor-mentee relationships (WM = 4.61). These results highlight a strong mentoring culture that contributes to the holistic development of future educators. In addition, cooperating teachers were found to be actively involved in instructional mentoring, helping student teachers enhance their lesson planning (WM = 4.66), improve questioning techniques (WM = 4.64), and develop instructional materials (WM = 4.59). These practices are crucial in equipping student teachers with practical teaching strategies and classroom skills necessary for effective teaching.

However, a few practices were rated slightly lower, falling under the "Often" category. These include allowing access to school information for research purposes (WM = 4.46), reviewing and discussing lessons with student teachers (WM = 4.48), conducting regular conferences with the student teaching supervisor (WM = 4.29), and teaching skills in preparing assessments and examinations (WM = 4.46). While these are still positively rated, the slightly lower mean scores suggest that these practices may not be consistently implemented across all cooperating teachers or schools. Factors such as time constraints, differing school policies, or lack of structured

guidelines may contribute to these variations. Despite these areas for improvement, the overall findings underscore that cooperating teachers are key contributors to the success of the student teaching program, offering not only instructional support but also professional mentorship and personal guidance. Their consistent practices serve as a strong foundation for the professional growth and readiness of student teachers entering the field of education.

Table 12 presents the weighted mean as to the deployment practices of Cooperating Teachers.

Table 12. Weighted Mean as Deployment Practices of Cooperating Teachers

Deployment Practices	WM	SD	VI
1. Accept student teachers from schools with whom there is an existing memorandum of agreement.	4.98	1.36	Always
2. Receives student teachers that were sent personally by the student teaching supervisors.	4.81	.552	Always
3. Accept student teachers that were assigned based on their choices.	4.69	.748	Always
4. Assign student teachers based on their field of specialization.	4.89	.372	Always
5. Accepts student teachers assigned based on the proximity of the residences.	4.80	.491	Always
6. Consider the schedule of the student teachers assigned in consideration to flexibility.	4.94	.231	Always
7. Orient the student teachers in terms of the rules and regulations of the cooperating school.	5.0	.000	Always
Total Mean	4.87		Always

The highest possible mean score of 5.0 was recorded for the item "orient the student teachers in terms of the rules and regulations of the cooperating school," indicating unanimous agreement among respondents and a perfectly consistent practice. The standard deviation of 0.000 further confirms zero variation, highlighting that this practice is not only essential but universally implemented across the board. This suggests a strong emphasis on pre-deployment orientation, ensuring that student teachers understand and comply with the institutional norms and policies of the schools where they are deployed.

Other highly rated practices include assigning student teachers based on their field

of specialization (WM = 4.89) and considering the student teachers' schedules for flexibility (WM = 4.94). These practices show that schools are attentive to aligning the deployment process with the professional and personal needs of student teachers, supporting a student-centered approach that enhances both teaching performance and overall experience.

Additionally, deployment decisions appear to be made with careful consideration of practical factors, such as the proximity of student teachers' residences (WM = 4.80) and their personal preferences (WM = 4.69). These results indicate that cooperating institutions are sensitive to logistical realities, likely reducing stress and promoting well-being,

which can contribute positively to the teaching performance of student teachers. Furthermore, the acceptance of student teachers from partner institutions with existing memorandums of agreement (WM = 4.98) and those sent personally by teaching supervisors (WM = 4.81) emphasizes the importance of formal institutional partnerships and direct coordination. These practices ensure a structured and collaborative deployment process, reinforcing accountability and institutional trust.

The generally low standard deviations across the indicators (most below 0.75) suggest a high level of agreement among respondents and uniform implementation of these deployment practices. The one exception is the relatively higher standard deviation for item 1 (SD = 1.36), which may reflect variability in institutional adherence or the availability of formal agreements between institutions.

