The Field Experience Journal

Volume 5 Spring 2010

Editor:	Kim L. Creasy, Ph.D.	Slippery Rock University
Reviewers:	Mrs. Karen Baar	Ferris State University
	Dr. Matthew K. Boggan	Mississippi State University
	Dr. Catherine Daters	St. Ambrose University
	Dr. Raymond W. Francis	Central Michigan University
	Dr. Ann Gaudino	West Liberty University
	Dr. Maureen Gerard	Arizona State University
	Mr. Gathu Kamanja	University of Swaziland
	Mrs. Lucy Kamanja	University of South Africa
	Mrs. Margaret Kernen	University of Akron
	Dr. Jim LaBuda	Nevada State College
	Dr. K. Sue Peterson	Emporia State University
	Dr. Jody S. Piro	Austin Peay State University
	Mr. Guy Pomahac	University of Lethbridge
	Dr. Michael J. Vetere	Edinboro University
	Dr. Debra Warwick	Ferris State University

Cover: **Ka-Mal**

The Ka-Mal, meaning "guide" in Arabic, was an instrument developed by Arab traders sometime shortly after 900 CE. They traded along the dangerous shoals and strong currents off the coast of East Africa which ran north to south and as far off as India, out of sight of land most of the time. It was important for them to know how far north or south they traveled along an unseen coast before it was safe to turn toward that coast and make their landfall. The navigator, before leaving homeport, would tie a knot in the cord so that, by holding it in his teeth, he could properly sight Polaris along the top of the transom and the horizon on the bottom. To return to homeport, he would sail north or south as needed to bring Polaris to the altitude observed when he left home, then sail down the latitude.

The Field Experience Journal

Submission Guidelines:

1. Manuscripts should be no more than 15 pages of narrative (excluding references, tables, and appendices), using the latest APA style, and double-spaced on one side of 8-1/2 by 11-inch paper with justified margins.
2. Manuscripts must be submitted electronically via email attachment to kim.creasy@sru.edu containing name, position, place of employment, mailing address, phone number, e-mail address, and a 2-3 sentence description of background and experience for each author. The title of the article should also appear on page 1 of the manuscript, but do not include the author(s) name(s).
3. Pages should be numbered consecutively including the bibliography, but the author's name should not appear on the manuscript itself.
4. Charts or illustrative material will be accepted if space permits. Such materials must be camera-ready. Photographs will usually not be used unless they are black and white and of high quality.
5. Authors are expected to take full responsibility for the accuracy of the content in their articles, including references, quotations, tables, and figures. The editor reserves the right to edit articles accepted for publication.
6. Authors of manuscripts accepted for publication are expected to make a presentation about their article at the next National Student Teaching Supervision Conference.
7. There is no remuneration for articles accepted for publication, but each author will be mailed a complimentary copy of the journal. There is no fee for the review of the manuscript.

The Field Experience Journal

Volume 5 Spring 2010

Table of Contents

From the Editor

Dear Readers of *The Field Experience Journal:*

This Spring 2010 edition of *The Field Experience Journal* features a Ka-Mal on the cover. This instrument of navigation served as a guide for Arabian traders along the east African coastline when the shore was unseen. During our work supervising in field settings, many times teacher candidates look to us as their navigational tool. We give direction, assist in navigating the unknown and unseen, and provide a broader perspective of daily advances. The articles selected for inclusion in this edition provide for us guidance in maintaining our paths and innovative perspectives from which to grow.

"School and University Partnerships in Student Teacher Supervision: Challenges and Strategies" submitted by Gathu and Lucy Kamanja investigates the perceptions of cooperating teachers towards their role during teaching practice and identifies challenges for universities and schools.

Dr. Elfreda V. Blue analyzes two models utilized with graduate special education teacher candidates at a historically black university during field experiences. Her study, "The Nature and Effectiveness of Two Field Experience Models on Community, Placements, Supervision, and Partnerships" delves into the nature and context of each model and the impact across all stakeholders.

Dr. Jo-Anne Kerr and Dr. Linda Norris of Indiana University of Pennsylvania, in their submission titled "Wondering Through Teaching: How Building Reflective Practice and the Teacher Work Sample Help Pre-service Teachers Develop Inquiring Minds", examined how the Teacher Work Sample required by their institution became a means of providing evidence that pre-service teachers in their programs met the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education Standards.

Tina Selvaggi and Dr. Sally Winterton, "Closing the Distance: Reaching Cooperating Teachers through Live Classroom", share a strategy to increase attendance at Cooperating Teacher Workshops. This article shares the format design and lessons learned in these interactive online workshops.

The final article in this edition comes from Dr. Greg Gibbs of St. Bonaventure University. The focus of his submission is the examination of both the positive and negative aspects of the projects that educational leadership candidates may become engaged in during their internships.

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

School and University Partnerships in Student Teacher Supervision: Challenges and Strategies

Gathu Kamanja and Lucy Gakenia Kamanja
University of Swaziland and University of South Africa

Abstract

This study was an attempt to identify the challenges faced by the university and schools in student teacher supervision and to recommend strategies for addressing the challenges. This was achieved by investigating the perceptions of cooperating teachers towards their role during teaching practice.

An open-ended questionnaire was used to conduct the investigation on a sample of sixty cooperating teachers from fourteen high schools in Swaziland. Based on the analysis of data, the following findings were made: 1.) there are several challenges that face the supervision of student teachers during teaching practice that undermine the exercise; 2.) cooperating teachers are eager to participate in the supervision of students during teaching practice and they view the exercise as a shared responsibility between schools and the university; and 3.) to make teaching practice a worthwhile exercise, there is need to change the strategies used in the supervision of student teachers and to share more responsibility with the cooperating teachers.

This study makes the following recommendations: 1.) there is need to revise the way teaching practice is organized at the University in order to involve the cooperating teachers more actively; and 2.) to integrate both the summative and formative evaluation components into the training of student teachers, this study would like to recommend a move towards school-based teacher development programmes.

Introduction

Practice teaching is one of the most important aspects of any pre-service teacher training programme if not the main event (Henry, 1989; Silbermann, 1970). The practicum is considered as one of the most useful components of the teacher education programme by student teachers and teacher educators (Lourdusamy, Soh, Moo, Lim & Sim, 2001; Ramsey, 2000). All the content courses and the professional education courses find their application in teaching practice. Alexander & Galbraith (1997, p. 18) states that "teaching realities gained from experience in the school are universally proclaimed as essential elements in teacher training". Tisher (1990, p. 76) reports that "student teachers believe that the practical experience of observing expert teachers, receiving feedback, and practicing strategies are the most important factors in their growth as teachers". The importance given to practicum in teacher education and the hands-on nature of practicum in a situated practice field requires teacher education institutions to make the practicum a meaningful experience. Student teachers need some mentoring at this point (Atputhasamy, 2005).

Teaching practice involves a triad consisting of the University supervisors, the cooperating teachers and the student teachers. Both the supervisor and the cooperating teachers are charged with specific roles and responsibilities during teaching practice.

The quality of practical training that the student teacher receives is greatly influenced by the degree of commitment from both the University supervisors and the cooperating teachers in executing their roles and responsibilities. This in turn depends on how each one of the two key actors perceives their roles and responsibilities during teaching practice.

Statement of the Problem

At the University of Swaziland, the student teachers are placed in the classrooms for twelve weeks with experienced teachers who have agreed to-cooperate with the University by allowing student teachers to practice with their students. The University entrusts the student teachers to the schools, the teachers and the school heads. However, university supervisors visit schools regularly to monitor the students and to ensure that the theory taught in the various content courses offered at the University is translated into practice. University supervisors also evaluate the student teachers' performance and award grades.

To make teaching practice a worthwhile experience for the student teachers, there is need to involve the cooperating teachers more actively. The cooperating teacher must play an active role as a mentor for the students attached to him or her, and must provide socio-emotional support, resources and assistance in curriculum and instruction to the student teachers.

When mentoring is effectively used, it can reduce the amount of time and resources spent by the university supervisors visiting schools to supervise students in class. It could also reduce the conflict that seems to emerge in the triad involved in teacher training.

For the cooperating teachers to play their role effectively during teaching practice, their perceptions towards the roles and responsibilities of cooperating teachers need to be understood. It is also necessary to understand the perceptions of cooperating teachers towards the university supervisors with whom they are expected to cooperate during teaching practice.

Objectives of the Study

To address the key areas that were raised in this study, the following issues were investigated: 1.) finding out whether the cooperating teachers were aware of their roles and responsibilities during teaching practice and whether they had a clear understanding of these roles and responsibilities; 2.) determining the perceptions of the cooperating teachers towards their role during teaching practice; 3.) determining the perceptions of the cooperating teachers towards the entire teaching practice exercise; 4.) establishing the fears and misgivings of cooperating teachers towards teaching practice; 5.) establishing how classroom teachers construed the role of a cooperating teacher; and 6.) evaluating how the role of a cooperating teacher affected the professional development of a classroom teacher.

Limitations of the Study

This study was conducted on selected secondary and high schools that had been used during a four week teaching practice for the Post-graduate Certificate in Education students. A sample of sixty teachers was used due to time constraint. Therefore, it might be difficult to generalize the findings from this preliminary study.

Review of Literature

School Policies on Mentoring

Teacher induction researchers have consistently suggested that mentor teachers need preparation and training (Bey, & Homes, 1990; Huling-Austin, 1989). Guyton and McIntyre (1990) shared the same view by arguing that when cooperating teachers are prepared for their supervisory roles, student teachers develop more positive attitudes.

According to Zheng and Webb (2000, p. 1), universities are urged to collaborate with public schools in preparing new teachers in new partnerships which allow expert classroom teachers to have more impact in training future teachers while allowing university faculty to work more cooperatively with the schools.

Relationships between Cooperating Teachers, Supervisors, and Student Teachers.

University supervisors play the more dominant role in the teaching, guiding, mentoring and assessment of student teachers with minimal input from the school practitioners in the planning and provision of training (Whiting, Whitty, Furlong, Miles & Barton (1996).

Literature available indicates that there is little evidence to show that cooperating teachers and university supervisors work together to provide a quality student teaching experience. On the contrary, Glickrnan, & Bey (1990), McIntyre (1984) claimed that conflict existed between cooperating teachers and university supervisors. The cited areas of conflict include: lack of agreement about the roles that the triad members should play; communication problems among the three members of the triad; as well as unclear triad roles and unclear goals in student teaching (Grimmet, & Ratzlaff, 1986). This often resulted in competition for control between cooperating teachers and University supervisors.

Perceptions of the Cooperating Teachers towards their Role

According to Koener (1992), though the cooperating teacher is vital to student teaching, little has appeared in professional literature about being a cooperating teacher. Most research on student teaching focuses primarily on what the experience means to

student teachers and how it influences them. Limited information has appeared about student teaching from the cooperating teachers' point of view.

Research Methodology

Research Design

The research design adopted for this study was a survey in form of a questionnaire.

Population

The study was conducted among the cooperating teachers in secondary and highs schools within the Manzini region of Swaziland. A total of sixty cooperating teachers were selected from fourteen secondary schools. The schools were selected at random from among the schools where student teachers enrolled for the post-graduate Certificate in Education programme had been posted for their four weeks teaching practice in February 2007.

Description of Research Instruments

To conduct this study, a questionnaire to be completed by the cooperating teachers was constructed. The questionnaire contained both open and close-ended items. The questionnaire required the respondents to give their own reasons for the views that they expressed with regard to the different questions raised.

Data Analysis

After the data was collected using a questionnaire, the information obtained was coded. Coding was based on the key questions raised in the study. The findings were then reported using descriptive statistics and other descriptive methods of reporting data.

Results

Findings for this study are reported based on the key questions that were formulated for the study. The following are among the questions that were formulated for the study:

1. Are the co-operating teachers aware of their roles and responsibilities during teaching practice?

To address this issue, the cooperating teachers were asked to indicate whether they received any communication from the University of Swaziland detailing their roles and responsibilities. From the responses obtained, 43 (71.7%) out of the 60 respondents indicated that they did not receive any communication from the University concerning their roles and responsibilities. The respondents were further asked to indicate whether they were satisfied with the communication that they received from the University concerning teaching practice. Out of the 60 respondents, 43 (71.7%) indicated they were not satisfied.

The reasons they gave for not being satisfied with the communication received from the University were: “the University supervisors never talked us whenever they visited schools to supervise the students. They only talked to student teachers”; “the only interaction we have with the University was that the student teachers were practicing with our classes and students”; “we do not receive any guidelines on what to observe from the student teachers”; “we are only informed of the exercise when the head teacher announces the arrival of student teachers for teaching practice”.

