DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 366 586 SP 035 006

AUTHOR Catalano, Anthony F.
TITLE High Involvement Teacher Education: Partnerships in Progress.
PUB DATE Feb 94
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Chicago, IL, February 16-19, 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Alternative Teacher Certification; Career Change; College Graduates; *College School Cooperation; Collegiality; Educational Philosophy; Elementary Education; Field Experience Programs; Graduate Study; Higher Education; Holistic Approach; Mentors; Nontraditional Education; *Partnerships in Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Design; *Teacher Education Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Antioch University WA Seattle; Clinical Schools; *Teachers Teaching Teachers

ABSTRACT

Antioch University (Seattle, Washington) established its Teacher Certification program in 1991 with several goals in mind: to provide adult learners with a program designed around their special learning needs, to address critical teaching and learning issues in urban classrooms with diverse populations, to encourage collegial attitudes and behavior in a profession where isolation is the norm, and to prepare new teachers to serve as change agents in schools. The program is intentionally small, admitting 40-45 students as a cohort group each January with certification awarded the following December. The year-long program, offering an alternative approach to K-8 certification, is designed for mid-life adults who possess bachelor's or master's degrees, have been in the workforce, and who wish to work with children as classroom teachers. The Antioch program is alternative due to its philosophic orientation which is reflected in three main areas: (1) total program design, (2) roles, and (3) relationships. This paper describes the program; discusses the changes implemented as a result of a U.S. Department of Education grant and program strengths and weaknesses; and suggests directions for further improvement. (Contains 22 references.) (LL)

HIGH INVOLVEMENT TEACHER EDUCATION: PARTNERSHIPS IN PROGRESS

Anthony F. Catalano, PhD
Antioch University
2607 2nd Ave.
Seattle, Washington
(206) 441-5352 ext. 5612

Presented at the 1994 Annual Meeting

of the

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

Chicago, Illinois

February 16-20

Abstract

Antioch University Seattle established its Teacher Certification program in 1991 with several goals in mind: to provide adult learners with a program designed around their special learning needs, to address critical teaching and learning issues in urban classrooms with diverse populations, to encourage collegial attitudes and behavior in a profession where isolation is the norm, and to prepare new teachers to serve as change agents in schools. The program is intentionally small, admitting 40-45 students as a cohort group each January with certification awarded the following December. Antioch's year-long, K-8 certification program is designed for mid-life adults who possess bachelor's or master's degrees, have been in the workforce, and who wish to work with children as classroom teachers.

The Antioch University Seattle Teacher Certification Program offers an 'alternative' approach to K-8 certification (Campbell, 1992). However, our concept of 'alternative' is not based on societal needs such as teacher shortages. Such alternative efforts, while sometimes necessary, can result in programs that hastily prepare teachers to fill the perceived need and foregoing quality preparation (McKibbin, 1988; Kennedy, 1991; Smith, 1991).

The Antioch Teacher Certification Program is alternative in three main areas: 1) Program Design, 2) Roles, and 3) Relationships. Antioch's program, then, is alternative due to its philosophic orientation which is reflected in our total program design (VerVelde, Horn and Steinshouer, 1991; Campbell, 1992; Valli, 1992; Ciscell, 1993; Combleth, 1987). This paper describes the program, discusses the changes implemented as a result of a USDOE Grant, program strengths and weaknesses, and suggests directions for further improvement.

An Alternative Program Design

Our constructivist program design is characterized by:

- a cognitive science theoretical base,
- a curriculum delivered in immersion weeks,
- a holistic learning philosophy,
- paired, clustered field experiences, and
- a cohort group admitted once each year.

A Cognitive Science Theoretical Base

Academic instruction revolves around three themes relating to the cognitive sciences: Learning About Learning, Enhancing Human Development, and Restructuring Education (Campbell, 1992; Fullan, 1993). These themes guide instruction and serve as benchmarks for program evaluation.

The cognitive sciences play an important role in the formation of our theoretical foundation. We include coursework on human development, learning theory, and multiple intelligences theory and practices from recent research in the neurological and psychological sciences (Campbell, et al., 1991; O'Neil, 1990; Guild, 1990; McCarthy, 1990; Powell, 1991). Antioch students learn to value and respond to cognitive differences in individuals and to prepare learning experiences which are responsive to individual student needs.

A Curriculum Delivered in Immersion Weeks

Perhaps one of the most noteworthy components of Antioch's teacher preparation model is a re-design of the formal class structure. State-required curriculum is delivered in week-long academic immersions which run from 9:00 until 3:00 daily, and innovative topics are interwoven with more conservative views of learning and teaching. Concepts such as new views of human intelligence, integrating the arts into instruction, holistic methods, and multi-cultural perspectives are emphasized. The immersions offer both students and faculty alike opportunities to pursue theoretical and practical issues in depth and provides pre-service educators with the opportunity to connect theory with practice while reflecting on what they have learned.

Antioch University has a tradition of commitment to excellence in teaching which attracts faculty who share the same commitment. The major outcomes of this common

philosophy are cohesion of faculty values and course delivery which emphasizes experiential, student-centered instruction. The result is that students are exposed to models of good teaching. Typically teachers teach the way they were taught; at Antioch, students are taught they way they should teach.

Faculty members model good teaching practices when presenting coursework and by developing and incorporating:

- positive learning environments
- learning-to-learn strategies
- experiential, multi-modal instructional techniques
- learning styles-based instruction
- thinking skills, problem-solving skills
- holistic human development strategies that address the cognitive, physical, emotional, social, and aesthetic dimensions of growth.

