

# *The Field Experience Journal*

Volume 25 Spring 2020

## Table of Contents

- ii From the Editor
- 1 Equity Issues in Dual Enrollment  
*Aaron Lyle Wallace and Penny Wallin*
- 19 Culturally Relevant Summer Field Experiences for Undergraduate  
Teacher Education Majors  
*Megan Adams and Sanjuana Rodriguez*
- 48 How Student Teachers, Teachers, and School District Administrators  
Perceive and Value International and Diverse Student Teaching Experiences  
*Ann Gaudino*
- 62 Field Based Teacher Preparation Written Feedback: What are Field Supervisors  
Saying to Preservice Teachers?  
*Emily Hoeh, Carla Rossiter-Smith, Wanda Santos, and Robert Raze*
- 83 Teacher Candidate Perceptions and Meta-Reflections on the Accuracy of  
English Learners' Self-Assessments of English Language Proficiency  
*Debra A. Giambo, Jenna DeVille, and Daisy Gonzalez*
- 103 Teacher Preparation through Immersive Field Experience: Model Development  
to Implementation  
*Carolynne K. Gischel*
- 113 Preservice Co-Teaching: Finding Common Intellectual Work Regarding  
Student Social-Emotional Learning  
*Lilliana Duyck, Douglas Busman, Sheryl Vlietstra, and Amy Schelling*

## From the Editor

Dear Readers of *The Field Experience Journal*:

Our lead article, submitted by Aaron Lyle Williams and Penny Wallin, is “Equity Issues in Dual Enrollment”. Their article examines how Dual Enrollment is being embraced as a means to increase the production of graduates who are college and career ready, as well as addressing equity issues in districts.

“Culturally Relevant Summer Field Experiences for Undergraduate Teacher Education Majors” by Megan Adams and Sanjuana Rodriguez shares a study investigating teacher efficacy before, during, and after a summer field experience.

A study submitted by Ann Gaudino interviews 30 superintendents, assistant superintendents, and human resource directors surrounding their perceptions of international and diverse student teaching experiences and how they account for these experiences when hiring teachers. This article is titled, “How Student Teachers, Teachers, and School District Administrators Perceive and Value International and Diverse Student Teaching Experiences”.

“Field Based Teacher Preparation Written Feedback: What are Field Supervisors Saying to Preservice Teachers?” sent to us by Emily Hoeh, Carla Rossiter-Smith, Wanda Santos, and Robert Raze is a review of field supervisor feedback given to preservice teachers prior to and after a training experience for field supervisors.

Debra Giambo, Jenna DeVille, and Daisy Gonzalez examined the reflective self-assessments of teacher candidates who completed field experience with small groups of English learners (ELs) focusing on the accuracy of English proficiency in “Teacher Candidate Perceptions and Meta-Reflections on the Accuracy of English Learners’ Self-Assessments of English Language Proficiency”.

Carolynne Gischel’s article, “Teacher Preparation through Immersive Field Experience: Model Development to Implementation” describes one model of immersive teacher preparation.

“Preservice Co-Teaching: Finding Common Intellectual Work Regarding Student Social-Emotional Learning” written by Lilliana Duyck, Douglas Busman, Sheryl Vlietstra, and Amy Schelling details a whole-school intervention program designed to build a supportive environment for social-emotional learning.

Finally, my thanks to those who have contributed their manuscripts for our consideration and to our reviewers for their time and expertise.

Kim L. Creasy

## **Equity Issues in Dual Enrollment**

*Aaron Lyle Wallace and Dr. Penny Wallin*

*Philadelphia (MS) High School and Mississippi State University (Meridian)*

### **Abstract**

The Every Student Succeeds Act, known as ESSA, addresses equal and equitable quality education for PK-12 students. With the increasing emphasis on producing graduates who are college and career ready and successful, schools across the nation have embraced Dual Enrollment as a component in addressing equity issues in their districts. Dual Enrollment is designed for high school students to enroll in college courses for credit prior to high school graduation, apply credits toward high school and college graduation, and increase readiness for postsecondary studies and the workforce. This paper examines equity considerations and barriers in Dual Enrollment programs, with specific state examples, in the areas of demographics, policy, location options, and instructional delivery. The analysis concludes with suggestions for greater consistency in availability, rigor, and funding if Dual Enrollment is to succeed in closing gaps in equity, particularly for low-income and first-generation college students.

*Keywords:* dual enrollment, equity issues, financial disparity, policy barriers, delivery formats

## **Equity Issues in Dual Enrollment**

Since President Johnson declared his war on poverty, schools have grappled with the charge to ensure equal and equitable education for students. The purpose of the Every Student Succeeds Act, ESSA, is to “provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps” (ESSA, 2015). With equity and access issues receiving explicit attention and focus, and in the midst of an increasingly competitive global society, dual enrollment has become a popular option for high school students to take college courses for credit before high school graduation, in order to get early experiences into postsecondary classes, an early start with college requirements, more challenging requirements while in high school, and more reasonable cost for courses. In 2002 it was estimated that 1.2 million students participated in dual enrollment courses; by 2012, there were 2 million—an increase of 75% (ACT, 2015). Dual Enrollment has become more vital because of the relationship between the rise in the college graduation rate for students who enrolled in dual enrollment in high school (Miller, 2012).

It is difficult to argue the importance of Dual Enrollment when looking at the data. Sixty-four percent of Dual Enrollment students complete a 4-year degree within 5 years of high school graduation, while the official five-year graduation rate of students attending public universities and colleges who did not take dual enrollment classes in high school drops to 33% (New, 2019). Eighty-eight percent of Dual Enrollment students enrolled in college by the age of 20 (Chatlani, 2018). Meanwhile fifty-five percent of students who enroll in college directly out of high school do not return full time for their sophomore year (More, 2018). Another study found that eighty-one percent of students who enrolled in Dual Enrollment classes enrolled in college when compared to seventy-two percent of students from the same schools who did not take dual

enrollment classes (Giana, 2014). Twenty-five percent of those Dual Enrollment students completed their associate's degree when compared with only five percent of the students who did not complete Dual Enrollment classes (Giana, 2014). The two studies were conducted at different schools and with varying percentages in the results. However, both of the studies show that Dual Enrollment results in students being more likely to attend college and more likely to earn a college degree. This fact remained true regardless of race, income, or student achievement (Giana, 2014).

### **Challenges and Possibilities**

Although ESSA puts more control back into the states' hands, the Act is also criticized when local leaders do not implement the control in fair and equitable ways. Several factors impact equity in administering Dual Enrollment, in the areas of demographics with the challenges of finances and ethnicity, funding and ethnicity, policy at national, state, and local levels, delivery options, and instruction.

### ***Demographic Considerations and Possibilities***

Financial and funding barriers inhibit Dual Enrollment from reaching full and equitable success. Unfortunately, students in high poverty schools who qualify often lack the financial resources to pay for Dual Enrollment classes, which restricts participation, even though the courses may be offered at reduced tuition cost (Nowicki, n.d.). These factors, combined with the importance of Dual Enrollment to achieve success in college, provide a clear correlation to understand why students from high poverty areas are less likely to graduate with a four-year degree. Whereas Title money provided to low income school districts may be used to fund Dual Enrollment, there is disparity among districts and states to equalize the playing field. Some districts refuse to use funds to pay for advanced classes because preference is given to other

financial needs, while others restrict students who can enroll based on ACT scores and/or grade level. Although the purpose of ESSA is to help create equality and remove barriers of a quality education due to a lack of income, even with Title money available to poorer school districts, students are still not served with fidelity. In 2011, 18% of low-income students were enrolled in Dual Enrollment classes, compared to 27% of wealthier counterparts, by a 9% gap. By 2015 the low-income students were enrolled at a rate of 13%. Their wealthier counterparts were enrolled at 23%. This 10% difference created a growth in the gap by 1% (Gewertz, 2017).

Some school districts opt to prioritize available resources to send teachers to conferences, buy materials, or add technology rather than invest in Dual Enrollment. Each of these areas can prove to increase the performance of the student if implemented correctly, but none of these have the same impact on long term effects as Dual Enrollment (Fink et al. 2005). According to ACT (2015), of 1,000,000 9<sup>th</sup> grade students in 2009 who took at least one dual enrollment course during high school, 11% were from a high poverty background. In this ACT study, eight states reported they eliminated all or most tuition costs for Dual Enrollment students, while nine states held students responsible for the full cost of participating. Many states have increased the amounts of money devoted to college education, although there is variation in supports offered, ranging from states that totally pay for Dual Enrollment tuition and providing avenues for local districts to allocate funds, to requiring students to fully pay, to allowing higher education institutions to decide who will pay. Statistically, less than 10% of children born in the bottom quartile of household incomes attain a bachelor's degree by age 25, compared to over 50% in the top quartile. Compelling evidence from the U. S. Department of Education (Feb. 2019) indicates that while 34% of high school students nationally take Dual Enrollment courses, the percentage rises to 42% for students whose parents have bachelor's degrees and drops to 26% for students

whose parents do not have a high school diploma. Too often, income data and school district performance levels point to the fact that school districts at the bottom of the performance list include districts that are also considered high poverty, while many districts at the top of the list are higher income areas.

There are creative options that are being piloted to deal with demographic inequities. The state of Florida has passed legislation that Dual Enrollment students taking courses at a public postsecondary institution are exempt from paying for registration, tuition, or fees (ACT, 2015). Through the increased availability of government grants and loans, more students are able to access funding (Pyzdrowski, 2011). 2000, taxpayers have spent over \$300 billion in Pell grants. In January 2014, Congress required the Department of Education to report on the percentage of students who receive Pell Grants graduate. However, only 39% of Pell Grant recipients earned a degree within 6 years (Butrymowicz, 2015). It is also important to note that ESSA allows for the use of Title funds to help pay for Dual Enrollment classes. Title III provides for funds to help English Language Learners enroll in Dual Enrollment classes. Title IV can be used for Dual Enrollment classes to promote academic enrichment. Title VIII provides a clear definition that colleges and universities must follow for Dual Enrollment to comply with ESSA. In fact, the College in High School Alliance has put out an easy to follow document on how school districts should be using Title money to pay for dual enrollment to include sections on Title 1, 2, 3, 4, and 8 funds to help create equality throughout the schools (Perry & Lowe, 2014). The U.S. Department of Education has recently added Education Freedom Scholarships to encourage participation. Another option is through private grants. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation worked across the state of Tennessee to support the SAILS (Seamless Alignment and Integrated Learning Support) program, a bridge-math approach. This program was born out of



data that showed that many of successful college students took Dual Enrollment courses in high school, earning college credit before enrolling in college. This approach allowed for both remedial support and Dual Enrollment courses. One Mississippi school was awarded a \$5,000 grant from the Weyerhaeuser Foundation, with the sole purpose of paying for students to enroll in one dual credit class each semester. (Giving Fund, n.d.). Some districts have asked local officials to sponsor students and pay for the Dual Enrollment classes. Often, if the business or individual is shown evidence of the success rate of Dual Enrollment students vs. non-Dual Enrollment students, they are more willing to contribute. Students who have participated in Dual Enrollment courses have a smoother transition from high school to college and are less likely to need remediation. When high school students can couple high school courses with college level courses, they save time and substantial amount of tuition in earning their degrees.

### ***Demographic Considerations: Ethnicity***

A study conducted by the state of Oregon showed the demographics of the most popular dual enrollment student to be a white, female, economically advantaged student (Pierson, 2017). In Texas, although more than 100,000 high-school students took dual-enrollment courses in 2014, data in 2016 determined that African American students receive less college credits through dual enrollment courses than white students, with 5% for African American students compared to 10% for white students (Gilbert, 2017). There have been multiple studies conducted on why there is such an inequity in dual enrollment classes. However, no study has been able to find, with certainty, a specific reason as to why this inequality exists (Miller, 2017). There was notable growth between 2000 and 2015 for African Americans who enrolled in dual credit classes. Unfortunately, a gap is still present. A study conducted by the Washington Student Achievement Council (2016) outlines issues in inequality for Dual Enrollment students.

Of the students enrolled in Dual Enrollment, 61% identified as white, while 19% identified as black. Only 39% of students who received free and reduced lunches were enrolled in a Dual Enrollment course. The study also discusses the passing of ESSHB 1546 as a way to support low-income students. This bill increased the amount of funding that was available to school to enroll students in accelerated classes, including dual enrollment. This, along with better communication to parents and students about the importance of Dual Enrollment classes, has lessened the inequality gap and enhanced access.

### ***Policy Considerations***

Even though financial and ethnicity issues are often cited as the major reasons for students not enrolling in dual enrollment classes, policy decisions may either help or hinder students. In Massachusetts, students are permitted to enroll in Dual Enrollment classes with a 2.5 G.P.A. If the student does not have a 2.5 G.P.A., the principal can write a recommendation letter to have the student placed into the class. This regulation allows any junior or senior student the possibility of enrolling in dual enrollment classes with the principal's recommendation. (Massachusetts, 2017). In Mississippi, students must have a 3.0 Grade Point Average and Junior status or a 3.0 Grade Point Average and a composite score of 30 on the ACT. (Accountability Standards, 2017).

Accountability models in many states have added Dual Enrollment statistics to impact ranking. In Mississippi, the accountability model is used to determine the performance level of schools. The Mississippi Department of Education states the standards, "do not measure how well an individual student or teacher is doing" (District and School Performance, 2019). The accountability model, not teaching and learning, is the driving force in today's K-12 educational system (District and School Performance, 2019). Within this state's accountability model is a

section called the ‘acceleration component’, which includes calculations based on Dual Enrollment classes. This acceleration component is used strictly for calculating points based on the number of Dual Enrollment junior and senior students who enroll in the courses, as well as advanced placement students and career and technical students (Accreditation Accountability, 2019). In order to calculate the Dual Enrollment component, the number of students who complete the class with a C or better creates the numerator for the equation. Students who take multiple Dual Enrollment classes are awarded a whole point for the first class and decimal points for each additional class. For instance, a student who takes 2 Dual Enrollment classes will count at 1.1, and a student enrolled in 3 classes will count at 1.2. The denominator is created by adding the total number of juniors and seniors. When the numbers are divided, it creates the Dual Enrollment figure for the acceleration component of the accountability model (Accreditation Accountability, 2019). Students who are enrolled in Dual Enrollment earn points for their school under this model. However, even within the state there is variation. Those districts that choose to only allow seniors to take Dual Enrollment classes are at a disadvantage when they are compared to districts that allow juniors and seniors to enroll in these courses.

Differences in legislation point to inequalities being created based on state policy. It appears that the states that should be working the hardest to erase the inequalities are often the states with stricter policies that help generate the inequalities. These gaps at the dual enrollment level are reflected into the postsecondary world. At the postsecondary level there are more barriers than at the high school level. These include out of pocket fees, lack of reliable transportation, and prior school achievement (Policy, 2017). One study described in depth how various states evaluate if a student is eligible for dual credit. For instance, schools can base the requirements on class rank, ACT score, minimum or maximum number of credits, GPA and even

age (Taylor et al., 2015). These requirements may be barriers to prevent a high school student from enrolling in a college level class.

Policy barriers to dual enrollment may affect both high and low achievers. Many high achievers are bored due to state accountability models focusing on assisting students to reach a set standard of proficiency. Once students reach that level, they may be pushed to the side and not advised as to the Dual Enrollment path. At the other end of the spectrum low achieving students may be failing the class simply because they are bored with repetitive basic information. Those students may need a challenge to help them focus and achieve high standards of learning (Cleaver, 2008).

Additionally, the accountability models in most states focus heavily on academics while devoting little to no component in social-emotional growth. Using Dual Enrollment classes to help students find a balance between their interests and possible academic pursuits can guide them from their current intelligence level to a level of maturity (Time, 2008). Allowing a student to take a college class in high school with support from a secondary teacher can help create a balance in maturity, responsibility, and academic growth.

There are no studies that show downfalls of obtaining required college credits in high school from a community college versus a university, although there is an ongoing debate on what types of organizations should handle Dual Enrollment classes. Some see community college as a lesser alternative to a university. Others see community colleges as an easier way to gain entry to a college environment. Physical proximity to dual enrollment classes is especially true for low income rural students. The majority of students who are enrolled in dual enrollment classes are completing the classes through a community college, either at the community college or in the high school setting. This has led to conflict between the community colleges and

universities due to the belief that it encourages students to further their education through a community college instead of a university (Giana, 2014). However, research has shown that students who transfer to a four-year university from a two-year university have a comparable rate of obtaining a four-year degree. The only penalty is the community college student being delayed into entering the workforce, which sometimes occurs with loss of transfer credits to the four-year setting (Xu, Jaggars, Fletcher & Fink, 2018). Another study shows an increase in the number of universities that are willing to work with community colleges using an articulation agreement. Universities have found that a close partnership with more rural schools will lead to a higher attendance of students enrolling at the university for their junior and senior years. When a cooperative agreement can be made, the value of the community college serving as a feeder institution has led to a higher standard of learning and more opportunities for students. This level of collaboration and cooperation supports the conclusion of the study in showing students who obtain college credits at a community college level will have comparable success to the four-year university students (Xu, Ran, Fink, Jenkins, & Dunbar, 2018).

### ***Instructional Considerations***

Over the course of the last decade the number of institutions that offer options for course delivery beyond face-to-face has increased to incorporate distance methods, such as online, hybrid, and blended courses (Federal Government, 2018). This allows colleges and universities to offer the same class and utilize the same teacher to a wider audience of students. This helps to increase the profitability of the higher education institution. Research has shown mixed results into which style of teaching and learning performs better. One study found a .07 GPA difference between classes offered in a face to face format vs. the distance, online format. This study (Cavanaugh & Jacquemin, 2015) was conducted using over 5,000 courses taught by over 100

instructors the course of 10 academic terms. The greatest indicator of success in either method was the student's G.P.A. A study by Dennis (2003) compared problem-based instruction using computer-based versus fact-to-face instruction, which showed no significant statistical variance in performance. Perceptual data showed no statistically significant difference between students' perception of obtaining a quality education between the two methods of instruction.

Studies that focus on high school students using distance learning have produced both positive and negative effects. Positive effects include the student being able to progress at a more independent rate. A negative effect is the lack of maturity of a high school student in being disciplined enough to complete the assignments (Naydanova, et al. 2018). Kumi-Yeboah, Dogbey, & Yuan (2017) report the factors influencing student success in a hybrid, blended, or online dual enrollment class include the use of cooperative learning opportunities, flexible timing, and availability of online resources, and without them, there is a possibility of decreased interest and performance. On the other hand, face-to-face instruction is held at the high school or local college, allowing for opportunities for time-bound, regulated collaboration, discussion, and feedback in a social, time-bound setting with common goals (Zhan & Mei, 2013). Both delivery formats afford students the opportunity to experience college learning.

### **Limitations**

Although the goal of this paper is to raise equity issues associated with Dual Enrollment, it does not explore every barrier. Only selected states have been highlighted as examples, so comments may only be generalizable to those states. The paper is not intended to be a comprehensive study, but rather it may serve as an impetus for more profound internal and cross-state research on Dual Enrollment as an equity tool.

## **Conclusion**

This paper has explored equity issues in dual enrollment. It has been established that there are variations across states and within districts. To protect equity in Dual Enrollment paths, states and districts may want to examine their practices more closely to ensure they are not discriminating against any student in the identified barrier areas of finance, policy and regulations, location, and delivery options. Establishing a consistent standard of admittance into Dual Enrollment courses across districts within states, as well as across states, could be a strategic step. Re-examining existing Title monies and ESSA guidelines could be used at a minimum to consistently fund any student who qualifies for Dual Enrollment classes in at least one course. This option could ensure that every interested student is afforded access to a college course experience. Expanded dialogue, leading to mutually beneficial partnerships among high schools, colleges, and universities, could establish shared, systematic steps in facilitating the process of access to dual enrollment, monitoring progress, and advising future decisions to earn degrees. Planned scaffolding and ongoing support of Dual Enrollment students as they experience college expectations, workload, and demands, could make the difference for a successful transition. Future research on Dual Enrollment, specifically pertaining to demographics, policy, location, and delivery, is needed to improve viable pathways from high school to higher education. As the focus upon equity grows, it is indisputable that Dual Enrollment provides an access opportunity with the potential for more students to be successful with postsecondary training and degrees.

## References

- ACT. Inc. (2015, December). Using Dual Enrollment to Improve the Educational Outcomes of High School Students. Retrieved from: <http://files.eric.ed.gov/id=ED563778>.
- Accreditation Accountability Standards. (2015). Retrieved from <https://www.mdek12.org/Accred/AAS>.
- Butrymowicz, S. (2015, August 17). Billions in Pell Grants go to students who never graduate. Retrieved from <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/education/billions-pell-grants-go-students-never-graduate>.
- Cavanaugh, J., & Jacquemin, S. J. (2015). A Large Sample Comparison of Grade Based Student Learning Outcomes in Online vs. Face-to-Face Courses. *Online Learning, 19*(2). doi:10.24059/olj.v19i2.454.
- Chatlani, S. (2018, August 27). Dual enrollment is increasing college-going behavior, but only for some students. Retrieved from <https://www.educationdive.com/news/dual-enrollment-is-increasing-college-going-behavior-but-only-for-some-stu/530590/>.
- Cleaver, S. (2008). Smart & Bored. *MasterFILE Premie, 117*(5). doi: 15320200.
- Dennis, J. (2003). Problem-Based Learning in Online vs. Face-to-Face Environments. *Education for Health: Change in Learning & Practice, 16*(2), 198-209. Dual Credit Report. (2016). *Washington Student Achievement Council*. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED573073.pdf>.
- Every Student Succeeds Act, S.1177, 114th Cong. (2015). Retrieved from [http://edworkforce.house.gov/uploadedfiles/every\\_student\\_succeeds\\_act\\_conference\\_report.pdf](http://edworkforce.house.gov/uploadedfiles/every_student_succeeds_act_conference_report.pdf).



