2021

Assessing Teacher Candidates' Pedagogical Judgement: An Analysis of Clinically-Based Instructional Assignments

Sonia Janis
University of Georgia, soniaelj@uga.edu

Mardi Schmeichel
University of Nebraska, mardi.schmeichel@gmail.com

Joseph McAnulty
University of Georgia, mcanulty@uga.edu

Chantelle Grace
University of Georgia, chantellegrace5@uga.edu

Kaitlin Wegrzyn
University of Georgia, kwegrzyn@uga.edu

Assessing Teacher Candidates' Pedagogical Judgment: An Analysis of Clinically-Based Instructional Assignments

Sonia Janis[1], Mardi Schmeichel[2], Joseph McAnulty[3], Chantelle Grace[1], and Kaitlin Wegrzyn[1]

Abstract

Research on clinically-based teacher education indicates that facilitating clinical experiences for teacher candidates improves their preparation for the profession. While we have answered the call to implement rich clinical experiences in our teacher education program, we have found that we also needed to design new, robust strategies to assess what the candidates are taking away from their clinical experiences. This paper describes our use of Horn and Campbell's (2015) notion of "pedagogical judgment" to analyze the work of social studies teacher candidates in clinical placements. We describe a rubric developed to evaluate candidates' pedagogical judgment and offer insights into the use of this assessment tool as a component of clinically-based teacher education. We explore how the use of this rubric enables targeted evaluations of preservice teachers around specific aspects of pedagogical judgments. We conclude that this rubric could offer a way to unpack how preservice teachers make sense of their emerging understandings and pedagogical practices.

Keywords

teacher education; clinical practice; assessment; social studies

[1] University of Georgia
[2] University of Nebraska
[3] Abilene Christian University

Corresponding Author:

Sonia Janis (Mary Frances Early College of Education, University of Georgia, Aderhold Hall, 105G, Athens, GA, USA, 30602)

email: soniaelj@uga.edu

Introduction

Calls in teacher education encourage programs to attend to the clinical experiences of their teacher candidates. Our social studies teacher education program has worked deliberately with our local schools and mentor teachers to build an evolving set of clinical experiences across our three-semester course sequence. The clinical experience discussed in this article is one component of the clinically-based experiences our candidates encounter. At our program's foundation, we have attempted to integrate an inquiry stance (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009; Dana, 2013; Dana & Yendol-Hoppey, 2014). The research study described here presents one way this inquiry stance informs the practices we hope our teacher candidates adopt and also our program's approach to clinical practice. These efforts draw on research that promotes clinical preparation that models exemplary pedagogies (e.g., Darling-Hammond, 2006; Louden & Rohl, 2006) in the certification program. To that end, practicing high-leverage social studies strategies (e.g., Cuenca, 2020) is embedded in the requirements of candidates' clinical experiences (e.g., AACTE, 2018; Ball & Forzani, 2009; Grossman et al., 2009; Kazemi et al., 2009; Lampert et al., 2013; McDonald et al., 2013; Windschitl et al., 2012).

During our first few semesters focusing on high-leverage strategies, we made significant changes to what the teacher candidates read, wrote, and talked about in our coursework. Further, we significantly increased both the time teacher candidates spent interacting with secondary students and the number of structured opportunities they had to plan and teach lessons. Both the change in content and pedagogies, as well as the work required to create structured clinical opportunities for the teacher candidates to practice high-leverage strategies, required significant effort. However, we began to recognize that we had not planned for the needed (re)design of assessments that could measure both teacher candidates' understandings and the efficacy of our efforts. In other words, we had correctly anticipated that working to support teacher candidates' capacity to implement exemplary pedagogies during their clinical experiences would require the revision and rethinking of our teacher education pedagogy, but we had not adequately anticipated how our clinically-based assessments would also have to undergo significant revision to better reflect the depth and richness of the context in which teacher candidates were now interacting with students. The recognition of the gap in our practice resulted in the study described here, which we based on the following research questions:

- How do teacher candidates make sense of their pedagogy and students' understandings of the content?
- How can clinically-based assessments measure and support teacher candidates' capacities to make sense of their pedagogy and students' understandings?

In this article, we address these questions by describing our attempts to respond to the assessment gap in our program by adopting and implementing a rubric that evaluates teacher candidates' *pedagogical judgment* (Horn & Campbell, 2015). In describing our work, we aim to contribute to the "long-overdue pedagogical shift" to prepare teacher candidates "through an interwoven structure of academic learning and professional application of knowledge" (NCATE, 2010).