Such approaches require active rather than passive learning and avoid perpetuating lecture and teacher-directed models of instruction. They also provide appropriate models of teaching K-8 students. Multiple ways of knowing are encouraged: students are encouraged to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding through art, music, poetry, and drama as well as through traditional oral and written methods.

A Holistic Learning Philosophy

Antioch has an institutional focus on educating the whole person which certification faculty model in course design and delivery (Knight, et al. 1990). The complex nature of the adult learner is considered, and diverse opportunities for learning and assessment are provided. Concepts introduced in immersions on learning, human development and restructuring issues reemerge later in methods, technology, instructional management, and foundations immersions. Students' work must meet or exceed the course standards and feedback is provided on the quality of student work, the ability to make connections between theory and practice, depth of reflection, and application of core concepts. This orientation toward whole-person learning is consistent with the university's policies and acts as a model for whole-child teaching practices.

In addition, there are a series of independent learning activities organized under an umbrella of "Guided Studies". These activities, designed to connect teacher candidates with broader aspects of children's and educators' lives, further expand upon on the program's themes. Students are required to develop a latent intelligence while learning

how children feel when presented with challenging material. They perform volunteer community service as well as conduct research in an area of individual choice which begins their Master's research project. Students also visit various community education and social service agencies to learn how childrens' needs may be met beyond the classroom.

The program's emphasis on experiential learning and holistic human development acts as a model for pre-certificate candidates as they prepare to facilitate the learning of others.

Extensive Paired, Clustered Field Experiences

Paired and clustered field experiences form another alternative program component which includes multiple opportunities for field experiences. In addition to a full quarter devoted to student teaching in the fall, Antioch students are in inner-city urban schools for eight to nine weeks during Winter and Spring quarters. These placements alternate with academic immersion weeks and include field assignments which integrate and expand upon course content. This field experience design nearly triples the amount of time our students spend in the field: while the state requires eight weeks, we require more than 20 weeks.

Paired field experiences are another unique element of the program. While in the schools, paired student teams support one another, reflect together, and deepen their learning experiences by co-planning lessons, coaching, and critiquing each other. The teaming process helps students explore ways to work and learn collegially, and makes collaboration, not isolation, a professional norm.

A Cohort Model That Emphasizes Collaboration, not Competition

The cohort model is the final critical aspect of our alternative program design. We admit one group each January which remains together for the twelve month-long certification process and, for 75% of the cohort, an additional six months of Master's degree completion work. Early field experiences are completed in pairs, there are multiple opportunities for group work during academic immersions; and regular group processing sessions are conducted - all attempting to model positive classroom interaction and problem-solving. Students report they find 'kindred spirits' in one another, recognizing the common issues they struggle with, while serving as resources for each other.

Alternative and Alternating Roles

The second feature of our alternative approach is in the role the key actors play in the Antioch program which is best characterized by:

- the utilization of classroom teachers as adjunct faculty,
- core faculty supervision of student teachers,
- an advisory board of classroom practitioners whose advice is actually used.

Classroom Teachers as Adjunct Faculty

A very unique element of our program is the utilization of classroom teachers as adjunct faculty. Teachers are selected from our clinical site partners and other public school personnel. Practitioner-adjuncts' duties range from 1/2 day guest appearances to designing and delivering entire courses. They lend a 'real-world' view of teaching conditions and practices, connect theory and practice for the students, and expose them to current issues concerning urban educators. Students cite practitioner visits as a highlight among their preparation activities.

As much as the students appreciate the practitioner-adjuncts, the practitioners themselves appreciate it even more since they perceive it enhances their professional stature.

Faculty Roles in the Supervision Process

We provide supervision of the student teachers by full-time core education faculty who work with students throughout their entire program. This component is unique to Antioch since most universities hire adjuncts to supervise student teachers and is valued by the practitioners with whom we work. Faculty know the students well through their roles as advisors and instructors, and are able to provide differentiated forms of supervision based on individual student needs and styles (Goodlad, 1991). This supervision further connects faculty to the host schools and cooperating teachers.

An Advisory Board that Truly Advises

Washington state law requires the formation of a Professional Education Advisory Board (PEAB) to assist with certification program development, implementation and evaluation. Board member composition must include current classroom teachers appointed by the state teacher's association, administrators, university faculty, and optional community and business representatives. The inclusion of educational

practitioners assists certification programs in addressing current classroom issues while enabling educators to influence the training of their successors. All members of the Antioch Board have previous experience with alternative education at their former colleges and/or are currently involved in public school restructuring efforts. These efforts and relationships are collaborative in nature; our Board actively participates in our program design conversations. Their input is valued since Antioch perceives that practitioners are among the most knowledgeable about effective practice and can contribute to educating both new and experienced teachers.

The PEAB had an integral role in the initial planning of the program in 1991. They took a strong stand (as did the Assistant Director of Professional Education in the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction) that the new program should be innovative and not simply a replication of existing programs or one that was merely created "to meet state codes." The Antioch PEAB has provided indispensable advice on program design, avenues for program improvement, grant applications, and timelines for implementation of redesign strategies such as a shift to a performance-based model.