- Fink, J., Jenkins, D., & Yanagiura, T. (2005). What Happens to Students Who Take Community College "Dual Enrollment" Courses in High School? *Community College Research Center, Teachers College, Columbia University*.
- Gewertz, C. (2017, August 29). Dual Credit: Race and Income Gaps Are Getting Wider, Study Finds. Retrieved from [http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/high\\_school\\_and\\_beyond/2017/08/dual\\_credit\\_race\\_and\\_income\\_gaps\\_getting\\_wider.html](http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/high_school_and_beyond/2017/08/dual_credit_race_and_income_gaps_getting_wider.html).
- Giani, M., Alexander, C., & Reyes, P. (2014). Exploring Variation in the Impact of Dual-Credit Coursework on Postsecondary Outcomes: A Quasi-Experimental Analysis of Texas Students. *The High School Journal*, 97(4), 200-218. doi:10.1353/hsj.2014.0007.
- Gilbert, E. (2017, Nov. 5). How Dual Enrollment contributes to Inequality. *The Chronicle of Higher Learning*. Retrieved from [www.chronicle.com/article/How-Dual-Enrollment/241668](http://www.chronicle.com/article/How-Dual-Enrollment/241668)
- Giving Fund. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.weyerhaeuser.com/sustainability/communities/community-investment/giving-fund/>.
- Higher education Transformation: Reforming Remedial Math in Tennessee. Retrieved from [https://postsecondary.gatesfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/Case-study-Transformation\\_SAILS.pdf](https://postsecondary.gatesfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/Case-study-Transformation_SAILS.pdf).
- Hoffman, N. (2003, July). Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning. Retrieved February, 2019, from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00091380309604110>.
- Johnson, M. (n.d.). The Every Student Succeeds Act: Opportunities and Responsibilities. re:VISION. *Hunt Institute*.

Justice, M., & Mansell, N. (2014). Learning from The Past: Dual Credit. *Administrative Issues Journal: Education, Practice, and Research*, 4(1). doi:10.5929/2014.4.1.1.

Kumi–Yeboah, A., Dogbey, J., & Yuan, G. (2017). Exploring Factors That Promote Online Learning Experiences and Academic Self-Concept of Minority High School Students. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 50(1), 1–17. doi: 10.1080/15391523.2017.1365669.

Massachusetts Department. (n.d.). Commonwealth Dual Enrollment Partnership. Retrieved from [https://www.mass.edu/strategic/read\\_cdep.asp](https://www.mass.edu/strategic/read_cdep.asp).

Mississippi Department of Education. (2017). Mississippi Public School Accountability Standards 2017. Retrieved from <http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/docs/accreditation-library/2017-ms-public-school-acct-stds-11-23-17.pdf?sfvrsn=2>.

Miller, T. (2012, Nov.14). Study Shows Dual Enrollment has Positive influence in Degree Completion for Low Income Students. Retrieved from [floridacollegeaccess.org/news/study-shows-dual-enrollment-has-positive-influence-on-degree](http://floridacollegeaccess.org/news/study-shows-dual-enrollment-has-positive-influence-on-degree).

Miller, T., Kosiewicz, H., Wang, E. L., Marwah, E., Delhommer, S., & Daugherty, L. (2017). Dual Credit Education in Texas. Retrieved February, 2019, from [http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research\\_reports/RR2000/RR2043/RAND\\_RR2043.pdf](http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research_reports/RR2000/RR2043/RAND_RR2043.pdf).

More high school grads than ever are going to college, but 1 in 5 will quit. (2018, July 06). Retrieved from <https://hechingerreport.org/more-high-school-grads-than-ever-are-going-to-college-but-1-in-5-will-quit/>.

District and School Performance (2019, Oct.). Retrieved from

<https://www.mdek12.org/OA/ODSP>.

Federal Government Publishes More Complete Graduation Rate Data (2018, Sept.). Retrieved from <https://www.cappex.com/articles/blog/government-publishes-graduation-rate-data>.

Naydanova, E., Beal, B. D., Doty, H. 2018. Internet use for school-mandated and self-initiated learning: Good, bad or both? *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 21(7): 444-449.

New Research Shows College Graduation Rates for Dual Enrollment Students Vary Widely by State - and by Income. (2019, February 16). Retrieved February, 2019, from <https://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/press-releases/new-research-graduation-rates-dual-enrollment.html>.

Nowicki, J. M. (2018). K-12 Education: Public High Schools with More Students in Poverty and Smaller Schools Provide Fewer Academic Offerings to Prepare for College. Report to the Ranking Member, Committee on Education and the Workforce, House of Representatives. GAO-19-8. *US Government Accountability Office*.

Perry, A., & Lowe, A. (2014.). The Every Student Succeeds Act: Provisions Concerning Dual and Concurrent Enrollment. Retrieved February, 2019, from [nacep.org/docs/research-and-policy/ESSA\\_provisions\\_Encouraging\\_College\\_in\\_high\\_school.pdf](http://nacep.org/docs/research-and-policy/ESSA_provisions_Encouraging_College_in_high_school.pdf).

Pierson, A., Hodara, M., & Luke, J. (2017). Earning College Credits in High School: Options, Participation, and Outcomes for Oregon Students. *National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance*. Retrieved February, 2019.

Policy and Strategic Initiatives. (2017). Retrieved February, 2019, from [www.mississippi.edu/cjc/dual\\_enrollment.asp](http://www.mississippi.edu/cjc/dual_enrollment.asp).

- Pyzdrowski, L. J., Butler, M. B., Walker, V. L., Pyzdrowski, A. S., & Mays, M. E. (2011). Exploring the Feasibility of Dual Credit Mathematics Courses in High School via a Web-Enhanced, Blended Model. *The Journal of General Education*, 60(1), 43-60. doi:10.1353/jge.2011.0002.
- Taylor, J. L., Borden, V. H. M., & Park, E. (2015). State Dual Credit Policy: A National Perspective. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 2015(169), 9–19. doi: 10.1002/cc.20128.
- U.S. is Failing Gifted Students. (Time, 2008). Retrieved from <https://www.questia.com/magazine/1G1-167905391/time-preview-u-s-is-failing-gifted-students>.
- United States Department of Education. (2017). Every Student Succeeds Act. Retrieved from <https://www.ed.gov/essa?src=rn>.
- Waits, T., Setzer, J. C., & Lewis, L. (2005). Dual Credit and Exam-Based Courses in U.S. Public High Schools: 2002-2003. *National Center for Education Statistics*. Retrieved February, 2019.
- Washington Student Achievement Council (2019). Retrieved from <https://wsac.wa.gov/sites/default/files/2019.07.10.012.2.Dual.Credit.pdf1>.
- Xu, D., Jaggars, S. S., Fletcher, J., & Fink, J. E. (2018). Are Community College Transfer Students “a Good Bet” for 4-Year Admissions? Comparing Academic and Labor-Market Outcomes Between Transfer and Native 4-Year College Students. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 89(4), 478–502. doi: 10.1080/00221546.2018.1434280.
- Xu, D., Ran, F. X., Fink, J., Jenkins, D., & Dundar, A. (2018). Collaboratively Clearing the Path to a Baccalaureate Degree: Identifying Effective 2- to 4-Year College Transfer

Partnerships. *Community College Review*, 46(3), 231–256. doi:  
10.1177/0091552118772649.

Zhan, Z., & Mei, H. (2013). Academic self-concept and social presence in face-to-face and online learning: Perceptions and effects on students' learning achievement and satisfaction across environments. *Computers & Education*, 69, 131-138.  
doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2013.07.002.

**Culturally Relevant Summer Field Experiences for Undergraduate  
Teacher Education Majors**

*Megan Adams and Sanjuana Rodriguez*

*Kennesaw State University*

**Abstract**

In order to better prepare teacher candidates to meet the needs of all learners, diverse field experiences are critical (Cochran-Smith, Davis, & Fries, 2003; Delpit, 2012; Hollis & Guzman, 2005; Sleeter 2001; Sleeter, 2008). This article describes a study investigating teacher efficacy before, during, and after a summer field experience. The teacher candidates worked for four weeks in a university-based literacy center with readers performing below grade level in reading who received free/reduced lunch. The findings of the study indicate that teacher candidates became more culturally relevant, developed as active listeners, began questioning their own deficit beliefs, and learned the importance of building relationships with students. The teacher candidates sense of efficacy increased in 20 out of 24 categories. This study highlights the importance of summer field experiences allowing teacher candidates rich learning opportunities, particularly in addressing gaps in their knowledge base prior to the clinical experience.

*Keywords:* teacher education curriculum, field experiences, marginalized learners, increasing teacher efficacy

**Disclosure and Data Availability:** There was no funding for this research, nor has any financial gain occurred because of the research. All data is available via Dedoose – please request access from the corresponding author.

## **Culturally Relevant Summer Field Experiences for Undergraduate Teacher Education Majors**

Elementary teachers must be prepared to teach a diverse range of learners and be prepared to teach students whose experiences do not reflect their own. Teacher candidates often enter teacher education programs with deficit perspectives about diversity. These may include deficit-based belief systems or discomfort working with children from other cultures (Delpit, 2012; Haddix, 2008). These perspectives can leave them feeling unprepared to meet the needs of all learners as they enter the classroom (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Delpit, 2012). Field experiences are an opportunity for candidates to learn asset-based approaches and culturally relevant pedagogy while under the supervision of experts in these areas and prior to entering the job market (Cochran-Smith, Davis, & Fries, 2003; Darling-Hammond, 2010; Delpit, 2012; Hollis & Guzman, 2005; Sleeter 2001; Sleeter, 2008)).

In a comprehensive overview of research studies focused on field experiences for teacher candidates, Cochran-Smith et. al (2015) conclude that field experiences focused on diversity “assumed that replacing teacher candidates’ deficit views about diversity with affirming or asset-oriented views was an essential step in the process of learning to teach” (p. 114). Candidates must spend time in schools that are different from the schools and communities they grew up in. Cochran-Smith et. al (2015) also conclude that studies provided theoretical evidence that teacher candidates “must develop critical awareness of the privilege they derive from their membership in racially, ethnically, and linguistically dominant groups” (p.115). Additionally, candidates must use their time in the field experience to gain confidence in addressing the needs of all learners. In order to address all of the components of a quality field experience incorporating diversity, creating a field experience where teacher candidates improved their sense of efficacy

in meeting the literacy needs of all learners while teaching culturally and linguistically diverse group of students.

### **Conceptual Framework**

This field experience allowed candidates to work with children from culturally and economically marginalized communities who are performing below grade level in reading. Candidates enter the experience with deficit thinking and language about cultures other than their own. Thus, the framework for this study is a combination of Paris' (2012) culturally sustaining pedagogy and foundational tenants from Ladson-Billings' culturally relevant pedagogy (1995a; 1995b; Sleeter, 2001). As Paris (2012) points out, it is critical in teacher education to consider the "shifting and changing practices of students and their communities" (p. 94). Yet, candidates in the researchers' context enter programs unaware of the deficit beliefs they carry into schools. As Guillory (2012) experienced, our candidates refuse to interrogate their own beliefs and are often more resistant following the work. This study, therefore, acknowledges its inability to produce what Guillory (2012) calls "capital T-transformations" (p. 163) in our teacher candidates. This field experience does insist that the three key components Ladson-Billings (1995a; 1995b) lists for teaching to be culturally relevant are present: 1) students must experience academic success in that classroom; 2) students must "develop or maintain" cultural competence; and 3) "students must develop a critical consciousness through which they challenge the status quo of the current social order" (p. 160).

### **Context of Study**

This study took place in a suburban university's literacy center. The summer literacy program was provided at no cost to children from grades 2-6 who were performing below grade level in reading. The summer program lasted for three weeks, from Monday through Friday from



8:30 am to 3:30 pm. The America Reads program funded tutors, all education majors, to work directly with the children in the program. Additionally, a class on Elementary Education Assessment Methods in literacy partnered with the program; each child worked with a teacher candidate from the course on developing reading skills as determined by reading assessments and interventions. The instructor for the course also focused on asset based pedagogies and the importance of getting to know students was also stressed in the course.

### **Description of Problem**

Teaching candidates often describe fear of working with struggling readers, fear of working with students from low socioeconomic backgrounds, and fear of working with students who are "other" (Delpit, 2012; Sleeter, 2001). Those candidates use deficit approaches to working with children who are culturally and economically marginalized. This study has two foci: the first focus is an investigation of the cultural relevance of the teacher candidates and the second focus is the increase in efficacy of the teacher candidates after recognizing (some of) their deficit beliefs and working with economically and culturally marginalized children for four weeks.

### **Review of Literature**

There is an urgent need to prepare teacher candidates to work with diverse populations. There are approximately 3.1 million teachers in American public elementary and secondary schools. Of those teachers, 82 percent are White, while teachers of color comprise only 17 percent of the teaching profession (NCES, 2014). This cultural mismatch in teachers and students has the potential to impact student achievement and success (Au, 1993). There is concern that schools continue to contribute to the marginalization and deficit beliefs about culturally and linguistically diverse students (Sleeter, 2012/2017; Zoch, 2017). In order to allow

teacher candidates the space to question their own bias and learn in a safe space about addressing the needs of all learners, meeting deficit beliefs through explicit instruction and unique field experiences is critical (Sleeter, 2001).

Teachers are also comprised primarily of people from middle-class backgrounds (Howard, 2003). In the United States, the gap between the wealthiest and poorest is continually growing (Hodgkinson, 2002; Hodgkinson, 2008). For teacher education, it is critical to note the difference between the cultural and economic conditions marginalizing children in schools and society. Thus, the term “opportunity gap” as opposed to “achievement gap”. Structures in place keep children from economically and culturally marginalized populations from having equal opportunity. Georgia’s Hope Scholarship is specifically cited in the literature as an example of opportunity being redistributed as opposed to income due to the lack of representation by the poorest Georgian children in the program (Hodgkinson, 2002). Both economic and cultural marginalization have been directly tied to readers performing below grade level.

### ***Struggling readers***

In 2015, according to the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) scores, approximately 30% of U.S. students were performing below the basic level in reading (NAEP, 2017). Reading proficiently by third grade, and continuing to do so beyond, is critical beyond success in reading intensive courses (Allington, 2011; Alvermann & Hinchman, 2012). In 2011, a longitudinal study funded by the Annie E. Casey foundation (2017) found that proficient readers in sixth grade are four times more likely to graduate high school on time; 23% of readers who perform below the basic level “drop out or fail to finish high school on time, compared to 9% of children with basic reading skills and 4% of proficient readers” (Hernandez, p. 3); children “who were poor for at least a year and were not reading proficiently in third grade” had

failed to complete high school at a rate of 26% (six times the rate for proficient readers) (p. 4). In order for readers to read fluently and comprehend their reading, a complex process of language knowledge and knowledge of sentence structure working fluidly with knowledge of context and text structure (Kintsch, 1998; Kintsch, 2005). Readers must be able to use their background knowledge to make sense of what they are reading, alongside understanding the structure of the sentence and the meaning of at least a majority of the words in the sentence. Readers performing below grade level in reading, particularly beyond third grade, appear to be missing multiple pieces of the process (Kintsch, 2005).

### ***Teacher Efficacy***

Bandura (1977) distinguished between “outcome expectancy” and “efficacy expectations” (p. 193). Outcome expectancy is the belief that an action will produce an effect; efficacy expectation is the belief that one can “perform the necessary activities” to “produce certain outcomes” (p. 193). This is critical in teacher education. A teacher candidate must believe that his/her action will produce the desired results with students. Teacher efficacy scales most often focus on two domains: behavior and learning (Oh, 2011). The connection between a teacher’s action and the reaction of the student is fundamental to making the transition from teacher candidate to teacher. While investigating how field experiences impact teacher candidates’ senses of efficacy is not new (Caires, Almeida, & Martins, 2010; Capel, 1997; Chan, 2008; Flores, 2006; Oh, 2011), understanding how to choose targeted field experiences designed to fill gaps in the knowledge of each teacher candidate is novel (Caires, Almeida, & Martins, 2010; Name removed to protect review process, 2016). Developing teacher efficacy can thus be tied to field experiences as well as teaching experiences (Anderson & Betts, 2001; Oh, 2011; Poulou, 2007).

Teacher candidates and novice teachers often experience shock when they discover the gaps in their preparation program and the realities of teaching on their own (Caires, Almeida, & Martins, 2010; Flores, 2006). The disconnect between the goals of a preparation program and the realities of the needs of the classroom are noted throughout literature on efficacy and culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Poulou, 2007; Sleeter, 2001; Sleeter, 2012). Thus, while culturally relevant teaching focuses on teachers using the strengths of all students to improve performance, teachers' and teacher candidates' senses of efficacy are not necessarily directly correlated to training in culturally relevant pedagogy (Izadinia, 2011; Sleeter, 2012). However, teachers' sense of efficacy has been described in the literature as connected to their performance in the classroom and strongly influenced by their own experiences (Bedel, 2016; Rimm-Kaufman & Sawyer, 2004; Yi-Hsiang, 2014). Therefore, connecting culturally relevant field experiences - providing teacher candidates' the opportunity to grow their practice with a variety of students in a variety of settings - may impact their sense of efficacy upon encountering a student from a background different than their own in their teaching careers (Bedel, 2016; Izadinia, 2011; Sleeter, 2017).

### ***Teacher Preparation***

Teacher preparation programs, in large part, still operate under White, middle class curriculum. Almost all programs now include one or two courses focused on issues of diversity while the rest of program course do not have an explicit emphasis on issues of race or culture (King & Butler, 2015). The research confirms that one or two courses focused on culturally relevant pedagogy are not enough to shift pre-service teachers' beliefs about working with culturally and linguistically diverse students (Sleeter, 2017). Furthermore, these courses not typically designed to address the systematic oppression and racism reflected in U.S. schools. In

his study of teacher education syllabi that focused on multicultural education, Gorski (2009) found that the syllabi did not address systemic inequalities. Instead, these syllabi stressed ideas such as celebration of differences. Paris (2012) suggests that to move away from that tradition, questioning the traditional norms of schooling and advancing a shift in preparation and educational policies is needed. To become culturally sustaining, teacher educators must first accept their role as advocates for all children; they must also be taught how to address the needs of all children.

### ***Field Experiences***

Another component of teacher education programs that needs to be considered is the field experience that teacher candidates complete. Field experiences have not been a priority in teacher education programs (Moulding, Stewart, & Dunmeyer, 2014; Wiggins, Follo, & Eberly, 2007). While teacher education relies heavily on experience-based learning, the field experience is often an afterthought, not pushing candidates to explore a variety of teaching contexts (Ritchie, 2012; Sleeter, 2017). Further, these field experiences are often observational in nature and traditionally have students reflect on a wide array of issues (Villegas & Lucas, 2002; Whipp & Geronime, 2017). These decisions about field experiences fail to take into consideration the retention of new teachers should they remain in those schools in their early careers, a critical topic in education today (Sydnor, 2017; Whipp & Geronime, 2017).

Although more research is still necessary in findings ways to prepare teacher candidates to work with culturally and linguistically diverse students, some recent studies describe the importance of field experiences in preparing teachers to work with diverse students (Onore & Gildin, 2010; Waddell, 2011). Addressing the needs of all learners while learning content may not be easy, but a shift in beliefs will allow teacher candidates to challenge deficit beliefs and

narratives (Ritchie, 2012; Sleeter, 2017). Further, a variety of field experiences with a range of responsibilities is critical for developing the expertise of teacher candidates (Greenblatt & O'Hara, 2015). New models of assessing teacher education, including edTPA, are designed with the goal to measure how prepared teachers are before they graduate. However, those programs often fall short of helping teachers choose the teaching landscape in which to begin their careers (Sydnor, 2017). While assessments like these require teacher candidates to reflect more upon their teaching choices during student teaching, they do not demand a range of settings for teacher candidates to practice their craft (Greenblatt & O'Hara, 2015; Madeloni & Gorlewski, 2013). This is in direct conflict with the tools needed to develop self-efficacy early in teaching (Greenblatt & O'Hara, 2015; Oh, 2011).

## **Methodology**

This type of case study requires a bounded system – a microcosm where the researchers and the participants interact and construct an iterative cycle of data surrounding the research questions: the researcher sets up the study, the participants act, the researcher observes/questions the actions, adjustments are made, etc. (Stake, 1995). The bounded system for this case study is the summer literacy program. Within that program, there are several facets; teacher candidates are acting as literacy tutors; an elementary education assessment course is partnered with the program; 2-6 grade children are participating in the program; two researchers are engaging with the program. As opposed to investigating the shifts in beliefs or identity of the students acting as tutors or the 2-6 grade children, this phase of the study focuses only on the field experience component. The research questions dictated that the researchers begin by describing the setting to the teacher candidates. Following, class sessions were devoted to beginning with understanding how, why, and when to use reading assessments. Following the work with the

children, candidates would de-brief, and instruction was altered in order to meet the needs of the candidates and best foster senses of efficacy. Increasing the senses of efficacy for teacher candidates will allow them to enter the field best able to meet the needs of all children (Delpit, 2012; Sleeter, 2001; Villegas & Lucas, 2002).