Literature Review

One unrelenting challenge we have experienced in our teacher education program is facilitating the transfer of the high-leverage practices we teach about in our classes to teacher candidates' use of those high-leverage practices in clinical spaces. Drawing on McTighe's (2014) work, we define transfer as the capacity to apply learning to varied and complex contexts. As McTighe (2014) explained, "Transfer is about intelligently and effectively drawing from your own repertoire, independently, to handle particular contexts on your own" (p. 1). McTighe's concept of transfer describes what teachers should be aiming for in their work within P-12 classrooms, but we assert that the concept is also helpful for thinking about how teacher candidates apply their understandings from program coursework to their teaching practice. The pedagogies and strategies described in this study are working towards transfer: we want our candidates to transfer what they learn in their teacher education courses to their own practice with students in 6-12 classrooms.

Transfer is a useful way of framing the theory-to-practice gap in the clinical spaces of teacher education. For example, the need to improve transfer is embedded in Ball and Forzani's (2009) call that teacher educators "shift [the] focus on what teacher [candidates] know…to a greater focus on what teacher [candidates] do" (p. 503). Achieving transfer requires "weav[ing] together novices' development of meaningful knowledge for teaching with their capacity to actually enact ambitious teaching" in secondary social studies classrooms (McDonald et al., 2013, p. 379). To accomplish transfer, candidates need to have not only an understanding of pedagogy but also an opportunity to engage in experiences that allow them to apply that knowledge to their pedagogical decisions and actions. In the literature review that follows, we describe three interrelated strategies that promote transfer in clinical spaces.

First, the research literature on teacher education indicates it is imperative for teacher candidates to engage in reflective analysis of their teaching enactments with students. Reflection has been found to effectively assist candidates to "make meaning from the [teaching] situations" (Loughran, 2002, p. 36). For example, Brouwer and Korthagen (2005) found their "students reported moving back and forth between action and reflection…[which] enabled them to achieve mounting levels of competence" (p. 214). Similarly, Broyles et al. (2011) explained the teacher candidates in their study "acknowledged change in their behavior and transferred specific teaching behaviors as a result of their participation" in a reflective process (p. 62). Research on clinically-based teacher education establishes clearly that reflection is a key component of achieving transfer.

Secondly, research on clinically-based teacher education suggests that to better prepare our candidates to make good decisions "in the moment" (Ball & Forzani, 2009, p. 503), we must help them develop the capacity to analyze and describe their choices. This involves creating assignments designed to "support teachers in learning to first notice what is significant in a classroom interaction, then interpret that event, and then use those interpretations to inform pedagogical decisions" (Van Es & Sherin, 2002, p. 575). Ericsson et al. (1993) referred to this theory-to-practice work as "deliberate practice," or "highly structured activit[ies] [with the] explicit goal of improving performance" (p. 368). Ghousseini and Sleep (2011) described this kind of clinical practice as "learning in and from being able to see, hear, and understand the

many details of classrooms (e.g., the content, the students, and the work of the teacher) and use this knowledge to analyze and improve one's own teaching" (p. 148). The kind of on-the-ground theory-to-practice support described here is often more difficult to capture and enact than other teacher education activities, like helping teacher candidates understand the components of quality lesson planning. In other words, the kinds of experiences teacher candidates encounter in clinical spaces requires a kind of teacher education pedagogy that is substantially different from the on-campus approaches to teacher education. Helping candidates improve their pedagogical decisions requires sufficient prompting and scaffolding to unpack how their idiosyncratic decisions (e.g., "noticing," "in the moment") influence the kind of student learning that can happen as a result of their instruction.

To achieve this kind of theory-to-practice integration, teacher educators must support teacher candidates' capacities to enact high-leverage practices early in their clinical experiences (Lampert & Graziani, 2009). This orientation addresses a third interrelated practice we found in the literature—structured field experiences. As university-based teacher educators, we must create deliberate and supportive clinical experiences that guide teacher candidates' development as pedagogues capable of enacting theory-supported practices. As Allen and Wright (2014) argued, the university supervisor's role in "facilitating the integration of theory and practice…is a factor of student learning that clearly cannot be overlooked" (p. 147). Ghousseini and Sleep's (2011) findings indicated that if teacher candidates are to learn:

> in and from practice, the onus is squarely on the teacher educators to not only frame representations of teaching using productive professional learning tasks, but [to] help teachers learn to use practice in ways that are more likely to result in learning. (p. 149)

To do this, they argued teacher educators must help candidates "mak[e] practice studyable" (p. 149). Similarly, Heath (2017) asserted teacher educators are critical to redirecting the teacher candidates "toward relevant processes occurring in the classroom" and asking them to analyze "what they are seeing and to make connections to theory" (p. 22).