Relationships That Matter: Acting On Our Beliefs

Finally, the relationships forged with public school colleagues, are grounded in Antioch's philosophically alternative perspective which includes:

- collegial not hierarchical, relationships,
- social action as a way of life,
- proactive selection of partner schools and teachers,
- integration of theory and practice,
- integration of adult students' previous life experiences.

Collegial Not Hierarchical, Relationships

Our relationships with the public schools represent a flattened hierarchy that communicates we are partners with K-8 educators. Practitioners perceive us as partners because of our high visibility in the schools and our implementation of some of their suggestions for program design. In their roles as adjuncts, public school teachers "become" university instructors and again have tangible evidence of our collaborative roles

Our frequent presence and the resultant conversations make our faculty part of the school 'family'; observation conferences often include the cooperating teacher and

university faculty provide classroom teachers with numerous resources. In addition, cooperating teachers use the same observation and evaluation forms as university supervisors when assessing our students' progress, lending further evidence of collegiality and respect.

Social Action as a Way of Life

Antioch University has a history of social action and a commitment to fostering social change that the Teacher Certification Program embodies. The majority of our students and faculty have backgrounds in social activist movements and are committed to creating social change through public education. All faculty are firmly committed to democratic public education as the best available means for achieving social and economic equality for all citizens. Our commitment to restructuring education is evident in faculty members' active participation in K-12 reform, coursework we provide that emphasizes innovation, and in relationships with our clinical site partners as we assist their transition to site-based models of governance. Our commitment to social change is also visible in curricular emphasis on multi-cultural education, alternative assessment, advocacy for children, and innovative approaches to instructional methods.

Another way our program emphasizes social action is by requiring that students perform 30 hours of community service. Faculty as well perform many forms of community service, such as participating in annual AIDS Walks, giving presentations, and volunteering at local shelters.

Proactive Selection of Partner School Sites and Teachers

Another aspect of the alternative nature of Antioch's program is our careful selection of public school partners. All sites have well-articulated missions and philosophies, are public alternative schools, and/or are actively engaged in restructuring efforts to improve the school's climate, teaching and learning processes, governance, and curriculum. One of our schools is a member of the Powerful Schools Network, one is committed to serving special needs students through an inclusion model, and another has mastered an open classroom model. These examples speak loudly to the Antioch commitment to expose our students to the best that public education has to offer. We also work with other quality schools in the city and at a distance, often accommodating students' geographical requests.

Our efforts to select quality school sites and supervisory field teachers reflects our goal to further the aims of public education while providing pre-service students with innovative educational models. We seek out field personnel whose teaching practices

include implementation of multi-modal instructional approaches, effective classroom management skills, demonstrated leadership skills, and participation in school improvement or restructuring projects.

Integration of Theory and Practice

As we further refine our partnerships with our clinical sites, the university is better able to integrate field and course experiences. We currently create field assignments for all the courses and schedule field visits immediately following methods courses in an effort to help students make the necessary connections between theory and practice. Efforts to bridge theory and practice requires faculty to search for new and better ways to give students opportunities to test theories in the field.

Integration of Adult Students' Previous Life Experiences.

Our program serves mid-career adults with diverse life experiences and perspectives which the program values. Our relationships with the students are simultaneously collegial and advisory; we provide support for the students' personal and professional needs, and seek to establish relationships of trust and mutual respect. Students conduct workshops in their areas of expertise at the university each summer, they identify how they have served as change agents in previous jobs, and how their prior life experiences benefit them in the classroom. Many are asked to conduct workshops at their placement schools to share their expertise with teachers in areas such as the arts, computer science, and literacy issues.

The faculty model problem-solving for the students as they are confronted with the demands of an intensive, year-long graduate program. For example, we encourage students to voice their concerns about program experiences and to submit alternative solutions to perceived problems. We invite them to participate in decision-making processes such as faculty hiring and program refinement. Students are empowered through such experiences and glimpse their future roles as decision-makers and change agents in their schools. Such participation also eases the stress of the intensive program and resultant changes in their lives.

While the Antioch University Teacher Certification Program presents an alternative model for midcareer adults, the USDOE Grant *Teachers Teaching Teachers* enabled us to further our philosophical and programmatic goals. What follows is a description of the grant, its implementation, strengths and weaknesses, insights into what was learned, and subsequent next steps.

The Teachers Teaching Teachers Grant: Practicing Our Beliefs - Again

In 1991, Antioch received a two year USDOE Mid-Career Teacher Training Grant of $99,000 to provide funding for two major efforts: (1) the development of clinical site partnerships with area public schools and (2) the establishment of a mentoring program for its graduates. These grant efforts were natural extensions of the certification program, consistent with our desire to encourage collaboration and professional growth.

In a memo to the Antioch community describing the USDOE Mid-Career Teacher Training Grant, Teacher Certification Coordinator Linda Campbell (1991) wrote:

> "Teachers Teaching Teachers provides critical support to beginning teachers, instills collegial roles at school sites, enhances the professional nature of educators, upgrades the knowledge base of experienced teachers, nurtures change at the school site and establishes new forms of university/school partnership so that, together, these institutions may evolve into effective learning communities."

Specifically, the main components of the grant provided:

- that Antioch certification graduates receive mentoring support during their first year of teaching.
- that mentoring teachers could serve as clinical faculty and receive a stipend for such contributions
- that Antioch University faculty would offer workshops at the clinical sites, retreats, and other special events for mentoring teachers and their colleagues.
- that Antioch students, beginning with the 1994 cohort, would have their field experience with Antioch graduates teaching in clinical sites.