Overall, the deployment practices reflected in the study indicate a well-organized, student-centered, and professionally aligned approach to placing student teachers in cooperating schools. The uniformity and high frequency of practice suggest a strong institutional commitment to effective teacher preparation. Practices are not only consistent but also responsive to student needs, ensuring that deployment is strategic, supportive, and conducive to professional growth. These findings validate the existing protocols while also reinforcing the importance of maintaining partnerships, orientation, and flexible scheduling in the deployment process.

Table 13 shows the weighted mean as to the Weighted Mean as to Mentoring Practices of Cooperating Teachers. The results of the study reveal that the mentoring practices of cooperating teachers are consistently carried out with exceptional commitment and effectiveness, as evidenced by the high Weighted Means (WM) and the low variability in responses (SD) across all items. The overall total mean of 4.95, interpreted as "Always",

indicates that cooperating teachers are highly engaged in supporting and guiding their student teachers in various essential aspects of their professional growth.

The mentoring practices that were rated the highest include giving constructive criticisms (WM = 4.98), sharing knowledge of the subject matter (WM = 4.96), and helping develop the student teacher's potential as a future educator (WM = 4.96). These results suggest that cooperating teachers are dedicated to providing insightful feedback, sharing expertise, and nurturing the professional development of student teachers. The very low standard deviation values for these items (e.g., SD = 0.136 for giving constructive criticisms) indicate universal agreement among respondents that these practices are consistently followed. Further supporting this, cooperating teachers also encourage active participation in school activities (WM = 4.94) and provide opportunities for open communication (WM = 4.96). This shows that mentors foster an inclusive, communicative environment where student teachers feel encouraged to engage in school life, thereby gaining valuable experience and insights beyond the classroom.

In addition, cooperating teachers ensure that resources are provided as references for the subject matter (WM = 4.93) and that they guide student teachers through the different stages of their teaching careers (WM = 4.93). These findings reveal that mentors take an active role in ensuring that student teachers have access to both instructional resources and ongoing support throughout their professional journey. The very low standard deviations (ranging from 0.136 to 0.264) indicate high consistency in the responses across different cooperating teachers, suggesting that the mentoring practices are uniformly implemented and that cooperating teachers consistently meet the expectations of their mentoring role.

Table 13. Weighted Mean as to Mentoring Practices of Cooperating Teachers

Mentoring Practices	WM	SD	VI
1. Guide and counsel my student teacher in the different stages of the teaching career.	4.93	.264	Always
2. Share my knowledge of the subject matter.	4.96	.191	Always

Mentoring Practices	WM	SD	VI
3. Encourage him/her to participate in all school activities.	4.94	.231	Always
4. Help develop his/her potential as a future teacher.	4.96	.191	Always
5. Give constructive criticisms.	4.98	.136	Always
6. Provide avenue to student teacher for open communication	4.96	.191	Always
7. Provide resources as references for the subject matter	4.93	.264	Always
Total Mean	4.95		Always

The findings strongly indicate that cooperating teachers are deeply committed to providing effective, supportive, and consistent mentorship to student teachers. The results underscore the importance of guidance, constructive feedback, and professional development in shaping future educators. The high levels of engagement and the consistent application of mentoring practices highlight the significant role that cooperating teachers play in not only guiding student teachers through their professional journey but also in helping them become competent and confident educators. The consistency across responses and the overall high ratings suggest a well-

established mentoring culture that is beneficial for the success of student teachers.

Table 14 presents the Weighted Mean as to Supervisory Practices of Cooperating Teachers. The research findings reveal that supervisory practices among cooperating teachers are consistently and effectively implemented, as demonstrated by the high overall weighted mean of 4.95, with all items rated as "Always" practiced. This suggests that cooperating teachers are not only fulfilling their supervisory roles diligently but are also fostering a structured, supportive, and development-oriented environment for student teachers.