For social studies candidates to accomplish the kind of knowledge-to-practice transfer of high-leverage practices we intend, we must address the complexity of early practicums as sites that create the opportunity for meaningful self-assessment of practice. Cuenca (2020) proposes seven core practices in social studies education. We have taken careful attention to engage our candidates in the enactment of three of them for the past number of years: (1) "using interpretive questions," (2) "connecting inquiries to students' lives," and (3) "extending inquiry into civic lives" (p. 7). We selected and began to work with our teacher candidates around these particular practices because of their transferability across each of the social studies disciplines (i.e., geography, economics, political science, and history). While collaborating with our partner mentor teachers, these were the three practices that they agreed would be impactful on the 6-12 grade students' learning, adaptable to the district's instructional vision, and enhance our candidates' capacities as novice teachers. We found that expecting our teacher candidates to accomplish the transfer of these three high-leverage practices in a clinically-based teacher education experience requires not only that mentor teachers and university-based instructors attend to the transfer of knowledge to practice through new curriculum, pedagogy, and clinical

opportunities, but that new ways of intervening and providing feedback through assessments were also needed.

Context of the Study

Our teacher education program has worked diligently to create opportunities for teacher candidates to practice ambitious methods. While we believe we have made significant strides toward creating the space for practicing these methods in clinical spaces, the faculty recognized we did not have formal structures in place to evaluate the nuances of candidates' clinical practice.

We felt that deliberately framing traits of pedagogical judgment could better mobilize our collaboration across courses and influence the ways our teacher candidates understand how pedagogical judgment can be developed. For example, the clinical experiences we had developed provided teacher candidates the opportunity to practice how to respond to the unexpected. In other words, the clinical experience provided a valuable opportunity for the teacher candidates to explore the dissonance between the moments they had planned and what actually happened in the moment and to analyze their immediate responses and reactions to students that occurred during their instruction. Although we often gave feedback on the teacher candidates' pedagogical responses to students in unanticipated moments, we did not systematically assess this aspect of their practice. As faculty, we did not possess a common tool for discussing what qualities would be considered better representations of candidates' transferring their understanding from their coursework to their pedagogical judgment calls in their field experiences.

Similarly, the clinical experiences we designed in our program provided multiple opportunities for teacher candidates to evaluate their lesson planning and enactment specifically in terms of their students' learning. These assignments invited the teacher candidates to think about their practice, but overall, we noticed their abilities to recognize how their students were engaging in the tasks and demonstrating understanding varied broadly. The candidates received feedback on their analyses, but we had not developed standards of evidence to assess their self-evaluations. Our candidates were not being equipped with explicit instruction to accomplish the transfer of theory-to-practice like we had intended. We had not offered them an opportunity to understand the difference between a more and less sophisticated analysis of their practice and student understanding.

While we have had several years of experience requiring teacher candidates to enact high-leverage (or "core") practices in clinical experiences, we realized assigning these practices was not enough (Cuenca, 2020, p. 3). We had not systematically framed pedagogical judgment as a set of qualities that could be demonstrated through the clinically-based courses. Likewise, we had not been able to identify candidates who needed targeted support in their efforts to develop pedagogical judgment. In essence, we were not enacting the third Tenet in the Central Proclamation of the AACTE Clinical Practice Commission's Report (2018) because we were not "articulating what accomplished is and how to measure it, and then creating the systems that allow teacher candidates to develop over time and under the supervision of accomplished practitioners" (p. 14). In the following sections, we describe how we turned to Horn and

Campbell's (2015) work to help us address this gap in our practice as we sought to more deliberately and systematically achieve these goals.

Pedagogical judgment in clinical practice

Horn and Campbell's (2015) work on "pedagogical judgment" offered a way of thinking about how novice teachers come to think about their practice and their students in ways that can bridge the theory and practice divide. As they explained, pedagogical judgment "is ecological thinking about the classroom" that encourages teacher candidates to consider the complexity of enacting ambitious instruction (Horn & Campbell, p. 155). Specifically, it is a way of characterizing the process through which "teachers accomplished in ambitious instruction reason about situations in ways that keep in mind the interconnectedness among things like classroom climate, teaching moves, student participation…and student learning" (p. 155).

Horn and Campbell (2015) described pedagogical judgment as the kind of enacted, situated knowledge that differs from the "typically inert, propositional knowledge support through acquire-apply pedagogy" (p. 154). The capacity to enact fluent, efficient teaching routines and innovative practices to respond to non-routine events (Lampert, 2010) are characteristics of pedagogical judgment that are "at the very heart of ambitious teaching practices" (Horn & Campbell, 2015, p. 155). By helping teacher candidates learn to address the "perennial puzzles of teaching," like, for example, who to call on and how long to spend on a topic before moving on, teacher educators can help them "sharpen their responsiveness to the critical moments of classroom life" (p. 155).