These four components represent new approaches for many university teacher education faculty. These efforts are consistent with the Antioch philosophy of the decentralization and personal ownership of knowledge and are based in respect for the work teachers do and the need for developing in new practitioners the same sense of empowerment and community most enjoyed in their previous careers.

Clinical Site Partnerships

The Teachers Teaching Teachers Grant enabled Antioch to establish clinical site partnerships with three elementary schools and one middle school in the Seattle area. The schools were selected for their commitment to innovation, to site-based decision-making, and to better serving the needs of diverse student populations.

Clinical site personnel were expected to serve as adjunct faculty, to host Antioch students during field observations and student teaching, to commit to hire Antioch graduates when possible, and to advise the university at regular program design retreats about teacher education issues. In return, the university provided funding to assist each school in the implementation of its clinical site responsibilities, offered in-service workshops to the clinical sites, and developed a for-credit mentoring course for clinical site teachers working with Antioch students and graduates. These roles and responsibilities were intended to provide longterm support for mid-career adults as they make the transition to teaching.

The Mentoring Program

The grant resulted in the development of an independent study course on mentoring available to teachers who supervise Antioch students or mentor newly hired Antioch graduates. This three-credit course is offered at reduced cost allowing teachers additional credits for advancement on the salary schedule while providing important research-based information on mentoring. Teachers reported that no other institution out of the 19 who certify teachers in Washington State had provided information on how to mentor others. It appears that the USDOE Grant enabled Antioch to create the state's first university course on mentoring for teachers who assume such roles.

Methodology

Qualitative research methodology was the most suitable approach for the purposes of this report for a number of reasons:

1) the semi-structured interview format encourages emergent issues to be voiced,
2) this research design better captures the subtle nuances of university-school partnerships.
3) qualitative measures enable whole-person insights;
4) it is consistent with the philosophic orientations of the Antioch Teacher Certification Program;
5) a narrative structure closely approximates Antioch's existing evaluation system.

Effective qualitative methodology relies on numerous data sources. Collecting raw data from multiple sources allows for triangulation; triangulation in turn assures more useful interpretation of events. The following methods were employed to obtain the information necessary for this report:

- document analysis
- interviews with 30 clinical site personnel and university personnel
- participant-observation, and
- demographic data describing clinical site practitioners.

Among the documents analyzed were meeting agendas and notes, retreat agendas and notes, letters between the university and clinical sites, and memos which circulated among university faculty. These documents provide a developmental view of the processes involved in both building the clinical site program and the mentoring efforts. They also provide insight into the thinking and interactions of faculty as they brought the grant to life.

Demographic data describing the clinical site practitioners is provided first to enable a comprehensive perspective of the classroom teachers involved in the grant. As can be seen from the following chart, the teachers have a wide variety of experiences with pre-service students and with teacher preparation institutions. This information helps clarify the uniqueness of the Antioch program.

The teachers who work with Antioch were able to serve in a number of capacities: a *cooperating teacher* working with a student teacher, a *host teacher* sharing the classroom with an early field experience student, an *adjunct faculty* member, a *clinical site liaison* charged with coordinating placements at the site, part of a *mentoring team* and/or a member of the *Professional Education Advisory Board.* The 26 teachers interviewed had a range of experiences with student teachers and with various universities.

Twenty-six teachers from the four clinical sites were interviewed; 19 have served as cooperating and host teachers. Four were adjunct faculty and five were part of a mentoring pair. 5 were male and 21 female. (Only two male graduates agreed to participate in the mentoring program; one was interviewed. The remaining 7 Antioch graduates who participated in the mentoring program were female.) Only 5 ethnic minorities were represented, inlcuding one African-American and three Asian-Americans, and one person of Middle Eastern descent. The participating teachers had an mean of 16.78 years experience, with the median falling between 16-17 years and a mode of 20. The teachers have been working with student teachers ranging from 2 to 22 years. They have worked with 224 student teachers in various capacities with nearly half the 19

teacher education universities in Washington State. The participating schools included two urban elementary schools, one urban middle school, and one suburban elementary school. Each of the urban schools' population included approximately 50% bused students and 50% neighborhood students, according to Seattle's 'Choice Schools' model. The suburban elementary school serves low-income, highly transient students; it also has a high degree of identified special needs students. With this information as background, the research results are presented below.

Clinical Site Partnerships That Work!

The grant was successful in helping Antioch University Seattle institutionalize practices to better ensure success and retention of mid-career adults as teachers in elementary and middle schools. A major goal of the grant was to develop true partnerships with K-8 schools. Our research indicates that we met this goal. The high visibility of the university faculty (especially as supervisors during the student teaching quarter), participation of classroom teachers as adjunct faculty, inclusion of practitioners at planning retreats, and implementation of practitioners' ideas were cited most often as critical to the partnership. Practitioners reported strong feelings of collegiality with the university, indicating that the availability of Antioch faculty as consultants, workshop presenters, and colleagues reflected the high professional esteem university faculty held for classroom teachers.

Participating teachers who served as mentors described their mentoring relationship as a partnership rather than a hierarchical pairing. The experienced teachers claimed they learned as much about the teaching/learning process from the relationship as the new teacher did. Part of this success was attributed to the self-selection process and part was due to the Antioch curriculum's focus on current cognitive research and integrated teaching practices.