### ***Research Questions***

This study was guided by the following research questions:

1. How did working with students from culturally and economically marginalized communities who were performing below grade level in reading impact teacher candidates' sense of efficacy?
- 2) What shifts in beliefs and attitudes were evident after working with students during field experience?

### ***Data Collection***

The case study follows Stake's (1995) model; it is action occurring within a bounded system to investigate change. In this case, the change being investigated is the teaching candidates' sense of efficacy. In order to investigate the shifts in senses of efficacy, the researchers used a pre and post efficacy survey, focus group questions, interviews, and observations as data points. Additionally, the researchers kept journals of any shifts in instruction noted by the instructor of the course and notes of any interactions with the candidates themselves; candidates often asked questions of any literacy expert in the area when a question arose. All of the data was entered into Dedoose (2018); this is a qualitative data program allowing multiple researchers to analyze and comment upon various forms of data. Journals, transcripts, videos of interviews and focus groups, and observation notes were all entered into Dedoose and coded by both researchers as themes were constructed.

## **Analysis**

### ***Qualitative Analysis***

Multiple themes were constructed based upon the feedback of the teacher candidates. The most overarching theme was becoming more culturally relevant. Candidates described this in multiple ways: questioning deficit beliefs, developing as reflexive practitioners, becoming a better tutor through active listening, developing relationships with the students. The themes will be unpacked in detail in the discussion section; the findings here provide an overview of those themes repeated most frequently in the qualitative data. In every interview and across both focus groups, candidates described situations where they jumped to a conclusion about a student before getting to know him/her. One candidate describes a student who was often lethargic. She questioned why he was so tired, and he let her know he was fasting. She had assumed that "he was up late", or "parents were not enforcing a bedtime" – she admits she made an assumption and realized. She realized that the child was fasting when she began to talk to him about why he was tired. The teacher candidate noted how impressive it was that a child was fasting for his beliefs and realized, through conversations with him, that he was making an individual choice to fast. Another theme, becoming reflexive practitioners, is closely tied.

Several candidates noted the bond formed between themselves and the children. One noted that he had not realized how much he meant to the child until she brought him a bracelet. The friendship bracelet, she said, was to help him feel better (he missed a day of tutoring due to illness). He realized that being reflexive meant thinking about how his own actions impacted the children he teaches. Active listening and agents of care were both threads woven across the narratives of the candidates as well. As they spoke in focus groups and interviews, candidates noted that when they "really listened" they were able to better connect with and understand the



children. Candidates noted that they understood "who the kid is" and that "knowing where they are coming from is so important in getting to know them". These themes indicate the value the candidates began placing on what culturally relevant teaching suggests; teachers must get to know each child as an individual before deciding how best to educate the child.

### *Survey Analysis*

For this study, we used the survey given to teacher candidates to inform our understanding of the qualitative data. The survey was one developed by Oh (2011) and is a scale to measure teacher efficacy. Efficacy surveys are often utilized to determine gains in confidence in working with K-12 grade students in varied ways (Oh, 2011). The survey analysis indicated that candidates increased their senses of efficacy across 20 out of 24 categories. Teacher candidates reported having higher efficacy beliefs following the field experience in all areas except: motivating students; having students follow classroom rules; reaching a student who is failing; and calming a student who is disruptive. It is interesting to note that candidates' efficacy in addressing behavior and motivation went down after the field experience, while the areas where growth in efficacy was most notably increased had to do with assessing students and using a variety of methods. The survey findings were meant to supplement the findings of the interviews, focus groups, and observations; there was alignment across the study that teacher candidates' sense of efficacy in improving the literacy of all children increased after the field experience. Our findings illustrate that while coursework prepares candidates for the mechanics of teaching, reaching all students and motivating them while monitoring behavior is a gap in our teacher preparation program(s). Appendixes A, B, and C provide the efficacy scale, the pre survey results, and the post survey results.

## **Discussion**

Candidates learned through this field experience that getting to know each child was critical to success. While there are many examples of deficit language and thinking and what Guillory (2012) terms "cultural drive by" approaches (p. 154), this beginning or little transformation (Guillory, 2012) provides a starting point for candidates to consider their deficit thinking about their students. Across all data points, teacher candidates indicated that understanding the point of view of the student was the key take-away from the field experience. In the focus group, several candidates describe learning to be better listeners in order to question their own biases. These themes are discussed more fully in the following sections.

### ***Questioning Deficit Beliefs***

One candidate described general nervousness at having little in common with a Muslim student she was tutoring. "My student was bilingual and um, he was Muslim, and we had like not a lot of common interests. I was nervous about how I was gonna bond with him. I didn't know, he was like very interested in wars and guns and I don't know a lot about guns or anything like that. So, I was nervous about their being a barrier between us because we are very different." She says she tried to educate herself to make it "about him, not about me" (focus group, 06/03/2016). Her quotes consistently indicate a reliance on her deficit beliefs. While she has begun questioning her beliefs, she certainly does not describe providing a space for her student to "develop or maintain" cultural competence while they work together (Ladson-Billings, 1995a, p. 160). This is more of what Guillory describes as "cultural drive-by" (p. 154); the candidate has only allowed her student to describe what makes his context different from her own.

### ***Becoming Culturally Relevant***

One student used an asset-based approach to build upon the reading strengths of her student. While she indicated that the student was weak in writing, she knew that her strong reading skills might allow for writing improvement. Therefore, she chose an activity to combine reading and writing. "The way, for the passage, I had her read, we actually just read a book that was on like a first-grade level. And then, I had her write a letter in response to the book we read. . . So, I used graphic organizers to help her organize her opinion, and then I had her write the letter. She did very well on the letter" (interview, 06/05/2016). The candidate understood that using the reading strength of the student and providing one to one writing instruction would allow the student to become more confident in writing. The experience did not indicate culturally sustaining pedagogical development in the teacher candidate – there is no questioning the systemic inequalities that may have led to the child's performance below grade level in reading or writing – yet there is a beginning point indicating an effort to provide opportunities for the student to "experience academic success" (Ladson-Billings, 1995a, p. 160).

**Learning Active Listening.** One candidate notes that she was “surprised that even in the summer, my student wanted to do school work” (focus group, 06/03/2016). While the candidates saw the work as something children might be resistant to, after listening carefully to the comments of their students, they found that they were actually excited to get additional help and work with college students in the summer months. The deficit beliefs the candidates held upon entering the field experience were acknowledged during the focus groups and interviews – the shifts in their beliefs were a starting point that may be built upon throughout their teacher education program. The interviews confirmed what we heard in the focus group. Phrases like "getting to know my student", "learning to hear what she was really saying", and "paying

attention to what he wanted to read or do for activities" illustrated active listening and shifting to a student-centered approach (focus group, 06/03/2016).

**Importance of Building Relationships.** One teacher candidate noted that she saw the greatest responsiveness from her student when she spent more time questioning her about what she wanted. "I mainly used a lot of conversation. My student responded really well when we talked one on one" (interview, 07/03/2016). She described working with art materials and interactive technological programs in order to promote engagement. Another says, "my student loves bingo. So, I incorporated some educational bingo in my activities. So, yeah, I tried to incorporate things she liked in the lessons" (interview, 07/03/2016). An additional student noted that he spent time getting to know the student so he "could make . . . lesson plans of . . . interest" and "really tried to get to know him" (interview, 07/03/2016). By intentionally choosing things that made the children happier, they were also elevating their instruction to increase student engagement. These moments allowed the candidates to learn from their students. Talbert-Johnson (2006) asserts that it is important for teacher candidates to possess pedagogical knowledge, but to also understand the role that more intangible concepts, such as care, can have on teaching. Choosing activities that were important to the students showed the children that tutors were listening and cared about their preferences.

**Survey Findings.** The pre and post survey were administered to all students in the course. The course partnered with the summer program was an undergraduate elementary education course on literacy assessment. As their field experience, candidates could choose to work with children in the summer camp program. Those who did completed both the pre and post survey. The survey is broken into categories: efficacy for instructional strategies, efficacy for classroom management, and efficacy for student engagement (Oh, 2011). Across the

categories, candidates overwhelmingly increased in all but one category in instructional strategies, and increased efficacy in all categories in student engagement. Candidates described similar confidence during the focus groups and interviews. They felt competent that they could choose activities that would be engaging and that would result in learning. It is also important to note those categories where candidates' efficacy decreased during the field experience.

**Decrease in Instructional Strategies Efficacy.** Only one falls into the category of “instructional strategies”, number 4. The prompt is “How well can you implement alternative strategies for your reading and writing lessons” (Oh, 2011, p. 237). During our focus groups and interviews, candidates repeatedly describe feeling unsure about how to engage students who were reluctant readers or writers. There was concern that this was a summer program and not “traditional” school; there was concern that students would not respond favorably if they didn’t enjoy the activity. Writing, in particular, was a concern repeated in the data. One candidate describes a student who just would not write the first session. During later sessions, the child would write, but it was with reluctance. The candidates clearly expressed more confidence in promoting reading. This is worth future study; are we teaching candidates how to incorporate reading and writing simultaneously in the elementary grades?

**Decrease in Classroom Management Efficacy.** Three out of four instances of decreased efficacy occur during classroom management. The prompts are “How well can you keep a few problem students from ruining an entire reading and writing lesson”, “How well can you respond to defiant students in reading and writing lessons”, and “To what extent can you make your expectation clear about student behavior during your reading and writing lesson” (Oh, 2011, p. 237). Table 1 shows the four questions where a decrease occurred.

**Table 1.**

*Instances of decreased efficacy*

Question	Pre Results	Post Results
4	6.85	6.64
13	7.46	6.91
14	6.54	6.09
15	6.31	6.18

In all of these questions, candidates are asked about their confidence in their ability to intervene with a disruptive student. Language like “problem students” and “defiant” are indicated in the survey; these terms also surfaced in the focus group and interviews. The student who refused to write early in the program is an example that stands out. The candidate felt completely lost; she describes feeling helpless and unable to get the student interested in the material. This sense of frustration makes sense. Candidates came into the field experience with either no experience in a classroom or with very little, supervised exposure in much younger grades. They felt confident (as shown on the pre survey responses to questions 13-15) addressing a couple of defiant students who did not want to work. They felt sure they could set expectations that would be followed. The reality is somewhat different. It takes understanding the complexities behind motivation and engagement to fully understand why a child might refuse to work. In addressing the needs of struggling readers in particular, the literature suggests understanding shame as a factor. In this case, young teacher candidates are encouraging children who have not succeeded in school to take on new tasks that may be challenging. The nuances of addressing reluctance to participate was apparently lost on the candidates; the field experience caused them to lose confidence in their abilities.

**Increase in Instructional Strategy Efficacy.** While candidates' sense of efficacy increased in 20 out of 24 areas, there were 6 prompts to which candidates' efficacy increased by over .5 points. These instances drew the researchers' attention as moments when candidates learned a great deal during the program. Those prompts were 5, 7, 8, 18, 19, and 23. It is significant to note that in classroom management, there were no instances of candidates' efficacy increasing so dramatically. There were 3 each from instructional strategies and engagement. Table 2 illustrates those increases.

**Table 2.**

*Instances of increased efficacy*

Question	Pre Results	Post Results
5	6.69	7.64
7	6	6.91
8	6.77	7.45
18	6.46	7.82
19	6	6.91
23	6.38	7.64

These instances will be discussed in relation to each other and the category they represent. Numbers 5, 7, and 8 all represent efficacy for instructional strategies. Number 5 states “how well can you respond to difficult questions about your reading and writing lessons from students” (Oh, 2011, p. 237). This experience allowed candidates to build confidence in planning, executing, and assessing a reading lesson. It is logical, then, that this skill grew and allowed for increased efficacy after the field experience. Numbers 7 and 8 state, respectively, “to what extent can you gauge student comprehension of what you have taught about reading and

writing” and “how well can you provide appropriate challenges for very capable students in reading and writing lessons” (p. 237). While gauging comprehension was mentioned in the focus group as a concern of several candidates, after designing an appropriate lesson and using both formative and summative assessments, candidates appear to feel more confident. The surprise is number 8. Which candidates worked with “very capable” students, and how was that defined? Did they take this to mean that they designed assessments that were appropriate for the level of their reader(s)? This requires further study and clarification in the future.

**Increase in Engagement Efficacy.** Numbers 18, 19, and 23 all represent student engagement. Numbers 18 and 19 both address motivation. They state, respectively “how much can you do to help your students value learning about reading and writing” and “how much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in their reading and writing schoolwork” (p. 237). As described from the qualitative data, these were areas candidates felt particularly confident about. This was a three-week summer camp; the expectation was that children would not want to engage much during the summer. Thus, when candidates had success engaging their students, they felt much more confident in how to do so during “traditional” school. Number 23 is a bit of an anomaly. It states, “how much can you do to foster student creativity in reading and writing” (p. 237). In the interviews and focus groups, we heard about science inquiries, engaging students in technology, and finding “fun” ways to work on writing. We did not see a lot of creativity in the reading or writing candidates were asking, or the projects did not indicate high levels of artistic requirements. However, we again believe this may be a language issue. Did candidates define “creativity” more broadly than the researchers? Did allowing students choice in topics equate to creativity for the candidates? We are not sure how to judge what caused this increase in efficacy. This requires future study and clarification.



## Significance

As noted, field experiences requiring candidates to work with students who are culturally and linguistically diverse are not the norm (Sleeter, 2017; Villegas & Lucas, 2002).

Incorporating community outreach in the form of a summer program with an intentional field experience design for teacher candidates allows new research opportunities. An important question is how working with children from economically marginalized communities who are performing below grade level in reading impacts teacher candidates. Future iterations of this study need to also investigate the impact on the tutors (hired through America Reads) and the 2-6<sup>th</sup> grade children. The program allowed the children to grow as readers; it is important to determine if their identities as readers are changing due to this program. Moving into year 3 of this study we wanted to change several things:

1. Recruit students who are recommended by their teachers for the program based upon the need for summer tutoring
2. Create a social justice curriculum framework to allow the 2-6 students and the tutors to create positive identities as readers and activists during the program
3. Adjust data collection so that similar data is collected from all teacher candidates involved in the program.

Enacting these changes will allow the researchers to develop more substantive conclusions in the third iteration of this study. In year two, the primary findings listed above allowed for refinement of the program and conclusions about the need for intentional placements with diversity and marginalized communities in mind. The candidates' growth allows them to enter the field with stronger feelings of preparedness and as more marketable teacher candidates. In future studies, we also want to investigate their impact once in the classroom; there are few

studies on whether these more culturally relevant candidates remain culturally relevant once in the field (Sleeter, 2001).

## References

- Allington, R. L. (2011). What at-risk readers need. *Educational Leadership*, 68(6), 40-45.
- Alvermann, D. E., & Hinchman, K. A. (Eds.) (2012). *Reconceptualizing the literacies in adolescents' lives: Bridging the everyday/academic divide*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Anderson, S. & Betz, N. (2001). Sources of social self-efficacy expectations: Their measurement and relation to career development. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58, 98-117.  
doi: 10.1006/jvbe.2000.1753
- Annie E. Casey Foundation (2017). Kids count data center. Retrieved from:  
<http://datacenter.kidscount.org/>
- Au, K. H. (1993). *Literacy instruction in multicultural settings*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215.
- Bedel, E. F. (2016). Exploring academic motivation, academic self-efficacy and attitudes toward teaching in pre-service early childhood education teachers. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 4(1). Retrieved from: <http://jets.redfame.com>
- Caires, S., Almeida, L. S., & Martins, C. (2010). The socioemotional experiences of student teachers during practicum: A case of reality shock? *The Journal of Educational Research*, 103, 17-27.
- Capel, S. A. (1997). Changes in students' anxieties and concerns after their first and second teaching practices. *Educational Research*, 39, 211-228.

- Chan, D. W. (2008). General, collective, and domain-specific teacher self-efficacy among Chinese prospective and in-service teachers in Hong Kong. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*, 1057-1069. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2007.11.010
- Cochran-Smith, M., Davis, D., & Fries, M. K. (2003). Multicultural teacher education: Research, practice and policy. In J. Banks (Ed.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd ed., pp. 931-975). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). Teacher education and the American future. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(1-2), 35-47.
- Delpit, L. (2012). *"Multiplication is for white people": Raising expectations for other people's children*. New York, NY: The New Press.
- edTPA (2015). Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity. edTPA handbook.
- Flores, A. (2006). Being a novice teacher in two different settings: Struggles, continuities and discontinuities. *Teachers College Record, 108*, 2021-2052.
- Gorski, P. C. (2009). What we're teaching teachers: An analysis of multicultural teacher education coursework syllabi. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*(2), 309-318.
- Greenblatt, D., & O'Hara, K. E. (2015). Buyer beware: Lessons learned from edTPA implementation in New York State. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 42*(2), 57-67.
- Haddix, M. (2008). Beyond sociolinguistics: Towards a critical approach to cultural and linguistic diversity in teacher education. *Language and Education, 22*(5), 254-270. doi:10.1080/09500780802152648
- Hernandez, D. J. (2011). Double jeopardy: How third-grade reading skills and poverty influence high school graduation. Report prepared for the Annie E. Casey Foundation. ERIC Number: ED518818.

- Hodgkinson, H. (2002). Demographics and teacher education: An overview. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(2), 102-105.
- Hodgkinson, H. (2008). Demographic Trends and the Federal Role in Education. *Rethinking the Federal Role in Elementary and Secondary Education*. Washington, DC: Center on Educational Policy.
- Hollins, E. R., & Guzman, M. T. (2005). Research on preparing teachers for diverse populations. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. M. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education* (pp. 477-548). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Howard, T. C. (2003). Culturally relevant pedagogy: Ingredients for critical teacher reflection. *Theory into Practice, 42*(3), 195-202.
- Izadinia, M. (2011). Incorporating the principles of critical pedagogy into a teacher efficacy measure. *English Language Teaching, 4*(2), 138-150.
- King, E., & Butler, B. R. (2015). Who cares about diversity? A preliminary investigation of diversity exposure in teacher preparation programs. *Multicultural Perspectives, 17*(1), 46-52.
- Kintsch, W. (1998). *Comprehension: A paradigm for cognition*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Kintsch, E. (2005). Comprehension theory as a guide for the design of thoughtful questions. *Topics in Language Disorders, 25*, 51-64.
- Kreader, J. L., Ferguson, D., & Lawrence, S. (2005). Impact of training and education for caregivers of infants and toddlers. *Child Care and Early Education Research Connections, 3*, 1-17.

- Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995a). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory into Practice*, 34(3), 159-166.
- Madeloni, B. & Gorlewski, J. (2013). Wrong answer to the wrong question. *Rethinking Schools*, 27(4), 16-21.
- Moulding, L. R., Stewart, P. W., & Dunmeyer, M. L. (2014). Pre-service teachers' sense of efficacy: Relationship to academic ability, student teaching placement characteristics, and mentor support. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 41, 60-66.
- NAEP (2017). The nation's report card: 2015 Mathematics and reading assessments. Retrieved from: [https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/reading\\_math\\_2015/#reading/acl?grade=4](https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/reading_math_2015/#reading/acl?grade=4)
- Oh, S. (2011). Preservice teachers' sense of efficacy and its sources. *Psychology*, 2(3), 235-240.
- Onore, C. & Gildin, B. (2010) Preparing urban teachers as public professionals through a university-community partnership. *Teacher Education Quarterly* 37(3), 27-44.
- Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology, and practice. *Educational Researcher*, 41(3), 93-97.
- Poulou, M. (2007). Personal teaching efficacy and its sources: Student teachers' perceptions. *Educational Psychology*, 27, 191-218.  
doi:10.1080/01443410601066693
- Rimm-Kaufman, S. E., & Sawyer, B. E. (2004). Primary-grade teachers' self-efficacy beliefs, attitudes toward teaching, and discipline and teaching practice priorities in relation to the "responsive classroom" approach. *The Elementary School Journal*, 104(4), 321-341.

- Ritchie, S. (2012). Incubating and sustaining: How teacher networks enable and support social justice education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 63(2), 120-131.
- Sleeter, C. E. (2001). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(2), 94–106.
- Sleeter, C. E. (2012). Confronting the marginalization of culturally responsive pedagogy. *Urban Education*, 47(3), 562-584.
- Sleeter, C. E. (2017). Critical race theory and whiteness of teacher education. *Urban Education*, 52(2), 155-169.
- Sleeter, C. E. (2008). Preparing white teachers for diverse students. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, & J. McIntyre (Eds.). *Handbook of Research in Teacher Education: Enduring Issues in Changing Contexts*, 3rd ed. (pp. 559-582). Routledge.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sydnor, J. (2017). “I didn’t realize how hard it would be!”: Tensions and transformations in becoming a teacher. *Action in Teacher Education*, 1-19.
- Talbert-Johnson, C. (2006). Preparing highly qualified teacher candidates for urban schools: The importance of dispositions. *Education and Urban Society*, 39(1), 147-160.
- U.S. Department of Education (2016). *The state of racial diversity in the educator workforce*. Accessed from <https://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/highered/racial-diversity/state-racial-diversity-workforce.pdf>
- Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). Preparing culturally responsive teachers: Rethinking the curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(1), 20–32.

- Waddell J. (2011). Crossing borders without leaving town: The impact of cultural immersion on the perceptions of teacher education candidates. *Issues in Teacher Education* 20(2): 23–36.
- Whipp, J. L., & Geronime, L. (2017). Experiences that predict early career teacher commitment to and retention in high-poverty urban schools. *Urban Education*, 52(7), 799-828.
- Wiggins, R. A., Follo, E. J., & Eberly, M. B. (2007). The impact of a field immersion program on pre-service teachers' attitudes toward teaching in culturally diverse classrooms. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(5), 653-663.
- Yi-Hsiang, P. (2014). Relationships among teachers' self-efficacy and students' motivation, atmosphere, and satisfaction in physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 33(1), 68-92.
- Zoch, M. (2017). "It's Important for Them to Know Who They Are": Teachers' Efforts to Sustain Students' Cultural Competence in an Age of High-Stakes Testing. *Urban Education*, 52(5), 610-636.