The notion of pedagogical judgment has much to offer teacher educators who work in clinical settings. In our case, we recognized that while our Professional Development School District (PDSD) relationships had created the spaces for our teacher candidates to try out ambitious teaching practices, they demonstrated a broad range of capacities to recognize how their students were engaging in the tasks and demonstrating their understanding. Some grasped the "broad terrain of student learning and [understood the value of] giving students opportunities for sensemaking…leading to different images of [student] 'engagement,'" while others did not (Horn & Campbell, 2015, p. 167).

In the following sections, we describe our use of Horn and Campbell's (2015) notion of pedagogical judgment to develop a rubric to evaluate the teacher candidates' experiences with students in clinical placements. Then, we use the data generated from the teacher candidates' responses to demonstrate how the rubric can be used to assess their self-evaluations and identify strengths and weaknesses in their field-based practice. Finally, we describe how the pedagogical judgment rubric can contribute to teacher educators' capacity to support candidates' clinical experiences in more meaningful ways.

Methodology

Our teacher education program participates in a Professional Development School District (PDSD) partnership that facilitates learning experiences for teacher candidates in the local schools. The study described here draws on 31 social studies teacher candidates' coursework in

our combined bachelor's and master's degree certification program in the 2017-2018 school year. The data used for this study were drawn specifically from the teacher candidates' work on two assignments in which they designed and taught multi-day inquiry lessons during their initial practicum in PDSD classrooms. We used the same set of prompts (see Figure 1) after each inquiry lesson to support teacher candidates' capacity to assess their lessons' efficacy and consider how students experienced them. This is the kind of assignment that Van Es and Sherin (2002) encouraged, as these "reviews" prompted the candidates to notice significant occurrences in the classroom, interpret those, and then make pedagogical decisions based on those interpretations. These two "review" assignments were completed after each of their inquiry lessons.

Figure 1: Review Assignment Prompts

1. What was challenging *for the* **students** in this lesson?
2. What challenges did you have in ***your*** *efforts to teach*?
3. What would you adjust about **your** *lesson design* to make this a better experience for your **students**?
4. What would you adjust about **your** *instruction* to make this a better learning experience for your **students**?

After the end of the semester, the research team met to discuss what the review assignments had produced, what understandings we could or could not identify in the candidates' responses, and what characteristics we would identify as sophisticated or unsophisticated responses to the questions. Our first analysis of these review assignments was unstructured but collaborative, as we each read through the samples of the candidates' and our interpretations of their pedagogical interpretations. We each described what we believed to be high-quality interpretations of practice by the candidates and which were of lower quality. As our conversation continued, certain traits of pedagogical interpretation seemed to outweigh other traits, and we began to see some patterns developing. While we were satisfied with the questions themselves, we did not feel we had a systematic way of determining what made some responses better than others.

At that point, we turned to Horn and Campbell (2015) and decided to mobilize their description of pedagogical judgment in evaluating the candidates' responses in these review assignments. Specifically, we worked together to operationalize what they referred to as "ecological thinking about the classroom" (p. 155). We brainstormed specific teacher moves and teacher-student interactions that would be evidence of the teacher candidates' ecological thinking and capacity to reflect on their practice from an ecological perspective. One example of this kind of ecological reflection we discussed was the teacher candidates' capacity to recognize that low student engagement could be tied to a boring lesson or task. Another example of the kind of enacted, situated knowledge that Horn and Campbell described was a nuanced perspective on how different students engaged with the lesson rather than monolithic descriptions of the whole class. Horn and Campbell did not provide an extensive list of particular characteristics associated with pedagogical judgment. Still, we found that their descriptions were generative for our efforts to put language to practices that we recognized to be valuable but elusive aspects of effective teacher pedagogy.

After brainstorming characteristics aligned with Horn and Campbell's description of pedagogical judgment, we went back to the data. Each researcher examined the assignments submitted by the same five teacher candidates to identify the presence or absence of pedagogical judgment. We then discussed the sample set and reached a consensus on the parameters for examples and non-examples of evidence of pedagogical judgment. Through this round of analysis, we found that most of the examples of the presence or absence of ecological thinking we had pointed to in the teacher candidates' responses fell into one of two distinct categories (see Figure 2): (a) rich descriptions of students and how they participated in and responded to the lessons and (b) willingness and capacity for pedagogical problem-solving. We decided that these two categories would be the frame through which we would assess the candidates' pedagogical judgment.

The first criterion's focus addresses the challenges novice teachers experience in attending to students' experiences and understanding of the lessons they teach. Specifically, we had often found that when teacher candidates were asked to describe what happened during the lesson, their account often only described their own activities and experiences: students weren't included at all. By requiring that teacher candidates report what the students did and said, and how they responded (or not) to the lesson, we aim to shift the focus of candidates' thinking about the lesson to descriptions that include awareness and thoughtful reflection about what the students did. The second criterion, which focuses on candidates' capacity to see the relationship between their choices and the lesson's success, explicitly advances our program's inquiry stance (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009; Dana, 2013; Dana & Yendol-Hoppey, 2014). By setting the expectation that they inquire into their own practice to problem-solve the kinds of engagement and learning happening with their students, we reinforce our own stance that educators have a responsibility to learn from and through practice.