Table 14. Weighted Mean as to Supervisory Practices of Cooperating Teachers

Supervisory Practices	WM	SD	VI
1. Promote a healthy mentor- mentee relationship by even providing a desk or personal work space.	4.89	.317	Always
2. Review and discuss lesson with my pre-service teacher before I allow him/her to engage in actual teaching.	4.96	.191	Always
3. Provide gradual transition for increasing teaching responsibility.	4.93	.264	Always
4. Allow him/her to teach but with my presence.	4.94	.231	Always
5. Give feedback when needed.	5.0	.000	Always
6. Keep a record of student teachers' progress	4.96	.191	Always
7. Observe the student teacher based on the rating scale during the actual final demonstration.	4.98	.136	Always
Total Mean	4.95		Always

A standout practice in the results is "giving feedback when needed," which received a perfect mean score of 5.0 and a standard deviation of 0.000, indicating unanimous agreement among all respondents. This underscores the critical role of timely, consistent, and constructive feedback in the supervision process. Effective feedback helps

student teachers reflect on their performance and refine their teaching strategies, significantly contributing to their professional growth. Other highly rated practices include "observing the student teacher during the actual final demonstration based on a rating scale" (WM = 4.98, SD = .136), and "reviewing and discussing lessons before allowing the

student teacher to engage in actual teaching" (WM = 4.96, SD = .191). These findings highlight a methodical approach to supervision, where student teachers are not only evaluated objectively but are also guided in lesson planning and classroom execution. Such supervision ensures instructional readiness and builds confidence in novice educators.

The practice of "keeping a record of student teachers' progress" also scored highly (WM = 4.96), showing that cooperating teachers maintain accurate and consistent documentation, which is essential for tracking development and providing data-informed feedback.

Further, practices such as "providing a gradual transition to increasing teaching responsibilities" (WM = 4.93) and "allowing the student teacher to teach under the cooperating teacher's presence" (WM = 4.94) reflect an intentional, step-by-step approach to developing teaching independence. This scaffolded mentorship model supports student teachers in becoming confident and capable classroom leaders, gradually exposing them to more complex teaching tasks while still receiving close supervision.

The promotion of a healthy mentor-mentee relationship, including the provision of a dedicated workspace (WM = 4.89), emphasizes the importance of creating a respectful and professional environment that values the student teacher's role. This kind of supportive atmosphere is crucial in fostering motivation, trust, and a sense of belonging in the teaching community.

Qualitative Data

The researchers also asked the cooperating teachers to describe the challenges they encountered in deployment, mentoring and supervisory practices. The gathered responses given by cooperating teachers that were categorized to default themes such as deployment, supervisory and mentoring practices however to gain deep understanding all responses a thematic analysis was made using the six steps thematic analysis by Braune and Clarke.

The qualitative responses from Cooperating Teachers (CTs) on deployment practices, mentoring practices and supervisory practices highlights five core themes regarding the deployment of Bulacan State University (BulSU) pre-service teachers.

Theme 1	Sub-Theme	Response	Citation Source
Operational Efficiency and Strategic Deployment	Standardized Administrative Protocols	Deployment is governed by structured SOPs, including official Notice of Acceptance (NOA) sign-offs by school heads, principal endorsements, and comprehensive pre-deployment orientation sessions	CT 13, 14, 31, 32, 52
	Intentional Placement	Candidate assignments systematically factor in academic major/specialization and geographical proximity to candidate residences to ease travel logistics and optimize schedule flexibility	CT 5, 19, 20
	Institutional Synergy	Strong organizational rapport and active coordination between BulSU supervisors and host school leadership establish clear expectations and mutual trust	CT 1, 12, 23, 39, 51