## Appendix A

### *Efficacy Survey*

<b>Teacher Beliefs</b>		<b>How much can you do?</b>								
Directions: This questionnaire is designed to help us gain a better understanding of the kinds of things that create difficulties for teachers in their school activities. Please indicate your opinion about each of the statements below. Your answers are confidential.		Nothing	Very Little			Some Influence		Quite A Bit		A Great Deal
1.	How much can you do to get through to the most difficult students?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
2.	How much can you do to help your students think critically?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
3.	How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
4.	How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in school work?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
5.	To what extent can you make your expectations clear about student behavior?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
6.	How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in school work?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
7.	How well can you respond to difficult questions from your <u>students</u> ?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
8.	How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
9.	How much can you do to help your students value learning?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
10.	How much can you gauge student comprehension of what you have taught?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
11.	To what extent can you craft good questions for <u>your students</u> ?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
12.	How much can you do to foster student creativity?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
13.	How much can you do to get children to follow <u>classroom rules</u> ?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
14.	How much can you do to improve the understanding of a student who is failing?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
15.	How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
16.	How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
17.	How much can you do to adjust your lessons to the proper level for individual students?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
18.	How much can you use a variety of <u>assessment strategies</u> ?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
19.	How well can you keep a few problem students from ruining an entire lesson?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
20.	To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation <u>or</u> example when <u>students are</u> confused?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
21.	How well can you respond to defiant students?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
22.	How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
23.	How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
24.	How well can you provide appropriate challenges for very capable students?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)

## Appendix B

### *Pre-Survey Results*

7	6	8	7	7	7	5	7	8	5	5	6	5	6.38461538
5	7	7	8	6	6	5	5	9	5	6	9	7	6.53846154
7	7	6	8	4	9	7	7	7	3	7	5	7	6.46153846
5	5	9	9	5	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	6.84615385
6	7	9	9	5	6	8	6	8	4	7	4	8	6.69230769
8	6	9	9	7	6	7	7	9	6	8	3	9	7.23076923
7	8	6	8	6	6	6	6	6	4	6	4	5	6
7	9	6	9	6	6	7	5	8	5	6	3	6	6.38461538
7	6	6	8	7	5	7	7	8	5	7	8	7	6.76923077
6	7	7	8	6	7	6	8	9	4	8	6	5	6.69230769
7	8	8	9	7	6	6	7	8	5	6	9	6	7.07692308
5	9	7	9	8	8	7	7	8	5	7	9	7	7.38461538
8	8	8	8	7	9	8	7	8	6	8	6	6	7.46153846
7	5	7	8	6	7	6	7	9	6	7	3	7	6.53846154
6	4	8	8	5	7	6	7	8	6	6	4	7	6.30769231
6	8	6	9	5	9	7	6	8	2	6	5	5	6.30769231
7	6	7	9	6	8	6	8	7	3	6	6	6	6.53846154
5	7	7	8	6	8	6	8	8	3	7	4	7	6.46153846
7	4	8	7	5	6	7	5	7	3	8	7	4	6
7	7	7	9	6	5	7	6	8	4	7	8	5	6.61538462
6	5	6	8	5	5	6	7	8	3	6	3	6	5.69230769
8	4	7	8	7	5	6	8	8	5	5	5	7	6.38461538
7	6	7	8	6	6	7	6	8	3	7	6	6	6.38461538
8	8	6	8	7	7	8	4	8	3	7	9	7	6.92307692

## Appendix C

### *Post-Survey Results*

7	7	8	7	5	6	8	7	6	6	7	6.72727273
7	8	7	7	9	6	7	8	7	8	7	7.36363636
8	7	8	6	4	6	7	6	6	8	8	6.72727273
7	7	8	8	3	4	9	6	7	7	7	6.63636364
9	7	9	7	7	6	7	7	9	8	8	7.63636364
7	8	9	7	8	8	9	8	6	8	8	7.81818182
6	7	7	6	8	5	7	8	6	8	8	6.90909091
6	7	8	7	6	7	8	8	9	9	7	7.45454545
7	8	8	6	8	7	8	7	5	8	8	7.27272727
8	8	8	8	4	7	7	7	6	7	6	6.90909091
6	7	8	8	9	8	7	8	5	8	6	7.27272727
9	8	8	8	9	8	7	7	7	8	6	7.72727273
8	8	7	6	6	6	6	7	6	8	8	6.90909091
5	7	8	7	2	4	6	7	7	7	7	6.09090909
5	8	7	6	7	4	6	6	6	6	7	6.18181818
7	8	7	6	4	5	6	7	7	8	7	6.54545455
8	8	7	8	2	7	9	8	9	7	7	7.27272727
8	8	9	8	8	7	8	7	9	7	7	7.81818182
7	8	7	7	6	5	7	8	5	8	8	6.90909091
7	8	7	7	9	7	7	7	7	8	6	7.27272727
8	7	7	7	1	6	8	8	6	7	7	6.54545455
7	8	7	8	4	6	7	8	5	7	7	6.72727273
7	8	9	8	8	7	7	8	7	8	7	7.63636364
7	7	7	8	9	7	7	8	8	7	7	7.45454545

# **How Student Teachers, Teachers, and School District Administrators Perceive and Value International and Diverse Student Teaching Experiences**

*Ann Gaudino*

*Millersville University of Pennsylvania*

With increasingly diverse populations in the United States, university accrediting bodies are requiring that teacher candidates complete clinical experience within culturally and linguistically diverse schools. International clinical experiences, in which university students observe and teach abroad for a period of time, are a means of meeting these accreditation requirements. Literature and previous studies from national education organizations, experts, as well as student teachers and teachers themselves who have completed international student teaching concur on the value of international student teaching. A single study focusing to administrator hiring practices in a quadrant of a single state demonstrated that the participant administrators also valued and accounted international student teaching in the hiring process. However, there is scant literature focusing more broadly on school districts across the United States and how, if at all, they value and account for international student teaching or teaching experience. This study attempted to begin to fill this gap by interviewing 30 superintendents, assistant superintendents, and human resource directors surrounding their perceptions of international and diverse student teaching experiences and how, if at all, they account for such experience when hiring teachers. Second, these administrator responses were compared with those in the literature from student teachers, teachers, and other experts in the field to determine what similarities and differences exist in how these various groups perceive and value international student teaching experience. Recommendations were made for both universities

that implement international student teaching experiences as well as school districts about how they can better account for such experiences in the hiring process.

## **Literature**

The Association of International Educators (NAFSA) asserts that, “Through internationalization of curriculums and programs in teacher education, colleges of education can foster the formation of teachers with a global vision and global understanding who can contribute to the education of tomorrow’s global citizens” (NAFSA, 2010). Furthermore, the Longview Foundation (2009) asserts the urgency of implementing such programs stating, “The critical role of teachers in internationalizing P-12 education has never been clearer” (p. 7). To address this need, NAFSA initiated a colloquium in 2009 for Internationalizing Teacher Education. This colloquium meets annually with the goal of encouraging and supporting universities to promote field and clinical experiences abroad for teacher candidates.

Dr. Craig Kissock and Dr. Paula Richardson (2009) of Educators Abroad, an organization that facilitates international clinical placements, summarize that through international clinical experiences, prospective educators develop, “a foundation of experience and insight on which to base their initial actions and to refine their global perspective of life and teaching throughout their career” (Kissock & Richardson, 2009, p. 6). Kissock (2001) challenges teacher preparation programs with an essential question: “Can we design and implement a teacher education program that prepares individuals to teach in any society in the world?” (p. 3). He further challenges teachers to broaden their questioning from what is the in the best interest of their students to, “What resolution will better serve the interests of our global society?” (p. 3).

From their experience, Richardson and Kissock (2009) believe that, “employers recognize their schools need educators who can relate instruction to the cultural background,

learning styles, and personal and future needs of their students. They will employ teachers who have demonstrated a willingness to develop a broader understanding of themselves and our global village” (p. 5). Furthermore, these authors assert that as teacher education programs require their new hires to be able to teach with a global vision, “Employers will be increasingly reluctant to hire individuals whose life experience and understanding of themselves and others is limited” (p. 5). Bradley, Quinn, and Morton (2009) affirm these assertions noting that student teachers develop a sense of professionalism and understanding of cultural differences during international internships that serves them well in the workplace.

Authors concur on the specific benefits that student teachers reap from student teaching abroad. A significant aspect of international clinical practice is that students develop greater personal awareness and confidence because they reflect more on themselves (Bradley, Quinn & Morton, 2009; Gaudino, Moss & Wilson, 2012; Martin, 2012; Marx & Moss, 2011; Stachowski & Brantmeier, 2002; Sumka, 2006; Wilson & Flournay, 2007; Wilson, 2009; Zeichner, 1996). Specifically, these experiences promote self-esteem, independence, and increased awareness of the need to know more about others in the world outside the United States (Cushner & Mahon 2002; Kaufmann, 1983; Mahon & Stachowski, 1992). Through studying abroad, significant gains are made in understanding cultural differences and developing a greater awareness of different ways of seeing and reflecting on issues which assist in challenging students existing views, beliefs and assumptions (Gaudino, Moss & Wilson, 2012; Sumka, 2005; Wilson & Flournay, 2007).

The perceptions of student teachers who have student taught abroad also demonstrate that they anticipate or have experienced benefits to student teaching abroad including developing greater: global vision and competence (Kissock & Richardson, 2009; Gaudino, Moss & Wilson,

2012); personal awareness and self-confidence (Bradly, Quinn & Morton, 2009; Martin, 2012; Marx & Moss, 2011; Stachowski & Brantmeier, 2002; Wilson, 2009; Wilson & Flournay, 2007); job opportunities (Bradly, Quinn & Morton, 2009; Gaudino, Moss, & Wilson, 2012); and increased ability to self-reflect on their professional practice and implement change (Gaudino, Moss & Wilson, 2012).

These student teacher perceptions align with the perceptions of teachers who previously student taught abroad. Bryan and Sprague (1997) were among the first to describe how teachers who had previously student taught abroad perceived the effect of that experience. They concluded that the abroad student teaching experience had positive effects for teachers in hiring, retention in teaching, attitudes towards students, attitudes towards a second language, and teaching strategies. Teachers gained respect for individual differences of students and cultural differences and they learned to be flexible in teaching in varied places and with diverse students. Similarly, DeVillar and Jiang (2012) and Gaudino and Wilson (2019) concluded that teachers who previously student taught abroad developed: greater cultural awareness, understanding and ability to differentiate instruction for diverse learners; self-confidence and classroom management skills; ability to self-reflect on professional practice to implement change; and job opportunities.

As these findings express the perceptions of businesspersons, authors, researchers, student teachers, and teachers, the question remained about whether administrators valued international student teaching or teaching experience and how, if at all, they account for it in the hiring process. Shively and Misco (2012) conducted a mixed methods study with 18 respondent administrators from the 38 largest school districts in one quadrant of a large Midwestern state and concluded that student teaching abroad is a benefit in the hiring process. However, there

were several caveats. Specifically, “the burden of proof to demonstrate transferability of this experience to the interviewing school rests with the interviewee” (p. 58). Furthermore, “to a small extent, the country in which the experience was gained matters” (p. 58) and administrators also concurred that a portion of the experience had to be in the United States or “be in a transferable setting to the interviewer’s school” (p. 58). Therefore, while Shively and Misco (2012) concluded that international student teaching was a benefit in the hiring process, it was only a benefit under certain circumstances and if the teacher portrayed his or her experience in certain ways.

As the findings of this studies expressed the perceptions of administrators in only one quadrant of one state, the question remained about whether administrators across the United States who hire teachers value international student teaching. Furthermore, do these administrators value it in the same ways as the previously mentioned experts, student teachers, and teachers?

## **Methods**

This study investigated the perceptions of school district administrators about student teaching abroad. Thirty central office administrators from 12 states across the United States were interviewed about their perceptions of international student teaching experience. Administrators included superintendents, assistant superintendents and human resource directors who were directly involved in the hiring process and ultimate decision to hire teachers. Participant central office administrators were located in the following states: California (4), Florida (3), Michigan (3), New York (3), Pennsylvania (3), Texas (3), Arizona (2), Georgia (2), Iowa (2), Massachusetts (2), Illinois (2), and Colorado (1). These interviews provided a broad range of

narratives that expressed perspectives of central office administrators who have responsibility for hiring teachers in their districts.

The questions posed to the administrator participants focused to how, if at all, they and their districts value and account for international as well as diverse local student teaching experiences. Data were collected via recording and hand-written notes by the researcher then transferred to a Tape-Based Abridged Transcript (Kruger & Casey, 2000) by the researcher. Data from the abridged transcript were organized and analyzed using both NVivo software and a Long-Table Approach (Krueger & Casey, 2000). Trends and patterns were coded and analyzed both within role alike groups representing each type of participate (superintendent, assistant superintendent, and human resource director), and across the role alike groups representing the participants collectively.

## **Findings**

All participant administrators believed that student teaching abroad is a valuable experience that has an effect on the lives of teachers and ultimately the students whom they teach. The most common words participant administrators used to express this value were “transformative” and “life changing experience.” Furthermore, all participant administrators themselves had a teaching or academic experience abroad and valued that experience; although such experience was not a requirement for participating in the study interviews.

Participant administrators also indicated that student teaching abroad increases cultural awareness and understanding as well as ability to differentiate instruction for diverse learners more so than student teaching in the United States. One participant summarized that, “From student teaching abroad, teachers develop the skill to respond to diversity in students better than teachers who have only taught in America... they understand and can better meet the needs of



our students.” Participant administrators concluded that teachers who have student taught abroad are “more confident in their ability to differentiate instruction than teachers who have not had abroad experience.” Finally, participant administrators indicated that teachers who have student taught abroad “seem to be better equipped than teachers who have taught in the United States to self-reflect and make change to their professional practice.” All participants agreed that teachers brought this skill into their subsequent teaching positions and that this practice has helped them to “have greater success as they transitioned into the district” and “deliver better instruction.” Several indicated that their teachers who had student taught or taught abroad also had high annual evaluations.

While participant administrator comments reflected their beliefs that international student teaching is valuable to the lives of teachers and the education of their students, 29 of the 30 participants indicated that such experience is not accounted for differently or more specifically than other experience in the hiring process. However, all 30 participants expressed that “international student teaching experience should be accounted for differently in hiring” because they “believe in the value of it.” The one administrator who indicated that his district accounts for student teaching abroad noted that his district also accounts for teaching abroad and the length of time a teacher taught abroad. This is likely due to the location of the district which has great diversity. All of these experiences are accounted for through points on the hiring rubric.

While most of the administrators had no formal way for accounting for international student teaching experience, all did have a way to account for diverse student teaching or teaching experience and indicated that international student teaching experience was at least account for in this way. When asked why, responses suggested that their districts value student teaching and teaching experiences in areas with diverse populations; but primarily if that

diversity mirrored the diversity in their own districts. One administrator's comments were reflective of others' comments as he stated, "When a student teacher or teacher has experience in a urban setting that is similar to ours, and they are successful in that setting, then I'm more confident that they will be successful in my district as well." The same types of comments were true for administrators in rural areas and those in areas of racial diversity.

## **Discussion**

Findings from this study add to the limited body of knowledge on this subject and align with some findings of Bryan and Sprague (1997), DeVillar and Jiang (2012), and Gaudino and Wilson (2019) in that both teachers and administrators felt that international student teaching experience helps teachers to gain: personal confidence; cultural awareness; and ability to differentiate instruction for diverse learners. This study, along with the study by Gaudino, Moss, and Wilson (2012) and Gaudino and Wilson (2019), also found that administrators concur with teachers and student teachers that student teaching abroad helps teachers to improve the ability to self-reflect on professional practice and implement change. However, it is significant to note that administrator participants in this study had all participated in some sort of study abroad experience themselves, which may have influenced their responses.

This study also reaffirmed literature surrounding administrator positive perceptions of the value of teaching in diverse settings and student teaching abroad (Shively & Misco, 2012). Through experience with diverse populations, teachers become more astute about culture differences and how to serve various groups of students (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Darling-Hammond, 2006; Mule, 2010).

Finally, this study resulted in different findings suggesting that administrators do not account for international student teaching experience any differently than any other type of

teaching experience, even though they value it more and differently. Teachers with international experience can certainly bring forth that experience in the hiring process, but may be more successful if they present it in terms of how the diversity in their international experience relates to the district in which they are applying and how they would use their diverse teaching experience to serve local students.

Finally, while only one administrator indicated that his district specifically accounts for international student teaching in the hiring process, all participant administrators felt that international student teaching should be accounted for differently in the hiring process. However, none had an immediate solution about how this could be done.

### **Recommendations**

Individuals who opine that student teaching abroad helps teachers to get a teaching position need to be aware of potential limitations and represent them accurately to student teachers who are considering such experience. Universities that offer student teaching abroad programs should continue to offer opportunities for international student teaching as such experiences appear to be beneficial to student teachers, however, they need prepare their students to interview in a way that differentiates how student teaching abroad makes them a stronger candidate because they can better relate to and teach the unique body of students in that district. Universities should work with their student teachers on job application and interview skills and how those students can best bring forth their abroad student teaching experience as well as other experiences in diverse settings. As administrators in this study had themselves experienced abroad learning, their opinions about international student teaching may or may not be representative of administrators as a whole; especially those who have not had an abroad learning experience. Further study would be needed to make more broad, generalizable

conclusions about how central office administrators as a whole value student teaching abroad in the hiring process. Finally, further research could be aimed at developing a hiring model that districts could use to account for international student teaching and teaching experience as well as other unique, diverse teaching experiences that are worthy of consideration.

## **Conclusion**

International student teaching placements make a difference in the lives of teachers and the students and schools that they serve. By a multitude of accounts of student teachers and teachers who have student taught abroad, their abroad experience was a life changing experience in which they learned how to self-reflect deeply on their professional practice to improve their teaching, interact and be comfortable and confident with those from other cultures, and in doing so developed a level of self-confidence never before felt from their American-based placements even if those placements were with diverse populations. Through such experiences, teachers become more global citizens with demonstrated conviction to bring this experience to their classrooms. It is now the responsibility of school district administrators to find ways to value and account for this type of teaching experience which will bring new, global forms of education to their district's students.