2. How did the cooperating teachers perceive their roles during teaching practice?

There seems to be confusion as to what the cooperating teachers perceived to be their role during teaching practice. Some of the cooperating teachers perceived their role to be administrative and supervisory while the majority of them perceived their role to involve mentoring, guiding and supporting student teachers. Some of the responses given by those who perceived their role as one of mentoring included: 1.) guiding the student teacher on the day to day activities both in class and within the school premises; 2.) helping student teachers to gain confidence during teaching practice; 3.) explaining and interpreting the syllabus to the student teacher; 4.) guiding the student teacher towards being a good teacher and helping in developing evaluation measures; 5.) helping and assisting the student teacher at all times; 6.) attending some lessons with the student teacher and then discussing their performance; and 7.) supervising and guiding the student teacher where necessary.

3. Should cooperating Teachers be involved in classroom supervision of student teachers?

Forty-eight (80%) of the respondents indicated that they should be involved in classroom supervision of student teachers. Majority of those who said that they should be involved felt they were competent enough to supervise student teachers during the teaching practice. The reasons that they cited for supporting this view were: “I am experienced in the subject matter”; “I can use personal experience to guide student teachers”; “I am in a better position to control and supervise the student”; “the student teacher will deliver the material freely in my presence”; and “I have firsthand knowledge of the problems that the class has”.

Another question required the cooperating teachers to indicate whether they thought supervision should be a shared responsibility between the University and cooperating teachers. Out of the 60 respondents, 49 (81.6%) felt that it should be a shared responsibility and they gave the following reasons for supporting this view: 1.) cooperating teachers were in school most of the time and could observe student teachers more closely and make fair judgment; 2.) cooperating teachers saw the student teachers every day while the University supervisors came once or twice and there was a lot they did not see concerning the student teachers; 3.) student teachers were freer with cooperating teacher than with University lecturers; 4.) cooperating teachers were responsible for what students learned in class; 5.) to ensure that both school and University requirements were met; 6.) to thrash out the differences between the University supervisors and the cooperating teachers; 7.) to ensure active involvement of cooperating teachers whose experience in the classroom could be shared fully with student teachers; 8.) since cooperating teachers would eventually take over the class, they needed to know what went on in class during teaching practice; 9.) to blend theory with practice and the realities of classroom situations; and 10.) to give feedback that can be compared with that from University supervisors.

4. What is the relationship between the University supervisors, cooperating teachers and student teachers?

From the data collected, it appeared that the relationship between the cooperating teachers and the student teachers was harmonious. Out of the 60 respondents, 44 of them (73.3%) thought that the relationship was harmonious. Only 6 (10%) of the respondents thought that the relationship was strained while 10 (16.7%) thought that the relationship

was neither strained nor harmonious. However, an interesting revelation was made on the relationship between the cooperating teachers and University supervisors. The data collected indicated that only 14 of the respondents (23.3%) thought that a harmonious relationship existed between them. Eight of the respondents (30%) thought that the relationship was strained while the other 28 respondents (46.6%) thought that the relationship was other than harmonious or strained.

When asked to give reasons why they thought the relationship was strained, the cooperating teachers cited the same reasons that they had given for not being satisfied with the communication received from the University. They also gave the following additional reasons; university supervisors only contact school administration and not cooperating teachers; the cooperating teachers were never given an opportunity to meet the University supervisors; and that the university supervisors ignored and undermined cooperating teachers.

5. Cooperating teachers' perception of the way teaching practice was organized by the University

One question that was asked sought to establish the fears and misgivings that cooperating teachers had concerning the way teaching practice was organized by the Faculty of Education at the University of Swaziland. The respondents expressed the following views: there was inadequate supervision of student teachers; schools were not informed in good time about teaching practice; student teachers were victimized by the differences in expectations between the schools and the University; and cooperating teachers were never briefed on what to do during teaching practice due to the breakdown in communication between the University and cooperating teachers.

6. Does participation as a cooperating teacher influence the professional development of a classroom teacher?

Forty-eight of the respondents (80%) indicated that being a cooperating teacher contributed to their professional development and they gave the following reasons for expressing this view: we are exposed to new ways of teaching; we are able to evaluate lessons taught by others; we are updated on new methods of teaching; we are helped to improve our performance as teachers; and we are able to share ideas with others.

Discussion

Involving practicing teachers in the training of preservice student teachers has been recognized as an important component in teacher education (Henry, 1989; Silbermann, 1970; Sutherland, Scanlon, & Sperring, 2005). Some researchers (Emans, 1983; McIntyre, 1984) argue that the cooperating teacher has as much if not more influence on the student teacher than any other person in preservice teacher education. Indeed, some researchers suggest that the university supervisor is not necessary (Monson & Bebb, 1970).

Despite the above conclusion, this study has established that there are serious challenges facing the school-university partnerships which ultimately affect the role performed by the cooperating teachers in the preservice training of student teachers.

One of the challenges involves communication between the university and the schools. Cooperating teachers felt left out in the whole process in the pre-service training of student teachers yet the students are left under their care with university supervisors appearing very irregularly in schools merely to award grades. This apparent disconnection between the university faculty and the cooperating teacher is supported by

Hamlin (1997) who recommends that teacher education programmes should encourage collaboration and seek the input of teachers and administrators in the design of its programmes.

Another challenge relates to the cooperating teachers' perceptions of their role during teaching practice. From the analysis of data, it is apparent that the cooperating teachers consider mentoring of student teachers as one of their main roles though some consider their role to be administrative. However, in the absence of any communication from the university detailing out their roles during teaching practice, the classroom teachers do not perform this mentoring role. When asked to indicate what additional roles they would like to perform, the cooperating teachers identified supervising student teachers, observing student teachers in class, assisting student teachers to set tests, preparing confidential reports to the university concerning the student teacher's performance, and conducting formal evaluation of student teachers as additional roles. This clearly demonstrates that cooperating teachers do not consider mentoring of student teachers as their role.

When asked to indicate whether cooperating teachers should be involved in the classroom supervision of student teachers, an overwhelming majority of the respondents (80%) felt that they should be involved and were willing to assume that role. This suggests that with better communication between the practicing teachers and the university, role expectations between the partners involved in the preservice training of student teachers would be clearly defined and the practicing teachers would be more actively involved in the preservice training of student teachers.

The relationship between cooperating teachers, student teachers and university supervisors is another challenge facing the school-university partnership. This study confirms earlier findings (Bowman, 1979; Goodland, 1990; Lasley, 1984; Schultz, Laine, & Savage, 1988; Slick, 1998; Smith, 1989; Tucker, 1991; Zimpher et al, 1980), that while the relationship between cooperating teachers and student teachers is harmonious, the relationship between the university and the cooperating teachers is strained. Slick (1998) describes the college supervisor as a "disenfranchised outsider" while Bowman (1979) calls for the elimination of the college supervisor position.

Despite the challenges highlighted from the findings of this study, the traditional model of student teacher training is still relevant and can be used in the pre-service training of student teachers. Traditional models of student teacher supervision often assume that student- teachers need to be supervised closely and overseen as they leave the University and move into the public schools. However, with the current arrangement and the challenges already identified from this study, this goal will be difficult to achieve. When cooperating teachers were asked about their misgiving about the way the Faculty of Education organizes teaching practice, they generally felt that the students are not adequately supervised and that student teachers are victimized by the differences in expectations between the schools and the University.

From the findings of this study, the practicing teachers are prepared to assume the role of cooperating teachers but the major setback is the poor communication between the university and the schools which results in conflict over role perceptions.

At a time of dwindling resources, the University supervisors should get less involved in the practical training of the teachers and let practicing teachers who would

like to be partners with the University participate. This would help to link up the schools with the University rather than being seen as separate entities, yet the University is producing teachers for the schools. By allowing school-based teacher development programmes, the mentoring role of student teachers could become a partnership between the university and the schools and would be in keeping with the realities of today's classroom.

Conclusion

This study has revealed that there is little evidence to show that cooperating teachers and University supervisors work together to provide quality student teacher experience. On the contrary, there seems to be a problem in the relationship characterized by: poor communication; hostile relationship; and undefined roles and responsibilities for the cooperating teachers.

From the views expressed by the respondents, they appear willing to get involved in teaching practice and are satisfied with the professional benefits that they get without asking for monetary gains.

For cooperating teachers to play a more active role during teaching practice, there is need for clear communication to be sent to them detailing the university expectations from practicing teachers. More dialogue is also required between the University supervisors and the cooperating teachers to map out the strategies for collaboration during teaching practice.

Recommendations

Based on the findings from this study, the following recommendations are made: 1) cooperating teachers should be given a chance to make meaningful contribution in the

training of student teachers rather than being silent partners in the experience. Hence the need to revise the way teaching practice is organized at the University. Stein, Silver, & Smith, (1998) proposes an alternative model entitled 'community of teachers' model'. In this model, student teachers are immersed in the school system as they proceed through their course work and school experience together. The underlying premise in this model is that prospective teachers need experience in collaborative learning communities in which they are afforded the freedom to experiment with alternative approaches with the support of their peers. One way to accomplish this change in the training of student teachers has been to support a move towards school-based teacher development programmes. It has been argued that this sort of arrangement could result in a partnership between the University and classroom teachers in the delivery of teacher education in order to link theory with practice. This study wishes to recommend that: 1.) cooperating teachers should be trained to undertake the supervisory and mentoring role among student teachers. Good mentor teachers have to be trained as this would allow them to assume the role of teacher-tutors; 2.) at a time of dwindling resources, the University supervisors should get less involved in the practical training of the student teachers and let practicing teachers who would like to be partners with the University participate. This would help to link up the schools with the University rather than being seen as separate entities, yet the University is producing teachers for the schools; 3.) there is need to revisit the University statutes particularly with regard to the appointment of academic members of staff. According to the current University statutes, all academic members of staff of the University are appointed by the University Council. The University statute spells out the minimum qualifications for any individual that should be appointed as an academic

member of staff. Usually the minimum qualification should be a Masters degree in a relevant field of specialization. This creates a problem in that majority of practicing teachers are first degree holders and this disqualifies them from playing the role of teacher tutors.

References

Alexander, D. & Galbraith, P. (1997). Stories of transition: From students to teachers. *Queensland Journal of Educational research,* 13 (1), 17-32.

Atputhasamy, L. (2005). Cooperating teachers as school-based teacher educators: Student teachers' expectations. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education***,** 30 (2), 1-11.

Bey, T. M. & Holmes, C. T. (1990). Mentoring: Developing successful new teachers. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Bowman, N. (1979). College supervisor of student teaching: A time to reconsider. *Journal of Teacher Education,* 30, 29-30.

Emans, R. (1983). Implementing the knowledge base: Redesigning the function of cooperating teachers and college Supervisors. *Journal of Teacher Education;* 34 (3), 14-18.

Glickman, C. D. Bey, T. M. (1990). Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach. Newton, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon.

Goodland, J. (1990). Teachers for our nation's schools. San Francisco, CA: Jossey- Bass.

Grimmett, P. P. & Ratzlaff, H. C. (1986). Expectations for the cooperating teacher role. *Journal of Teacher Education,* 37 (6), 41-50.

Guyton, E., & McIntyre, D. J. (1990). Student teaching and school experiences. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp.5I4-534*)*. New York: Macmillan.

Hamlin, K. (1997). Partnerships that support the professional growth of supervising teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 24* (1), 77-88.

Henry, M. (1989). Change in teacher: Focus on field experience. In J. Braun (Ed.), *Reforming teacher education: Issues and new directions* (pp. 69- 95*)*. New York: Garland Publishing.

Huling- Austin, L. (1989). Teacher induction programs and internships. In W. R. Hauston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp.535-548*)*. New York: Macmillan.

Koerner, M. E. (1992). The cooperating teacher: An ambivalent participant in student teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 43 (1), 46-56.

Lasley, T. J. (Ed.). (1984). Editorial. *Journal of Teacher Education;* 35(6); Inside Cover.

Lourdusamy, A., Soh, K. C., Moo, S. N., & Lim, W. K. (2001). *Development and evaluation of teaching competence in Singapore and Brunei Darussalam.* A Paper presented at the Australian Education Research Conference, University of Notre Dame, Fremantle, Australia.

McIntyre, D. J. (1984). A response to the critics of field experience supervision. *Journal of Teacher Education,* 35 (3), 42-45.

Monson, J. A. & Bebb, A. M. (1970). New roles for the supervisor of student teaching. *Educational Leadership,* 28, 44-47.

Ramsey, G. (2000). *Quality matters, revitalizing teaching: Critical times, critical choices*. Report on the review of teacher education in the New South Wales. Available from http://www.det.nsw.edu.au/teachrev/reports/reports.pdf

Schutz, L. , Laine, C. , & Savage, M. (1988). Interaction among school and college writing teachers: Toward recognizing and remarking old patterns. *College Composition and Communication*, 39, 139-153.

Silberman, C. E. (1970). Crisis in the classroom. New York: Random house Publishers.

Slick, S. K. (1998). The University supervisor: A disenfranchised outsider. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 14 (8), *821*-834.

Smith, S. D. (1989). Professional partnerships in educational change: Effective collaboration over time. *Journal of Teacher Education, 43* (4).