Theme 2	Sub-Theme	Response	Citation Source
Mentorship as a Mutual, Reciprocal Development Process	Bridging Theory to Practice	Mentors guide preservice teachers from academic theory into live classroom execution, scaffolding confidence through co-planning, demonstration, and gradual assumption of full teaching duties	CT 2, 13, 20, 34, 38
	Bi-Directional Value Exchange	While CTs impart classroom management and pedagogical wisdom, preservice teachers introduce fresh strategies, enthusiasm, and digital/technological capabilities to the host school	CT 7, 34, 38, 45, 49
	Relational and Emotional Support	Effective mentoring centers on building trust, establishing rapport, and offering emotional encouragement to help student teachers navigate workload demands and initial anxiety	CT 13, 14, 19, 43
Theme 3	Sub-Theme	Response	Citation Source
Reflective Supervision and Professional Identity Shaping	Targeted Feedback Loops	Supervision relies heavily on structured pre- and post-observation discussions, lesson plan reviews, and reflection journals to cultivate self-correction and instructional refinement	CT 16, 20, 26, 42
	Classroom Management and Conduct	Direct oversight prioritizes developing student engagement techniques, enforcing consistent discipline, and instilling professional ethics and decorum	CT 19, 29, 47, 48
	Addressing Variable Readiness:	CTs adapt their supervisory styles to account for diverse candidate capability levels—ranging from highly proactive, self-directed candidates to those requiring extra guidance in multitasking and initiative	CT 5, 7, 17, 33

Challenges in Student Teaching Practices Deployment practices

The cooperating teachers of Bulacan State University College of Education cited that the deployment practices being observed by the college were very good although there is no uniform practice being done. There are schools that are strictly observing the need to deploy

students to schools near their residences and there are also instances that such is not being followed. The college has prepared a memorandum of agreement that is duly signed by representatives of both the college and school heads prior to deployment of student teachers. It has been cited also that it is very important that both the cooperating school and

the sending school have very good rapport. It can also be noted that student teachers were assigned to cooperating teachers once they have the Notice of Assignment (NOA).

Mentoring practices

Several mentoring practices are observed by cooperating teachers, where each cooperating teacher has different views of their mentoring task. As mentioned by the cooperating teacher participants, mentoring is an opportunity for them to share with their student teachers their experiences and challenges they had in the past years. Although not directly mentioned, for some cooperating teachers, they do the mentoring process and protocols by first allowing their students to observe them how they teach, manage the class, assess the students, create lesson plans and develop instructional materials. After the exposure to the typical teacher activities, the student teachers will be given the chance to do the actual teaching, classroom management, assessment of students, create lesson plans and develop instructional materials. Student teachers are being exposed to the daily routine of teaching being done in the classroom. For cooperating teachers, mentoring student teachers is fulfilling, especially if they can see big improvements on their student teachers. It was also mentioned to be challenging since being assigned as a cooperating teacher is a big responsibility since they also need to further improve the teaching pedagogy of the student teachers. The cooperating teachers are actually validators of the theoretical learnings that student teachers received in teacher education institutions. Below are some of the statements of cooperating teachers regarding the mentoring practices.

Supervisory Practices

Supervising student teachers plays an important role in the student teaching program. In supervising, there are a set of guidelines to be followed. Cooperating teachers typically emphasized the importance of adhering to guidelines set forth by the institution. In the case of the student teachers, they are supposed to follow both the guidelines set by the sending school and the cooperating

school. Supervising student teachers would require ample time since there is a need for cooperating teachers to always provide guidance to student teachers in almost all aspects of student teaching like lesson planning, instructional materials development, classroom management and assessment. As cooperating teachers, they are responsible for overseeing the activities being done by their assigned student teacher. Cooperating teachers are usually tasked to develop the student teachers mentally, professionally and emotionally. Listed below are the responses of cooperating teachers.

Summary

This study examined the student teaching practices of 265 student teachers from the College of Education during the academic year 2024–2025. These student teachers were deployed to the different cooperating schools in the Schools Divisions Offices of Bulacan and the City of Malolos, Region III, Philippines. The study focused on three interrelated domains critical to the success of practice teaching: deployment practices, supervisory practices, and mentoring practices. In addition to the student teachers' perspectives, insights were also gathered from 48 cooperating teachers, who played essential roles as mentors throughout the field placement.

The researchers employed a mixed-method research design to gather both quantitative and qualitative data, enhancing the depth and credibility of the findings. Quantitative data were collected using validated questionnaires that measured perceptions of the student teaching experience, and analyzed using statistical measures such as weighted mean and standard deviation. Meanwhile, qualitative data were gathered through unstructured interviews conducted with both student teachers and cooperating teachers to validate and deepen the understanding of survey responses. These qualitative responses were processed using Braun and Clarke's six-phase thematic analysis framework, allowing for the emergence of meaningful patterns and themes related to teaching practices.