Along with articulating these two criteria upon which to assess teacher candidates' growth, we drew from the examples of student work we had examined together during the previous round of analysis to list specific examples of how a teacher candidate might demonstrate their capacity to enact the criteria associated with pedagogical judgment. To clarify further how a teacher educator or mentor teacher might notice pedagogical judgment in a candidate's work, we distinguished between two levels of pedagogical judgment: sophisticated and less sophisticated. The sophisticated label applied to instances in which the teacher candidate articulated a teacher move or insight that demonstrated ecological thinking. Importantly, this applied to descriptions of their lesson that reflected pedagogical judgment as well as reflections on their lesson that demonstrated pedagogical judgment. As such, descriptions of enacting ecological thinking in the classroom were equally valuable as recognizing what one *could* have done differently in reflecting on the lesson. Responses that did not incorporate the elements of pedagogical judgment–teaching or reflection–were deemed less sophisticated. These levels of pedagogical judgment were refined as we continued to revisit the data and re-evaluated how the rubric aligned with the representations of pedagogical judgment in those candidates' reflections. As we continued developing the rubric, we found it was easy to identify examples of data classified as "sophisticated" or "less sophisticated.". However, we also realized some of the candidates' work on the review assignment often did not fall neatly into the sophisticated and less sophisticated categories. For example, the candidates' analysis often offered a "mixed bag" of understandings that were difficult to put into just one of the two existing categories. In the last stage of rubric

Figure 2: Criteria for Sophisticated Pedagogical Judgment

	Sophisticated	**Semi-Sophisticated**	**Less Sophisticated**
Rich descriptions of students and how they participated in and responded to the lessons	Descriptions of the lesson provide specific descriptions of students learning. Recognizes that students demonstrate something that should have been accounted for by the teacher. Recognizes students' positive response to task as an element of pedagogy. Students are framed as active learners, capable of exploring ideas and figuring things out on their own Draws on the socio-cultural context of student learning and complexity (SES, race, gender, norms of the school, etc.) to describe students' response to the lesson.	A blend of both sophisticated and less sophisticated language about their students.	Descriptions of lessons provide vague or thin accounts of student responses. Descriptions of students' responses focus only on one particular pedagogical moment that fails to provide insight into students' responses to the lesson. Student responses are largely irrelevant in the teacher's analysis of the lesson. Students framed in monolithic terms.
Willingness and capacity for pedagogical problem solving	Recognizes their role in the failures of the lesson. Discusses ways *their* choices shaped the success or failure of the lesson. Describes changes made "on the fly" to respond to students.	A blend of both sophisticated and less sophisticated language about solving emergent pedagogical problems.	Students' deficits and/or interests are the primary barriers to learning. The teacher does not frame their own actions and decisions as the primary source to resolve problems in the lesson. A limited rationale for failure to factors outside of the teacher that constrained the learning.

development, then, we included a third category–semi-sophisticated–to classify the data that showed both sophisticated and less sophisticated characteristics.

The emergence of this third, semi-sophisticated category illuminates one of the underlying unanswered limitations of this research study. In this article, we did not cite examples of candidates' work that was sophisticated in one category and semi-sophisticated or less sophisticated in another category, though there were participants coded within those categorizations. There is the possibility that the candidates' performance on these review

assignments and the corresponding rubric is less about their capacity to make high quality, pedagogical decisions and more about their ability to write about the kinds of possible decisions they could have made in the classroom. Our team acknowledges that this research cannot account for the level of nuance between the participants' decisions and thoughts compared to their written descriptions of their decisions and thoughts. We deem the patterns that we did find among this cohort of candidates and their performance on this pedagogical judgment rubric noteworthy. Our research supports the advancement of clinically-based teacher education that is unendingly complex and could improve with stronger approaches to assessing what takes place among and within candidates as they learn to teach.

Findings

The research team analyzed 31 teacher candidates' assignments to assess the sophistication of responses based on the two markers of pedagogical judgment. Of the 31 social studies teacher candidates participating in the study, ten were rated less sophisticated, eight were rated semi-sophisticated, and thirteen were rated sophisticated.

Drawing on the characteristics of pedagogical judgment offered by Horn and Campbell (2015), sophisticated pedagogical judgment included both (a) rich descriptions of students and how they participated in and responded to the lessons *and* (b) a willingness and capacity for pedagogical problem-solving. To be assessed as sophisticated on the first criterion–rich descriptions of students–the candidates' responses needed to include explicit references to students' experiences, understandings, or perspectives. For example, one candidate who provided a "sophisticated" response offered this perspective on her lesson on the credibility of a media source: "Many students felt that if the information seemed correct, or had extensive information, it was credible even if there was no author or sources to be found." A reference like this one provided evidence that the teacher candidate provided specific descriptions of her students' attempts to grapple with the material. She also framed the learners as active participants who were trying to figure out credibility through the lesson.