Stein, M. K. , Silver, E. A., & Smith, M. S. (1998). Mathematics reform and teacher development: A community of practice perspective. In J. Greeno & S. Goldman (Eds), *Thinking practices in Mathematics and Science learning (*pp. 17-52). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Sutherland, L. M., Scanlon, L. A., & Sperring, A. (2005). New directions in preparing professionals: Examining issues in engaging students in communities of practice through a school-university partnership. *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 21 (1), 79-92.

Tisher, R. P. (1990). One and a half decade of research on teacher education in Australia. In R.P. Tisher & M. F. Wideen (Eds.), *Research in Teacher Education: International Perspectives,* London: Falmer Press.

Tucker, J. (1991). Global education partnerships between schools and Universities: From thought to action, (pp.109-124). Alexandria; VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Whiting, C., Whitty, G., Furlong, J., Miles, S. & Barton, L. (1996). Partnership in initial teacher education: *A topography, modes of teacher Education Project (MOTE),* London.

Zheng, B., & Webb, L. (2000). A New model of student teacher supervision: Perceptions of supervising teachers. *Mid-South Educational Research Association.*

Zimpher, N. , De Voss, G., & Nott, D. (1980). A closer look at University student teacher supervision. *Journal of Teacher Education,* 31 (4), 11-15.

Gathu Kamanja *is a Senior Lecturer in the Department of Curriculum and Teaching at the University of Swaziland where he teaches Educational Technology and Skills as well as Teaching Principles and Practice. He coordinates Micro-teaching in the Faculty of Education and participates actively in supervision of Bachelor of Education and Post-Graduate Certificate in Education students during teaching practice.*
Lucy Gakenia Kamanja *is currently working as an Education Consultant with the University of South Africa where she is involved in curriculum development and instructional design for Open and Distance Learning Materials. She is a teacher by training and has worked in the education profession since 1978.*

The Nature and Effectiveness of Two Field Experience Models:

Impact on Community, Placements, Supervision, and Partnerships

Elfreda V. Blue

Hofstra University

Abstract

This case study describes two field experience models used at a historically black university in the southeastern region of the United States. Used to facilitate the field experience of graduate special education teacher candidates over the course of three years, the Chaos Model and the Integration Model provided requisite structure for orchestrating field placements with children in school settings. This study describes the nature and context of each model as well as the impact of each model on the university community, school-university placements, supervision and partnerships.

The focus of field experience research has focused upon collaboration and roles of school-university partners. Partnerships are essential to establishing dynamic learning communities (Galassi, White, Vesilind, & Bryan, 2001; Mebane & Galassi, 2000). Stakeholders must have a shared vision of the field experience, suggesting equity of stakeholders in planning and setting goals (Anagnostopoulos, Smith & Basmadjian (20007). The school-university partnership is only as effective as the field experience it fosters. Field experiences are a vital part of teacher preparation programs. Further study is needed to assess the effectiveness of field experience models and the part they play in school-university partnerships.

Related Research

The field experience model has fallen below the radar in educational research. Recent studies relative to the field experience can be categorized by education context—general education and special education. Research in the general education context includes:

- the use of technology in field experiences (Dawson, 2006),
- the physical education context as field experience—toward the development of learning community (LaVine & Mitchell, 2006), and
- the nature of field experiences in high-need urban settings (Foote & Cook-Cottone, 2004).

Relevant literature in the special education context is quite limited. One study describes a yearlong field placement (Gut, Oswald, Leal, Frederiksen & Gustafson, 2003). Another describes the preparation of special education teacher candidates in a highly specialized niche to address personnel development needs (Compton, Niemeyer,

& Michael, 2004). Two studies report findings from nationwide surveys about: undergraduate special education student teaching practices (Conderman, Morin, & Stephens, 2005) and relationships between school and university partners through the field experience for pre-service teachers (Prater & Sileo (2002). The latter provides specific insight into the pre-service field experience for candidates in special education programs. What follows is a review of research on field experience relative to special education.

Gut et al. (2003) describe a yearlong project involving general education and special education pre-service teachers in an elementary inclusive collaborative project. Pre-service teachers collaborated on academics and behavioral/social plans (for students with disabilities and students "at-risk" of failure) five days a week for an entire academic year. This study served as a pilot study for implementing field experiences in inclusive education teacher preparation for researchers.

Research by Compton et al. (2004) describes a research-based model for field experiences for pre-service teachers preparing to teach very young children with disabilities. The model described in this work focuses upon the development of professional personnel to address the auditory needs of children. Pre-service teachers were placed in a segregated setting and an inclusive setting during methods courses. This experience prepared a cadre of pre-service teachers for a highly specialized niche, atypical of the pre-service field experience in most teacher preparation programs.

The focus of Conderman et al.'s (2005) research is upon special education student teaching practices. Researchers surveyed teacher educators about their own special education teacher preparation program to examine grading systems, assignments given

during the student teaching experience, and supervision of student teachers. Special challenges to the student teaching experience were also investigated. While this study provides a wealth of information about special education teacher preparation programs, it does not present specific insight into the pre-service field experience.

Prater & Sileo (2002) conducted a national survey of institutions of higher education which offer special education teacher preparation programs. Their purpose was to have participants describe and evaluate partnerships in terms of field experience for pre-service teachers. Two-thirds of participants reported the existence of a formal partnership between schools and universities at various partnership levels (district, school, teacher, or combinations of these.

This study provided insight into the specific nature of field experience. For instance, the number of required field experience hours reported averaged 163 contact hours (almost one month of full-time field work) for pre-student teaching field experience. This study also provides insight into the supervision of pre-service teacher candidates. Prater & Sileo's research implies the need for greater participation and engagement of university faculty of teacher preparation programs in the work of school-university partnerships.

Purpose

The two-fold purpose of this article is to use the case study approach to describe two field experience models (which emerged in light of changes to NCATE standards) and to he effectiveness of each model. The article documents one faculty member's observations of placement practices relative to: 1) each model's impact on the university

community, 2) school-university partnerships, and 3) engagement of university faculty in observation and supervision.

Context

A historically black university, Antioch Northern Academic University (pseudonym) is located in the southern region of the United States. ANAU offers more than more than fifty baccalaureate, master, and doctoral degrees. The School of Education provides professional preparation for pre-service and in-service candidates and professional school personnel. Between 2002 and 2005, 37% of the university's total enrollment was housed in the School of Education. The School graduated more than 150 undergraduate and graduate candidates annually.

The Field Experience

ANAU is one of many colleges and universities that had to rethink school-university partnerships and redesign the field experience component of teacher preparation programs, in keeping with NCATE standards. For ANAU, realignment required major adjustment. In 2002, the director of Field Experience was the principal collaborator with school administrators and cooperating teachers affiliated with field experience activity. Four school districts partnered with the university on an annual basis. The School of Education required approximately 60-90 field placements each semester. Of those, special education candidates required at least 5-10 placements. Because Collaborative Teacher programs prepared pre-service teachers for certification in special education and general education at the early childhood, elementary, or middle-high school level, candidates were required to complete field experience hours in general education and special education settings. Pre-service teachers enrolled in special

education methods courses were placed in school settings for field experience in one of three levels:

- Level 1: 10 hours of observation hours of children with disabilities;
- Level 2: 40 hours of practice and observation and participation with master teachers with children with disabilities;
- Level 3: 550+ hours over 14 weeks as interns with master teachers of children with disabilities.

Study Design

This researcher chose to employ a naturalistic approach to participant observation research, or ethnographic study. This approach provides an inside perspective to a problem or phenomena through natural contexts, relationships, and behavior. It also provides information crucial to data interpretation. This approach to research allows researchers to describe what is observed in the context of complexity and ambiguity (Huberman & Miles, 2002). This approach allows the "field worker to use the culture of the setting (the socially acquired and shared knowledge available to the participants and members of the setting) to account for the observed patterns of human activity" (Maanan, 1979; p. 539).

As university faculty, the researcher observed field placement practices over three years. Recursive review and reflection of field placement practices led to the emergence of two field models: the chaos model and the integration model. Presented here are the nature and effectiveness of each.

Data Analysis: Determining "Nature" & "Effectiveness"

"Nature" is delimited to university or school requirements for field placement, pre-placement provisions for teacher candidates, and placement practices at local school sites. It also refers to the parameters of field supervision as it involves university faculty and cooperating teachers. "Effectiveness" refers to the extent to which each model impacted the university community as well as the extent to which school-university collaboration in field placement provided teacher candidates access to best practices and model teachers.

Models

To facilitate the field experience of gradate special education teacher candidates, two models—the chaos model and the integration model—were implemented at ANAU over the course of three years. These models provided requisite structure for orchestrating field placements with children in school settings. Also reported is the impact of each model on the university community, school-university placements, supervision and partnerships.

The Chaos Model

Nature & Context

The chaos model placed teacher candidates in schools for 40 contact hours (in one week—up to seven days) with school children. This model was utilized exclusively from 2002-2004. Field placements for special education teacher candidates were located within 25 miles of the university campus.

School of Education administrators mandated suspension of university study during the week of field placement for teacher candidates. For one week, teacher

candidates enrolled in one or more methods courses were mandated to report to local schools as assigned. University instructors were expected to visit teacher candidates on-site and provide constructive feedback over the course of the semester.

Impact on University: School-to-School

The Chaos Model interfered with university-wide cohesion and school-to-school function. School of Education information relative to the weeklong field experience was not systemically disseminated to other Schools on campus. There were no university-wide announcements, reminders, or communiqués to apprise faculty in other schools of the field experience week and what it required of teacher candidates. Rather, the field placement office provided students with form letters to submit to instructors of other courses—usually two-three weeks before the field experience. The letter was minimally accepted.

School-University: Field Placement

Each field placement was coordinated through the field placement office. Placements were made via facsimiles between schools and the Field Experience Office. No formal agreement existed to establish specific school-university partnerships.

The placement location for pre-service teacher candidates was dependent upon a number of factors: recommendations from university faculty, willingness of school administrators to accept teacher candidates (in mass) for one week, willingness of classroom teachers to serve as cooperating teachers, and availability of student transportation. Each of these drastically impacted each teacher candidate's access to "best practices" sites and teachers.

When school administrators deemed the timing of field placements inappropriate for his/her school, student placements were cancelled. When this occurred, the field placement office was left to search for alternative placement sites. The goal of placement transitioned from placement in a "best practices" site or classroom to "documentable placement" in a school with children.

Access to "best practices" classrooms was further jeopardized when schools did not identify cooperating teachers to supervise pre-service teacher candidates. When teacher candidates arrived at those sites, they watched as teachers were vigorously recruited, on the spot, to accept them into classrooms as observer/participants.

School-University: Field Supervision

University faculty who taught methods courses were expected to supervise all pre-service teacher candidates on their roster within the week. However, the schedules of university faculty did not coincide with the daily schedule of each classroom slated for visitation, thereby making drop-in visits difficult to accomplish. One class of pre-service teacher candidates were placed in three to five schools in a twenty to thirty mile radius of the campus. Transportation became an issue for faculty, without financial remuneration for travel. Still, university faculty was expected to visit schools, to observe teacher candidates and collaborate with cooperating teachers.

Observation appointments took extensive planning; however, it lessened the number of walk-through "sightings" university faculty could accomplish. Some faculty announced to teacher candidates that they could possibly visit during the weeklong field placement experience. But because there were more teacher candidates to visit than time to accomplish the task, many faculty did not visit any field placement sites.

School-University: Partnership

Local schools and the university operated in complete isolation. The university sought placements for pre-service teacher candidates. And schools accepted placements as convenient. Teacher preparation programs operated without input from local schools. Schools operated without evidence of consideration of the university. The brevity of the field placement did not afford opportunity to engage stakeholders in meaningful partnership efforts. These conditions widened enormous gaps in collaboration between school and university faculty.

The Integration Model

Nature & Context

The integration model required the placement of teacher candidates in schools four to six hours each week in order to acquire 40 contact hours with school children over 13 weeks. The model reflected a field experience model, which preceded the chaos model at the university three decades before its implementation in the School of Education during the 2004-2005 year. To transition toward the integration model, the Elementary Education department initiated a plan to schedule two methods courses each semester, starting Fall 2004. Students enrolled in one or more Monday methods course(s) were slated for four hours per course of field experiences on Wednesdays. Special education pre-service teachers were required to complete four-hour placements one day a week for 13 weeks within 25 miles of the campus.

Impact on University: SOE Department to Department

The Integration Model demonstrated the need for interdepartmental consistency of practicum implementation policy.

The Elementary Education Department's decision to schedule Wednesday field placement with Monday methods courses limited pre-service teacher candidates' access to other courses offered in other schools and other departments.

Impact on Pre-Service Special Education Teachers

In order to meet field experience requirements, special education pre-service teachers seeking elementary and early childhood certification had to drop half their course load. Pre-service teacher candidates were required to complete 40 contact hours with students for each methods courses. Candidates enrolled in both special education and elementary education methods courses could not complete the requisite contact hours with both populations in one semester. Without required contact hours, teacher candidates were ineligible for student teaching. As a result, program completion, graduation, and certification were delayed.