## References

- Association of International Educators (NAFSA). (2010). Internationalizing teacher education: resources from NAFSA's 2010 Colloquium. Retrieved from <http://www.nafsa.org/resourcelibrary/default.aspx?id=21253>
- Blasé, J. & Kirby, P. (2001). Bringing out the best in teachers. A
- Bradley, R., Quinn, S., & Morton, M.L. (2009). *Consonance and dissonance in a study abroad program as a catalyst for professional development of pre-service teachers*. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25, 525-532.
- Bryan, S. L., & Sprague, M. M. (1997). The effect of overseas internships on early teaching experiences. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 70(4), 199-201.
- Creswell, J. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Cushner, K. & Mahon, J. (2002). Overseas student teaching: affecting personal, professional, and global competencies in an age of globalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 6, 44-58.
- Danielson, C. (1996). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). *Powerful teacher education: Lessons from exemplary programs*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Darling-Hammond, L. & Bransford, J. (eds.). (2005). *Preparing teachers for a changing world*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- DeVillar, R. & Jian, B. (2012). From student teaching abroad to teaching in the U.S. classroom: Effects of global experiences on local instructional practice. *Teacher Education Quarterly, Summer 2012*. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1001435.pdf>
- Gaudino, A., Moss, D., & Wilson, E. (2012). Key issues in international clinical experiences for graduate students in education: Implications for policy and practice. *Journal of International Education and Leadership* 2(3), 1-16. Retrieved from <http://www.jielusa.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/Key-Issues-in-an-International-Clinical-Experience-for-Graduate-Students3.pdf>
- Gaudino, A. & Wilson, E. (2019). The long-term effects of international student teaching placements. *Journal of Comparative & International Higher Education*, 11(Spring), 22-29. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.32674/jcihe.v11iSpring.927>
- Kaufmann, N. (1983). *The Impact of Study Abroad on Personality Change*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Indiana University, Bloomington.
- Kissock, C. (2001). *Practical Experiences in Teacher Education*. Keynote Address presented at the 5th International Globalising Teacher Education Conference, Melbourne, Australia, 2001.
- Kissock, C. & Richardson, P. (2009). *It's Time to Internationalize Teacher Education*. Paper presented at the International Council on Education for Teaching 54th World Assembly December 14-17, 2009. Muscat, Oman. Retrieved from <https://educatorsabroad.org/eacontent/articles/223.pdf>
- Krueger, R.A. & Casey, M.A. (2000). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research*, 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Longview Foundation. (2009). *Teacher preparation for the global age: The imperative for*

- change*. Silver Spring, MD: Longview Foundation.
- Mahon J.M. & Stachowski, L. (1990). New horizons: student teaching abroad to enrich diversity. *Action in Teacher Education* 12(3), 13-21.
- Martin, L. (2012). *International Student Teaching in Non-Western Countries: Impact on First Year Teachers*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=3406&context=etd>
- Marx, H. & Moss, D. (2011). Please mind the culture gap: Intercultural development during a teacher education study abroad Program. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 62(1): 35-47.
- Marzano, R. (2012). *Becoming a reflective teacher*. Bloomington, IN: Marzano Research Laboratory.
- Morse, J.M., Barrett, M., Mayan, M., Olson, K., and Spiers, J. (2002). Verification Strategies for Establishing Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*. 1, 2.
- Mule, L. (2010). *Teacher education, diversity, and community engagement in liberal arts colleges*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Shively, J. & Misco, T. (2012). Student teaching abroad will help you get a job: Exploring administrator perceptions of international experiences for preservice teachers. *The International Education Journal: Comparative Perspectives*, 11(1), 52–68.
- Stachowski, L. & Brantmeier, E. (2002). *Understanding Self Through the Other: Changes in Student Teacher Perceptions of Home Culture from Immersion in Navajoland and Overseas*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher

- Educators (Denver, CO, February 2-6, 2002). Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED465715.pdf>
- Stronge, J. (2002). *Qualities of effective teachers*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Sumka, S. (2005). The impact of study abroad: educational travel as a model for responsible tourism. *Transitions Abroad*. Retrieved from <http://www.transitionsabroad.com/listings/study/articles/studymay1.shtml>
- Wilson, E. 2009. *Curry in Cambridge: The First Year*. Northeastern Educational Research Association Conference Proceedings, 2009, Paper 32. Retrieved from [http://digitalcommons.uconn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1032&context=nera\\_2009](http://digitalcommons.uconn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1032&context=nera_2009)
- Wilson, E. & Flournoy, M. (2007). *Preparing students for the intercultural experience: Orientation and training*. In *Intercultural Student Teaching: A Bridge to Global Competence*, edited by Kenneth Cushner and Sharon Brennan, 1-12. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- Zeichner, K. (2010). Preparing globally competent teachers: A US perspective. Keynote address presented at the 2010 Colloquium on the Internationalization of Teacher Education, Kansas City, June 2010, Retrieved: from [http://www.nafsa.org/\\_/File/\\_/zeichner\\_colloquium\\_paper.pdf](http://www.nafsa.org/_/File/_/zeichner_colloquium_paper.pdf)



## **Field Based Teacher Preparation Written Feedback:**

### **What are Field Supervisors Saying to Preservice Teachers?**

*Emily Hoeh<sup>(1)</sup>, Carla Rossiter-Smith<sup>(2)</sup>, Wanda Santos<sup>(3)</sup>, and Robert Raze<sup>(3)</sup>*

*SUNY Plattsburgh<sup>(1)</sup>, Pasco-Hernando State College<sup>(2)</sup>, St. Petersburg College<sup>(3)</sup>*

#### **Abstract**

Classroom based preservice teacher preparation is an essential experience for novice teachers. These experiences are based in effective feedback from faculty, field supervisors and cooperating classroom teachers. The following is a review of field supervisor feedback given to preservice teachers prior to and after a training experience for field supervisors based on the Marzano Teacher and Leader Evaluation (2013) and the Center for Educational Leadership 5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning™ (2019). The impacts are discussed with regards to the type of preservice teacher feedback given on a standardized written evaluation form, including descriptive statistics and narrative vignettes. The areas of future research and limitations are also included in this discussion of effective preservice teacher feedback.

**Field Based Teacher Preparation Written Feedback:  
What are Field Supervisors Saying to Preservice Teachers?**

**Literature Review**

***Preservice Teacher Supervision***

It is often assumed that if you are a good teacher, you will have positive student outcomes. Yet, research indicates teachers must have a strong foundation in theories, knowledge of the field, intentional mentorship and research during their professional careers (Goodwin et al., 2014). The preparation of effective classroom teachers is essential to the prosperity of the education system. Despite this awareness, the National Research Council (2010) found little empirical evidence to support specific types of instruction and experiences for effective teacher preparation. This lack of empirical evidence includes a research gap on the components of field experiences that are most likely to yield future teachers capable of positively impacting student learning.

Participation in field experiences is a common component of teacher preparation programs in the United States (National Research Council, 2010). Identifying effective assessment practices for quality field experiences in teacher preparation programs is critical (Sandholtz & Shea, 2012). One component often overlooked in this process are the skills of the field supervisors. Systematic formative feedback from field supervisors can provide future teachers with the necessary skills to successfully implement evidence-based practices. Nolan and Hover (2005) propose a triad system of feedback for faculty supervisors. The triad includes a pre-observation conference, extended observations during teaching, and a post-observation conference. A shared decision-making process is found in Hattie's (2009) guiding questions: where am I going (goals), how am I doing (qualitative and quantitative) and where to next?

## ***Feedback***

Cornelius and Nargo (2014) reviewed eight rigorously screened single-subject design research studies and concluded that there was empirical evidence to support performance feedback as an evidence-based practice for increasing the use of evidence-based instructional strategies with fidelity. Cornelius and Nargo defined performance feedback “as a critique of observed behavior that is immediate, specific, positive, and corrective when needed, designed to move the recipient toward a desired performance (2014, p. 135).” Cornelius and Nargo, divided behavior change into two mutually exclusive categories: implementation fidelity of evidence-based instructional strategies and teacher-specific behaviors. Cornelius and Nargo (2014) further concluded that current research on the impact of performance feedback on desired teacher-specific behaviors is insufficient for the designation of an evidence-based practice. It was determined there was enough evidence to support the use of performance feedback on teacher-specific behaviors as a promising practice in teacher preparation.

**Delivering Effective Feedback.** Scheeler et al. (2004) conducted a meta-analysis of 10 studies from a pool of seventy-seven to determine the attributes of effective feedback. The authors used Van Houten’s (1980) framework of effective feedback to organize the results. This framework includes three categories: the nature of feedback, temporal dimensions of feedback, and the individual delivering the feedback. The nature of feedback refers to the content and the medium in which the feedback is delivered (Scheeler, Ruhl, & McAfee, 2004). The focus of feedback provided, is further categorized as corrective including the type and extent of error along with ways to correct the identified error -- non-corrective, general, positive, or specific. Scheeler et al. define temporal dimensions of feedback to include immediate feedback as that which takes place during instruction with a supervisor interrupting instruction, identifying a

specific error and asking the teacher how he/she could correct the error. The third attribute of feedback focuses on potential observers, including faculty, peers, or supervisors; they highlight the expert/novice differences between faculty or traditional supervisors compared to peer coaching. Scheeler et al. found the research base was not sufficient to make definitive statements on the effectiveness of one set of observer characteristics over another. Combining the promising and effective practices from their findings, Scheeler et al. conclude: “feedback that is immediate, specific, positive and corrective holds the most promise for bringing about lasting change in teaching behavior” (2004, p. 405).

**Receiving Feedback.** According to Simeral and Hall (2008), the nature of the feedback provided should be influenced by the individual receiving the feedback, on a continuum of four stages. The unaware stage: limited awareness of best practices. The conscious stage: knows effective instructional practices, but for whatever reason is not implementing them. The action stage: open to feedback and seek to act on new information. The final stage of refinement: a seasoned, responsive to individual student needs, and can adapt the lesson adeptly. For the purposes of this discussion the unaware stage was applicable, which includes positive praise and specific suggestions as the best approaches for teacher development. Positive comments help to establish a relationship between the preservice teacher and field supervisor. Specific suggestions include recognizing a positive strategy and telling the teacher to repeat that specific strategy or providing recommendations for improving an ineffective practice (Simeral & Hall, 2008).

The purpose of this discussion is to provide an overview of field supervisor training procedures and the impact training has on the type of feedback provided by field supervisors. The analysis will include potential impacts on the effectiveness of field supervisor written feedback to preservice teachers post feedback training. The focus on effective feedback was

selected as a means of providing preservice teachers with a growth model for improving instructional delivery as well as management practices in an elementary classroom.

**Methodology**

Field based observations were completed using a standardized observation tool. The partnering state college designed the observation instrument based on components of the Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model (2004) and the Center for Educational Leadership 5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning™ Version 4.0 (2019).

This study was completed across 13 classroom settings with three field supervisors as participants. Baseline data were collected within the context of an urban school district in the southeastern region of the United States within the context of a state level college undergraduate teacher preparation program. The field supervision was completed at elementary level Title I public schools except for one public school that did not qualify for Title I status. The school settings were comprised of culturally and linguistically diverse k-12 students and an average of 56% minority representation. All sites except one are considered economically disadvantaged (Florida Department of Education, 2017).

**Table 1**

*Field Supervisor Participants*

Participants	Professional Training	Gender	Teaching Experience	Higher Education Experience	Elementary State Certification
Participant 1	B. S. Nursing M.S. Education Ed. Curriculum and Instruction	F	1982-present	2005-present	Y
Participant 2	B.S. Elementary Education M.S. Early Childhood	F	1998-present	1985-present	Y

	Ed. Curriculum and Instruction				
Participant 3	B.S. Elementary Education M.S. Health Education	M	2001-present	2007-present	Y

Field supervisors were provided training within the context of the Marzano Teacher and Leader Evaluation framework over three days as well as a two-day Center for Educational Leadership Institute (CEL). The Marzano training included the following topics: goals and scales, inter-rater reliability (IRR), scoring, and feedback. The goals for the Marzano training were: use of the model and strategies to support preservice teacher growth through the feedback process. The CEL training included the 5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning™ Feedback and classroom walk-throughs. The goals for the CEL Institute were to address the observation process and providing actionable feedback for preservice teachers.

The Marzano Teacher and Leader Evaluation framework began in 2009 with the work of Robert Marzano and the state of Florida Department of Education. The instrument was designed to observe 41 specific instructional behaviors that happen in a classroom. It employs a five-point scale (Not Using, Beginning, Developing, Applying, and Innovating) which implies a particular strategy should be used in such a way that its desired effect is exhibited with all students (Marzano, 2014). In addition, this instrument included research-based strategies with a clear correlation to increase student achievement. It also put in place a focused system of regular feedback aligned with the 41 strategies. This feedback loop supports the continuous improvement of instruction based on a model of professional development called deliberate practice, derived from the work of Swedish cognitive psychologist, K. Anders Ericsson (Marzano & Toth, 2013). The model was designed to help teachers continuously improve as

instructors, not as an assessment or measure of practice. Marzano's framework supports the practices of teacher development. The model aims to be both comprehensive and specific as well as focused on professional growth in various instructional strategies (Marzano, 2013).

Center for Educational Leadership (CEL) partners with public school districts in an effort to improve teacher practices and employ current research to maximize the learning for all students. The CEL framework is comprised of 3 components: (a) to communicate the structure of the observation to those with a vested interest (i.e. faculty, supervisors, accreditation body), (b) provide specific procedures for implementation, and (c) provide a point of reference for continuous review of the tool to maintain relevance to the practice of teaching and learning (Center for Educational Leadership, 2019).

CEL defines quality instruction through a framework; 5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning™ (5D) and thirteen subdimensions. The 5D framework derived from a multi-year effort to mine research on what constitutes quality instruction, informed by the experiences of practitioners. In order to complete 5D framework, CEL identified and organized behaviors from experts observing in classrooms and providing feedback to teachers (Fink & Markholt, 2011). The CEL approach relates: the focus of expert observers, the conclusions to their observations, and the use of that information to craft feedback to teachers (Fink & Markholt, 2011).

**Review of Records.** For the purposes of this study, data were collected and analyzed using a review of records submitted to the state college for the purposes of meeting and reporting state level certification requirements for preservice teachers. Observational feedback forms submitted by the supervisors were collected at baseline and post training for analysis within the context of effective feedback as defined by Scheeler, Ruhland and McAfee (2004). Two baseline field supervision forms/experiences were analyzed during the fall for each practicum

pre-service teacher, totaling 26 observations. The post analysis was completed based on two field supervision forms/experiences completed during the spring term with final interns. The three field supervisors and 13 preservice teachers' observations were consistent across the practicum and internship experiences.

A coding procedure was completed using the criteria for effective feedback to include both content and procedurally specific comments in the areas of corrective measures: (a) type and extent of error with specific recommendations to correct, (b) non-corrective: type and extent of error are identified, (c) general: vague, nonspecific, but evaluative, (d) positive: praise given for demonstration of a specific behavior and (e) specific: objective information related to predetermined specific behavior (Appendix A). Two coders completed the analysis separately and then came together in agreement for any codes assigned to different categories reaching complete agreement for all coded data. Coder A had formal training in data analysis with a master's in management and undergraduate degrees in political science and social work. Coder B had formal training in qualitative, quantitative data analysis, field supervision of preservice teachers and a doctoral degree in special education. A frequency count for overall changes was completed as well as a deeper look at specific comments discussed in greater detail as example participant comments or vignettes.

**Field Supervisor Training.** Between the spring and summer terms, state college field supervisors received a series of four trainings related to providing feedback to preservice teachers. These trainings were led by master trainers who received intensive training related to the Marzano and Centers for Educational Leadership frameworks. The training series included an introduction to 41 indicators, the observation process, a review of the observation process,



and the final training to review the post conference. The ultimate goal of these trainings was to provide field supervisors with strategies to support the growth of preservice teachers.

During the first training the participants (field supervisors) identified content instruction indicators they felt well-versed on and indicators which required more clarification/examples. Field supervisors received training in self-reported areas of weakness.

The second training addressed the preview and practice components of the observation process, or the pre-conference procedure. A step-by-step pre-conference checklist was provided to each field supervisor during the training which addressed all sections of the state college standardized preservice teacher lesson plan (Appendix B). The checklist also outlined how to address the indicators (areas of focused feedback) selected by the preservice teacher, cooperating teacher and field supervisor.

The third training focused on the review of the observation process (Appendix C). Field supervisors were trained in recording direct observations of preservice teacher behavior known as, *I notice* statements. Based on the direct observations, the field supervisors were trained to develop statements that explicitly state what preservice teachers can demonstrate based on the indicators as well as goals for future development as an educator known as, *not far from* statements. To establish interrater reliability, participants practiced scoring video vignettes. The field supervisors implemented the direct observation method. The selected indicators were scored based on evidence gathered and developed *I noticed* statements. The field supervisors and trainers discussed the results to check for interrater agreement.

The purpose of the fourth and final field supervisor training, was to address the post review process with preservice teachers. This process was known as the post-conference, which includes self-reflection, and actionable feedback based on selected indicators. A post-conference

form was the final step in the field supervisor training. This form provided an opportunity to review the indicator comments and edit the comments to ensure that the feedback was specific and actionable. In addition, the final training included a review of the entire feedback process, pre-conference to post-conference.

## **Data Analysis**

The data set was based on three field supervisors and 13 preservice teachers over four observations for each student (2 baseline and 2 post training). A frequency count for the comment type was completed at baseline and post training based on the definition of effective feedback. The coding scheme used for this study includes 10 types of feedback codes split evenly between procedural and content specific feedback. Content feedback is defined as delivery of evidence based instructional strategies to support academic language objectives. Procedural feedback is defined as feedback on a teacher-specific behavior (Cornelius & Nagro, 2014). The five types of feedback coded across the two behavioral dimensions include corrective, non-corrective, general, positive and specific. The coding scheme also accommodated options for other and the absence of written feedback. Definitions for the types of feedback and coding scheme can be found in Appendix A.

## **Results**

The comparison between baseline and post training experience provides overarching changes in the type and amount of feedback provided to preservice teachers. The following will provide a discussion of descriptive statistics and specific field supervisor comments using pseudonyms as vignettes to support generalized claims.

### **Figure 1**

*Comparison of Pre/Post Content vs. Procedural Feedback Type Count & Percentage*

Feedback Type	Pre Count	% of Pre Total	Post Count	% of Post Total	Absolute Change	% Change
Total Content	155	46%	163	41%	8	5%
Total Procedural	180	53%	225	57%	45	25%
Other	2	1%	6	2%	4	200%
Total	337	100%	394	100%	57	17%

The feedback provided to pre-service teachers was balanced between procedural and content specific comments for both the baseline and post treatment data set (Figure 1). There was a slight drop from 46% to 41% in the area of content feedback as compared to a gain in the area of procedural 53% and 57%, respectively. This balanced approach to comments for preservice teachers in the final year of preparation, provides them with direction beyond classroom management to include the act of delivering knowledge through academic rigor for k-12 students.

The following are examples of post treatment written field supervisor feedback provided to preservice teachers. “The lesson began by relating addition and place value to everyday life such as the use of money. Ms. Smith, a classroom teacher, continued to focus on the place value and remind students throughout the lesson of which value each number had. She reiterated the content throughout the lesson in a variety of ways” (content feedback). “Ms. Smith is positive and smiles throughout her teaching. She is respectful to her students and therefore they are to each other as well. This was evident in the small group when the students would help each other and share materials. Ms. Smith praised them during this time. She will utilize popsicle sticks next week to provide fairness when calling on students” (procedural feedback).

**Figure 2**

*Content/Procedural Pre/Post Combined Feedback Type Count & Percentage*

Feedback Type	Pre Count	% of Pre Total	Post Count	% of Post Total	Absolute Change	% Change
Corrective	110	33%	131	33%	21	19%
General	7	2%	9	2%	2	29%
Non-corrective	9	3%	10	3%	1	11%
Positive	51	15%	37	9%	-14	-27%
Specific	158	47%	201	51%	43	27%
Other	2	1%	6	2%	4	200%
Total	337	100%	394	100%	57	17%

The subcategory of coding corrective, general, non-corrective, positive, specific and other provide an insight into the type of feedback typically used as areas of growth, the pre-service teacher received from the field supervisor. The majority of the comments provided are in the areas of corrective and specific for both content and procedural feedback. The field supervisor is providing the preservice teacher with corrective feedback, which includes a specific behavior as well as a suggestion for future practice. The specific comments provide the preservice teacher with clarity in the areas for improvement. General/non corrective comments were limited in use.

The following are examples of post treatment written field supervisor feedback provided to preservice teachers. “Allowed some students a chance to answer; however, you need to really focus on giving your students enough time to think through the problems and allow them to

respond, esp. with math problems. Continue to work with this indicator” (corrective content).

“Before you start any lesson always establish your rules and expectations for that lesson.

Students need some type of structure. I noticed that you jumped into the lesson and students were still all over the place and not following along. Students were asking each other for the page number. You had one student, Justin that was disrupting your lesson and you had to address him several times” (corrective procedural).

### Figure 3

*Comparison of Pre/Post Feedback Type Count & Percentage*

Feedback Type	Code	Pre Count	% of Pre Total	Post Count	% of Post Total	Absolute Change	% Change
Content corrective	1	40	12%	47	12%	7	18%
Content non-corrective	2	4	1%	4	1%	0	0%
Content general	3	3	1%	3	1%	0	0%
Content positive	4	27	8%	9	2%	-18	-67%
Content specific	5	81	24%	100	25%	19	23%
Procedural corrective	6	70	21%	84	21%	14	20%
Procedural non-corrective	7	5	1%	6	2%	1	20%
Procedural general	8	4	1%	6	2%	2	50%
Procedural positive	9	24	7%	28	7%	4	17%
Procedural specific	10	77	23%	101	26%	24	31%

Other	11	2	1%	6	2%	4	200%
Total		337	100%	394	100%	57	171%

In the area of overall comments made, the post treatment data revealed that the preservice teachers are gaining more feedback in the general number of comments made on the feedback forms (337 and 394, respectively). This increase in 57 comments or 17% was matched by an increase in the areas of procedural specific feedback (23% or 77 comments and 26% or 101 comments, respectively). There is a slight decrease in the use of content positive feedback (8% or 27 comments and 2% or 9 comments). The other areas of the feedback remained comparable between baseline and post treatment. It seems there might be more room for additional content positive feedback for future training in feedback, since that is less than one comment per preservice teacher over the course of two post training observations.

The following are examples of post treatment written field supervisor feedback provided to preservice teachers. “The lesson included a motivational nature walk which provide a discovery activity of living and non-living things. Continue to plan and implement activities like this to engage students in meaningful learning events” (content positive). “Mrs. Smith provides a climate of fairness and support as evidenced by her frequent positive reinforcement of positive behavior and academic responses.” (procedural specific)

It is important to note that the data received additional lines of code under the area of code 11, Other. In this case, the coders provided a breakdown of feedback deemed other as 11.1 or 11.2 used in conjunction with code 11. This finer look at the qualitative data on the feedback form assisted with the identification of comments that are believed to be corrective based on the use of phrases like “She will...” vs. “You should, next time, etc.” These comments may also be

corrective without the expression of type and extent of error present. The code of 11.1 was used to represent comments related to content related; 11.2 related to procedural type. These comments were then collapsed into the code lines of 5 content corrective and 10 procedural corrective. Comments of this type represented 10% of the content corrective and 14% of the procedural corrective comments in the pre data. They represented 11% of the content corrective and 16% of the procedural corrective in the post data. In fact, most corrective comments followed this pattern of wording in the written feedback.

### **Limitations**

There were two limitations to include in the discussion. The selection of field supervisors was limited based on comparable areas of credentialing (i.e. Elementary Education), supervision of clinical field-based experiences for elementary education pre-service teachers and the participation schedule of field supervisor training offered at the local state college. Although there were a limited number of participants the data points used for pre/post training analysis exceeded 20 in total for each, allowing the researchers to create a stronger connection to the impact of the training in the behavior of the supervisors over multiple data points in comparable environments. A second limitation, one participant was part of the research team, however, did not code data, participate in analysis of descriptive statistics or select example comments.

### **Recommendations**

This study is part of a larger discussion on the topic of effective feedback for preservice teachers. One recommendation is to identify more field supervisors with narrative written feedback to analyze for components of effective feedback. Pairing field supervisors to specific cohorts of preservice teachers would allow for a deeper analysis of growth over time. Finally, continuous training opportunities for faculty, field supervisors, and district staff on creating and

using effective feedback would provide a deeper insight into the impact of professional development for experts on the development of preservice teachers.