Operationally, the responsibilities delinated above have been met by both the schools and the university. Clinical site personnel, in a series of interviews, indicated that one of the major benefits of the clinical site partnership was the availability of university faculty for inservices. Clinical site faculty also valued the $2500 allocation they received from the university. This money was used by all four sites to further their staff development agenda of enhancing mentoring skills and services: one site brought in specialists, another compensated its teachers for attending a weekend retreat, and others purchased professional resource materials. These expenditures enhanced the mentoring process by increasing each site's professional knowledge base. For example, teachers learned how to more effectively implement multiple intelligence and cooperative learning

strategies, thereby increasing the practical application of those strategies as well as reflecting methods taught at the university. Another school met to discuss steps to take to further its site-based management governance model, again implementing what Antioch teaches in its preparation program. Allocation of these funds with so few strings attached was perceived by the clinical site teachers as an expression of trust; that the university trusted their decision-making authority.

Teachers cited two additional indicators of the university's high regard for the clinical site practitioners: one was the presence of the university faculty on sites as student teaching supervisors, and the other was the invitations extended to the clinical site faculty to attend and participate in planning retreats. In the words of one clinical site administrator,

> "It is obvious that Antioch doesn't take us for granted, doesn't act as if we're doing it a favor, and we really appreciate that attitude."

Other practitioners echoed that theme in a number of ways.

> "I like the way that Antioch works with our school itself. We're very fortunate to have another one of your students in our program. I feel it is a nice support of our program... and you know what I really liked, was being invited to your university classroom... I think it helps us see what you're doing and how to maybe work with your students in a better way."

> "We had a Saturday session, and we were able to pay staff to attend... you are really looking at teacher time, and how much we require of teachers to put in as extra..."

> "I think the enthusiasm of both the Antioch staff and the students is wonderful. It feels real good. It's real quality. Your support of the school, your interest in what's going on in schools, and what you want to share with us feels very collaborative... we can be open with each other."

Clinical site liaisons pointed to one significant problem area. Even though they give Antioch students priority in placements over students from other universities, the intensive nature of our program and the quantity of field placements creates a burden for

the teachers. There is a tension between the clinical sites' desire to participate and the realities of hosting many students each quarter. This tension is exacerbated by demands made by other universities (there are 6 other teacher certification programs operating in the Seattle area) and by commitments made by the cooperating teachers themselves. We have attempted to address this issue by expanding the number of available clinical sites to eight schools during the year following the grant and by investigating ways to make the placement process more efficient.

In addition to hosting students, teachers also expressed concerns about inadequate communication of expectations.

> "I think the teachers could use some breaks. Maybe Wednesday afternoons students shouldn't behere so you don't have your shadows..."
>
> "I don't think my September experience student really knew what to expect, what to do once she got there, or what her outcome was supposed to be. It didn't seem clear to her. And it wasn't real clear to us as teachers, what was expected of us."
>
> "We need to know the difference between a 2-week and a 3-week experience. Do we have them jump in and do something, or is it OK if they're just sitting in the back the whole time? There should be some clear definition on that."
>
> "I think somehow spreading the students out a bit would help our staff. We get so overwhelmed with students and placement requests from the different universities that we could use a break..."

This feedback from the cooperating teachers led the university to add four new clinical sites for the 1993-1994 school year. This helps to remedy teacher burnout and brings our total clinical site number to eight, all of which exemplify innovative, committed educational practices in diverse settings. One new site is a non-graded K-8 model, still another is an environmentally-focused alternative public school, and one elementary site has adopted the James Comer Model of community decision-making and management. These models allow us to offer our students experiences which are diverse and challenging. We have also created field manuals, suggested calendars of activities,

field assignments and assessment tools for students and teachers to address communication concerns.

Developing and nurturing the clinical sites is a ongoing process: dialogue must always be open, university liaisons must regularly visit the sites to 'check in', and site representatives must feel free to initiate contact us when there is a need for information and feedback.

Our model of clinical site partnerships is fluid: we continually reevaluate our relationships and reflect on what is working and what isn't. We listen to our sites, we collaborate with them, we value their input and perspective. All 26 clinical site practitioners we interviewed stated unequivocally that our work with their school was empowering to the teaching staff.

The university faculty felt both elation and constraints with the clinical site program. As public school teachers' expectations increased and as they became more comfortable in their role as critic and partner in program design, the university faculty felt greater pressure. The most problematic issue for them was time demands. Clinical sites began to request more complementary in-service training from the university. Since university personnel were already engaged in full-time instructional responsibilities and as school consultants, their time was limited. In addition, faculty realized there had to be a limit to the number of pro-bono offerings they could provide. This conflict has been remedied by the faculty combining to offer an extension course for clinical site teachers once yearly. In addition, the faculty has begun discussing ways to incorporate a site-based Master's program to support a district's yearly needs.

Other faculty responses to the program were positive:

> "Working with schools is exciting. It's actually reinforcing to see how many positive things are going on."

> "We're fortunate to be working with such open-minded schools. Our students are reaping terrific benefits by observing and student teaching with such professionals."

Overall, the faculty enjoys the challenges connected with working with public school teachers and administrators. The feeling is that the process is giving the university greater and continued impetus to reflect upon and refine its program to better serve new teachers of the 1990's. While the USDOE grant served as a catalyst for Antioch to establish clinical sites, all faculty members are committed to maintaining such partnerships as an ongoing aspect of our certification program.