School-University: Field Placement

Teacher candidates enrolled in methods courses were assigned field placements and began observations two weeks after the start of each semester. Placement locations were initially based on university faculty recommendation, "best practices" school accessibility, and the availability of effective cooperating teachers. Candidates became acclimated to the school environment, the ebb and flow of instruction, as well as the strengths and weaknesses of classroom management as implemented. Classroom teachers incorporated teacher candidates into small group activity, guided reading opportunities, and one-on-one tutoring experiences.

School-University: Field Supervision

The 13-week field experience afforded an opportunity for supervision by university faculty, when field experience days did not conflict with on-campus instruction schedules. Faculty involvement was limited without reimbursement of travel. Consequently, field supervision and debriefing with university faculty occurred during weekly course sessions.

School-University: Partnership

Local schools and the university initiated early steps toward initial school-university partnership. However, these partnerships reflect what Dallmer (2005) calls the "great divide" between university and school partners. University activity focused on university-related initiatives. During the 2004-2005 academic year, there was evidence of school-university activity (school service on university advisory committees, very minimal consultant work for university faculty in area schools). Partnership on projects had to be negotiated on a project-by-project basis.

Model Effectiveness: Chaos & Integration

The Chaos Model

The swift completion of the field experience in the Chaos Model benefited the field placement office, university faculty, and local schools willing to endure the intense inconvenience of the weeklong placement. It did not reflect the existence on-going school-university partnerships, nor did it lend itself to little or no collaboration between partnership stakeholders. With little or no interaction between school and university personnel, opportunity for establishing a viable partnership was minimal. Grounded in

the “sink or swim” approach associated with teacher preparation for many decades, this model not conducive to preparing teachers for the profession.

Integration Model

The integration model provided pre-service teachers the opportunity to acclimate to the classroom setting, observe and interact with students and teachers, and experiment with specific methods and instructional approaches in a real learning environment. Candidates placed with effective teachers witnessed best practices week after week. Extended field experiences provided opportunities for interaction and collaboration between university faculty and school personnel. Observations of best practices in classrooms informed university practice. Interaction between school-university partners made room for collaboration on other projects. However, evidence of school-university collaboration was limited.

Discussion

This description of field experience models demonstrates the need to redesign field experience structures currently in place (Little & Robinson, 1997). It documents the importance of equitable collaboration between schools and universities in facilitating access to exemplary teacher practices. This article highlights the negative impact of isolated entities (i.e., universities, schools) on field placements. When schools have no stake in the preparation of pre-service teachers for the profession, placement in school classrooms is vicarious, haphazard, and inconsistent. With little or no thought given to quality of placement, field placement experiences can be wrought with negative examples of teaching in dysfunctional classroom settings. Without university faculty in the supervisory process, the field experience model is ineffective. Planned placements over

time provide the impetus for stakeholders to establish equitable school-university partnerships (Dallmer, 2004).

Further Study

Further study will ascertain whether an effective field placement model depends upon a viable school-university partnership. Another line of inquiry on this topic involves a look at how model impacts teacher preparation. It seems important to ascertain the perceptions of school administrators and cooperating teachers who agree to accept pre-service teacher candidates from ANTU. Such study will provide insight into the importance of school-university partnership to major stakeholders.

Conclusion

Teacher candidates must gain access to effective classrooms in schools before student teaching. The impact of an ineffective model cannot be underestimated. This is particularly true for teacher preparation programs through which hundreds of pre-service teacher candidates matriculate. Research suggests that the quality of teacher preparation programs impacts teaching practice and student achievement (Darling-Hammond, 2000). Unfortunately, poorly prepared teachers have limited pedagogical knowledge and content knowledge and are ill equipped for the profession.

It takes many educators to prepare tomorrow's teacher. Each one must be committed to the work and the responsibility they bear in the preparation process. Ineffective field experience models can result in the isolation of stakeholders in school-university partnerships. When the model provides opportunity to engagement and relationship building, the result may be collaborative, equitable partnerships.

References

Anagnostopoulos, D., Smith, E.R., & Basmadjian, K.G. (2007). Bridging the university-school divide: Horizontal expertise and the "two-worlds pitfall." *Journal of Teacher Education* 58; 138. DOI: 10.1177/0022487106297841. Downloaded from http://jte.sagepub.com at Ebsco Host temp on November 9, 2007.

Compton, M.W., Niemeyer, J.A., Michael, S. (2004). Auditory/oral birth-kindergarten teacher preparation: A research-based model. *The Volta Review* 104(2), 93-106.

Conderman, G., Morin, J. & Stephens, J.T. 92005). Special education student teaching practices. *Preventing School Failure* 49(3), 5-10.

Dallmer, D. (2004). Collaborative relationships in teacher education: A personal narrative of conflicting roles. *Curriculum Inquiry* 34(1), 29-45.

Dawson, K. (2006). Teacher inquiry: A vehicle to merge prospective teachers' experience and reflection during curriculum-based, technology-enhanced field experiences. *Journal of Research on Technology in Teaching* 38(3), 265-292.

Darling-Hammond, L.(2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. *Education Policy Analysis Archives* 8(1). Retrieved from http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v8n1/

Foote, C., Cook-Cottone, C. (2004). Field experience in high needs, urban setting: Analysis of current practice and insights for change. *Urban Review* 36(3), 189-210.

Glassi, J.P., White, K.P., Vesilind, E.M., Bryan, M.E. (2001). Perceptions of research from a second-year, multisite professional development schools partnership. *Journal of Educational Research* 95(2), 75-83.

Gut, D.M., Oswald, K., Leal, D.J., Frederiksen, L., Gustafson, J.M. (2003). Building the foundations of inclusive education through collaborative teacher preparation: A university-school partnership. *College Student Journal* 37(1), 111-127.

Huberman, A.M. & Miles, M.B. (2002). *The qualitative researcher's companion.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

LaVine, M. & Mitchell, S. (2006). A physical education learning community: Development and first-year assessment. *Physical Educator* 63(2), 58-68.

Little, M.E. & Robinson, S.M. (1997). Renovating and refurbishing the field experience structures for novice teachers. *Journal of Learning Disabilities* 30(4), 433-441.

Maanan, J.V. (1979). The fact or fiction in organizational ethnography. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 24(4), 539-550.

Mebane, D.J. & Galassi, J.P. (2000). Responses of first-year participants in a middle school professional development schools partnership. *Journal of Educational Research* 93 (5), 287-293.

Prater, M.A. & Sileo, T.W. (2002). School-university partnerships in special education field experiences: A national descriptive study. *Remedial and Special Education* 23(6), 325-334, 348.

Zimpher, N.L. & Howey, K.R. (2005). The politics of partnerships for teacher education redesign and school renewal. *Journal of Teacher Education 56*(3), 266-271.

Dr. Elfreda V. Blue *is an associate professor at Hofstra University in Hempstead, New York. Dr. Blue has observed multiple models of field experience as university faculty in several general and special education teacher preparation programs.*

"Wondering" Through Teaching:

How Building Reflective Practice and the Teacher Work Sample Help Pre-service Teachers Develop Inquiring Minds

Jo-Anne Kerr and Linda Norris

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Introduction

This year, as we attended our Teacher Education Coordinators Council's monthly meetings, we found ourselves in recurring discussions about the Teacher Work Sample (TWS). At our institution, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, the TWS evolved as a means to provide evidence that pre-service teachers in our education programs meet the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) Standards 1C Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates and 1D Student Learning for Teacher Candidates.

In each TWS, a student teacher chooses a unit of study and must demonstrate accountability for what students have learned. As we examine the work sample projects of our secondary English student teachers, we continue to see some very rich reflection at distinct points in student teaching that we have not collected or analyzed in our collaborative research in English education before. Student teachers are asked to submit a pre-, mid- and post- "test" and to report out the results of what their students are learning. Typically, they are then asked to write about what they learned as beginning teachers of these units and what they would change if they taught the unit again. The following sample reflection excerpt is from Amanda, one of our spring-semester student

teachers, after she administered similar pre- and post- surveys about prejudice for her unit on Harper Lee's novel, *To Kill a Mockingbird*:

> One very interesting thing that caught me off guard happened when I was passing out the post-test…. Students were…confused as to why they were doing the same thing twice…I explained that I wanted to see where their opinions had changed…. One girl…said, 'But my opinions aren't going to change. I mean, it's only a book.' I was floored. Only a book! It was To Kill a Mockingbird! But then I sat down and thought about it…. I' m not going to swoop into a classroom with a magic spell that makes everyone a good, moral person. And, really, whose morals are they? I mean, if I'm really so open to diversity and the supportive educator I want to be, don't I have to give students the freedom to be who they want to be?

Amanda's response, not unlike others we've collected from pre-service teachers in our program, indicates that the opportunity for reflection provided by this project as well as by our program's methods courses is valuable, as reflection fosters the development of inquiring minds, what can be called a "habit of mind," (Costa & Kallick, 2000, 2008) integral to effective teaching.

Habits of mind, what John Dewey calls "habits of thought," indicate a way of thinking that, while habitual, is nonetheless mindful (qtd. in Costa & Kallick, vii, 2000). Kallick and Costa define habits of mind as "patterns of intellectual behaviors that lead to productive actions," and they assert the following habits of mind important to behaving intelligently:

a. Persisting
b. Managing impulsivity
c. Listening with understanding and empathy
d. Thinking flexibly
e. Thinking about thinking (metacognition)
f. Striving for accuracy
g. Questioning and posing problems
h. Applying past knowledge to new situations
i. Thinking and communicating with clarity and precision
j. Gathering data through all senses
k. Creating, imagining, innovating
l. Responding with wonderment and awe
m. Taking responsible risks
n. Finding humor
o. Thinking independently
p. Remaining open to continuous learning (pp. 8-9).

While several of these habits of mind are important for effective teachers, we focus on the importance of fostering inquiring minds, particularly questioning, in pre-service teachers, and we illustrate how two methods courses, Teaching and Evaluating Writing, and Teaching English and Communications in the Secondary School along with the TWS help us accomplish this. We also further explore the significance and importance of questioning, persisting, and responding with wonderment throughout pre-service teaching, linking it to the role of teacher-research in one's professional life.

Helping Pre-service Teachers Develop an Inquiring Mind

in Teaching and Evaluating Writing

In the teaching writing methods course, generally taken as juniors in the spring before student teaching, students read widely in composition theory, research, and scholarship. They also read books by well-known practitioners, including Nancie Atwell, Ralph Fletcher, Dan Kirby, and Donald Murray, to help them link theory and practice. Course requirements include, among other assignments, designing and implementing a lesson plan and designing a unit plan.

To help students develop a questioning habit of mind, we ask that they reflect on their lessons plans in two ways: first, by offering a rationale for their lesson; and, second, by reflecting on the lesson after teaching it.

Whereas standards and curricula often dictate what teachers teach and thus co-opt teachers' expertise and knowledge of their students, requiring a rationale for lessons from our pre-service teachers works to help develop a questioning habit of mind: why teach this lesson at this time? What prior knowledge are my students bringing to this lesson? How will I build upon this prior knowledge? Likewise, reflection and questioning <u>after</u> teaching do the same: What theories and research informed the design of this lesson? What might I change if and when I teach this lesson again? While we <u>assign</u> these aspects of lesson planning, what we hope we are encouraging is the <u>habit</u> of questioning lesson design and implementation, remembering that habits of mind are <u>habitual</u> yet <u>mindfully</u> employed.

Another opportunity to help students develop a questioning habit of mind occurs with planning a unit. Again, while curricula may dictate units (and textbooks even

provide them), we want our students to engage in unit planning in a thoughtful, rather than knee-jerk, manner. Yes, the curriculum must be taken into account, along with standards; however, what other facets of teaching and learning should be considered? Thus, we ask students to think about students—their developmental needs, their interests, their culture and community, and their needs. We also remind them to consider themselves—their interests and knowledge. As with their lesson plans, we ask for a rationale: Why have they decided on the topic? How might they defend the topic if challenged? What theory informs the design of the unit? How is the unit relevant for students?

The unit plan also provides for further questioning, as students are asked to provide not only a means for summative assessment but also means for formative assessment. How will they check for understanding before the end of the unit? How will they know that students are learning/not learning what is necessary for them to reach the unit objectives? Requiring formative assessment helps pre-service teachers understand that teaching does not always result in learning and that effective teaching necessitates flexibility and rethinking lesson design to ensure success for all students.

For example, one of our students designed a unit on poetry for eighth graders. At the unit's end she wanted students to understand the ways that poetry is different from prose. To assess students' understanding of these differences before the unit's end, she had them write a "found poem" by changing prose into poetry and then to reflect in their journals on how their poems differed from the prose from which they were generated. Students' success (or lack thereof) with this assignment would signal their understanding or lack of understanding before the end of the unit. Thus, any students who struggled

with the found poem or indicated a lack of understanding through the journal reflection could be helped through an additional assignment or through other means. Formative assessment, then, means that teachers are asking (wondering), "What are my students learning? What are they struggling with? What do I need to do differently or in addition to help them meet the unit's objectives and the understandings that I'd like them to have?"