It is also suggested that the following be considered for future research: (a) relationship between field supervisor and preservice teachers, (b) preservice teacher preparation program effectiveness, (c) comparison of effective feedback for current classroom teachers to preservice teachers, (d) effective feedback based on grade school level of instruction versus adult learners, and (e) developmental stages of preservice teachers with the type of feedback given to inform practice. The topic of effective teacher feedback on the growth of preservice teacher in practice is an important conversation to continue as it directly impacts the growth of the professional and ultimately the learning outcomes of grade level students.

This was a grant funded project: Centers of Excellence in Elementary Education, 15AT58



## References

- Center for Educational Leadership. (2019). Retrieved from <https://www.k-12leadership.org/content/service/5-dimensions-of-teaching-and-learning>
- Cornelius, K. E., & Nagro, S. A. (2014). Evaluating the Evidence Base of Performance Feedback in Preservice Special Education Teacher Training. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 37*(2), 133-146. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0888406414521837>
- Florida Department of Education. (2017). Florida School Accountability Reports. Retrieved from <http://www.fldoe.org/accountability/accountability-reporting/school-grade/>
- Fink, S. & Markholt, J. (2011). *Leading for instructional improvement: How successful leaders develop teaching and learning expertise*. Indianapolis, IN: Jossey-Bass.
- Goodwin, A. L., Smith, L., Souto-Manning, M., Cheruvu, R., Tan, M. Y., Reed, R., & Taveras, L. (2014) What Should Teacher Educators Know and Be Able to Do? Perspectives from Practicing Teacher Educators. *Journal of Teacher Education, 65*(4). 284-302. [doi.org/10.1177/0022487114535266](http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022487114535266)
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible Learning Meta-Study*. London: Routledge.
- Marzano Center for Teacher and Leader Evaluation. (2013). *Developing a Passion for Professional Teaching: The Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model*. Blairsville, PA: Learning Sciences International.
- Marzano, R. & Toth, M. D. (2013) Teaching for rigor: A call for a critical instructional shift: Why essential shifts in instruction are necessary for teachers and students to succeed with college and career readiness standards. *A Learning Science International*. [Monograph]. Retrieved from <https://www.learningsciences.com/wp/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/Essentials-Executive-Summary-06-03-14.pdf>.

- National Research Council. (2010). *Preparing Teachers: Building Evidence for Sound Policy*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/12882>.
- Nolan, J., & Hoover, L. A. (2005). *Teacher supervision and evaluation: Theory into practice*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Sandholtz, J. & Shea, L. (2012) Predicting performance: A comparison of university supervisors' predictions and teacher candidates' scores on a teacher performance assessment. *Education and Educational Research*. 1(63). doi:10.1177/0022487111421175
- Scheeler, M., Ruhl, K. & McAfee, J. (2004). Providing performance feedback to teachers: A review. *Teacher Education and Special Education*. 3(27).  
[doi.org/10.1177/088840640402700407](https://doi.org/10.1177/088840640402700407).
- Simeral, A. & Hall, P. (2008). *Building Teacher's capacity for success: A collaborative approach for coaches and school leaders*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Center for Educational Leadership. (2010). 5 Dimensions of teaching and Learning Instructional Framework Version 4.0. University of Washington, Retrieved from <https://www.k-12leadership.org/content/tool/5-dimensions-teaching-and-learning%E2%84%A2>
- Van Houten, R. (1980). *Learning through feedback*. New York, NY: Human Sciences Press.

## Appendix A

### *Coding Scheme*

Type	Definition	Code
Content corrective feedback	Type & extent of error w/ specific recommendation to correct	1
Content non-corrective feedback	Type & extent of error are identified	2
Content general feedback	Vague, nonspecific, but evaluative i.e. Okay	3
Content positive feedback	Praise given for demonstration of a specific behavior	4
Content specific feedback	Objective information related to predetermined specific behavior	5
Procedural corrective feedback	Type & extent of error w/ specific recommendation to correct	6
Procedural non-corrective feedback	Type & extent of error are identified	7
Procedural general feedback	Vague, nonspecific, but evaluative i.e. Okay	8
Procedural positive feedback	Praise given for demonstration of a specific behavior	9
Procedural specific feedback	Objective information related to predetermined specific behavior	10
Other	Feedback type is not defined	11
No feedback given	Absence of feedback	12

## Appendix B

### *Conference Checklist*

#### Field Supervision Checklist

Pre-service Teacher: \_\_\_\_\_

Field Supervisor: \_\_\_\_\_

#### Pre-conference

Complete the forms below during the pre-conference.

\_\_\_\_\_ Pre-conference Steps

\_\_\_\_\_ Deliberate Practice Plan

\_\_\_\_\_ Lesson Plan

\_\_\_\_\_ Lesson Plan Rubric

#### Direct Observation

Use this instrument during your lesson observation.

\_\_\_\_\_ Lesson Observation Instrument

#### Post-conference

\_\_\_\_\_ Post-conference

\_\_\_\_\_ Lesson Observation

## Appendix C

### *Lesson Observation Instrument*

#### Lesson Observation

Pre-service Teacher: \_\_\_\_\_ Grade and/or Subject Area: \_\_\_\_\_

Lesson Topic: \_\_\_\_\_

Indicators: \_\_\_\_\_

Pre-service Teacher does and says...	Student does and says...

Recommendations based on observation: \_\_\_\_\_

---

# **Teacher Candidate Perceptions and Meta-Reflections on the Accuracy of English Learners' Self-Assessments of English Language Proficiency**

*Debra A. Giambo, Jenna DeVille, and Daisy Gonzalez*

## **Abstract**

Teacher candidates (TCs) studying second language acquisition and cross-cultural communication completed field experience with small groups of English learners (ELs) and engaged in reflection regarding the accuracy of their ELs' self-assessments of English proficiency as well as meta-reflection regarding potential bias in the role of the assessor. Pairs of TCs worked with small groups of 2-6 ELs in K-5<sup>th</sup> grades over 10 weeks. Language and literacy development was the target of instruction, and TCs administered a pre- and post-self-assessment of English proficiency to their ELs. In partners, TCs analyzed their ELs' assessments to gain experience with informal assessments and the interpretation of student data. Subsequently, they reflected on their perceived accuracy of the ELs' self-assessments and then engaged in meta-reflection on potential bias in the role of assessor. Findings indicated that, while most TCs analyzed ELs' self-assessment as accurate, some did not, and TCs' reasons for their accuracy ratings as well as subsequent meta-reflections illustrate some of the benefits of reflective and meta-reflective assessment experiences in field experience, including opportunities to apply developing observation skills and knowledge of second language acquisition.

*Keywords:* teacher candidates, English learners, English language learners, field experience, self-assessment, reflection, meta-reflection

## **Author Note**

The authors would like to express sincere thanks to Ms. Niurka Castro, EL Contact and Teacher, who works tirelessly to provide opportunities for university TCs to work with her elementary ELs.

## **Teacher Candidate Perceptions and Meta-Reflections on the Accuracy of English Learners' Self-Assessments of English Language Proficiency**

The number of English learners (ELs) in public schools in the U.S. continues to increase and create a parallel increase in the need for the preparation of teacher candidates (TCs) to work effectively with them, requiring practical knowledge of second language acquisition and cross-cultural communication, implementation of research-based practices, and perspectives that support ELs' education and educational rights. In 2016, 9.6% (or 4.9 million) of public school students in the U.S. were ELs, a rise of 1.1 million in only 6 years. The states with the highest percentage of ELs in public schools included California (20.2%) and Texas (17.2%). Florida's ELs made up 10.3% of the public school population (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2019 May). At the same time, U.S. public schools have seen a decline in the percentage of white, non-Hispanic students. In fall 2015, the U.S. public school population had a minority majority; the percentage of white, non-Hispanic students dropped to 49% (National Center for Education Statistics, 2019 February).

Demographic changes create a need for changes in teacher preparation, since many teachers have a different cultural and linguistic heritage than their students, especially their ELs. Many teachers already feel unprepared to work with ELs (Wessels, Trainin, Reeves, Catalano & Deng, 2017), and differences between the background and experiences of TCs and their diverse students may contribute to TCs' negative perceptions of their ELs. TCs with backgrounds different from their diverse students have demonstrated expectations that their diverse students would create more discipline problems, experience higher rates of child abuse, and demonstrate fewer gifted and talented traits and lower motivation as compared to their other students (Terrill & Mark, 2000). Solutions can be found in teacher preparation programs.

A comprehensive understanding of ELs and the academic and social effects of cultural and linguistic diversity is essential. Facets of TC preparation in working with ELs have been recommended by De Jong, Harper, and Coady (2013) and include: (1) a contextual understanding of bilingual learners within their linguistic and cultural heritage; (2) an understanding of the function of language and culture within the schools that strengthen TCs' knowledge and skills for teaching and learning; and (3) an understanding of and willingness to advocate for change in educational policies that are not beneficial to ELs' learning. Bartolome (2004) advocates for assertive thinking of TCs with questioning dominant ways of thinking, such as meritocracy (i.e., support for a social order based on the belief that those who have more are more deserving), viewing their students with assets, rather than deficits, in skills, rejection of viewing the white, middle-class as superior, experience with positions of low status or thoughtful observations of such, and taking on an advocacy role for their ELs.

Requirements in teacher preparation programs can be effective in preparing TCs for effective work with ELs (Coady, Harper, & de Jong, 2011; Cowan & McCloskey, 2004; Danielson, Kuhlman, & Fluckigier, 1998). Programs that provide multicultural and multilingual education coursework and experiences, including opportunities to work with ELs, can help teachers develop more positive attitudes toward ELs (Author & Szecsi, 2007; Greenfield, 2013) and an understanding of the importance of culturally relevant instruction and materials (White, 2017). Field experiences with diverse learners can help TCs develop awareness of personal biases, empathy, sensitivity to social injustice, a sense of personal responsibility, and appreciation for cultural diversity (Bollin, 2007). In turn, TCs with more positive attitudes toward ELs demonstrate beliefs regarding the positive effect of the ELs' native language on their learning, the benefits of bilingual education, ELs' ability to comprehend, and that teaching ELs



does not consume extra time and resources (Greenfield, 2013). Finally, when field work is connected to related course work, meaning, depth, and commitment to diverse students can be enhanced (Cowan & McCloskey, 2004; Fitts, 2012; Singh, 2017), which TCs themselves often recognize (Coady, Harper, & de Jong, 2011; Singh, 2017).

### **Meta-Reflection**

The opportunity for reflection in field experience is critical to help TCs develop meaning that can carry forward in their development and practice (e.g., Danielson, Kuhlman, & Fluckigier, 1998). Even deeper opportunities for *meta-reflection* can add a more meaningful layer to the experience. Literature in the field on the use of meta-reflection in teacher preparation is lacking and is limited in other fields (for new university faculty: Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning, 2019; test performance: Hagström & Scheja, 2014); architectural design; Martí Audí, Adroer Puig, & Fonseca-Escudero, 2016; sociology: Scrambler, 2015). Meta-reflection has been defined as both, “looking back at previous observations and reflections and writing about how you wrote them” (Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning, 2019) and “a constant and continuous process of thinking, analyzing, observing, and reinterpret[ing] the activities and intellectual tasks” (Martí Audí, Adroer Puig, & Fonseca-Escudero, 2016). Meta-reflection in the field of teacher preparation can help TCs develop a deeper awareness of their own perceptions, including biases.

### **Benefits of Field Experience for ELs**

Immediate benefits of TCs’ field experience for the ELs they work with is less well documented, although it is critically important, since effective use of limited academic time is crucial for ELs. There is a limited body of literature in this area. Some positive effects for ELs, language minority students, and struggling readers (although not disaggregated to demonstrate

effects for ELs) has been shown (Cheung & Slavin, 2005; Elbaum et al., 2000). While ELs in K-5 who participated in field work with TCs demonstrated, in one study, statistically significant gains in some literacy skills have been shown, although attribution solely to the tutoring experience could not be drawn from the data (Author & Castro-Curet, 2017).

This study sought to better understand TCs' experiences in field work surrounding their perceptions of their ELs' self-assessments of English proficiency and their perceptions of potential bias in their interpretations. The following research questions guided this investigation:

1. How do TCs perceive their ELs' self-assessments of English proficiency (e.g., accuracy, change from pre- to post-assessment)
2. What factors do TCs use to account for perceived accuracies or inaccuracies?
3. When TCs engage in meta-reflection, to what extent do TCs perceive their analyses of accuracy to be affected by teacher bias?

## **Methodology**

### ***Context***

**Location.** Participants were enrolled in a teacher education program at a regional university in the Southeastern United States. Participants were enrolled in a university course focused on second language acquisition, cross-cultural communication, and culture, which was held at a local elementary school. The student population of the school includes 28% with a home language of Spanish, Haitian Creole, or other, 30% economically needy, 6% EL only (not including students with disabilities; Schools overview, 2019). TCs collaborated with an assigned class partner to develop and implement activities focused on language and literacy development with a small group of between 2 and 6 K-5 ELs for an hour a week for 10 weeks. ELs were

grouped by the EL teacher according to grade level, English proficiency level, and literacy needs. TCs completed an extensive and reflective field log as part of course requirements.

**Participants.** A total of 63 TCs participated in this investigation over three semesters. Participants were studying for majors within the teacher preparation program, including elementary education, special education, early childhood education, secondary biology and mathematics education, music education, and child and youth studies. All were enrolled in an education course focusing on second language learning and cross-cultural communication. This required, junior-level course is typically the second course on EL education for all except the secondary and music education majors for whom it is the first.

Participants included 55 female and 8 male teacher candidates, including TCs with some racial/ethnic diversity: 54 White, non-Hispanic, 5 Hispanic-American, 1 Asian-American, 1 Haitian-American, 1 African-American, 1 Indian-American. While the majority of participants were native English-speakers fluent only in English, most also had some experience with a language other than English, due to language study requirements in school or the university, 5 participants spoke Spanish fluently, 3 had some proficiency in American Sign Language, 1 student spoke 3 languages fluently (English, Haitian-Creole, and French), 1 spoke Korean.

### ***Measures***

The self-assessment measure of English proficiency, *How Do You Use English?*, that was used at pre- and post- was adapted from O'Malley & Valdez Pierce's (1996) rubrics for EL self-assessments on listening, speaking, reading, and writing. (See Appendix A.) The measure lists 29 statements (6 addressing social language, 8 for academic language, 8 focused on reading, and 7 targeting writing), and ELs were asked to read the statements and place a checkmark in the box

that indicates either a smiling face, a neutral face, or a sad face. If needed, assistance was provided in reading and understanding any or all statements.

Teacher candidates completed analysis charts for the pre- and post- data to record and calculate means for each of the four language domains, consider and discuss with their field work partner their own perceptions of the accuracy of ELs' self-assessment results, record reasons for determinations. TCs completed a summary form on which they calculated and recorded change from pre- to post-assessment for each EL and wrote about their perceived accuracy of the self-assessments from pre- to post-assessment.

Lastly, teacher candidates completed a final form on which they were asked to review and consider the information they had previously recorded with their partner on previous forms and to engage in critical reflection on the potential for teacher bias (final question form).

### ***Procedures***

After explanation of the assessment and the procedures, TCs administered the self-assessments to their groups of ELs during their field work and were instructed to provide assistance, if needed, to promote comprehension of the statements. Following each administration, TCs were provided pre- and post-assessment forms during class and were asked to record scores, calculate means for listening, speaking, reading, and writing, and to consider in collaboration with their partner the extent to which they perceived the self-assessments to be accurate for each student in their groups. At post-assessment, TCs calculated growth from pre- to post-assessment and, again, recorded their perceptions of accuracy.

Following an in-class explanation of the potential and reasons for teacher bias in assessment as well as the difference in the roles of teacher and assessor, TCs were asked to critically review all previously recorded information for each of the ELs in their group and to

engage in careful and individual reflection to attempt to determine whether there was bias in their responses (meta-reflection). Responses were recorded in writing on the final question form.

### ***Data Analysis***

**Quantitative.** The research team rated the TCs responses according to the level of accuracy expressed regarding their EL buddies' self-assessments (pre-, post-, and change) on a scale of 1 to 3 with 1 signaling "accurate", 2 "somewhat accurate/inaccurate," and 3 "not accurate." The team used TCs' written statements to make the score designation. Some TC responses indicated clear perception of accuracy or inaccuracy. Indications of noncommittal to one extreme of the other or if it was stated that only some aspects of language (listening, speaking, reading, or writing) were accurate, 2 was recorded in the database. Once the perceptions were rated, ratings were recorded in the database. The ratings were discussed among the research team members to reach consensus.

**Qualitative.** To ensure richness and depth of data and to address reliability, data was coded and organized into categories. Categories were condensed into increasingly fewer categories to determine principal themes, and themes were discussed among the members of the research team (Hewitt-Taylor, 2001; Saldana, 2013).

## **Results**

### ***Perceptions of Accuracy***

Data was collected on TCs' perceptions of the accuracy of their ELs' self-assessments at (1) the beginning of the semester after the first working session with their ELs, (2) at the end of the semester just after their last working session, and (3) at the end of the semester after considering the change in EL's self-assessments results from the beginning to the end of the semester.

**Pre-assessment.** TCs stated that 40 (49%) of the ELs’ self-assessments were accurate at pre-assessment. In contrast, 24 (30%) were perceived as somewhat accurate and, the lowest, 18 (22%) as inaccurate. The pre-assessment was given to ELs on the first day the TCs met with their ELs, and their perceptions were recorded on that day as well.

**Post-assessment.** For approximately half of the ELs (39 or 51%), TCs perceived their self-assessments as accurate at the end-of semester post-assessment. TCs perceived 23 (30%) as somewhat accurate and 14 (18%) as inaccurate.

**Change from Pre- to Post-assessment.** A slightly more even distribution that included a still higher percentage for accuracy was present when TCs considered ELs’ change from pre- to post-assessment. TCs perceived 25 (48%) ELs’ self-assessments as accurate, 15 (29%) as somewhat accurate, and 12 (23%) as inaccurate.

Across the three points of data collection, TCs’ perceptions consistently resulted in approximately half of the ELs’ self-assessments to be accurate, approximately 1/3 as somewhat accurate, and approximately 1/3 as inaccurate. Findings regarding whether TCs perceive that their ELs’ self-assessments of English proficiency are accurate and whether these perceptions change from pre- to post-assessment are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1**

*TCs’ Perceptions of the Accuracy of ELs’ Self-Assessments (84 ELs; 55 TCs)*

<u>EL data point</u>	<u>Accurate</u>	<u>Somewhat accurate</u>	<u>Inaccurate</u>
Pre-Assessment	40 (49%)	24 (30%)	18 (22%)
Post-Assessment	39 (51%)	23 (30%)	14 (18%)
Change from Pre- to Post- Assessment	25 (48%)	15 (29%)	12 (23%)

***Factors Accounting for Perceptions of Accuracy***

TCs were asked to reflect on whether their ELs’ self-assessments were accurate or inaccurate. (See Table 2). The reasons TCs provided for the accuracy of ELs’ self-assessments were focused on observed abilities, the improvement in targeted skills, and EL comfort with honest self-reflection. Reasons for inaccuracies centered on awareness of negative student affect, such as lack of motivation and confidence, results not reflecting TCs’ observations while working with the ELs, the TCs’ awareness of language acquisition processes, including the unequal growth of listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills as well as the ELs’ self-assessment scores themselves being affected by limited English proficiency.

**Table 2**

*TCs’ reflections on factors accounting for perceptions of accuracy*

Accurate because...	Inaccurate because...
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results reflect abilities / observed improvements (9)</li> <li>• Targeted skills improved (7)</li> <li>• Lessons were effective &amp; engaging (3)</li> <li>• Post-assess were more accurate, because students more comfortable &amp; confident after working together for weeks (4)</li> <li>• Students who self-assessed with lower scores</li> <li>• were more comfortable being honest about their abilities (3)</li> <li>• ELs had better comprehension on post-assessment (1)</li> <li>• Lack of confidence (1)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of motivation (7), confidence (2)</li> <li>• Scores do not reflect observed improvements (4)</li> <li>• Student improvements can vary across 4 domains (L, S, R, W; (2))</li> <li>• Confusion on/about assessment (2)</li> <li>• Wanted to please assessor, putting scores we wanted to see (1)</li> <li>• May be affected by outside factors (1), such as not eating breakfast (1)</li> </ul>

***Meta-Reflections***

TCs were asked to consider the potential effects of bias on their previously recorded perceptions, review their previous responses for each of their ELs, and individually record their

perception of actual bias in regard to each EL in their group. Responses were recorded on a Likert scale from “not biased” (1) to “biased” (5). Results are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3**

*TCs’ reflections on factors accounting for perceptions of accuracy*

<u>Not biased - 1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>Somewhat biased - 3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>Biased - 5</u>
3 (6%)	15 (28%)	21 (39%)	9 (17%)	6 (11%)

The majority of TCs (39% or 21 TCs) responded that their responses were “somewhat biased” with the next most common response (28% or 15 TCs) being less than “somewhat biased” but not quite “not biased.” Seventeen percent (9 TCs) perceived their responses to be more than “somewhat biased” but not quite “biased,” and 11% (6 TCs) responded that their previous perceptions had been “biased.” Only 6% (3 TCs) perceived their responses to be “not biased.”

**Lack of bias.** Responses regarding perceived lack of bias in analyses of ELs’ self-assessments (1 or 2 on Likert scale; 18 TCs; 34%) fell into two major themes: (1) TCs considered the different rates of learning for ELs and (2) TCs considered themselves aware of their ELs’ abilities from working together over the semester.