Mentoring Teams That Feel Like Partnerships

A second critical decision was not to limit the program to those employed only by clinical sites, in public schools, or full-time: rather, Antioch graduates employed in any school in the Puget Sound area could participate in this unique program. The original goal of the grant was to provide two mentors for each new teacher; this was modified to a one-to-one ratio once the program was implemented. This decision was based on the realities of teacher time, scheduling, and curriculum commitments.

The team decided to create an independent study mentoring course to assist the mentors with the mentoring process. The five credit course was developed by Antioch faculty and designed so that participating mentors and their proteges could be supported in their efforts. The course was also designed to minimize the time spent on campus and best utilize the time the teachers spent at their site.

In addition, we decided to make the available to cooperating teachers as a compensation option for their work with our students. For a reduced enrollment fee, the cooperating teachers could register for the mentoring course, complete it during the student teaching quarter, and earn credit to apply to their salary schedules.

A key facet of a successful mentoring effort is self-selection of mentors as opposed to assigning partners (Christensen and Conway, 1990). For that reason, our mentoring program was designed to allow each participant time to seek out and find one another. Once a teacher is hired, s/he is encouraged to identify a colleague with whom she has common interests, skills, goals, etc. Participants discover each other through normal interaction at their school sites and often find themselves working together in an informal mentoring relationship. Once they decide to formalize their partnership, they are invited to take a course in mentoring and meet with other mentor teams regularly to assess their work and investigate new strategies to further their professional growth.

We asked that selection be made by October and the teams were then invited to Antioch to receive their packets. Included in the packet was general information about the mentoring course. Meetings were scheduled monthly and mentor teams were encouraged and given free rein to pursue their own professional and personal needs within the context of their schools. The mentoring project was piloted in early 1992, refined for the 1992-1993 school year, and further improved for the 1993-94 school year.

The success of the mentoring component of the grant was mixed. As stated below by mentors and 'mentees' we interviewed, the program's success included the course content and the self-selection components.

"I think the course packet was excellent... I appreciate the fact that it wasn't locking us in to specific things that we had to do but offered us suggestions for direction. And it was very helpful."

"It worked out really well for me because she is the head teacher and was also a kindergarten teacher... we kind of found each other naturally... it helped that the Antioch program was here because it gave us a structure within which to work and to move ahead."

"...in my position in activities, I tend to think that people might need some help understanding some of the school activities, so I'd already gotten to know him that way. And so, we didn't change our relationship, we simply got a pittance for doing it. It was nice."

"I got involved initially with the pilot mentoring program setting up some of the basic procedures, going over the initial concepts, timing them out. I located a mentor, somebody that I respected very much that I felt I could work with and learn from. And I've been involved ever since."

An unexpected program strength came from the effect of the mentoring relationship on the mentor. The relationship became collegial; both participants benefited. The designated 'mentor' felt more like a partner in the learning process; she gained as much from the relationship as did the 'mentee'. When conversations turned to the mentoring relationships, the overwhelming response centered around the professional growth experienced by both members of the team. In fact, the relationship was characterized more as a partnership, as collegial, rather than hierarchical. The 'mentors' all held the view that the partnership greatly improved their teaching as well as improved the practice of the novice teachers.

"The strength of being a mentor teacher is that I really got to reflect a lot on my own practices and beliefs, which was really good. To talk to someone else about it: what I felt, what my values were, what my experiences have been, to explain that to someone else really called for a lot of reflecting."

"It's very nice to have someone to talk with, to share my successes and failures with. For me, it's working very much as having somebody that

I can share my enthusiasm and excitement with; somebody that will listen and is interested in what I'm doing."

"My mentoring 'protege' has outstanding ideas. I think of her as really a good person who came from Antioch. Because she has so much knowledge on seven intelligences and learning styles . . .she opened me up to a lot of ideas in a real supportive climate."

There were problems with the mentoring program. These had to do with timing and with support for the supporters. Each mentoring team was awarded $500.00 to apply to their professional growth activities in any way they found useful. Unfortunately, the money was not allocated until the spring, which frustrated the mentors.

Another area of weakness was that the independent study course was too loosely structured. There were two meetings only lightly attended by mentoring teams. At these meetings they were given enrollment forms and little else perceived as valuable. The statements below come from mentor course participants at elementary and middle school levels.

"One of the weaknesses is that we didn't really have an orientation into the mentoring course, in terms of being at Antioch to discuss what the mentoring program was all about. We got the booklet. We got that kind of late, too. And if we had an initial session at Antioch to talk about what the mentoring program was all about, and go through it , preview it, and then work independently, I would have felt more grounded with it."

"As I recall, Keith was given the opportunity to have a mentor, and then he said, 'OK, this is who I'd like to work with.' And then the university contacted me and said, 'He's interested in working with you as a mentor.' Now that was very pleasant because I knew I'd been requested. Beyond that, we had no guidelines, and it was sort of 'Now what?'"

"I know it was the first time you went through it, but we didn't know for a while that it was changed from five credits to three credits. And... another thing is that we still haven't gotten our money for this year and it's now June. Timeliness is pretty important because we're trying to do our part."

> "One thing is the funding. There were some opportunities we had that we passed up because we haven't received any of the funds yet. One was for substitute money. It was very difficult to arrange to get a substitute so we could leave the building. We very much wanted to observe some excellent classrooms together where she could help me make meaning of what I saw. But we've yet had the opportunity because there's been a delay in reimbursement."