Reflection and Questioning in Teaching English and Communications in the Secondary School

Further opportunity to develop a questioning habit of mind occurs in Teaching English and Communications in the Secondary School, a methods course students take the semester prior to their student teaching. In this course students are provided several opportunities to reflect on planning and to question the effectiveness of their plans and, as with Teaching and Evaluating Writing, are required to provide rationale for plans and ideas for a classroom set-up, bulletin board, and classroom management plan.

As a component of their Working Portfolio, our students design a classroom set-up, create a mini-bulletin board, and devise a classroom management plan, all of which include a rationale of justifications for their choices. To do so, they must ask themselves "Why?"—Why do I want my classroom set up this way? Why is this bulletin board an effective use of space? Why is this a sound classroom management plan?

Additional components of the Working Portfolio are two lesson plans and a unit plan. With opportunity to implement their lesson plans, pre-service teachers are then asked to reflect on them. Writing about teaching a lesson related to a novel that students were reading, Jacki, wrote:

> I'm not sure if the decisions I made were the right ones, but I was happy that it didn't bother me to change plans within seconds. I realize this is a very small victory in the enormous scale of teaching, but I feel that flexibility is very important…. It [teaching] was definitely a wake-up call to notice the differences between knowing theory and putting it into practice. I spent a long time reflecting on the lesson and ways that I could have performed better…. I definitely need to work on organization, classroom management, and time management.

Here Jacki wonders why certain parts of her lesson didn't work as well as she had hoped. She realizes that her effective management of time was lacking and that while she was able to change some parts of her lesson quickly, having to make these changes may have compromised the quality of the lesson. Without taking the time to question her execution of the lesson, Jacki may not have discovered the importance of flexibility when teaching as well as the importance of effective time management.

Another requirement of this methods course, developing a teaching philosophy or an emerging pedagogy, also directs students to question—in this case their beliefs about the teaching of English. This is their assignment:

> Throughout the semester we will write, revise, and revisit our pedagogy a minimum of three times: at the beginning of the semester, at both collections of the Working Portfolio, and for our final Showcase Portfolio…. Your pedagogy should be student-centered and focused in the English language arts…. You might ask yourself, *What are my beliefs*

about students, teaching, and learning? And *How do those beliefs create my pedagogy?*

Students are also directed to write two "emergent pedagogies" prior to their final teaching philosophy.

Thus, the process of writing this document becomes recursive, with opportunity to "see" and "see again" as they work toward articulating their beliefs about teaching English. Wondering and questioning are built into the process. Furthermore, as students are working on this document, they are working on lesson plans and so are directed to question their planning: do lesson plans reflect their teaching philosophy? They also receive peer feedback to their philosophies and to teaching demonstrations; this feedback from other teacher candidates builds a community of learners and often supports and repeats the advice and suggestions that we as experienced mentors provide.

Students' Showcase Portfolios are submitted at the end of the semester. These portfolios include final drafts of students' teaching philosophies and three exhibits of what students consider to be their best achievements from the Working Portfolio. Students are directed to write a cover letter explaining portfolio component choices, a final chance to question and respond.

These excerpts from Beth's cover letter show the importance of reflection on this final assignment and the implicit questioning that was part of her decision-making process. About her unit plan, Beth wrote, "I learned how to best organize what I am teaching; I had to have specific reasons for why I wanted a week to teach the basics of a persuasive paper, and eight days to write the paper, for example." Commenting on a lesson plan, she noted, "I wanted something that would…show my pedagogy. I am

a…proponent of group work, and I want to incorporate media into my classroom whenever I can…."

Similarly, Jacki's cover letter also reveals these habits of mind: a wondering or questioning stance, independent thinking, and application of knowledge to new situations as she considered, for example, the role of assessment in unit planning: "[T]eachers will constantly need to assess student progress to make sure learning occurred. Some of these assessments will be observationally based, while others will take place in the form of formal summative evaluations."

We include Jacki's and Beth's complete cover letters at the end of this article (See Sample A); we have boldfaced sections of their letters that illustrate forward thinking and the emerging habit of reflective practice.

Building "Habits of Mind" Before and During the Work Sample

In the undergraduate and graduate methods courses just prior to student teaching, we prepare pre-service teachers to develop habits of reflective practice, which necessitates questioning and wondering, through five specific assignments:

1. Choice responses to required texts (Teacher candidates read both required and choice texts from a list and write personal critiques and blogs with the instructor and peers)
2. Reflections on two practice lessons (Candidates microteach 30-minute lessons, receive feedback from peers and instructor, then they reflect and revise)
3. School project (third lesson) with reflection (Candidates participate in a university-school partnership where they first teach a lesson in methods

class, receive feedback, reflect, and then teach the revised lesson at the school site and write an additional reflection)

4. Reflection on emerging pedagogy (three drafts)
5. Reflection on working and showcase portfolios (three best-practice items with reflective cover letter).

In the graduate methods course we also require that teacher candidates design and report on an inquiry project that they work on throughout the fifteen weeks of the semester; this project is based on the research model developed by Hubbard and Power (1999, 2003), encouraging pre-service teachers to ask questions, be observant, and become automatically (habitually) self-reflective. Graduate students are guided to develop a research plan including a research purpose, research questions, subquestions, data collection, data analysis, and reflections (Hubbard & Power, 1999, pp. 49-51). Some of our Master's program inquiry projects have included surveys of practicing teachers (e.g., How are classic vs. adolescent literature texts being used?), visiting school websites for future employment, or examining an important school issue (e.g., bullying and cyber bullying). We find that assignments like these introduced in the methods classes prior to student teaching reinforce and reify an inquiring stance and allow for a smoother transition into the more substantive kinds of work student teachers could produce at the school site. We agree with the notion that we can encourage even the newest teachers to examine their classrooms more closely: "What matters isn't how experienced you are—it's how willing you are to ponder questions with no easy answers" (Hubbard & Power, 1999, p. 30). Next we will examine the TWS further, showing how

the habits of mind that were fostered in methods classes are further utilized for this project during student teaching.

To meet and exceed the required elements on the TWS, student teachers create an inquiry project and become teacher-researchers (see the full description of the TWS below and note that we refer to the TWS as a "teacher-research project" in the project overview). They choose one class and one unit they've designed, and over the course of the unit, they analyze and synthesize their data. Their reflective practice, similar to what they have already experienced in methods courses, comes in the forms of observation journals, unit plans, assessments, evaluations, and professional readings and discussions. We believe these projects help new teachers position themselves, not only as teacher as reflective practitioner, but also as accountable teacher for the learning that is going on in the classroom and how to improve learning so that all students can learn best. Furthermore, what could be perceived as yet another assignment (or hoop to jump through) is instead a meaningful and integral component of effective pedagogy. Good teachers habitually question, wonder, make necessary adjustments.—and persist in their quest to foster and facilitate student learning.

CULMINATING STUDENT TEACHING PROJECT
Student Teaching Work Sample

NOTE: Your university supervisor will contact you the first week of student teaching and will explain this project as part of your requirements for student teaching at your first on-site meeting.

Overview of Project: During student teaching you will engage in a teacher-research project in which you will prepare a "work sample" to provide evidence of the effects of your teaching including verification that you have had a positive impact on your students' learning. Your teacher-research project and work sample will indicate your ability to

- Engage in thorough and effective standards-based planning.
- Use best practices that provide opportunities for student success.
- Use appropriate assessment strategies to foster and document the development of your students' knowledge and skills.
- Analyze student assessment results, reflect on them, and adapt instruction accordingly.

Required Components of the Work Sample:

Please word-process this document and place it in your hard-copy binder; you must also include this work sample in your Step 3 electronic portfolio CD for the College of Education.

Label each section as follows:

Title Page

Student Teaching Work Sample

Name

Semester _____ Year _____

School Site

Grade Level/Period, Number of Students, Subject, Topic, Textbook and/or Key Resources (**NOTE:** Choose ONE class; you may choose your smallest class for the work sample)

A. Description of the Learning Environment

Teaching journal: The journal will consist of the following entries:

*Journal entry #1: (component of Student Teaching Work Sample): A one-paragraph description of your school, including name of district, name of school, demographic information, and key information about the student body as you understand it in the early days of your experience.

*Journal entry #2: (component of Student Teaching Work Sample): One to two paragraphs about one of the classes that you will eventually teach. Describe the students (gender, ages, characteristics as learners, manner of dress, behavior, interactions, academic performance, etc.). Do not use actual names in this report.

Remainder of journal entries should be reflections of your own teaching experiences (may be shared dialogically with the cooperating teacher). This part of your journal must be written in no less than once a week for a total of **15** journal entries to meet this requirement.

B. Planning for Instruction (Unit Plan)

1. Using the unit plan template provided below, include the following components:

- Title of unit and length/duration

- Rationale for unit (include why this unit of study is important for students, why it should be delivered at this time, the purpose it will serve for students, how the learning will serve students beyond the classroom)
- PA Standards for English/Language Arts that will be addressed and critical thinking skills that will be exercised
- An explanation of skills that students must bring with them to successfully meet the new learning goals and how you will determine if students have these skills (consider Bloom's taxonomy and/or Gardener's multiple intelligences); include a pre-test, activity, or survey so you will be able to describe your students' prior knowledge
- Briefly describe your integration of culture, interdisciplinary connections, and/or technology in this unit
- Three lesson plans from unit (one from beginning, one from middle, and one from end) along with any adaptations to instruction and/or assessment for diverse learners and self-reflections/evaluations for each of these three lessons
- **At least two** formative assessments must be conducted (include any adaptations for special needs students); may use alternative assessment, such as journal entries, performance, project, etc.
- Appropriate summative assessment (post-test or final project or performance)
- Analysis of student learning (evaluation of and reflection on unit). Include the following components in your analysis:

1. What do your students' grades/scores indicate about the effectiveness of the unit?

2. Write a brief summary of learning for 3 students (no last names): if possible, one for whom assessment indicates s/he met all objectives; one for whom assessment indicates s/he met most objectives; and one for whom assessment indicates s/he met only a few or no objectives (if all were in one or two of these categories, that is also possible). Include in your summary possible reasons for students' success or failure.

3. What, if anything, will you change in the unit?

C. Evaluation of Instruction

1. One observation evaluation of one of the unit's lessons by cooperating teacher
2. One observation evaluation of one of the unit's lessons by university supervisor
3. Self-evaluation (included with the three lesson plans)

D. Assessment of Student Learning (included in unit plan)

E. Analysis of Student Learning (included in unit plan)

F. Reflection on Teacher-Research Project (attach to the end of the unit plan)

Finally, reflect on your teacher-research project, including:

- How Danielson's four domains (Planning & Preparation, Classroom Environment, Instruction, Professional Responsibilities) affected your unit's effectiveness
- What you learned about successful and unsuccessful classroom activities
- What you might do to improve student learning if you teach this unit again

- What you learned about student learning
- What you learned about conducting teacher-research, including the value that it has and how it might work for your own professional development

G. Evaluation of the Work Sample:

The work sample will be counted as approximately 1/3 of the overall student teaching grade. This project will be scored using an adaptation of the rubric on the College of Education website under the Teacher Work Sample.

The Teacher Work Sample and Its Fit with NCATE Standards

The TWS counts for roughly one-third of the student teaching grade. We mentioned earlier that one purpose of the TWS was to meet the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) Standards 1C Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates and 1D Student Learning for Teacher Candidates. To achieve the "Target," or highest level, for Standard 1C, pre-service teachers must be accountable to the following description:

> **TARGET**
>
> Teacher candidates reflect a thorough understanding of professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards. They develop meaningful learning experiences to facilitate learning for all students. They reflect on their practice and make necessary adjustments to enhance student learning.

Likewise, Standard 1D reads:

> **TARGET**
>
> Teacher candidates focus on student learning and study the effects of their

> work. They assess and analyze student learning, make appropriate adjustments to instruction, monitor student learning, and have a positive effect on learning for all students. Candidates in advanced programs for teachers have a thorough understanding of assessment. They analyze student, classroom, and school performance data and make data-driven decisions about strategies for teaching and learning so that all students learn. They collaborate with other professionals to identify and design strategies and interventions that support student learning (http://www.ncate.org/public/unitStandardsRubrics.asp?ch=4#stnd1).

Below is the scoring rubric we use to assess candidates' work sample; generally, we collect the TWS toward the completion of student teaching and go over the document with the student teacher. If there are any areas that are missing or deficient, we allow candidates to revise and resubmit the TWS with changes, thus encouraging new teachers to meet or exceed the NCATE standards. Of the nine areas on the TWS Scoring Rubric below, we discovered that areas 5, 7, 8, and 9 parallel NCATE Standard 1C, and areas 7 and 9 match NCATE 1D; thus, for both accreditation and building reflection purposes, the TWS is a measurable example of some of what teacher candidates are doing in the classroom and how they are becoming more reflective practitioners.