**Somewhat biased to biased.** Responses that indicated at least some bias (3-5 on the Likert scale; 36 TCs; 67%) were grouped into 3 themes:

(1) *Wanting their ELs to do well.* TCs expressed desire to see growth after their own and their ELs’ hard work over the semester through the connections they made with students. One TC wrote, “From the work I put into it, I would hope to see a positive outcome from it, and I think that’s where the biased comes in” (7-1). Another expressed,



“I know I have somewhat of a bias because I have grown to care about these students, but I would like to think that I can accurately recognize where they are skill wise. However, I’m sure if they had faults in some areas I would try to justify it because I have grown to know them and their personalities” (8S-2).

(2) *Connections with some students can create bias against others.* TCs acknowledged that the connections they built with some of their ELs created bias against other students. One TC addressed this conflict demonstrating that, when connections were built with some students but lacking with others, the TC’s passion connected with student success was imbalanced among the students:

“I was more biased towards the students that I connected with more, but the other students I may not have been as biased with, because I did not feel as passionate about their definite success” (4-2).

(3) *The effect of teacher-student connection on motivation and achievement.* TCs recognized that connections with students can increase their motivation, which can result in higher achievement. This chain leading to higher achievement was expressed by a TC as follows:

“I think our perception of students affects their ability to do well because if we care about them and want them to perform well then, we will put in the effort to show and tell them we do. If they know we care, then they are more likely to care as well. My partner and I really wanted our students to do well and we made sure they knew we cared which is why they improved so much.” (11S-1)

## **Limitations**

Various limitations in the investigation related to those that accompany research on perceptions, limited linguistic and cultural experiences of TCs and ELs, and EL attendance and motivation. Since this study focused on TC perceptions, effects of various experiences, awareness, and viewpoints would affect the results. Self-assessments may have been affected by the level of English proficiency as well as the comfort level and motivation of the ELs, even with translation provided by some TCs, other ELs, and the course professor, along with limited cultural experiences, since some of the ELs were newcomers during the semester. Fluidity of attendance affected the results, since some of the ELs were not enrolled at the school at the beginning of the semester, so only post-assessment results were available for consideration by TCs.

### **Discussion and Conclusions**

TCs' perceptions of the accuracy of their ELs' self-assessments of English proficiency demonstrated significant and careful reflection, in cooperation with their class partner, of factors they considered as affecting their perceptions of accuracy. Most of the TCs at pre-assessment and at post-assessment as well as when considering change in self-assessment from pre- to post-assessment perceived that their ELs' assessments were either accurate (approximately 50%) or somewhat accurate (approximately 30%). TCs' reasons were focused on observed abilities, the improvement in targeted skills (Author & Castro-Curet, 2017), and student comfort with honest self-reflection. The reasons that TCs who perceived ELs' self-assessments inaccurate (approximately 20%) gave demonstrated awareness of negative student affect, results being markedly different from TC observations during their time working with the ELs, and an awareness of the nature of language acquisition, including the unequal growth in listening, speaking, reading, and writing, as well as the effects of limited English proficiency. Results

indicate that TCs were practicing and developing observations skills, professional abilities in planning and implementing activities they felt confident were targeting appropriate EL skill development, and awareness of their students' personalities and abilities, and a deeper understanding of academic language acquisition in a new language, which reflects back to application of course content.

TCs were subsequently asked to engage in meta-reflection by carefully reviewing and reflecting on previously written reflections on their perceptions of accuracy, including at pre-assessment, post-assessment, and considering change from pre- to post-assessment. Specifically, they were asked to consider whether their previous perceptions regarding their interpretations of accuracy of their ELs' self-assessments of English proficiency reflected bias that can be common when the educator is also the assessor. Upon engaging in meta-reflection, two-thirds of TCs expressed that their earlier interpretations may have been biased or at least somewhat biased. Reasons provided included the following themes: (1) wanting their ELs to do well after their own and their ELs' hard work, (2) the formation of positive and stronger connections with certain ELs in the group, which resulted in less passion about how the other ELs achieved, and (3) the perception that connections with students leads to increased student motivation, which in turn, leads to better student performance. These factors revolve around affective responses, which align with the concept of bias in interpretation of results.

Approximately one-third of TCs' meta-reflections indicated a lack of bias in their previous reflections, and meta-reflections were grouped into two major themes: (1) TCs were open to various results on the assessments due to awareness of different rates of English language acquisition that is apparent in a group of ELs, and (2) TCs perceived awareness of their ELs' abilities resulting from their time working together over the course of the semester. The

perception of a lack of bias due to awareness of differing rates of English language acquisition among ELs reflects back to and demonstrates awareness of issues involved in new language acquisition, which was part of the course content. Awareness of EL abilities demonstrates developing observation and assessment skills. These themes evolving from perception of a lack of bias in the interpretation of assessment results connect strongly to course content as well as to the more objective role of the assessor.

Results throughout the stages of this study indicate the importance of providing opportunities for TCs to engage in reflection regarding their perceptions as well as meta-reflection connected to course-based field experience. The results lend support to the inclusion of field experiences that build TCs' contextual understanding of ELs within their language and the school commingled with the developing efficacy in teaching for effective learning (De Jong, Harper, & Coady, 2013). In this reflective field experience, TCs demonstrated both positive attitudes toward ELs as well as honest consideration of their own biases in regard to individual students within their groups ( Bollin, 2007; Coady, Harper, & de Jong, 2011; Cowan & McCloskey, 2004; Danielson, Kuhlman, & Fluckigier, 1998; Author & Szecsi, 2007; Greenfield, 2013). Opportunities for meta-reflection led to deeper reflections that revealed application of (1) emotional responses or (2) course content and the objective role of the assessor to interpretation of assessment results. The inclusion of meta-reflection in field work has potential to deepen TCs' experience and preparation for effective work in educational settings.

## References

- Bartolome, L. I. (2004). Critical pedagogy and teacher education: Radicalizing prospective teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 31(1), 97-122.
- Bollin, G. (2007). Preparing teachers for Hispanic immigrant children: A service learning approach. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 6(2), 177-189.
- Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning (2019). *The process of reflection* (for new faculty; Purdue University). Retrieved from <https://www.pfw.edu/offices/celt/for-new-faculty/the-process-of-reflection.html>
- Cheung, A., & Slavin, R. E. (2005). Effective reading programs for English language learners and other language-minority students. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 29(2), 241-267.
- Coady, M., Harper, C., & de Jong, E. (2011). From preservice to practice: Mainstream elementary teacher beliefs of preparation and efficacy with English language learners in the state of Florida. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 34(2), 223-239.
- Cowan, R., & McCloskey, E. (2004 Spring). "It's the fieldwork": A reflective view of supervised fieldwork in a graduate literacy program. *The Language and Literacy Spectrum*, 14, 104-110.
- Danielson, K. E., Kuhlman, W., & Fluckigier, J. (1998). Benefits of literacy field experiences: Three views. *Reading Horizons*, 39(1), 33-47.
- Elbaum, B., Vaughn, S., Hughes, M. T., & Moody, S. W. (2000). How effective are one-on-one tutoring programs in reading for elementary students at risk for reading failure? A meta-analysis of the intervention research. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 92, 605-619.
- Greenfield, R. A. (2013). Perceptions of elementary teachers who educate linguistically diverse students. *The Qualitative Report*. Retrieved from

<http://link.galegroup.com/apps/doc/A353692790/AONE?u=gale15690&sid=AONE&xid=ab443f97>

Author & Castro-Curet, N. (2017). Learning together: Benefits of focused language and literacy instruction for ELLs by pre-service teachers in a course-based field experience. *The Field Experience Journal*, 20, 76-108.

Author & Szecsi, T. (2007). Does diversity education make a difference in teacher education?. *Practice and Theory in Systems of Education*, 2(3-4), 35-50.

Hagström, L., & Scheja, M. (2014) Using meta-reflection to improve learning and throughput: redesigning assessment procedures in a political science course on power, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(2), 242-252.

Hewitt-Taylor J (2001) Use of constant comparative analysis in qualitative research. *Nursing Standard*, 15(42), 39-42.

National Center for Education Statistics (2019 May). *The condition of education: English language learners in public schools*. Retrieved from [https://nces.ed.gov/programs/raceindicators/indicator\\_rbb.asp](https://nces.ed.gov/programs/raceindicators/indicator_rbb.asp)

National Center for Education Statistics (2019 February). *Status and trends in the education of racial and ethnic groups. Indicator 6: Elementary and secondary enrollment*. Retrieved from [https://nces.ed.gov/programs/raceindicators/indicator\\_rbb.asp](https://nces.ed.gov/programs/raceindicators/indicator_rbb.asp)

O'Malley, J. M. & Valdez Pierce, L. (1996). *Authentic assessment for English language learners: Practical approaches for teachers*. Boston, MA: Addison-Wesley.




Martí Audí, N., Adroer Puig, M., & Fonseca-Escudero, D. (2016). Active learning using digital technology and ubiquitous information in architectural construction: PBL as a Vvtal methodology for instructional design. In *Handbook of research on applied e-learning in*

- engineering and architecture education*. Fonseca, D., & Redondo, E. (Eds.). Hershey, PA: IGI Global, 338-367.
- Saldana, J. (2013). *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Scrambler, G. (2015). *Meta-reflection in sociology*. Retrieved from <http://www.grahamscambler.com/meta-reflection-in-sociology/>.
- Schools overview (2019). Website retained due to anonymity.
- Singh, D. K. (2017). Role of clinical practice in teacher preparation: Perceptions of elementary teacher candidates. *Education, 138*(2).
- Terrill, M. M., & Mark, D. L. H. (2000). Preservice teachers' expectations for schools with children of color and second language learners. *Journal of Teacher Education, 51*, 151–155.
- Walker, A., Shafer, J., & Iiams, M. (2004). “Not in my classroom”: Teachers attitudes toward English language learners in the mainstream classrooms. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice, 2*(1), 130-160.
- Wessels, S., Trainin, G., Reeves, J., Catalano, T. & Deng, Q (2017). Pre-service teachers' confidence and attitudes toward teaching English learners. *Teacher Education & Practice, 30*(3), 443-461.
- White, M. (2017). A study of guided urban field experiences for pre-service teachers. *Penn GSE Perspectives on Urban Education, 14*(1).

## Appendix A

### How Do You Use English?

Write an X under a face for each sentence.

	 Usually	 Sometimes	 Never
1. I can ask questions in class.			
2. I can understand others when I work in a group.			
3. I can understand TV shows and movies.			
4. I can speak with other people in English outside of school.			
5. I can talk on the phone.			
6. I can ask for an explanation.			
7. I can describe things and people.			
8. I can describe things that happened in the past.			
9. I can understand the radio.			
10. I can answer questions in class.			
11. I can give my opinion (tell what I think).			
12. I can explain why I agree and disagree.			
13. I can summarize a story (tell what a story is about).			
14. I can make a presentation in front of my whole class.			
15. I like to read.			
16. I read at school.			
17. I read at home.			



18. I read different kinds of books.			
19. I read easy books.			
20. I read difficult books.			
21. I read books that are just right.			
22. I talk with other people about books that I read.			
23. I like to write stories.			
24. I am a good writer.			
25. Writing stories is easy for me.			
26. Writing to friends is fun.			
27. Writing helps me in school.			
28. I write at home.			
29. I like to share my writing with others.			

Items 1-6 social language (6); 7-14 academic language (8); 15-22 reading (8); 23-29 writing (7)

Adapted by Author (2017), from reproducible assessments in O'Malley, J. M., & Valdez Pierce, L. (1996). *Authentic assessments for English language learners: Practical approaches for teachers*. Addison-Wesley Publishing, pp. 70, 71, 103, 154.

**Teacher Preparation through Immersive Field Experience:  
Model Development to Implementation**

*Carolynne K. Gischel*

*Florida Gulf Coast University*

**Abstract**

Field experience is critical to effective teacher preparation, especially when it is comprehensive, meaningful, progressive throughout the program, and designed through ongoing collaboration between educator preparation programs and professional development school partners. A result of collaboration between university faculty and district partners, a pilot cohort program was developed to provide teacher candidates with a rigorous, immersive experience from the first semester through the final internship. This article describes one model of immersive teacher preparation, from model development through implementation and initial feedback from participants in a pilot cohort.

## **Teacher Preparation through Immersive Field Experience: Model Development to Implementation**

### **Introduction**

Designing effective educator preparation programs requires collaboration and genuine partnerships between teacher educators and the communities they serve. Within the context of Professional Development School (PDS) partnerships, the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) Standard 2 explicitly requires collaboration in clinical preparation of future educators (CAEP, 2017). The National Association of Professional Development Schools (NAPDS) Nine Essentials requires cohesive school-university partnerships with a joint vision committed to preparing future educators, sharing the commitment to innovative and reflective practices, as well as furthering professional education for practicing teachers and improving the broader community (NAPDS, 2017). Beyond standards at national and state levels, successful and sustainable PDS programs rely upon shared governance, clearly defined roles, and shared responsibilities. Nolan, Badiali, Zembal-Saul, Burns, Edmondson, Bauer, Queenley and Wheland (2007), found that collaborative structures including interns, faculty instructors, mentors and building administration, and university PDS faculty, forged a shared bond and vision. Groth, Parker, Parsons, Sprague, Brown, Baker and Suh (2017) reported on the collaborative work of George Mason University's PDS program and key stakeholders. By networking and nurturing relationships between educators, district leaders, and the university, knowledge base in teacher education as well as beneficial and reciprocal professional development were strengthened. The value of partnership has also been linked to long-lasting positive effects on teacher retention in urban districts, as well as improving the overall growth of P-12 students (Donaldson, 2009).

In one collaborative PDS partnership, university faculty, including internship

coordinators, supervisors, and advisors, along with school district staffing and recruitment personnel, formed a task force which met regularly to engage in analysis of current practice, district needs, and educator preparation standards for the purpose of creating an innovative teacher preparation model. The resulting recommendations led to the formation of an Honors immersive program focused on rigor and real life experiences in local school district classrooms. This educator preparation model was piloted successfully, with ongoing collaboration to gather data and engage in continuous improvement of the program. One key to success in developing this model was the ongoing positive and genuine collaborative partnership between university and school districts.

### ***Field Experience Task Force***

**Purpose and Charge.** The College of Education Clinical Experience Task Force was assembled in September of 2015 to review field experience practices in all of the institution's undergraduate teacher preparation programs, in particular related to conflicts arising as a result of program curriculum changes and adjustments to seminars for Level I and Level II internships. The Task Force was charged by the college Dean to establish a strategic plan regarding clinical preparation in all programs (i.e., fieldwork and internships), to ensure effective preparation of current candidates as well as with an eye towards future growth.

**Composition.** Membership on the Task Force included faculty representatives from each educator preparation program, advisors, field experience coordinator and internship supervisors, as well as local PDS and district administrators. The Task Force was chaired by the department chair and field experience coordinator.

**Process.** The Task Force met for two hours most Monday mornings throughout the fall semester, beginning in early September through November. Initial Task Force meetings centered

on organizational tasks such as electing a co-chair, reviewing CAEP and state Department of Education (DOE) standards and requirements regarding clinical preparation of teacher candidates, as well as establishing a general process and timeline for accomplishing the task. Earlier meetings also included a review of past and current practice, issues and concerns, gaps between current practice and current district needs, and opportunities to strengthen current practice moving forward to better prepare teacher candidates for successful teaching careers. As the work of the Task Force progressed, CAEP and state standards were frequently reviewed and referenced to guide discussions and recommendations.

Throughout the semester, input was solicited from stakeholders (e.g., program faculty, internship supervisors, unit and university administrators, current and future teacher candidates, and PDS partners), and frequent updates were provided to these groups. Activities included the following:

- Program representatives were asked to solicit input from program faculty on issues discussed by the Task Force, and to provide updates to faculty at program meetings. Updates were provided to all department faculty at monthly department meetings and discussions took place allowing for input back to the Task Force.
- All university internship supervisors were asked to complete a brief online survey regarding current practice and potential opportunities for improvement of clinical preparation. Additionally, all university supervisors were invited to attend focus group meetings where additional input was collected. Two university supervisors served on the Task Force and attended regular meetings.
- School and district partners reported back to their constituents and brought input to the Task Force on issues and recommendations being considered.

- Task Force recommendations were shared with an informal focus group of current teacher candidates and program completers to gain insight and input from the student perspective. Feedback indicated support for all recommendations, including a more systematic and manageable fieldwork experience throughout the program, as well as an overall positive reaction and support for the Honors Immersion Cohort model.
- Towards the end of the semester, recommendations were compiled into a draft report and reviewed, discussed, and revised over several meetings. The draft report was presented to program faculty, current teacher candidates, and program completers for additional input. The final report was revised based on feedback received, finalized by mid-January, and presented to the college dean at that time. The dean reviewed Task Force report and provided approval to move forward with a pilot program to implement recommendations.

**Task Force Recommendations.** As a guiding principal, the Task Force recommended clinical experiences be systematic, progressive, meaningful, and manageable. However, the Task Force recognized each “phase” of teacher candidate preparation has unique needs that may best be met through a fieldwork approach/model specific to that phase. For example, introduction courses require different types of fieldwork experiences than do foundational and methods courses. Therefore, the recommendations section of the Task Force report was organized as follows: *General Recommendations and Considerations*, followed by three phases of teacher preparation including *Introduction Courses*, *Blocks 1-3*, and *Internship*, and a final section providing recommendations for the new *COE Honors Immersion Cohort*. Since this article focuses on the COE Honors Immersion Cohort, only those recommendations are included here.

### *Honors Immersion Cohort*

**Model Overview.** Task Force discussions on how best to integrate and implement fieldwork throughout programs resulted in the conception of the Honors Immersion Cohort model, an immersive experience that would provide students with a highly rigorous program from beginning to end.

Teacher candidates participating in this model would experience a comprehensive cohort immersion experience in which the majority of courses (three of four or five) would be taught at a single PDS site each semester, while rotating schools and districts each semester to provide experience in a variety of diverse settings. Teacher candidates would attend class meetings and spend time in assigned PDS mentor classroom three full school days per week (until final internship), with university and PDS faculty collaborating to provide integrated learning experiences which students could apply immediately.

In addition, cohort participants would be accepted into the university Honors Program and be required to fulfill expectations according to the pillars of this program, including scholarly advancement, cultural enrichment, community engagement, and leadership development. In the Honors Immersion Cohort model, these requirements would be integrated into the program allowing for an enriched seamless experience.

Other Task Force recommendations regarding this model included:

- Honors Immersion Cohort should have a cap of 20 students.
- Include as many degree programs as feasible in the pilot (e.g., elementary, special education, early childhood) and then expand to include all undergrad teacher preparation programs.

- Provide opportunities for Honors candidates to collaborate with faculty on research and service projects.
- Seek funding to offer scholarship opportunities to Honors Immersion Cohort participants.
- Seek funding to support enrichment opportunities and additional professional development for Honors candidates, all teacher candidates, and district PDS partners.

**University Supports.** While actual implementation of Task Force recommendations may have been restricted initially by logistical limitations, such as funding, enrollment, space available at partner schools, teacher candidate transportation, etc., the Task Force encouraged efforts be made to find solutions and support ongoing movement fully implementing recommendations outlined in the report. The department chair and dean sought supports such as specific approvals, resources, deadline flexibility, and innovative scheduling from a variety of institutional departments and offices, including the Provost's Office, Registrar's Office, Honors Program/College, Service Learning Department, and Facilities.

**Recruitment and Admission.** Cohort participants would be recruited through emails and phone calls from advisors inviting qualified candidates to Open House and orientation sessions. Although there were a handful of candidates who jumped at the chance to participate, others were hesitant due to the time investment at the PDS site and required multiple sessions and conversations to determine if this experience would be right for them.

Since this model included an Honors component, teacher candidates would apply to the university Honors Program, and those accepted would then apply to the College of Education Honors Immersion Cohort. Requirements to be accepted into the COE Honors Immersion Cohort



include a minimum GPA of 3.5, an interview with faculty, and a commitment to completing program requirements on PDS sites in an immersive experience.

**PDS Partners.** Selection of PDS partner sites for implementation of this model was based on district input, willingness of school administrator to support the model, and proximity to the university. Diversity of PDS student population was also an important factor, although logistical requirements limited selection based on diversity alone. Since our initial pilot involved elementary and early childhood programs, only elementary schools were selected to participate.

Selection of mentor teachers (PDS teacher of record) included an orientation session for all interested teachers at the site, and then final selection was made by school principal. Interests and preferences of teacher candidates was provided to the school principal, who then assigned teacher candidates with mentor teachers with those considerations in mind to the extent possible.

## **Conclusions**

Extensive work of a collaborative university and PDS Task Force resulted in general recommendations that fieldwork be systematic, progressive, meaningful, and manageable. In addition, the Task Force made recommendations to increase the fieldwork component from the first semester in the program through to final internship, as well as to focus on rigor. As a result of recommendations from the Task Force, the Honors Immersion Cohort model was developed and piloted as a new delivery model for teacher candidates in elementary education, special education, and early childhood education programs. In this model, teacher candidates were accepted into the university Honors Program, and participated in systematic and comprehensive clinical experiences starting in the first semester, with the goal of graduating highly prepared and effective teachers.

Preliminary results are favorable, with teacher candidates participating in this pilot exhibiting high self-efficacy, confidence, and competence, as confirmed through self-reporting, district mentor teacher feedback, faculty observations and focus groups. In addition, the number of Honors students enrolled in the College of Education increased from 0-1 annually to 11.