These criticisms are well-founded; they also reflect the success of our ability to build a program perceived as collegial. Specifically addressing the mentoring program's weaknesses has clarified the importance of timing and support.

There was another problematic area: of the 28 students of the first Antioch cohort who had the opportunity to participate in the pilot mentoring program, nine accepted. Of the nine, only two were males. During the second year, there were no males who participated in the mentoring program. What accounts for this disproportionality? The answer may be in the very design of the program: the midcareer males who make up nearly half the cohorts, have all been successful in business and may feel they are capable of succeeding without help. Another perspective may be the general tendency of males to be reluctant to accept help; the image of the rugged individualist springs to mind. We are continuing to research this phenomenon.

Believing in Our Practices: Additional Actions

All of the interviewees indicated that they are impressed with our commitment to the partnership. Indicators of our commitment included the visibility of our faculty supervisors, eliciting practitioner input on a regular basis, and changes we make in the program based on practitioner input.

The Antioch faculty supervise each student minimally three times each month; students receive more supervision if there is a perceived need. In addition, the supervisors regularly pay visits to the classroom teachers or principal as part of the supervisory process. Since there is usually a cluster of two to six students at one site, the supervisor often spends the entire day at the site. This allows the Antioch faculty to gain greater insight into the schools' unique cultures and missions. One teacher commented,

> "...it's very important for the supervisor to know the class, the personality of the classroom and the individuals in the classroom that the student teacher is dealing with, because not all classrooms are created equal and not all groups of children are created equal. For you

to really assess how this particular student teacher is doing, you have to be there a lot to see the kinds of personalities they have to deal with."

From lunchtime conversations which take place at the sites, we as university faculty are better equipped to meet the staff development needs of the clinical site as well as better understand the conditions under which our students work. This in turn results in coursework and field preparation that more closely resembles the reality of modern urban public schools.

Clinical site practitioners appreciate being part of the design process at Antioch. Their input is elicited and acted upon in two major ways. First, they are invited to planning retreats two to three times each year. The planning teams include Antioch faculty, PEAB members, administrators and teachers from the four original clinical sites.

The agendas for the planning retreats include: introductions, historical overviews, current tasks, brainstorming sessions, preliminary planning, and implementation strategies. The three retreats, December 1991, May 1992, and May 1993, consisted of discussions centered around roles and responsibilities, various compensation options, problem-solving, and the teacher education curriculum.

The most interesting facet of the processes were the openness of the teachers when asked for their input. They unabashedly spoke their minds, giving Antioch personnel honest, in-depth critiques and suggestions for improvement.

"When you send your students out in January, February, March, they come wanting to do lessons or units in areas we aren't covering. Can't you prepare them better for what we're doing in the classroom?"

"I really think you should come into our classrooms and demonstrate lessons, use my students as examples for your students. You could even have them come in to do microteaching with my kids. They need that dose of reality."

"There's not enough emphasis on lesson planning or classroom management. They come not knowing how to do lesson plans and you can't have a group of middle school kids for 45 minutes and not have a plan."

"They need to be with us longer, especially in the spring, when we're planning for the fall. Sometimes they leave right after school and they miss out."

As is evident, during these sessions the curriculum of the Antioch program is the subject of discussion and revisioning. While each practitioner carries his or her own vision for a satisfactory teacher education program, some common elements do emerge. For example, we have made three programmatic changes for the 1994 Cohort based on input gathered at retreats: 1) we are not placing students in classrooms beyond the second week in May, 2) we are collecting information from the teachers on units they are teaching during the winter and spring so that university methods and theory courses and field assignments will be more congruent with the teachers' work, and 3) we are planning teaching episodes in clinical site classrooms.

Viewing the clinical site partnership as mutually beneficial is another theme which emerged from the interviews. The practitioners stated they appreciated the inservices and the $2500.00 granted the site to assist with implementation of its grant responsibilities. However, as much as the financial aspect was welcomed, there was greater indication that the most valued University input was in the form of inservice and feedback regarding "what we're doing right or wrong". A number of teachers also invited University faculty to teach in their classrooms in an attempt to keep current with present-day conditions and to model good practices for the certification candidates.

"I think of it as dying and going to heaven, because I have always thought that one of the most exciting things about teaching is to be affiliated with a college in the town you are teaching in... I have always heard of other people maybe being affiliated with a university professor, and then they come out and do some training, and I think now we have a whole university. We can do anything. We could ask for any information, and you could hook us up with that."

"I think the strength would be helping to keep our faculty current on publications, articles, research and best practices to give us that intellectual tie-in, to keep us from getting too stale."

Many teachers also said that having Antioch interns in their classrooms,

"...forces us to become better teachers... it's kind of an update to hear what they have to say."

Two examples of the 'updates' teachers learn of is the research and practice of multiple intelligence theory. We spend a good deal of time with these two concepts and provide the students with many opportunities to operationalize them in their lessons. The students then take them to the classrooms and support the teachers' development and implementation. Another benefit some teachers noted was the variety of ways the Antioch faculty interacted with them; one faculty member substituted in 4 classrooms, others presented at inservices, and clinical site teachers were invited to present at numerous times during the three quarters of coursework.

The teachers also see the University benefiting primarily by having placements for our students. They are clear that, from our interactions, that they are doing us a favor rather than us doing them one. This perception came up repeatedly; teachers knew through the totality of their experiences with us that we value them, their input and their time and that we recognize the invaluable service they are providing our program.