Scoring Rubric for the Teacher Work Sample

Required elements of the TWS	**Completed = 3 points**	**Not completed = 0 points**
1. Description of the learning environment/inclusive context		
2. Planning for instruction in inclusive settings: Unit plan		
3. Planning for instruction in inclusive settings: Selected lesson plans		
4. Implementing instruction: Evaluation by supervisors		
5. Implementing instruction: Self-evaluation on lesson plans		
6. Assessment of student learning in inclusive settings		
7. Analysis of student learning: Formative and alternative assessments		
8. Reflection on teaching effectiveness		
9. Reflection on professional growth		

TOTAL RUBRIC SCORE _____ points

Rubric formula: $\frac{\text{total points x } 52}{27} + 48 =$ _____ % Grade: _____

Examples of Developing "Habits" from the TWS

To illustrate further how student teachers hone their reflective practice, including questioning and posing problems as well as a stance of awe and wonderment, we've selected some examples from two work samples submitted by Amanda, who we introduced at the beginning of this article, and Beth, the pre-service teacher we selected previously to provide some samples of her writing from the methods class prior to student

teaching. Their full responses to parts of each of their TWS are included in Sample B at the conclusion of this writing.

What we noticed emerging for both student teachers were patterns of language that indicated recurring questioning and response as a teacher-researcher would do in conducting classroom inquiry. We boldfaced these patterns with the full text of the student teacher's responses in Sample B below. Both Amanda and Beth used thoughtful questioning and consideration statements patterns to formulate their thinking about what was happening with their students and to support or change or challenge what they should do next. Examples of questions and statements such as:

It's important to consider…

I did this because…

I had to consider…

I wanted to assess…

I have found that…

If I redid this lesson, I would…

One thing I've learned…

Next time I will use…

I began to realize…

I realized…

I analyzed…

I struggled with…

As I look back, …

When teaching myself, I will be able to…

Would…?

How would…?

Don't I…?

I found out…

I would still consider…

I was not able to answer…

I think it is safe to say…

I will continue to…

serve as evidence that what our student teachers are producing in the TWS solidifies and reinforces inquiring habits of mind that begin in our methods courses and that we are hopeful will continue throughout their teaching careers.

Further, as we looked closely at the student teachers' responses (here we have boldfaced their patterns of thinking and underlined important discoveries), we discovered a shift in their thinking that clearly focuses on the students rather than a preoccupation on themselves as beginning teachers; for example, when Amanda states what she learned from the pre-test: "**I analyzed** the results of this pre-test and revisited my learning objectives to students to better serve student's needs, " or, in teaching the lesson, "**I have found that** learning about the author and the time period often helps students understand and relate to the novel." And for Beth, "I asked my students for feedback, and most said they felt rushed with this project. I agree and go one step further: not only were they rushed, but I do not think many of them were able to make the connection they needed to the next big step. Of course, **when teaching myself, I will be able to** see the overarching year long big picture, and help my students make these connections. **When I teach this**

unit again, I am going to strive to do that." And, again, commenting with a student-centered focus from her inquiry, Beth writes, "If the interest isn't there, then the students will not want to work as hard. The students that were researching what they wanted to research tried harder, had fewer discipline problems, and generally enjoyed the unit more. **I think it is safe to say that** the difference between these two types of students was small, but substantial to the effectiveness of my unit."

We believe that continued and repeated preparation in reflective habits of mind (and the accompanying questioning and wondering) in our methods courses ensure that our pre-service teachers are prepared for the questioning inherent to the TWS and teacher-research. While we perceive the reflection we ask of our students in our methods courses helps our students successfully negotiate the components of the TWS, we also realize that purposeful assignments such as the TWS serve to reinforce these habits and thus create another level of maturity and ability in new teachers to see a clearer picture of their teaching and most importantly, what will be of most benefit to their students' learning.

References

Costa, A. L. & Kallick, B., Eds. (2008). Learning and leading with habits of mind: 16 essential characteristics for success. *Alexandria: ASCD.*

Costa, A. L. & Kallick, B., Eds. (2000). *Assessing and reporting on habits of mind*. Chapter 1. Defining indicators of achievement. (http://www.ascd.org/ed_topics/2000costa/costa_ch.1html)

Costa, A. L. & Kallck, B., Eds. (2000). Discovering and exploring habits of mind. *Alexandria, VA: ASCD.*

Hubbard, R. S. & Power, B. M. (2003). *The art of classroom inquiry: A handbook for teacher-researchers*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Hubbard, R. S. & Power, B. M. (1999). *Living the questions: A guide for teacher-researchers.* Portland: Stenhouse.

Dr. Jo-Anne Kerr *is Assistant Professor of English at Indiana University of Pa., where she teaches College Writing, Humanities Literature, Teaching and Evaluating Writing, and Teaching English and Communications in Secondary Schools. She also directs the Undergraduate English Education program at IUP.*
Dr. Linda *Norris* *is Associate Professor of English at IUP, where she directed the Undergraduate English Education Program for several years. She is a State System Representative on the PAC-TE Executive Board. Her most recent book is Unpacking the Loaded Teacher Matrix (Peter Lang, 2007), co-authored with Dr. sj Miller, which received the 2007 NCTE Richard A. Meade Award for research in the teaching of English.*

SAMPLE A.
Examples of Pre-service Teacher Reflections Before the Work Sample Assignment

Showcase Portfolio Cover Letter 1: (Pre-service Teacher Candidate Jacki)
April 28, 2009
Dr. Norris and Dr. Kerr,

The presentation of this showcase portfolio demonstrates pieces which best exemplify the aspects of teaching that I've achieved in understanding over the course of my education. I've selected three documents to represent my learning of teaching English. They have been revised over the course of a semester to include professional revisions as well as changing approaches, ideas, and philosophies.

The first document selected is a diagram of a classroom arrangement and its rationale. Throughout my progression of education courses, I have been strongly influenced by Danielson's domains, one of which being 'environment.' The classroom arrangement illustrates my understanding of the effects a classroom environment can play in a student's education.

Despite how a classroom is arranged, student learning must still take place. I included a unit plan to demonstrate my comprehension of the necessary planning needed to map out an effective lesson. I feel I learned an enormous amount from this assignment. Previously, I was unaware of how much organization is required to create a unit plan. I also learned that even in a broad spectrum view of instructional material like a unit plan, attention still must be paid to detail.

Throughout any learning process, like those delivered in a unit plan**, teachers will constantly need to assess student progress to make sure learning occurred. Some of these assessments will be observationally based, while others will take place in the form of formal summative evaluations.** The third document I added to my portfolio is the unit project designed to evaluate content knowledge covered in my unit plan. By creating a project, I discovered the complete knowledge of standards that teachers must have in order to make a test that reaches those educational goals. Also, **teachers must have a clear idea of the academic objectives they wish their students to achieve, which will be reflected in the assessment.**

A showcase portfolio is an excellent tool to gauge progress over the course of time. **I feel that these documents depict my growth and progress as a pre-student teacher. The pieces chosen represent my philosophies and professional personalities that I've developed** over the course of my time spent in the educational department of IUP.

Showcase Portfolio Cover Letter 2: (Pre-service Teacher Candidate Beth)

For my showcase portfolio, I chose to highlight the work I did with *Jane Eyre* and the CH High School students. I have included my unit plan (worth 8% of the grade), my

Jane Eyre lesson plan (worth 7% of the grade) and my CH High School teaching reflection, class notes, and the handouts that I made for the student responses (worth 6% of the grade). I wanted cohesion and a unifying factor for this portfolio, so that I might be able to show three different aspects of teaching (unit planning, lesson planning, and reflection on the lesson) within a given unit. Furthermore, **I think that these three artifacts highlight my best strengths**, and I am particularly proud of them.

I had a lot of fun creating my unit plan. For me, the hardest part was trying to decide how to work the final paper in to the fourteen-day lesson. I wanted to give the students plenty of time to write their papers while still
reading the book, and get class and teacher feedback on their drafts. On top of that, the students were expected to make a presentation out of their paper, and that was to be the culminating activity of the unit. Not only did I have to negotiate between the paper and the book, but I also had to give them enough time to finish and polish their paper before I could expect them to turn it into a good presentation. I like the system that I have now; I gave the students a week to write first drafts, and then they have a weekend to fix any problems that come up in their conferences. They get to conference again, and then they have two days to make a final draft and write their presentations. As a teacher, I worry that they might not have enough time between their second draft and their final draft, but I do give them a lot of time to brainstorm ideas and work on a first draft. Obviously, I would be able to evaluate what a class is able to do, and tweak the schedule accordingly if need be. While making this unit plan, **I learned how best to organize what I am teaching; I had to have specific reasons for why I wanted a week to teach the basics of a persuasive paper, and eight days to write the paper, for example. It was a challenge, but I loved it. The unit plan emphasizes my ability to plan and organize.**

The second artifact in my portfolio is my *Jane Eyre* lesson plan. I included this because it was part of the unit and it is a good example of the kinds of lessons I intend to teach within the unit. I also included it because I incorporate both group work and media into this lesson; **I wanted something that would help to show my pedagogy. I am a big proponent of group work, and I want to incorporate media into my classroom whenever I can (where appropriate).** The clips I use in the lesson give students many opportunities to meet the objectives of the unit as well as introduce the students to the ideas of audience and directorial intent. Furthermore, since they will be watching a movie, they will be more interested in the content. I put a lot of effort into this lesson, changing it around a few times from its first incarnation, and I am very proud of it. **This lesson plan showcases my ability to organize a smaller lesson and adapt the lesson to individual class needs.**

The final artifact is a reflection on teaching the above lesson to an eleventh grade class at CH High. I have added this to my portfolio as the culminating factor in the whole *Jane Eyre* unit. Obviously, I was unable to teach the whole unit to the students at CH High. The reflection on the lesson gives me the opportunity to show how I respond to a lesson after I have taught it. Furthermore, **it emphasizes the "final" step in the complete teaching process, which is reflecting on how to improve the lesson or what might need to be changed. I included the student work in this section of the**

portfolio, as well, as a way to show how the students responded to the lesson. If I do not take student responses in to account when reflecting, my reflection will be incomplete and (most likely) not very helpful in the long run.

I am very proud of this portfolio. I believe it presents my best work, and I am thrilled to be able to show three artifacts that fit together so nicely. Not only do they all mesh in the same unit, but **they are able to highlight three important steps in the teaching process: planning, adapting, and reflecting. And, most importantly, I had a lot of fun making it.**

SAMPLE B.
Examples of Student Teacher Reflections from Their Work Samples

Teacher Candidate Amanda
From Journal #2:
Because of the large number of students, they are easily distracted and put off-task. When planning lessons and ideas for the class**, it's important to consider** their number. Simple small group or independent assignments tend to become overwhelmingly cacophonous. Group activities are difficult to orchestrate because of the noise level and difficulty keeping everyone on task. This is no fault of the students; there are just so many of them that it becomes chaotic quickly.

From the three lessons, pre-, middle, and post:
Reflection/ Response to Day 1 Lesson
This lesson served several purposes. First of all, students were assigned new seats. **I did this because** I felt my students needed a change to get the most out of this unit. Students had become very comfortable with the people they sit around, so I decided to move the seats to take advantage of opportunities to make classroom management just a little bit easier. The development of my seating chart was difficult**; I had to consider every student's personality and work ethic, and who I felt would work best together.**
Secondly, students took a pre-test on their knowledge and attitudes about prejudice and discrimination. **I wanted to assess what sort of conceptions my students were bringing into the unit. I analyzed the results of this pre-test and revisited my learning objectives to students to better serve student's needs.**
Finally, as a class we reviewed the context and history of the text so that students could be better prepared to analyze the text. **I have found that** learning about the author and the time period often helps students understand and relate to the novel. This lesson was no different. Students felt better prepared to read the novel because they already new something about why it might have been written and what they might get out of it.
The lesson went very smoothly and overall, I was proud of it. The only part that was mildly mismanaged was the beginning, when students were assigned their new seats. However, I feel that the nature of this activity is a little chaotic.
Response/Reflection to Day 15
With a group as large as this one, it can easily become overwhelming during discussions. So I began using small group discussion, handing out worksheets and discussion questions to facilitate discussions**. This really works, not only because it creates**

manageable discussion groups, but also because having students record their answers holds them accountable for the readings.

Using this theory also helps me focus on students' individual needs. I can spend more time talking with each student, finding areas where they need more help and objectives they aren't meeting on their own. This is especially true for students who struggle with the class, and are less likely to contribute to whole class discussions.

The class is much more manageable in small groups. It's easier to monitor what they're doing when they're in smaller groups. **If I redid this lesson, I would** utilize think-pair-share instead of just small groups, to help not only manage the class better, but to raise the level of accountability in the assignment.