This teacher candidate was also able to demonstrate sophisticated pedagogical judgment on the second criterion–a willingness to problem-solve their practice. For example, later in this response, the same teacher candidate explained, "We allowed credibility to take over the first day and lost the flow of asking the basic inquiry question. Although credibility is important, it should have been an element and not the point of one of the two days." By recognizing her role in the failures of the lesson and acknowledging a need to manage time better, she engaged in a sophisticated level of pedagogical problem-solving.

Teacher candidates were ranked as demonstrating semi-sophisticated pedagogical judgment if they either included (a) rich descriptions of students and how they participated in and responded to the lessons *or* (b) a willingness and capacity for pedagogical problem-solving. This type of response was demonstrated by one candidate who explained, "I find myself almost disappointed in the lack of seemingly 'heated' discussion, as this lesson lends itself to a very significant topic that is very easily made relatable and relevant to the world outside the classroom." The candidate neglected to provide a sufficient description to explain what the students in the class were or were not doing. It is also unclear how he assessed that they were not engaging in the kind of

discussion he had imagined. As such, it is also unknown if this candidate's use of discussion, which on the surface could be considered a "core practice" in that it would "extend inquiry into [students'] civic lives" (Cuenca, 2020, p. 7). Thus, the research team determined this candidate did not demonstrate the ability to offer rich descriptions of students.

Later, this candidate acknowledged that some of the lesson's failures were related to his inability to provide answers or leading questions during instruction by stating, "I found myself panicked or 'unrehearsed' in the answers that I received after asking questions." This indicates he acknowledged failures in the lesson were a result of his response to the unpredictable questions the students posed, which was an indicator of a willingness to problem-solve his practice. Overwhelmingly, the eight semi-sophisticated teacher candidates were willing to problem-solve, but they struggled to draw upon specific examples of student learning and/or the larger social, political context as potential rationales for making their proposed revisions.

The ten teacher candidates demonstrating less sophisticated pedagogical judgment did not use rich descriptions of students and student responses to support their analysis of the lesson. These candidates were also unable to acknowledge their own role in the lesson failures, and in turn, they were unable to engage in pedagogical problem-solving. For example, one teacher candidate explained that his challenge "was getting [the students] to move fast enough to allow them to do it by themselves." This description described the class in monolithic terms and fell short of acknowledging aspects of the lesson that needed revision to support student learning. The response demonstrates that, at least in terms of this assignment, the candidate could not move beyond the perceived student deficits to recognize instead how the students were making meaning and engaging with the lesson. Less sophisticated responses were, in general, characterized by an unwillingness of the teacher candidates to consider the reasons why the students in their classrooms did not respond as expected.

Evaluating and reevaluating these teacher candidates' analyses of their instruction allowed us to design a common tool for recognizing the kinds of pedagogical judgment we are working to help our candidates develop. In particular, this rubric allowed us to identify teacher candidates who were struggling to develop more sophisticated pedagogical judgment and consider ways to better assist them in recognizing student understandings and taking responsibility for their role in student learning.

Discussion

Our rubric is one attempt to address the third Tenet of the Central Proclamation within the Clinical Practice Commission's 2018 Report. By offering a way of "articulating both what accomplished [social studies teaching] practice is and how to measure it," we seek to contribute to the body of knowledge on creating meaningful clinically-based teacher education experiences (AACTE, 2018, p 14). This article describes our attempt to develop an assessment that identifies the presence of pedagogical judgment and reasoning. This rubric, which can be used in a variety of clinical experiences (e.g., developing a common language among teacher educators around candidate performance, offering common goals for teacher candidates between teacher educators and partnering mentor teachers, assessing field-based experiences differently than traditional on-campus coursework), is one example of an approach to promote more thoughtful clinical

experiences. It is a response to Grossman et al.'s (2009) call to "take clinical practice seriously" by adding to "our existing repertoire of pedagogies of reflection and investigation" this assessment of teacher candidates' analysis of their own teaching enactments (p. 274). We hope this rubric also inspires different kinds of "sustained inquiry about the clinical aspects of practice" while allowing other teacher educators to be better positioned to explore ways to develop "skilled practice" among their teacher candidates through their courses, field experiences, and programs (Grossman & McDonald, 2008, p. 189). Our development and dissemination of this rubric is one enactment of the second Tenet of the Pedagogy Proclamation in the AACTE Clinical Practice Commission's Report (2018) because our rubric, and thus, our teacher education "pedagogy is serving as a guidepost for shared professional standards of evidence-based practice in teaching that in turn guide the development of clinical practice" (p. 16).