The findings revealed several strengths in the current student teaching model. First, the deployment of student teachers to diverse

school contexts provided valuable exposure to real-world classroom dynamics. Student teachers reported gaining firsthand experience in lesson planning, classroom management, and student engagement. Second, many cooperating teachers were found to be highly supportive, providing constructive feedback and modeling professional behavior, which significantly contributed to the development of student teachers' confidence and competence.

However, the study also uncovered critical challenges and inconsistencies that hinder the full realization of 21st-century teaching competencies. Deployment practices, for example, were found to lack uniformity. Some student teachers were assigned to schools without adequate orientation, while others noted a mismatch between their teaching specialization and the level or subject area assigned. This misalignment limited opportunities to apply content-specific teaching strategies learned during coursework.

In terms of supervisory practices, variability in the frequency and quality of supervision emerged as a major concern. While some student teachers were regularly observed and guided by their mentors and college supervisors, others received minimal feedback or only end-of-term evaluations. This lack of consistent supervision weakened opportunities for timely instructional adjustments and professional growth.

Mentoring practices were also mixed. Although some cooperating teachers served as exemplary mentors, others admitted to being unfamiliar with updated pedagogical frameworks such as differentiated instruction, technology integration, and collaborative learning, core components of 21st-century teaching. This gap highlighted the pressing need for the retooling and continuous professional development of cooperating teachers to align their guidance with the current demands of teacher education.

Conclusions

These conclusions were derived from the findings obtained:

1. The current deployment system provided adequate exposure to real classroom settings as manifested in the results.

However, inconsistencies in placement coordination and school readiness were noted by both student teachers and cooperating teachers.

2. Supervisory support varied significantly across cooperating schools. While some student teachers received consistent guidance, others experienced minimal feedback, affecting their professional growth.
3. Mentorship was deemed essential, with student teachers valuing constructive feedback and modeling of effective teaching strategies. However, a need for uniform mentoring standards across cooperating teachers was identified.
4. There is a gap between what is taught in pre-service coursework and what is practiced during student teaching. Student teachers expressed a need for more training in digital literacy, differentiated instruction, and classroom management before deployment.
5. Both student and cooperating teachers recognize the need for ongoing professional development that emphasizes 21st-century teaching competencies, collaborative learning, and innovation in instruction.

Recommendations

These recommendations are offered after a scrutiny of the findings and conclusions:

1. Strengthen coordination with cooperating schools to ensure appropriate and equitable placement of student teachers and prepare schools for hosting teacher trainees.
2. Develop a consistent framework for supervision that includes scheduled observations, feedback mechanisms, and performance tracking aligned with 21st-century education standards.
3. Conduct regular training sessions and orientation for cooperating teachers to update them on the latest teaching trends, 21st-century skills integration, and effective mentoring techniques.
4. Revisit and revise the existing teacher education curriculum of COEd to effectively integrate practical modules on digital

pedagogy, classroom innovations, and real-world teaching challenges commonly faced by student teachers.

5. Implement intensive pre-deployment workshops focusing on lesson planning, use of educational technology, inclusive teaching strategies, and classroom discipline.
6. Introduce tools and rubrics to assess the mentoring practices of cooperating teachers and ensure accountability and effectiveness.
7. Encourage student teachers to engage in reflective journals and professional learning communities during deployment to promote self-awareness and continuous improvement.
8. Establish formal feedback loops between student teachers, cooperating teachers, and the College of Education to inform curriculum design and program enhancements.
9. Strengthen partnerships with the Department of Education to align student teaching experiences with current public school initiatives, policies, and innovations.
10. Support continuous research on field-based experiences to track trends, challenges, and innovations that could further refine the student teaching program.
11. Future studies are encouraged to look closely at how dynamic student teaching and mentorship actually shape new teachers over time. Hearing directly from student teachers and watching their progress will help colleges see what works best in real classrooms.