Response/Reflection to Day 22

In installments throughout the unit, students have watched segments of the movie. The film supplemented the text and was one technique I used to engage visual learners. This lesson is meant for the final installment of the movie, and **allows students time to reflect and respond** to what they just saw. The questions students responded to made them think about the movie, and how the movie and the book complimented or detracted from each other.

This lesson went very well. Classroom management is the only area where I am lacking; and even there, I am making great strides, especially in situations like this one, where it is easy to manage students and monitor their individual progress.

Analysis of Student Learning

1. My students are a very intellectually and academically diverse group, and I think that is reflected in the assessment grades. The scores ranged from 55% to 99%, with the average score being 86%, which is a low B in this district. **This reflects that the unit was effective, however, modifications should be made next time to meet the needs of all students.**

2. The three students I chose represent their peers well.

a. Jay – Jay's current classroom grade is a 97%. He's missed moderate amounts of class time for extracurricular assignments. Jay has completed all assignments, and if necessary, revisited them to help bring up his grade. I would say that having assignments completed on time is the reason Jason succeeds in my classroom. Jay also pays attention during class and always has completed the assigned readings when they are due.

b. Alea – Alea's current grade is an 87%, which is a B. She misses school moderately frequently, and has to be encouraged and reminded to turn in assignments missed during absences. She will occasionally not pay attention in class, or fall asleep during SSR, which accounts for her moderate summative exam score.

c. Barbara – Barbara rarely comes to school. She misses on average, 2-3 days a week, which makes her very susceptible to missing assignments. She never turns in make-up work, even after encouragement and reminders. Because of this, she's is currently failing with a 64%. Barbara's main fault is that she doesn't turn in her work. She will occasionally not even turn in work done in class. During silent reading periods, she sleeps, and during discussion, she never pays attention.

3. **There is only one thing I would change** in my unit; **next time, I will use** guiding prompts when assigning journal entries, so that students have a better idea of what I'm looking for.

In my last week of student teaching, I've mostly been working on finishing up loose ends and grading papers. **One thing I've learned** is that a teacher's job is never finished. I can't remember a time in the last month where I haven't taken papers and worksheets home and spent at least two hours grading. It's tedious, but I genuinely enjoy it.

From Reflection on Teaching Effectiveness

One very interesting thing that caught me off guard happened when I was passing out the post-test I wanted students to complete. I used the exact same pre-and post-test, so that I could specifically pinpoint how student's opinions changed. Students were immediately confused as to why they were doing the same thing twice, and I explained that I wanted to see where their opinions had changed and if they could pinpoint what discrimination is and how we can change it. One girl looked at me and said, "But my opinions aren't going to change. I mean, it's *only a book*." I was floored. Only a book! It was *To Kill a Mockingbird*!

But then I sat down and thought about it, and maybe she's right. One book doesn't automatically change who you are and how you think. It was a little disheartening, and definitely humbling. I'm not going to swoop into a classroom with a magic spell that makes everyone a good, moral person. And, really, whose morals are they? I mean, if I'm really so open to diversity and the supportive educator I want to be, **don't I** have to give students the freedom to be who they want to be? I feel like this experience has really solidified my education. **It gave a real-world practicality to teaching for me.**

Teacher Candidate "Beth"

From Work Sample Reflection on Professional Growth:

I consider this experience a success for many different reasons; foremost among them **is the amount helpful information I learned about myself, my teaching styles, and the way in which I want to command my own classroom.** While I have always known that I wanted to teach, there has always been some anxiety about how well my classroom would run—**would** the students understand my approaches to things? **Would** they appreciate my sense of humor and reciprocate? **How would** I handle a student throwing a chair in the middle of my class (something that I witnessed in another teacher's classroom). **I was not able to answer all of these questions, but I know that I am capable of dealing with so many situations now that I no longer feel worried about how my classroom will work.**

First**, I found out so much** about the ways that I need to conduct lessons. I had quite a few successful activities, and other activities that I would like to retool. Many of my more creative projects worked—the *Outsiders* magazine project, for example, or the newspaper project—**but I would still consider** new ways of working with them. Most of my unsuccessful projects—the grammar jeopardy, or the Google group—were not

unsuccessful in that they did not work. Rather**, they did not work in the ways that I was expecting them to**. In these cases, I found that it was my own failing that caused issues. I did not take into account the difficulty of such a large group when it came to grammar jeopardy, for example (or the fact that we did not have buzzers). The Google group needed more time, and some of the classes needed even more specific direction for using it. When I had a classroom activity that I consider unsuccessful, **the problems were usually centered around** my inability to clearly explain what I wanted, or the fact that the students felt rushed and ran out of time.

As I stated in my unit reflection, I would love an opportunity to try the Mythology unit again, this time with more specific guidelines for the students, better "big questions," and (as I have been lamenting all this experience) more time. I was told in my methods class that I would always wish I had more time, and it is far too true. I asked my students for feedback, and most said they felt rushed with this project. I agree and go one step further: not only were they rushed, but I do not think many of them were able to make the connection they needed to the next big step. Of course, **when teaching myself, I will be able to** see the overarching year long big picture, and help my students make these connections. When I teach this unit again, I am going to strive to do that.

Another bit of feedback I got from my students asked to be able to choose the topics they studied and researched. **I struggled with** letting the students choose their own research groups, and eventually came down on the side of letting them choose their own research topics within the research group. (For example, a student assigned to the deity research group could choose any Greek god or goddess he or she wanted to research). For most of my students, this worked out alright. For a few, this system made them not want to work at all. When I tried to explain my methods, they understood, but still had no interest in the research they were conducting. If the interest isn't there, then the students will not want to work as hard. The students that were researching what they wanted to research tried harder, had fewer discipline problems, and generally enjoyed the unit more. **I think it is safe to say that** the difference between these two types of students was small, but substantial to the effectiveness of my unit.

As I look back at my unit and reflect, I can see how much Danielson's four domains were a part of my lesson. For example: Domain 1, planning and preparation. I had a very strong knowledge of my students, a generally good knowledge of my content, and I tried my best to design coherent instruction and assessment. Without this information, I would not have gotten even a quarter of what I wanted from these students. Even with this information, however, the unit (and some individual lessons) did not turn out quite like I planned. When my knowledge failed, that was when managing behavior, classroom procedures, and working on a good learning environment came into play (Domains 2 and 3). I keep thinking about my Wednesday and Friday lessons of the first week: so many people were lost or confused about what was supposed to be happening, and I was running around trying to make sure that everyone got what they needed. My planning and prep had helped me, but now I needed to switch things up and work with problems I hadn't anticipated—confusion over choosing groups and inability to

understand the website being the main two. While I might not have always handled the situation the best way possible, I did manage my classroom the best that I could at the time, and it got us through the tough lessons. I
encouraged my students to ask as many questions as they could, and I provided them with a quick list of big questions to focus on—in fact, the whole unit was built around that idea of answering some big general questions.

As the unit went on**, I began to realize** that the students were confused in certain areas and that there were changes that needed to be made. In this instance, I was unable to adapt as I went, which made my unit less effective than it could have been. I frequently discussed options with my co-op, although he did try to stay out of it as much as possible so that it would stay "my" lesson. **I tried to be as reflective as I could** be as the unit was happening, but due to time and schedule constraints, there were very few things that I was able to change on the fly. I was able to stretch out my research days in response to quite a few students being absent due to school wide functions (another reason why many students were confused), but the majority of my changes and reflections are taking place after the fact, when I will be able to change the lessons and teach them in my own classroom.

Overall, I found this experience to be extremely fulfilling and vindicating for me. As I mentioned before, I have always had that anxiety about how I would relate to a real classroom, teaching real information for an extended period of time. Thanks to this semester, **I realized** how much I love teaching. Personally, it was extremely satisfying. Professionally, I was able to see my co-op teaching and ask questions, as well as get feedback on the things that I do in a lesson. This experience was invaluable to me. I observed seven teachers overall throughout the semester, discussed a myriad of ways to handle any one given situation, and was able to come away knowing that this is something that I want to do for the rest of my life. I am good at this, **and I know that I will continue to be as reflective as I was this semester; I will always be seeking out new ways of doing things, and I will love to get feedback on how I am doing. This is an experience I will cherish and build upon for the rest of my career.**

We wish to thank our students, Beth Blumer, Amanda Hack, and Jacki Theis, for allowing us to highlight their work, thus showing our readers not only the powerful value of reflection but also the exemplary quality of our IUP English education pre-service teachers.

Closing the Distance: Reaching Cooperating Teachers through Live Classroom

Tina Selvaggi and Sally Winterton

West Chester University of Pennsylvania

Abstract

In an effort to increase attendance in the third year of the Cooperating Teacher Workshops, the Live Classroom feature of Blackboard was used to conduct interactive workshops. This feature permitted the cooperating teachers to "attend" workshops from their classroom or homes. As in the past, an on campus "in-person" workshop was offered also. This article shares the format and lessons learned in providing the online interactive workshops for the participants.

"Education is not the filling of a bucket, but the lighting of a fire." - W.B. Yeats

The Background

In response to the NCATE standard related to professional development for cooperating teachers, we developed three session workshops for cooperating teachers and university supervisors. Each semester, we offered two on campus workshops offered for university supervisors and three workshops for cooperating teachers. To accommodate cooperating teachers, we offered one workshop on campus, and two workshops in different regions where our teacher candidates are placed.

Cooperating teachers and university supervisors received invitation letters from the Dean of the College of Education to attend the workshops. As an incentive, Act 48 credits are provided to those attending all sessions of the workshops. In addition, participants who attend all sessions receive a copy of Charlotte Danielson's *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching, 2nd Edition* and a certificate of completion from the Dean of the College of Education.

Session One focuses on the College of Education Conceptual Framework; the teacher candidate evaluation tools: Pennsylvania Department of Education 430 form (PDE 430); the College of Education Teacher Intern Performance Rating (TIPR), and their interrelationship, as well as discussing Charlotte Danielson's "Four Domains of Teaching Responsibility" as the foundation of the PDE 430. In the second session the use of qualitative and quantitative observational tools (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2004; D'Arcangelo, 1987) are presented and practiced by viewing teaching videos. The Session Three workshop helps participants better understand and apply the mentoring

skills of conferencing, questioning, mirroring and modeling/reflection in their work with teacher candidates. (Boreen, Johnson, Niday, & Potts, 2000)

The Dilemma

Cooperating teacher attendance for the workshops has been a concern since the inception of the project in spring 2007. Each semester approximately 12% of the cooperating teachers invited attend the workshops. Reasons for lack of attendance were the time conflict presented by the evening's schedule, rising gas prices, the accessibility of locations, and the other personal, and/or professional responsibilities that cooperating teachers have. Although cooperating teachers wished to attend the workshops, they were unable to attend due to babysitting issues, graduate classes or other after school responsibilities, such as coaching. As full time professors in the College of Education, we had full teaching loads and were often limited to the number of nights that we could offer the workshops. In addition to this, gas prices had risen and cooperating teachers were reluctant to travel too far from home or work.

The Plan

We developed a new plan with the goal to allow teachers to access the workshops from home or office rather than traveling to one of the three locations of the workshops. During the fall 2008 semester, the on campus three-session workshops for the university supervisors continued. For cooperating teachers, we offered one workshop on campus and one at a remote site. In an effort to "close the distance", we offered cooperating teachers opportunity to join the on campus sessions electronically. We used the Live Classroom feature of Blackboard to deliver the online workshops.

Live Classroom allows participants to see and hear the presenters, view the PowerPoint presentations, and view video clips. If participants' computers have video capability, the presenters can see them. By using their computer microphones, they can participate in dialogue. Those without microphones are able to type comments, enabling the workshop to become interactive. The online workshop would be delivered while a session with cooperating teachers in person was occurring. This allowed for interaction among the presenters, on line participants a, and participants on campus.

The Implementation and Lessons Learned

The workshop was set as an organization in the Blackboard program. Cooperating teachers received log on instructions. We used a MAC book with video capability. The plan was one of us would interact with the on-line participants and the other with the cooperating teachers in the room.

Cooperating teachers evaluate each session. Feedback from the online participants related to the experience included:

a) The font on the PowerPoint was not clear to the remote users. We changed the font to Arial but any sans serif font would work,

b) Attendees at home lost audio when presenter typed responses. We added an additional computer so we could use one for audio and one for typing,

c) MAC video camera only showed the presenter. We added an eyeball camera taped to a rolling chair to pan the room and remote users were able to see attendees well.

d) MAC microphones did not capture the attendees' voices. We added a hand held microphone for attendees and presenters use.

This was the first time anyone in the College of Education used the Live Classroom feature in this manner. We received a tremendous amount of support from our Academic Computing group and the College of Education Technology Center Director. At each session our Academic Computing person was present and the technology center Director attended on-line.

We met to debrief after the sessions and rework any glitches and respond to suggestions from the participants. Because of the success of the Live Classroom, we conducted a third series exclusively on line. During spring 2009, we presented online workshops through Live Classroom without a live audience in the room. This allowed us to be more attentive to the participants logging on from home or office and to permit discussion among these participants.