Teachers with whom our students work commented on the quality of the overall educational experience Antioch students have. First among curricular strengths is the focus on multi-cultural education and our commitment to diversity. Teachers feel that Antioch students are unusually committed to working in ethnically and economically diverse settings.

Since our clinical site partners have some of the most diverse student populations and are involved in restructuring, the certification candidates get multiple, quality field experiences in which meaningful work is conducted.

It was also requested by clinical site faculty that Antioch students somehow learn to be less judgmental about practices in the 'real world' during their initial field observations.

One teacher, an Antioch graduate, commented interestingly,

> "I caution them about getting into the blind men and the elephant syndrome... You come in to observe, and it's very easy to make broad generalizations based on what you see And those broad generalizations can be misleading."

In response to this input, Antioch faculty are also rethinking the sequence of its courses; for example, in 1994 we begin the program with anthropologically-based observation, description, and interpretation techniques, a strategy which would more adequately prepare the student for their post-certification master's research projects. However, this is but one change generated by the evaluation of the grant. There are others

• We revamped the course in learning styles to stress more the teaching implications of style and to introduce students to the ambiguities inherent in the discussion of learning styles by framing the study as the unveiling of questions.
• Each faculty member is responsible for 12-14 advisees and will meet weekly to discuss emergent issues as well as engage in microteaching and discuss student concerns around classroom management and student discipline.
• Service-learning principles are being applied to the community service component of our program as a model of experiential learning and social action.
• We have established 'field adjuncts' at the clinical sites who conduct weekly sessions focusing on both emergent and required curriculum issues with our students during filed experience weeks and student teaching.
• We are also instituting monthly "class meetings" in an effort to further student involvment in the program processes.
• Student teaching has been extended three additional weeks with students returning to campus one afternoon per week for reflection and inquiry.

We hope these program modifications strengthen our students' abilities as teachers. The Antioch Seattle Teacher Certification program is dynamic, responsive, committed to excellence, and developmental. We are in our fourth year and look forward to continued partnerships with students, practitioners, and colleagues.

Bibliography

1. Alkove, L. and McCarty, B. Plain Talk: Recognizing Positivism and Constructivism in Practice. Action in Teacher Education. 1992 Jun; XIV(2): 16-22.

2. Browne, Carol. Classroom Teachers as Teacher Educators: Towards Building Collaborative Linkages. Action in Teacher Education. 1992 Jun; XIV(2): 30-37.

3. Campbell, L. Dickinson , D., and Campbell, B. Teaching and Learning Through the Multiple Intelligences. : New Horizons for Learning; 1992.

4. Campbell, Linda M. Practicing Beliefs: Teacher Education at Antioch University.

5. Catalano, A. and Tillie, D. Power and Involvement in Pre-Service Teacher Education. ERIC.

6. Christensen, J. and Conway, D. The Use of Self-Selected Mentors by Beginning and New-to-District Teachers. Action in Teacher Education. 1990 Dec; XII(4): 21-28.

7. Ciscell, Robert. Who's Teaching America's Teachers? Educational Leadership. 1993 Mar; 50(6): 14-15.

8. Cornbleth, Catherine. Knowledge in Curriculum and Teacher Education. Social Education. 1987 Nov: 513-516.

9. Fullan, Michael G. Why Teachers Must Become Change Agents. Educational Leadership. 1993 Mar; 50(6): 12-15.

10. Goodlad, John I. Why We Need a Complete Redesign of Teacher Education. Educational Leadership. 1991 Nov; 49(3): 4-10.

11. Guild, P. and Garger, S. Marching to Different Drummers. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development; 1990.

12. Kennedy, Mary M. Some Surprising Findings on How Teachers Learn to Teach. Educational Leadership. 1991 Nov; 49(3): 14-17.

13. Knight, S. Owens , E., and Waxman, H. Comparing the Classroom Learning Environments of Traditionally and Alternatively Certified Teachers. Action in Teacher Education. 1990; XII(4): 28-35.

14. McCarthy, Bernice. Using the 4MAT System to Bring Learning Styles to Schools. Educational Leadership. 1990 Oct; 48(2): 31-36.

15. McKibben, Michael D. Alternative Teacher Certification Programs. Educational Leadership. 1988 Nov; 46(3): 32-35.

16. O'Neil, John. Making Sense of Style. Educational Leadership. 1990 Oct; 48(2): 4-9.

17. Portman, Penelope. Barriers to Change in Teacher Education. Action in Teacher Education. 1993 Mar; XV(1): 14-21.

18. Powell, Richard. Acquisition and Use of Pedagogical Knowledge Among Career-Change Preservice Teachers. Action in Teacher Education. 1991 Dec; XIII(4): 17-23.

19. Smith, Joe. Flaws in the New Jersey Plan. Educational Leadership. 1991 Nov; 49(3): 32-36.

20. Valli, Linda. Beginning Teacher Problems: Areas for Teacher Education Improvement. Action in Teacher Education. 1992 Mar; XIV(1): 18-25.

21. VerVelde, P. Horn , P., and Steinshouer, E. Teacher Education: On Site, On Target. Educational Leadership. 1991 Nov; 49(3): 18-20.

22. Wise, Arthur E. We Need More Than Redesign. Educational Leadership. 1991 Nov; 49(3): 7.