We are working to continue to enhance our capacities to implement meaningful learning experiences for our teacher candidates and their students through clinical practice. We believe this rubric could be one way forward to more coherently provide our candidates with a systematic opportunity to develop their pedagogical judgment during their time in our teacher education program. During the spring of 2019, we used this pedagogical judgment rubric and its criteria explicitly with our teacher candidates in their initial field experience. We discussed pedagogical judgment with the next cohort of teacher candidates a semester earlier than the candidates who were the participants in this study. We revised the prompts (see Figure 1) for the candidates to purposefully reflect on their reasoning for their decisions when implementing tasks with secondary students in the field. We also used versions of the rubric and samples of teacher candidates' reflections as a teaching tool to bolster their ability to recognize pedagogical decision-making in their classmates so that they could, in turn, reflect upon and develop their own pedagogical judgment. The data generated in that second phase of this study indicated candidates were able to develop more sophisticated pedagogical judgment with intentional interventions into their capacities to describe students in robust ways while also drawing upon evidence of student learning to analyze and problem-solve their teaching practice.

Conclusion

As our teacher education program continues to invest the time and resources to create robust field experiences, we will continue to enact an inquiry stance (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009; Dana, 2013; Dana & Yendol-Hoppey, 2014) towards revising and redesigning the clinical components of our program. As such, we will also continue to unpack how our teacher candidates make sense of their practice within these clinical spaces and how they develop their ability to transfer high-leverage and core practices to their future classrooms with their students (Cuenca, 2020; Levine, 2006; Robinson, 2007). Teacher educators engaging in clinical practice must develop a better understanding of how to create and assess learning experiences that take full advantage of fieldwork. The extensive and supported opportunities to work with students provided in clinical experiences requires assessments that can better illuminate the nuances and subtleties present in teacher candidates' perceptions and understandings.

This pedagogical judgment rubric created one route for us to have a stronger sense of what is being accomplished in the field experiences. We are motivated to use this rubric and its future

iterations to better inform the learning in our clinical experiences. As teacher preparation requirements become more complex and rigorous, a rubric like this one offers an example for developing a method for collaboratively analyzing teacher candidate work in the field. It also demonstrates one approach for informing candidates about the goals for the thinking and decision-making they should demonstrate in their teacher preparation field experiences.

Our work also exemplifies one model for collaboratively developing the capacity to facilitate robust PDS and clinical experiences among more novice faculty, instructors, and mentor teachers. The PDSD partnership provides "the most proven vehicle for establishing and maintain[ing] environments in which [teacher candidates] can develop essential professional knowledge and skills" (Allen & Wright, 2014, p. 149). In focusing on the potential of clinical experiences, we echo the sentiments of Ghousseini (2015), who asserted that for teacher candidates to enact ambitious practices, "teacher educators must be mindful of the maxims that guide [their] work in practice and help them reassess, revise, and develop these maxims in ways that support student learning" (p. 355).

References

Allen, J.M., & Wright, S.E. (2014). Integrating theory and practice in the pre-service teacher education practicum. *Teachers and Teaching, 20*(2), 136-151.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE). (2018). *A pivot toward clinical practice, its lexicon, and the renewal of educator preparation: A report of the AACTE Clinical Practice Commission*. AACTE. https://aacte.org/programs-and-services/clinical-practice-commission/

Ball, D. L., & Forzani, F. M. (2009). The work of teaching and the challenge for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, (60)*, 497-511.

Brouwer, N., & Korthagen, F. (2005). Can teacher education make a difference? *American Educational Research Journal, 42*(1), 153-224.

Broyles, T. W., Epler, C. M., & Waknine, J. W. (2011). A case study examining the impact of cognitive load on reflection and pre-service teachers' transfer of specific teaching behaviors. *Career and Technical Education Research, 36*(1), 49-66.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (2009). *Inquiry as stance: Practitioner research for the next generation*. Teachers College Press.

Cuenca, A. (2020). Proposing core practices for social studies teacher education: A qualitative content analysis of inquiry-based lessons. *Journal of Teacher Education,* 1-16.

Dana, N. F. (2013). *Digging deeper into action research: A teacher inquirer's field guide.* Corwin Press.

Dana, N. F., & Yendol-Hoppey, D. (2014). *The reflective educator's guide to classroom research: Learning to teach and teaching to learn through practitioner inquiry, 3rd Edition.* Corwin Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). *Powerful teacher education: Lessons from exemplary programs.* Jossey-Bass.

Ericsson, K. A., Krampe, R.T., & Tesch-Romer, C. (1993). The role of deliberate practice in the acquisition of expert performance. *Psychological Review*, *100*(3), 363-406.