References

- Bakija-Haraçija, N., Ferizi-Shala, R., & Walker, T. L. (2024). Exploring the value of student teaching practice: Insights from preschool student teachers in Kosovo. *Cogent Education*, 11(1), Article 2312217. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2312217>
- Boyd, D. J., Grossman, P. L., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2009). Teacher preparation and student achievement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 31(4), 416–440. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373709345158>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp0630a>
- Canipe, M. M., & Gunckel, K. L. (2020). Imagination, brokers, and boundary objects: Interrupting the mentor-preservice teacher hierarchy when negotiating meanings. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 71(1), 80–93. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487118812322>
- Cleaver, S., Detrich, R., States, J., & Keyworth, R. (2020). *Overview of student teaching*. The Wing Institute. <https://www.winginstitute.org/pre-service-student>
- Colson, T., Sparks, K., Berridge, G., Frimming, R., & Willis, C. (2017). Pre-service teachers and self-efficacy: A study in contrast. *Discourse and Communication for Sustainable Education*, 8(2), 66–79. <https://doi.org/10.1515/dcse-2017-0016>
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2014). Strengthening clinical preparation: The holy grail of teacher education. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 89(4), 547–561. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2014.938989>
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2021). Defining teaching quality around the world. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 44(3), 295–308. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2021.1919080>
- DeFeo, D. J., Dogbey-Gakpetor, J., Duffield, S., & Tran, T. C. (2024). The impact of disrupted in-person student teaching on preservice teachers' perceptions of preparedness. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 142, Article 104523. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2024.104523>
- Department of Education. (2017). *National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers* (DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017). Republic of the Philippines.

- Department of Education. (2019). *Policy guidelines on the K to 12 Basic Education Program* (DepEd Order No. 21, s. 2019). Republic of the Philippines.
- Fives, H., Hamman, D., & Olivarez, A. (2007). Does burnout begin with student-teaching? Analyzing efficacy, burnout, and support during the student-teaching semester. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(6), 916–934. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.03.013>
- Grisham, D. L., Laguardia, A., & Brink, B. (2000). Partners in professionalism: Creating a quality field experience for preservice teachers. *Action in Teacher Education*, 21(4), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2000.0.10462981>
- Grossman, P. (2010). *Learning to practice: The design of clinical experience in teacher preparation* (Policy Brief). American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Grossman, P., Compton, C., Igra, D., Ronfeldt, M., Shahan, E., & Williamson, P. W. (2009). Teaching practice: A cross-professional perspective. *Teachers College Record*, 111(9), 2055–2100. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016146810911100905>
- Grossman, P., & McDonald, M. (2008). Back to the future: Directions for research in teaching and teacher education. *American Educational Research Journal*, 45(1), 184–205. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831207312906>
- Jessica, H. (2022). The role of student teaching purposes and its objectives. *Global Journal of Teacher Education*, 10(2), 1–2.
- Nagro, S. A., & deBettencourt, L. U. (2019). Reviewing the effects of video analysis on preservice teacher reflection and teaching execution. *Journal of Special Education Technology*, 34(4), 257–270. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0162643419833005>
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2006). *Professional standards for accreditation of schools, colleges, and departments of education* (2006 ed.). ERIC Clearinghouse.
- 240 Tutoring. (n.d.). *Student teaching: What it is and what to expect*. Retrieved June 30, 2025, from <https://www.240tutoring.com/resources/becoming-a-teacher/student-teaching>
- Whitford, B. L., & Villaume, S. K. (2014). Clinical teacher preparation: A retrospective. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 89(4), 423–435. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2014.938972>
- Zeichner, K., & Bier, M. (2015). Opportunities and pitfalls in the turn toward clinical experience in US teacher education. In E. R. Hollins (Ed.), *Rethinking field experiences in preservice teacher preparation* (pp. 20–46). Routledge.