The Outcome

During the Fall 2008 semester 19 cooperating teachers attended the on site workshops and seven logged on for the Live Classroom sessions; while during Spring 2009, seven cooperating teachers attended on site sessions and nine logged on to the Live Classroom sessions.

According to workshop evaluations, cooperating teachers who participated in the on campus workshops valued the fact that the University embraces the cooperating teachers' needs in terms of observing, conferencing, and evaluating teacher candidates and provides workshops for the cooperating teachers. They also valued the way that the workshops met their needs. As in the past, they appreciated the ability to get together to discuss student teachers and what was and was not working.

The teachers who participated in the online portion of the workshops were happy to be able to see the PowerPoint on the screen while also seeing the facilitators and the comments from other cooperating teachers all at the same time. The online participants, like the on campus participants, stated they valued the hard work of our teacher candidates and the support from the University.

Next Steps

Due to budget constraints, the workshops offered for cooperating teachers during the 2009-2010 school year will be scaled back, but will continue to be offered in an organized and effective manner. One online workshop workshops will be offered through Live Classroom in late August in an effort to reach cooperating teachers before the semester begins. During the fall semester, two workshops will be presented; one on line and one on campus. Plans for the spring 2010 semester are to offer only online workshops Live Classroom.

Using Live Classroom as a means of providing cooperating teachers workshops has been successful for our program. Live Classroom aided us in “closing the distance” to meet with the cooperating teachers.

.

References

Borden, J., Johnson, M., Niday, D., & Potts, J. (2000). *Mentoring Beginning Teachers.* Portland, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.

Danielson, C. (1996). *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Danielson, C. (2007) *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

D'Arcangelo. M. (Producer). (1987) *Another Set Of Eyes: Techniques for Classroom Observation.* Alexandria, VA: *Association for Supervision and* Curriculum *Development.*

Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. (2004). *Supervision and Instructional Leadership: A Developmental Approach* (6th ed.). Columbus, OH: Allyn & Bacon.

Tina Selvaggi, M.S. *is an adjunct professor in the Department of Literacy at West Chester University of Pennsylvania. Prior to joining WCU, she taught elementary school, gifted education, served as an Instructional Support Teacher, a Reading Specialist and, most recently, a staff developer in Pennsylvania public schools. She is currently enrolled in a Reading Leadership doctoral program.*
Sally Winterton, Ed. D. *is an associate professor at West Chester University of Pennsylvania. She has served as Coordinator of Field Experiences in the Department of Elementary Education, a university supervisor, and as the Interim Director of the Teacher Education Center. Prior to joining WCU she taught elementary school, served as an assistant middle school principal, an elementary school principal, and a Director of Personnel in public school districts.*

Guiding Student Interns Through Project-based Experiences: Good or Bad?

Greg K. Gibbs

St. Bonaventure University

Occasionally the candidates in the St. Bonaventure University (SBU) educational leadership program run into difficulties securing an appropriate internship placement. Faculty helps them along the way, but part of the process includes the candidates going through the rigors of seeking out a proper placement themselves.

One usual situation is the candidate serving in an internship in a district in which they all ready are employed. Usually the school district is aware of the strengths and weaknesses of those individuals and a proper placement often begins quickly and is typically very focused. It is the candidate that cannot do that type of internship that often goes out of their district and seeks an internship in a neighboring institution or district.

When a candidate goes to a district that is unfamiliar with their professional background they have to "sell" themselves to that district and let them clearly know what that candidate can do for them in return for the mentoring through their internship. These situations often begin with the candidate offering to do something for the district that most likely takes the form of a project. These projects are typically things that districts would like to do themselves or something that may be of general benefit to them but something that they just do not have the resources and time to accomplish.

The SBU program has had successful examples in the past but using a project to get at all the administrative competencies that we require is often difficult. Achieving multiple competencies within a single project based internship can present an unwieldy

challenge. Therefore, the faculty readily discourages internships based upon projects. However, faculty shares the belief that projects have a place in the program and are used whenever addressing competencies in authentic, real, situational arenas.

What are the options for class assignments, ways in which students can practice and/or demonstrate their skill development? Some items include a research paper, an opinion essay, an exam, spreadsheet creation, reading summaries, and presentations of conceptual applications. Yes, SBU uses all of them within our total program structure but as candidates get to the end of their program coursework, faculty begin to look for application venues that bring the candidates and the authentic and real world of educational administration together in safe but challenging ways.

In the SBU course entitled "The School and Community Relations", the project built into the curriculum can often be the door to an internship opportunity. SBU requires candidates to define a communication or public relations need or problem in a school district. The candidates must set up a plan to effectively identify a need, address that need, develop a process, and many times, create a product that will benefit that entire scenario.

SBU has had candidates identify some interesting needs in the past and develop some great solutions to those needs. Although the audience for the final presentation and product is the class itself, faculty encourages candidates to share these works when appropriate with their district or the districts that may be involved. SBU has had many districts embrace the candidates work and ask to use their piece for their own audiences. If the student hadn't thought of an internship in that district they often reply with, "when you are ready to do an internship come and see us".

The quality of the candidate's work creates that level of understanding of their professional skills and doors may be open to them that they had not even thought of prior to that educational leadership class. If SBU had just another textbook based assignment, exam, case study, or research paper as a requirement the outcome would obviously be different. It is this author's belief that class projects that relate to the real world often are well received by real audiences and serve the student, the skill development, the program, and effective integration of our local educational community at large.

Candidates are gaining understanding in the identification of needs based upon data and research and beginning to examine their own educational environments in new and different ways. This is something that is encouraged in every class within the SBU program. The value of this truly comes to fruition when a candidate identifies a real need and comes up with a viable solution to effectively address that need. Typically this saves a district time and money that they often do not have. When these projects are shared with school districts they are always appreciative and again often see the value of having an intern work with them.

Internships should always be mutually beneficial but many times the host school sees the process as a great degree of work that no one has any extra time for. If one can show the district some value-added element you are more likely to have their interest. SBU's work in the general local educational community has helped to gain a positive reputation; a reputation that includes seeing our interns as valuable commodities to be embraced. Candidates individual skill mastery obviously varies and not every candidate is superior in every way but the SBU track record has been positive and the partner districts appreciate being able to work with SBU student interns. They do see them as an

asset. They capitalize on their eagerness and the fact that they are continually supervised by university professionals as well as assigned to their own site supervisors. Partner schools see them generally as self-starting individuals who can add to the district in many ways.

One such project involved the school embarking on a volunteer program for their elementary school. Many schools have some opportunity for volunteers, parents, community members to come into their school and work with students. Does a school typically have the time to create flyers and brochures to inform the community of such a program and actively provide some public relations recognition for the volunteers? Some may and some may not.

One of the SBU interns took the details of the program; the qualifications, the training, the level of need, the hours, the subject areas and built a public relations plan around this volunteer program. They developed a consistent logo and graphic design for each element within the plan which further developed the program as an important entity within itself. A news release was the first element stating what was in the planning phase and what the general goals of a volunteer program would be focusing on the positive student achievement aspect, then a flyer announcing the program was developed, next a brochure outlining how you could become involved with contact information was created. It began to look very organized and official, not that it was not before, but with the addition of consistent documents it gave a very professional and important look to the entire process. This went beyond what might be able to be done at a school using secretarial time and often somewhat limited resources. This volunteer program was an important element with the school and now it was given the stature it deserved.

Participants immediately felt they were involved in something special and approached the effort with a dedication and sincerity that was exemplary. Would this have been the same without such a public relations plan? Perhaps, but it was clear that this added plan and public relations project gave this entire effort a positive, professional spin that elevated the volunteer program to an important community-school connection that became a tremendously important element and a hallmark of that elementary school.

The school and the district were amazingly pleased with the intern's work both through the quality and quantity of the elements of the project. They were so pleased that they offered the intern summer work in an administrative capacity with pay. This would later (within just a few months) turn into an opportunity for full-time employment as a beginning level administrator.

Another most recent example began as a result of an SBU intern attending school board meetings. This is something we suggest highly so our students will gain a better perspective about school governance in a real way through attending such sessions. The school board wanted a summary piece that would define the school district, its mission, and generalities about the community for perspective residents and employees. The conversation came up when discussion school-age population figures for the coming year and why people were moving into the district or why they were going elsewhere. The board's goal was to showcase what is good about the school district in a positive manner to encourage folks to move into their school district and community. This was a rural area where the school is a major focus of activity within the community and the community is truly somewhat defined by the school. It was discussed for quite some time with questions about who could create such a thing, who has the time and ability, the

knowledge, the technology, etc. Eyes turned to our intern who was present and a few members of the board asked the superintendent if this is something that the intern could work on as a project. The superintendent simply said yes. After that board meeting, the superintendent met with the SBU intern and outlined some details to the assignment and helped frame the project.

The intern immediately went to work collecting any information that could be put together to create such a document. She determined a brochure format would be best. What were the district's best points? What would matter to parents seeking a school for their children? What sets this district apart from neighboring districts that could best be focused into a brochure format? The intern did a masterful job of collecting that data and putting together images and information that could answer some of these questions and be an eye catching and quality presentation. The School Board reviewed the final product and liked it so much they asked the intern to do a presentation to the local Chamber of Commerce, again on the highlights of the school. The district wanted to be sure that every business person throughout the district was well aware of the school as an asset. It truly did pinpoint what the district was most proud of and showcased in a professional, objective manner. Besides her own conceptual growth the board was very appreciative of her efforts and it went along way to helping her career and also gave very positive feedback to our entire program at the university.

She now has a piece for her own portfolio that not only demonstrates her understanding of creating a needs based school-community relations piece but it has served an authentic need within that school district and will no doubt be seen by hundreds of potential home buyers and future community members. One of the SBU program

goals involves gaining an understanding of the larger context of a school and district. Such an assignment helped focus this intern on researching information to not only see that context historically but project it forward and create a platform for future consumers as well. Another program goal involves the understanding of stewardship of a vision (see Appendix: ELCC Standard 1.4). The research needed to create such a project also helped this intern see what the school vision was, how it was implemented and how that stewarding of the vision translates into outreach to the community. These two goals were realized in an authentic setting that could rarely be duplicated within a classroom setting at the university. It takes engagement within the community, researching history and talking to employees about their future vision to put such a project together. These are real elements that involve emotion and life long passion and personal involvement of people. These are things which cannot be planned for in advance and sometimes that cannot be predicted.

It is planned that this brochure will be sent to real estate agents within the general area. It appears from the intern's research that no such brochure exists for other neighboring districts and this may help this particular district stand out and attract future families and students.

The use of authentic-based projects within the content of the SBU program curriculum has paid off in many ways. The dual benefit of administrative knowledge, skills, and disposition acquisition along with active contribution in the field is hard to beat. The SBU engagement within the local education community at large has increased through these efforts and it has increased the availability of internships for the candidates.

As SBU continues to re-design and evaluate the curriculum every year, there is careful attention to look at projects as an important element with the required coursework. There are appropriate assignments that may best be done through a research paper, an opinion essay, an exam, a spreadsheet, a school improvement plan, etc. Although faculty are cautious about not basing an entire internship on a project it is felt that projects do have a valuable function in the SBU program and they are used throughout the program as an effective way to integrate skills and applications where the student-candidates can truly demonstrate some of the skills they are developing within the coursework.

Dr. Greg K. Gibbs *started his career as a public school teacher in 1971. He has spent over 10 years as a building principal and several years as a central office administrator. Over the past six years he has served as an assistant professor teaching in the educational leadership program at St. Bonaventure University in Olean, New York. He makes an effort to engage students with practical applications of leadership theory as they progress toward their administrative certification.*

APPENDIX

Educational Leadership Consortium Council Standards

(ELCC Standards as used by New York State Department of Education)

Standard 1 – Planning and Assessment to Facilitate a Vision of Learning:
The competent school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

1.1 Develop a Vision
1.2 Articulate a Vision
1.3 Implement a Vision
1.4 Steward a Vision
1.5 Promote Community Involvement in the Vision

Standard 2 – School Culture and Instructional Leadership:
The competent school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

2.1 Promote Positive School Culture
2.2 Provide Effective Instructional Program
2.3 Apply Best Practice to Student Learning
2.4 Design Comprehensive Professional Growth Plan

Standard 3 – Organizational Management and Safety:
The competent school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

3.1 Manage the Organization
3.2 Manage Operations
3.3 Manage Resources

Standard 4 – Collaboration with Families and Communities:
The competent school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

4.1 Collaborate with Families and other Community Members
4.2 Respond to Community Interests and Needs
4.3 Mobilize Community Resources

Standard 5 – Professional Standards and Ethics:
The competent school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

5.1 Acts with Integrity
5.2 Acts Fairly
5.3 Acts Ethically

Standard 6 – The Larger Political, Social, Economic, Legal and Cultural Context:
The competent school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

6.1 Understand the Larger Context
6.2 Respond to the Larger Context
6.3 Influence the Larger Context