Ghousseini, H. (2015). Core practices and problems of practice in learning to lead classroom discussions. *Elementary School Journal*, *115*(3), 334–357.

Ghousseini, H. & Sleep, L. (2011). Making practice study able. *ZDM Mathematics Education, 43,* 147-160.

Grossman, P., Hammerness, K., & McDonald, M. (2009). Redefining teacher: Re-imagining teacher education. *Teachers and teaching: Theory and practice, 15*(2), 273-290.

Grossman, P. & McDonald, M. (2008). Back to the future: Directions for research in teaching and teacher education. *American Educational Research Journal, 45*(1)*,* 184-205.

Heath, M. (2017). The Cognitive Apprenticeship Model and backchanneling technology to support reflection in early clinical experiences: A new practice for field-based courses in the Professional Development Schools. *School-University Partnerships: The Journal of the National Association of Professional Development Schools, 10*(3), 16-29.

Horn, I. S. & Campbell, S. S. (2015). Developing pedagogical judgment in novice teachers: mediated field experience as a pedagogy for teacher education. *Pedagogies: An International Journal, 10*(2), 149-176.

Kazemi, E., Franke, M., & Lampert, M. (2009). Developing pedagogies in teacher education to support novice teachers' ability to enact ambitious instruction. In R. Hunter, B. Bicknell,

& T. Burgess (Eds.), *Crossing divides: Proceedings of the 32nd annual conference of the Mathematics   Education Research Group of Australasia* (Vol. 1, pp. 12-30). MERGA.

Lampert, M. (2010). Learning teaching in, from, and for practice: What do we mean? *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(1-2), 21-34.

Lampert, M., Franke, M. L., Kazemi, E., Ghousseini, H., Turrou, A. C., Beasley, H., Cunard, A., & Crowe, K. (2013). Keeping it complex: Using rehearsals to support novice teacher learning of ambitious teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 64*(3), 226-243.

Lampert, M., & Graziani, F. (2009). Instructional activities as a tool for teachers' and teacher educators' learning. *Elementary School Journal*, *109*(5), 491-509.

Levine, A. (2006). *Educating School Teachers*. The Education Schools Project.

Louden, W., & M. Rohl. (2006). Too many theories and not enough instruction: Perceptions of preservice teacher preparation for literacy teaching in Australian schools. *Literacy, 40*(2), 66–78.

Loughran, J. (2002). Effective reflective practice: In search of meaning in learning about teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(1), 33–43.

McDonald, M., Kazemi, E., & Kavanagh, S. S. (2013). Core practices and pedagogies of teacher education: A call for a common language and collective activity. *Journal of Teacher Education, 64*(5), 378–386.

McTighe, J. (2014). *Transfer goals*. https://jaymctighe.com/downloads/Long-term-Transfer-Goals.pdf

National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2010). *Transforming teacher education through clinical practice: A national strategy to prepare effective teachers*. A report of the Blue Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation and Partnership for Improved Student Learning. NCATE. http://www.highered.nysed.gov/pdf/NCATECR.pdf

Robinson, S. (2007). *Response to educating school teachers*. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Van Es, E. A., & Sherin, M. G. (2002). Learning to notice: Scaffolding new teachers' interpretations of classroom interactions. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education, 10*(4), 571-596.

Windschitl, M., Thompson, J., Braalen, M., & Stroupe, D. (2012). Proposing a core set of instructional practices and tools for teachers of science. *Science Education 96*(5), 878-903.

Author Biographies

Sonia Janis is a Clinical Associate Professor of Social Studies Education in the Mary Frances Early College of Education, where she teaches pre- and in-service social studies teachers. Her scholarship is in critical mixed race theory, curriculum in the U.S. South, and clinically-based teacher education. She has expertise in secondary social studies teaching, mentoring induction teachers, and designing curriculums that engage learners with counter-narratives.

Mardi Schmeichel is an Associate Professor in the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Teacher Education at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Her research focuses on the characteristics of rich clinical experiences for pre-service social studies teachers and the role of news media literacy in teacher education.

Joseph McAnulty is an Assistant Professor of Secondary Education in the Department of Teacher Education at Abilene Christian University. His work examines the ways a teacher's knowledge of and reactions to the political and social world shape and inform their classroom teaching.

Chantelle Grace is a doctoral candidate in the Mary Frances Early College of Education at the University of Georgia. Her work consists of designing and facilitating learning experiences that support preservice social studies teachers entering the field. Her research interests center around teacher preparation, critical inquiries, and design-based research.

Kaitlin Wegrzyn is a doctoral candidate in the Mary Frances Early College of Education at the University of Georgia. Her research focuses on social justice teacher education and Critical Whiteness Studies in elementary education.