Collection of additional data is necessary to determine effectiveness of the pilot Honors Immersion Cohort model. This data may include attrition and retention as employed educators, self-perception and self-efficacy ratings, interviews with program completers and their administrators, as well as student achievement data for their students.

## References

- CAEP. (2017, October 1). Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. Retrieved from [caepnet.org](http://caepnet.org).
- Donaldson, M. L. (2009). Into-and out of- city schools: The retention of teachers prepared for urban settings. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 347-370.
- Groth, L., Parker, A., Parsons, S. A., Sprague, D., Brown, E. L., Baker, C., & Suh, J. (2017). George Mason University's Elementary PDS Program: Embracing Innovation. *School-University Partnerships*, 3-4.
- NAPDS. (2017, October 4). Retrieved from <https://napds.org/nine-essentials/>.
- Nolan, J., Badiali, B., Zembal-Saul, C., Burns, R., Edmondson, J., Bauer, D., . . . Wheland, M. (2007). The Penn State-State College Elementary Professional Development School Collaborative: A Profile. *School-University Partnerships*, 19-30.

**Preservice Co-Teaching: Finding Common Intellectual Work Regarding Student Social-  
Emotional Learning**

*Lilliana Duyck, Douglas Busman, Sheryl Vlietstra, and Amy Schelling*

*Grand Valley State University*

**Abstract**

The purpose of this research was to determine whether preservice co-teaching enhances the ability of expert teachers (cooperating teachers) and novice teachers (student teachers) to find common intellectual work regarding student social-emotional learning. The research was conducted at a West Michigan elementary school using a qualitative, quasi-experimental design. A survey was used to gather the reactions of three expert teachers and four novice teachers following professional development training in Restorative Practices. The findings, in general, supported the hypothesis that expert teachers and novice teachers can find common intellectual work regarding student social-emotional learning.

## **Preservice Co-teaching: Finding Common Intellectual Work Regarding Student Social-Emotional Learning**

The study described in this article was conducted at a local elementary school in West Michigan, near the authors' home institution. In 2018, this school began implementing whole-school intervention designed to build a supportive environment for social-emotional learning. Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) was utilized (Anonymous School Social Worker, personal communication, November 22, 2019). PBIS—an evidence-based, three-tiered framework for addressing student behavior by changing systems (Barrett, Eber, McIntosh, Perales, & Romer, 2018)—allows school staff to acknowledge when a student is doing something good, rather than only acknowledging when a student is doing something bad. Tier 1 refers to Universal Prevention; social, emotional, academic, and behavioral supports are given to all students (Barrett, Bradshaw, & Lewis-Palmer, 2008). Tier 2 refers to Targeted Prevention, when supports are being given to some students. Tier 3 refers to Intensive, Individualized Prevention, which is aimed at the few students who need it most (Barrett et al., 2008).

According to the elementary school's recent Tier 1 Fidelity Tool Report (2019), the school had been making progress by posting positively stated behavioral expectations, purposefully teaching expected behaviors directly to students, and using professional development to educate all staff on the aspects of the Tier 1 system and practices.

Within this context, the researchers sought to add to current research on preservice co-teaching and its relationship to social-emotional learning. At the beginning of the 2019-2020 school year, the research team gained the support of the school principal and the authors' College of Education to provide expert and novice teachers with copies of the book *All Learning Is Social and Emotional: Helping Students Develop Essential Skills for the Classroom and Beyond*

(Frey, Fisher, & Smith, 2019). This book was read and discussed by expert and novice teachers at the partner elementary school during the first semester of the 2019-20 school year. In January 2020, the researchers secured funding to provide training for these expert and novice teachers in Restorative Practices. Restorative Practices is defined as “whole-school interventions designed to build a supportive environment through the use of communication approaches that aim to build stronger bonds among leadership, staff, and students, such as using “I” statements and encouraging students to express their feelings” (Acosta, Chinman, Ebener, Malone, & Wilks, 2019, p. 876).

Building on the PBIS work at the school, the book study, and the Restorative Practices training, the researchers focused on social-emotional learning (SEL) in recognition of the importance of the role that SEL plays in student learning. According to Frey et al. (2019), SEL allows students to thrive, instead of just meeting the standards that need to be met to move on to the next grade level.

## **Review of Literature**

### ***How Preservice Co-Teaching Affects SEL***

Aside from academic success, preservice co-teaching can help students thrive socially and emotionally. Social-emotional learning emphasizes several student abilities, including self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, responsible decision making, and relationship skills (Denham & Brown, 2010; Frey et al., 2019). Increasing students’ abilities in these areas can lead to students who are better able to manage themselves and their behavior; they will possess the skills to regulate their emotions, understand the feelings of others, make responsible choices, initiate and sustain positive relationships, and reflect on their feelings and behaviors (Frey et al., 2019).

When social and emotional learning is taught in co-taught classrooms, students can see the concepts of SEL being played out in real life. Higgs and McMillan (2006) found that modeling was an effective instructional method for teaching appropriate behavior. This applies to preservice co-teaching because the teacher and co-teacher are able to model what building a positive relationship is like, as well as the other aspects of SEL. Students can see the co-teacher listening and paying attention to the other teacher while they are talking. They can also see how the co-teachers treat one another. Using teachers as positive behavior models can help students to behave better themselves (Badiali & Titus, 2010).

### ***Finding Common Intellectual Work***

Expert teachers and novice teachers benefit from co-teaching (Austin 2001; Strogilos & King-Sears, 2019). For example, when working collaboratively, expert and novice teachers struggle together as fellow learners to identify problems, challenge ideas, and critique each other (So, 2013). Zeichner, Payne, and Brayko (2015) discussed the idea of “horizontal expertise,” which refers to people from different backgrounds working collaboratively to create new goals, tools, and practices. Teachers who work more collaboratively with their colleagues have been able to further enhance their professional development because collaboration goes beyond just learning and allows teachers to construct knowledge (So, 2013).

When teachers collaborate, they blur the lines between expert and novice, and have a different relationship with knowledge. Teachers across the professional life span can review their own knowledge, experience, and practice, and collaborate to learn better. This shows the importance of treating student teachers as new teachers, rather than as practice teachers who lack the ability to make a valuable instructional contribution. When people are committed to working

together in communities, trust builds, ideas can further develop, and members feel more comfortable evaluating themselves (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999).

### *Inquiry as Stance*

One way that expert teachers and novice teachers can collaborate is through inquiry as stance, as described in a three-year study that looked at the relationship between inquiry, knowledge, and professional practice (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999). Cochran-Smith and Lytle defined inquiry as stance as “the positions teachers and others who work together in inquiry communities take toward knowledge and its relationship to practice” (1999, p.288). Inquiry as stance specifically looks at how inquiry can lead to knowledge, how it relates to practice, and what teachers can learn from using inquiry in a community (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999). When teachers use inquiry as stance, they “emanate from neither theory nor practice alone, but from critical reflection on the intersections of the two” (Kim, 2018, p.88). Inquiry as stance assumes that teachers, both expert and novice, who are engaged in their work have knowledge about their work, and that these teachers can collaborate to create knowledge, critique knowledge, and improve practice (So, 2013).

According to Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1999), inquiry as stance is a place where expert and novice teachers can find common intellectual work regarding student learning. Cochran-Smith and Lytle stated, “Learning from teaching through inquiry, across the professional life span, assumes that beginning and experienced teachers need to engage in similar intellectual work...” (1999, p.292). Inquiry as stance can blur the boundaries between expert and novice because inquiry as stance sees all teachers as having ideas and experiences to bring to the table (So, 2013).



Using inquiry as stance allows for co-generative dialogue. Co-generative dialogues identify and resolve contradictions, creating a consensus among the co-teachers and the participating students on how learning environments can be improved (Tobin, 2006). Teachers can also collaborate to generate questions and ideas, form hypotheses, and gather data to adjust their practice (So, 2013).

### ***Action Research***

Action research, as a manifestation of inquiry as stance, provides a research-based structure for expert and novice teachers in the preservice co-teaching experience to interact to find common intellectual work regarding student learning. Action research is ideal for individual classroom use, allowing teachers to research topics such as how students learn best and what methods work for teaching certain material (Mertler, 2009). Expert and novice teachers can collaborate to research a variety of topics related to improving student outcomes and/or problems of practice that arise in the classroom.

Madigan Percy et al. (2019) stated that experience is paramount in learning to teach. The authors argued that we need to hear many different voices (experienced teachers, novice teachers, university faculty, etc.) to create positive change in education. When experienced and novice teachers work together, they can collaborate to pose problems, challenge routine, and draw on the work of others. Teachers need the opportunity to use their experiences to shape knowledge, which can occur in professional development (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999).

### ***Theoretical Framework and Purpose***

In our research the work of Roth and Tobin (2002) provided a critical, foundational framework for viewing the preservice teacher as a real teacher that adds value to the learning environment rather than as a deficient teacher whose presence might threaten a high-quality

learning environment. There are few scholarly works on how preservice co-teaching affects SEL (Frey et al., 2019). Therefore, the purpose of this research was to contribute information to begin to address this gap in the literature.

## **Method**

### ***Research Question***

Can expert and novice teachers find common intellectual work regarding student social-emotional learning?

### ***Hypothesis***

Preservice co-teaching is a place where expert and novice teachers can find common intellectual work regarding student social-emotional learning.

### ***Participants***

The researchers used purposive sampling to recruit participants who were either an expert or novice teacher currently participating in preservice co-teaching at a local elementary school. According to Swanson, O'Connor, and Cooney (1990), novice teachers are preservice student teachers. There are varying definitions of expert teachers, so for the purposes of this study, expert teachers were defined as teachers who were no longer students in college and were currently actively in service.

### ***Research Design***

The researchers used an exploratory, qualitative, quasi-experimental design for this study. Participants were not randomly assigned to groups.

### ***Data Collection***

Before conducting this research, the researchers obtained university IRB approval at the authors' home institution. The researchers also obtained approval from the local elementary school's principal to conduct the research with teachers from that school.

To collect the data, the researchers asked participants (the pairs of expert and novice teachers who attended the Restorative Practices training) to complete either the expert or novice teacher survey on Qualtrics, depending on their status as either an expert or a novice teacher. The surveys are attached in Appendix A.

### ***Data Analysis***

Once the researchers stopped receiving a steady influx of survey responses, they started to code the responses using open coding and content analysis. There were seven total responses, three from expert teachers and four from novice teachers. One of the novice teachers did not answer the open-ended questions on the survey, so the researchers could only include their answers for the close-ended questions.

### **Results**

#### ***Expert Teachers***

All three of the expert teachers stated that they felt as though they contributed to the Restorative Practices professional development training in a valuable way. The teachers had different reasons for this, which included enjoying helping new teachers and being able to connect the training to what they were currently doing so they could move on to the next step. All of the expert teachers agreed that they were able to gain a deeper understanding of Restorative Practices, that they felt included in the Restorative Practices training, and that it was beneficial that both expert and novice teachers were included in the training.

The expert teachers reported that they liked having both expert and novice teachers in the same training, but they reported different reasons behind this. One reason was the expert teacher felt as though they were a team with their novice teacher, so they could not have done the training alone. One teacher said, “We work so closely together! I couldn’t do it alone.” Another stated reason was because everyone has more information they felt that “...it gives perspectives that would otherwise not be present.”

All expert teachers felt that there was an advantage to having both expert and novice teachers in the same training. The teachers stated that they felt this way because they worked closely with their novice teacher and they enjoyed hearing new and fresh ideas.

All expert teachers also reported that they had a discussion with their paired novice teacher after the training that helped further their understanding of SEL. They and their novice teacher became even more focused on incorporating student SEL into their classrooms and the school as a whole. One teacher stated, “This is a direction we are going as a building as well as in our own classroom. The discussion is ongoing and happens daily.” Since the teachers were all focused on this goal, the discussions held after the training were helpful in advancing their understanding of SEL.

### ***Novice Teachers***

Half (two out of four) of the novice teachers reported that they felt as though they had contributed to the Restorative Practices professional development training in a valuable way because they were engaged throughout the training. The other two reported that they did not feel as though they had contributed to the Restorative Practices professional development training in a valuable way. Those who said they did not feel this way indicated it was because they had already attended a similar training or they were not engaged in the training. Some novice

teachers also had to leave early because they had to attend a college class. It is important to note that the novice teachers who said they did not feel as though they had contributed to the professional development training in a valuable way did not feel this way because they were intimidated to participate and contribute; they had already seen the presentation, were not engaged, or had to leave for class.

All of the novice teachers agreed that they were able to gain a deeper understanding of Restorative Practices, that they felt included in the Restorative Practices training, and that it was beneficial that both expert and novice teachers were included in the training. All of the novice teachers, except one who chose not to respond to the open-ended survey questions, reported that they liked having both expert and novice teachers in the same training because it was beneficial to hear other opinions and perspectives. Two of the novice teachers stated that having both expert and novice teachers in the same training was an advantage, while one novice teacher said that it could be both an advantage and a disadvantage. The reasons for it being an advantage included the opportunity to later discuss the training in more detail and the possibility to learn more from others. One of the novice teachers said, “I think it was nice to have several different perspectives in the room to hear many different ideas and past experiences.” The one disadvantage that was mentioned was that novice teachers might feel as though they did not have a lot of valuable input to add to the conversation.

All of the novice teachers reported that they had a conversation with their paired expert teacher after the training. Two reported that the discussion was useful in furthering their understanding of SEL because they were able to talk about what they had learned with their expert teacher and apply the information to their past experiences. A novice teacher stated “...mentor teachers could share their past experience with teaching social-emotional learning

with students. They also shared their experience teaching social-emotional learning to students who struggle with it based on life experiences.” One novice teacher reported that there was a discussion after the training, but they were also left with some unanswered questions.

## **Discussion**

The primary purpose of this research was to determine whether preservice co-teaching enhances the ability for expert and novice teachers to find common intellectual work regarding student social-emotional learning. The findings, in general, supported the hypothesis that inquiry as a stance is a place where experts and novices find common intellectual work regarding student SEL.

Having both expert and novice teachers in the same Restorative Practices training did not inhibit the teachers’ ability to gain a deeper understanding of Restorative Practices, and all of the teachers found it beneficial to have both experts and novices working together.

Expert and novice teachers who co-taught were able to use inquiry as stance as a place where experts and novices can find common intellectual work regarding student learning. This allowed the expert and novice teachers to create a community of learners. They did this by reflecting on the Restorative Practices training using co-generative dialogue and by intersecting both theory and practice by discussing the training and applying what they learned to their teaching methods. The preservice co-teachers were able to blur the lines between experts and novices by realizing that everyone had something valuable to bring to the discussion surrounding the Restorative Practices training.

## **Limitations**

There were a few limitations to this research. For example, the sample size was relatively small, with only seven total teachers responding. Also, one of the novice teachers only answered

the multiple-choice survey questions, and not the open-ended questions. Another limitation was the fact that a few of the novice teachers had to leave the Restorative Practices training early because they had a college class to attend.

## **Conclusion**

The results of this study revealed that expert and novice co-teachers can find common intellectual work regarding student social-emotional learning. Both expert and novice teachers have ideas and experiences to bring to the table and can work together to create a community of learners. Preservice co-teaching enhances the abilities of expert and novice teachers to find common intellectual work regarding student social-emotional learning.

## References

- Acosta, J., Chinman, M., Ebener, P., Malone, P., & Wilks, A. (2019). Evaluation of a whole school change intervention: Findings from a two-year cluster-randomized trial of the Restorative Practices Intervention. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 48(5), 876–890.
- Anonymous School Social Worker. (2019). Elementary tier 1 fidelity tool report.
- Austin, V. L. (2001). Teachers' Beliefs About Co-Teaching. *Remedial and Special Education*, 22(4), 245–255.
- Badiali, B., & Titus, N.E. (2010). Co-teaching: Enhancing student learning through mentor intern partnerships. *School-University Partnerships*, 4(2), 74.
- Barrett, S., Bradshaw, C., & Lewis-Palmer, T. (2008). Maryland statewide PBIS initiative: Systems, evaluation, and next steps. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 10(2), 105-114.
- Barrett, S., Eber, L., McIntosh, K., Perales, K., and Romer, N. (2018). Teaching social-emotional competencies within a PBIS framework. *PBIS*. Retrieved from [https://assetsglobal.websitefiles.com/5d3725188825e071f1670246/5d76ca39247be1864e3ba932\\_teachingsocialcompetencieswithinapbisframework.pdf](https://assetsglobal.websitefiles.com/5d3725188825e071f1670246/5d76ca39247be1864e3ba932_teachingsocialcompetencieswithinapbisframework.pdf)
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S.L. (1999). Relationships of knowledge and practice: Teaching learning in communities. *Review of Research in Education*, 24, 249-305.
- Denham., S. A., & Brown, C. (2010). “Plays nice with others”: Social-emotional learning and academic success. *Early Education and Development*, 21(5), 652-680.
- Frey, N., Fisher, D., & Smith, D. (2019). All learning is social and emotional: Helping students develop essential skills for the classroom and beyond. *ASCD*.
- Higgs, A. L., & McMillan, V.M. (2006). Teaching through modeling: Four school's experiences



- in sustainability education. *The Journal of Environmental Education*, 38(1), 39-53.
- Kim, J. (2018). Exploring teacher inquiry through a teacher research community: Inquiry as stance and multicultural education as inquiry. *KEDI Journal of Educational Policy*, 15(2).
- Madigan Percy, M., Kidwell, T., Destefano Lawyer, M., Tigert, J., Fredricks, D., Feagin, K., & Stump, M. (2019). Experts at being novices: What new teachers can add to practice-based teacher education efforts. *Action in Teacher Education*.
- Mertler, C.A. (2009). *Action research: Teachers as researchers in the classroom* (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Roth, W., & Tobin, K. (2002). *At the elbow of another: Learning to teach by co-teaching*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- So, K. (2013). Knowledge construction among teachers within a community based on inquiry as stance. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 29, 188-196.
- Strogilos, V., & King-Sears, M.E. (2019). Co-teaching is extra help and fun: Perspectives on co-teaching from middle school students and co-teachers. *Journal of Research in Special Education Needs*, 19(2), 92-102.
- Swanson, H. L., O'Connor, J.E., & Cooney, J.B. (1990). An information processing analysis of expert and novice teachers' problem solving. *American Educational Research Journal*, 27(3), 533-556.
- Tobin, K. (2006). Teacher education and the new sciences. *Teaching Education*, 17(2), 133-142.
- Zeichner, K., Payne, K., & Brayko, K. (2015). Democratizing teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 66(2), 122-135.

## Appendix A

### *Expert Teacher Survey*

The Grand Valley State University College of Education is conducting a study on novice (student) and expert (teachers who are currently teaching) teachers in professional development. The purpose of this research is to look at how expert and novice teachers interact following professional development training. You have been identified as an expert teacher who participated in the restorative practices training on January 9, 2020. Following your experience in this training, we are asking you to please complete this brief 8-question survey about your experience. Participation in this study is voluntary and refusing to participate or discontinuing participation will not lead to any penalty or loss of benefits to which the participant is otherwise entitled. **All of your answers will be kept confidential and you will not be able to be identified from your survey.** This study has been reviewed and approved by GVSU's Institutional Review Board (Protocol number 20-168-H). By completing this survey, you consent to participate in this research. If you have any questions, please contact Doug Busman at [busmando@gvsu.edu](mailto:busmando@gvsu.edu).

1. Do you feel that you contributed to the professional development training in a valuable way?
  - a. Yes
  - b. No
2. Why or why not?
3. Do you feel that you were able to gain a deeper understanding of restorative practices?
  - a. Yes
  - b. No
4. Did you feel included in discussions during the restorative practices training?
  - a. Yes
  - b. No
5. Did you find it beneficial that both expert and novice teachers attended this training?
6. Did you like having both expert and novice teachers in the same professional development training? Why or why not?
7. Do you feel like there was an advantage or disadvantage to having both expert and novice teachers in the same professional development? Why?
8. If there was a discussion between you and your student teacher, was it helpful in furthering your understanding of social-emotional learning? Why or why not?

## Appendix B

### *Novice Teacher Survey*

The Grand Valley State University College of Education is conducting a study on novice (student) and expert (teachers who are currently teaching) teachers in professional development. The purpose of this research is to look at how expert and novice teachers interact following professional development training. You have been identified as a novice teacher who participated in the restorative practices training on January 9, 2020. Following your experience in this training, we are asking you to please complete this brief 8-question survey about your experience. Participation in this study is voluntary and refusing to participate or discontinuing participation will not lead to any penalty or loss of benefits to which the participant is otherwise entitled. All of your answers will be kept confidential and you will not be able to be identified from your survey. This study has been reviewed and approved by GVSU's Institutional Review Board (Protocol number 20-168-H). By completing this survey, you consent to participate in this research. If you have any questions, please contact Doug Busman at busmando@gvsu.edu.

1. Do you feel that you contributed to the professional development training in a valuable way?

- a. Yes
- b. No

2. Why or why not?

3. Do you feel that you were able to gain a deeper understanding of restorative practices?

- a. Yes
- b. No

4. Did you feel included in discussions during the restorative practices training?

- a. Yes
- b. No

5. Did you find it beneficial that both expert and novice teachers attended this training?

6. Did you like having both expert and novice teachers in the same professional development training? Why or why not?

7. Do you feel like there was an advantage or disadvantage to having both expert and novice teachers in the same professional development? Why?

8. If there was a discussion between you and your mentor teacher, was it helpful in furthering your understanding of social-emotional learning? Why or why not?